WORKERS' ATTITUDES AND BOURGEOIS HEGEMONY

WORKERS' ATTITUDES AND BOURGEOIS HEGEMONY:

INVESTIGATIONS

OF THE

POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS OF CANADIAN WORKERS IN THE 1980S

By

TOM LANGFORD

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

June 1989

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1989)   McMASTER UNIVERSITY
(Sociology)   Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Workers' Attitudes and Bourgeois Hegemony:
           Investigations of the Political Consciousness of
           Canadian Workers in the 1980s

AUTHOR: Tom Langford, B.Sc. (University of Guelph)

                          M.A.   (University of Guelph)

SUPERVISOR: Professor W. Peter Archibald

NUMBER OF PAGES: ix, 551

ABSTRACT

Workers' Attitudes and Bourgeois Hegemony:
Investigations of the
Political Consciousness of Canadian Workers in the 1980s

The principal objectives of this thesis are to deepen our understanding of the character of working class consent to capitalist domination in contemporary Canada, and to assess the possibilities for the development of an alternative hegemonic movement.

The following four points are among the important findings of my research. (1) Canadian workers are generally to the Left of other classes on economic issues, and are far more libertarian on social issues than sociologists have commonly thought. (2) The social experiences which have an important influence on a wide range of workers' political attitudes are class background, manual or nonmanual work, age, education, and residency in Quebec. (3) Many members of the Hamilton local of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) did not continue to struggle in the weeks after the government legislated an end to their 1987 strike. They passively consented to management domination on the shopfloor and government domination of the negotiation process because they believed that nothing could be done to change the situation. In many cases these alienated workers' individual identities and priorities had taken precedence over their identification with the collective cause. This indicates that the mere presence of individual opportunities to do something else, even if they are not taken up, is often sufficient to deflect workers' dissatisfaction and build up a

certain amount of active consent to the status quo in Canadian society. (4) In 1987-88 the national leadership of CUPW attempted to organize a broad cross-section of groups around its vision of a "worker- and service-oriented postal system". My assessment of the problems which plagued this political campaign suggests that a labour union will only be able to carry through a counter-hegemonic project in Canada if it has a strong service record and has nurtured grassroots activism over an extended period.

PREFACE

In this study of the political consciousness of Canadian workers, I strive to appraise the character of working class consent to capitalist domination, develop an understanding of bourgeois hegemony in Canada, and identify some of the factors which are impediments to the construction of an alternative hegemony.

The major questions addressed in the thesis, and concepts such as working class consent, bourgeois hegemony and alternative hegemony which are utilized to frame the questions, can be identified as Gramscian in perspective. In his writings as a political prisoner in Italy from 1926-1935, the Italian communist leader Antonio Gramsci made major breakthroughs in analyzing the character of bourgeois class power in Western capitalist countries and outlining the strategy which was necessary to undermine that power. In my estimation a Gramscian perspective is a very useful vantage point for a study of Canadian workers' political consciousness in the 1980s. Its chief advantage is that it combines the pragmatic focus of the social researcher with the vision of the political organizer. Specifically, a Gramscian perspective orientates analysis towards the political and intellectual/ethical sources of stability in advanced capitalist societies, but also directs attention to the type of political organizing required to build an anti-capitalist movement among workers.

In undertaking this project I have expended considerable effort in simply gathering and/or analyzing data on workers' political

v

consciousness. My research consists of three interrelated investigations of Canadian workers' political consciousness which are reported in Parts One, Two and Three of the thesis. Part One contains studies which employ data from national sample surveys to examine the broad trends and key divisions in workers' political attitudes. Part Two identifies the typical ways that individual workers organize their attitudes towards labour unions. Part Three is a study of workers' political attitudes and actions during the 1987 strike by the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW). These three investigations are complementary in two different ways. First, each study approaches workers' political consciousness from a unique direction and, as a result, makes a distinctive contribution to our understanding of the subject. Second, the methodology and content of the studies is overlapping at different points. This allows me to make direct comparisons across research contexts; as a consequence, the validity of the research is enhanced.

CONTENTS

ix

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND PREVIEW

The
evidence
points to
the fact
that,
without
serious
qualifi-
cation,
wage
workers
under
mature
capital-
ism do
accept
the
system.

C. Wright
  Mills
  (1963:
    450)

Like single rocks from space hitting the moon
The fist of the Québécois in the next room
Thump ... Thump ... Thump ... Far into the night
                    -- I make no objection
The turbulence of his mind matches the turbulence of mine.

In the daytime he has visitors. Thru the wall
I can't make out much except his larynx grating again and
                                                      again
"C'est pa'd' juste ... C'est pa'd' juste!"*

The town's afflicted with workless wanderers.
Indian and White ... Native and foreign
They came in honesty, came with honor;
Came to labour: And there is none.

Late into the night I hear his fist. Late into the day
I hear his voice as if it was grinding rock.
"C'est pa'd' juste ... C'est pa'd' juste!"

Milton Acorn, "At Dawson Creek Hotel", 1969-71
(Acorn, 1972:18)

        * "This is not justice ..."

Can modern theory be in opposition to the "spontaneous"
feelings of the masses? ("Spontaneous" in the sense
that they are not the result of any systematic
educational activity on the part of an already conscious
leading group, but have been formed through everyday
experience illuminated by "common sense", i.e. by the
traditional popular conception of the world -- what is
unimaginatively called "instinct", although it too is in
fact a primitive and elementary historical acquisition.)
It cannot be in opposition to them. Between the two
there is a "quantitative" difference of degree, not one
of quality. A reciprocal "reduction" so to speak, a
passage from one to the other and vice versa, must be
possible.

        -- Antonio Gramsci, 1933-34 (Gramsci, 1971:198-199)

My objective in this thesis is to address an important gap in our knowledge of class power in contemporary Canada. The nature of this gap is captured in a comparison of the quote from C. Wright Mills and the poem by Milton Acorn. The generalization offered by Mills more than a quarter century ago is certainly still valid -- in some sense workers in mature capitalist countries do "accept the system". Yet, with its images of the Quebecois worker's thumping fist and grinding voice, Acorn's poem points to another dimension of workers' political consciousness -- workers see the unemployment and economic insecurities of working class life as grave injustices. Thus, while on the one hand most workers seem to accept the capitalist system, on the other hand their most deeply felt values and sense of morality seem to be firmly opposed to what the capitalist system often does to working people.

We are faced with an interesting puzzle. It seems reasonable to conclude that many workers in Canada both "accept" and "oppose" the capitalist system. It is curiosity about this puzzle, and its implications for our understanding of bourgeois class power, which propels my study.

My research consists of a series of studies of workers' political consciousness in Canada. The immediate goal of the research is to compile a fairly comprehensive description which highlights the main tendencies, broad trends and key divisions in working class political attitudes. Such research is necessary, it seems to me, because studies of workers' political consciousness over recent years have amounted to little more than a series of thumbnail sketches. At the same time, I am not content to simply describe. These studies lead

to a better understanding of the character of workers' acceptance of capitalist domination in Canada and, as a result, to a clearer picture of the contours of bourgeois class power.

My investigations also help us to better understand the distinctive, oppositional, aspects of workers' political consciousness. As Antonio Gramsci wrote in the passage quoted at the beginning of the chapter, workers' "everyday experience illuminated by 'common sense'" results in "spontaneous" class perspectives. Gramsci's view was that socialist political theory ("modern theory") must be congruent with workers' "spontaneous" political consciousness. He also argued that socialist politics must consist of a contestation of bourgeois hegemony with the aim of attracting support for an alternative hegemony. I interpret my research results in light of Gramsci's views. Specifically, my findings are interrogated to shed light on the objective impediments and strategic predicaments which confront attempts to build an alternative hegemony in contemporary Canada.

Four preliminary tasks are undertaken in this chapter. First, I sketch the economic, social and cultural context of working class experience in Canada in the postwar years. Without this context it would be impossible to adequately interpret the attitudinal data presented in succeeding chapters. Second, I define the main interpretive concepts employed in the thesis: capitalist class power, working class consent, bourgeois hegemony and alternative hegemony. These conceptualizations are based upon my own understanding of the prison writings of Antonio Gramsci (1971) and are supplemented by the more systematic analyses of social power and domination advanced by Max

Weber (1968) and Steven Lukes (1974, 1979). Third, I present an overview of the major characterizations of workers' political consciousness in advanced capitalist countries. These characterizations will serve as reference points for my interpretation of the actual political consciousness of Canadian workers. Fourth, I preview the thesis, briefly describing the analyses presented in the succeeding 10 chapters.

THE CONTEXT: WORKING CLASS EXPERIENCE IN CONTEMPORARY CANADA

There have been far-reaching economic, social and cultural changes in Canadian society in the postwar years. These changes have so transformed the character of working class life that in many ways the experiences of the contemporary working class are qualitatively different from the experiences of earlier generations of workers. My objective in this section is to examine the postwar trends in a variety of economic, social and cultural indicators. These statistics, although they capture none of the flavour of workers' actual lives, suggest the general contours of working class experience in Canada in the 1980s.

The first 30 years of this period were characterized by consistent economic growth, an unemployment rate that never rose above 7.1% and a phenomenal increase in the real income of Canadian families. The median family income of Canadians in 1951 was only $14,000 (1986 dollars). By 1976, however, it had risen 150% to $35,000 (see Table 1.1). Also important to workers' material well-being was the introduction or expansion of a number of social security programs in this period. As a consequence, a greater percentage of the national

wealth was directed into the social welfare. For instance, with the introduction of hospital insurance (Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act) in 1957 and medical insurance (Medical Care Act) in 1968, health expenditures on hospitals, physicians and dentists rose from 2.3% of the Gross National Product (GNP) in 1946 to 4.9% in 1971 (see Table 1.1). Furthermore, with the expansion of the unemployment insurance program in 1971, unemployment payments rose from 1.2% of the GNP in 1961 to 1.8% in 1976 even though the unemployment rate was the same in each year. It is important to note that despite the implementation of a number of important social security programs, federal government expenditures as a percentage of the GNP were relatively stable in the first three postwar decades, falling from a wartime-influenced high of 22.2% in 1946 to 16.0% in 1966 and rising again to 19.2% in 1976 (see Table 1.1). Therefore, contrary to popular perceptions the federal government did not mushroom in size over these years.

The long run of economic good times in Canada was broken around 1970 with the onset of combined high unemployment and high inflation. The economic crisis deepened in the early 1980s as the national unemployment rate climbed to an unprecedented postwar high of 11.9%. As a consequence of the economic crisis, the median real family income of Canadians was unchanged from 1976 to 1986 -- quite a contrast to the previous decade which had seen a 46% increase (see Table 1.1). Family income was constant in this period despite the fact that the labour participation rate of women rose from 61.1% to 65.7% between 1976 and 1986 (Canadian Social Trends, Summer 1987:32) and the incidence of multiple jobholding rose from about 2.5 per 100 workers in 1978 to 4 per

100 workers in 1988 (<u>Canadian Economic Observer</u>, August 1988:3.28).
Thus, it appears that some Canadian families were having to do <u>more</u> paid
work to maintain their standard of living. This situation is partially
attributable to the shrinking size of the higher wage manufacturing
sector and the growing size of the lower wage service sector. In 1976
manufacturing occupations, including material handling, accounted for
19% of all occupations (<u>Canada Year Book</u> 1978-79:363). By 1986 the
share of manufacturing jobs had declined to 16% (<u>Canada Year Book</u>
1988:5-22). In the same period service occupations increased from 12%
to 14% of all occupations.

The social welfare programs put in place in the first three
postwar decades shielded many Canadians from economic ruin during the
economic crisis. Thus, while there have been no major social security
initiatives in the past dozen years, the existing programs supplied a
measure of economic stability. As shown in Table 1.2, the distribution
of total income across all families and unattached individuals was
remarkably stable both before and during the economic downturn. Behind
this stability are two contradictory dynamics, however. First, as
described by Keith Banting (1987:331), there has been growing inequality
in income derived from the market economy. Second, government transfer
payments have largely neutralized this tendency towards income
inequality. Consequently, although social welfare programs have not
ushered in an era of progressive economic equality in Canada, they have

provided a modicum of economic security for millions of people adversely affected by the capitalist economic crisis.[1]

Two final economic notes should be made before proceeding to an analysis of social and cultural trends. First, federal government expenditures as a percentage of the GNP did not expand during the first few years of the economic crisis (see Table 1.1). Only with the onset of the record unemployment levels of the early 1980s did federal government expenditures make a marked jump. By 1985 they reached 24.5% of the GNP -- up considerably from the 18-19% range characteristic of the 1970s. Federal government expenditures as a percentage of the GNP declined somewhat in 1986 and 1987. Second, unlike the situation in the United States where union membership as a percentage of the non-agricultural paid workforce has been steadily declining since the mid-1950s (Huxley, Kettler and Struthers, 1986:118-119), union membership in Canada expanded up until the mid-1980s. In 1983 unionization in Canada reached its highest ever figure -- 40% of the non-agricultural paid

---

[1] It must also be remembered that the social welfare net in Canada allows many individuals to "fall through the cracks". Thus, charitable food banks are a feature of life in urban centres in the 1980s. A large part of the impetus for the food banks is the woeful inadequacy of government welfare assistance. This means that those unable to work in a paying job are forced to live very frugally, often in conditions bordering on abject poverty. The welfare system in Canada is set up to force able-bodied 'welfare bums' back into the labour market. The only problem with this logic is that the overwhelming majority of welfare recipients are unable to work -- they are single mothers looking after children, or disabled people, or elderly. In analyzing postwar economic trends I am not unaware of the plight of the poor in Canada. We live in a society which is far from egalitarian and, indeed, far from Sweden's "full employment" - "social citizenship" welfare state (Myles, 1988:98-99). My primary objective here, however, is to highlight the experience of the majority of the working class.

workforce.[2]   The relative numerical strength of the contemporary Canadian labour movement is largely due to the successful unionization of the growing number of public administration workers in recent decades.   Indeed, in 1985 public administration was the only economic sector where more than 60% of the workforce was unionized (Canadian Social Trends, Spring 1988:14); in contrast, less that 40% of manufacturing workers were unionized.   As a consequence, the three unions with the largest membership in Canada in 1986 were all public sector unions and the largest union in the country, the Canadian Union of Public Employees, had a membership (304,000) which was almost double that of the largest industrial union, the United Steelworkers of America (160,000) (Canada Year Book 1988:5-9). The Canadian labour movement has thus managed to expand its membership and financial base in the postwar years.   Nevertheless, the addition of tens of thousands of public administration workers to the ranks of unions has substantially changed the profile of the typical Canadian union member.

I also want to examine five social, cultural and political indicators.   In Table 1.3 the trend in full-time post-secondary education enrolment of 18-24 year olds is recorded. Between 1951 and 1971 the percentage of this cohort in full-time attendance at post-secondary institutions more than tripled, rising from 6.0% to 18.5%.   In the next decade growth in the post-secondary participation rate of this cohort largely stabilized.   However, in the 1980s it jumped ahead again,

---

[2] Since that time the unionization rate has declined slightly. In 1986, 37.7% of the non-agricultural paid workforce was unionized (Canada Year Book, 1988:5-24).

standing at 25.5% in 1986. Two comments can be made about this educational trend. First, it is important to note that three out of every four 18-24 year olds were not in full-time attendance at a post-secondary institution in 1986. Some of this group of non-attenders would have already finished a post-secondary degree or diploma, but many others would never have attended a post-secondary institution. Clearly many younger workers, like workers in earlier generations, do not have a post-secondary education. Second, the rapid expansion of post-secondary education in Canada in the 1960s, and the rapid rise in the participation rate of 18-24 year olds during the worst years of the economic crisis, mean that the working class is increasingly becoming differentiated by educational level. More and more workers have received university or college educations.

A rising standard of living and technological changes have dramatically transformed the way in which working class families live their lives. I have chosen two cultural indicators to illustrate this proposition. In 1946 there were only 14 registered passenger cars for every 100 Canadian adults (see Table 1.3). Obviously many working class families got by without a passenger car. In the next 30 years, however, the growth in registered passenger cars far outstripped the growth in population -- in 1976 there were 54 passenger cars for every 100 Canadian adults. It became a norm for Canadian families to own at least one car. As a result, postwar workers were much more mobile than prewar workers. They did not need to live close to where they worked, and they could be quite mobile in leisure pursuits.

Television broadcasting was initiated in Canada in 1952. By 1958 91% of the Canadian population was in the reception area of at least one television station (Statistics Canada Culture Statistics 1978:8-9), and by 1960 almost 80% of households had a television set (Report of the Task Force on Broadcasting Policy, 1986:83). Data on television viewing habits is available from 1969 to 1985. Canadians spend over 20 hours per week watching TV (see Table 1.3). A 1978 survey of leisure time activities found that regardless of the amount of leisure time available to an individual, he or she tended to spend between 25% and 30% of that time watching TV (Statistics Canada Culture Statistics 1978:19).[3] So accustomed have we become to watching TV that life without TV becomes hard to imagine. But before the 1950s television was not available to Canadians and, by necessity, leisure had to involve other pursuits. The television age has tended to decrease the diversity of cultural experiences. It seems likely that this has somewhat decreased the diversity in political attitudes among Canadians.

Another postwar social trend of some importance has been the rapid increase in non-European immigration. As recorded in Table 1.4, more than 90% of the 282,000 immigrants to Canada in 1957 had previously resided in a European country while a mere 2% had previously resided in Asia or Central America. Immigration from Europe has declined sharply in the past 30 years; in 1985 only 22% of the 84,000 immigrants to

---

[3] Another 1978 survey found that women (18 years of age and over) watched slightly more TV than men. Among respondents who worked 20 or more hours per week for pay, however, women and men watched an equal amount of television (Statistics Canada Culture Statistics 1978:18).

Canada had previously resided in Europe. In contrast, immigration from Third World countries, particularly from countries in Asia, has risen. In 1985 46% of the immigrants had previously resided in Asia and 13% had previously resided in Central America. The immigration patterns of recent years have thus resulted in the growth of a number of visible minority groups in Canada. Since most new immigrants choose to reside in large cities, this complicates divisions in the working class in urban centres: workers who were either born in Canada or who have been here for some time tend to have European ethnic origins and hold higher wage jobs; recent immigrants, often from Third World countries, are inevitably concentrated in low wage jobs.

Given the many economic, social and cultural changes in Canada in the postwar years, it is interesting to examine the extent to which Canadians' involvement in electoral politics shows any trend throughout this period.[4] Fourteen federal elections were held between 1945 and 1984. An average of 75% of the electorate voted in the elections, with the high point being 81% in 1958 and the low point being 68% in 1953. In the 1984 election 75% of the electorate voted. Overall, no trend in federal vote participation throughout this period is evident, although participation was the greatest in three successive elections in the late 1950s and early 1960s (Diefenbaker years). There is also no trend in voting participation in the thirteen postwar Ontario elections, although

---

[4] Data for federal elections is from Historical Statistics of Canada, second edition and various issues of the Canada Year Book. Data from Ontario elections comes from the Election Returns published by the Chief Elections Officer, Ontario with the exception of data for the 1987 Ontario election which was supplied by an official in the office of the Chief Elections Officer, Ontario.

voting participation in the late 1940s and early 1970s was higher than at other times. An average of 65% of the electorate voted in these elections, with the high point being 73% in 1971 and the low point being 58% in 1981. In the 1987 election 62% of those on the voting list took part.[5]

In closing this section one general point can be made. My analysis has revealed that social and cultural changes in postwar Canada do not mirror economic trends. Thus, while economic developments can easily be divided into two periods (1946 to the early-1970s, and the more recent economic downturn), not all social and cultural developments fit this periodization. For instance, both the participation rate of 18-24 year olds in postsecondary education and the voting participation of Canadians cannot be periodized in this way. Consequently, in interpreting the data on workers' political attitudes presented in this thesis, it will be important to keep in mind both the economic and noneconomic factors which have shaped working class experiences in recent decades.

KEY INTERPRETIVE CONCEPTS

Capitalist Class Power

Steven Lukes has noted that an asymmetric relation of power can be defined in three ways: as social control, as a relation of dependence, and as inequality (1979:636-638). In understanding the

---

[5] The percentages presented in this paragraph represent the percentage of enumerated individuals who cast a ballot. They overestimate actual voting participation since a number of those who have no interest in electoral politics are not enumerated.

character of class power in capitalist societies it seems important to highlight all three of these conceptual dimensions. I will begin by examining capitalist class power as social control. Workers often experience autocratic command relations while on the job and sometimes experience command relations in dealings with government bureaucrats or social service professionals. Thus, command relations -- the "power to command and duty to obey" which Weber identified as his narrow sense of domination (1968:943) -- are an important dimension of contemporary class relations. Lukes notes that the obedience of subordinates in relations of social control may be forced, due to superordinate manipulation, or voluntary (1979:636).

Unlike relations of social control, the other two dimensions of class power are not centred upon role interaction. I will first discuss capitalist class power as a relation of dependence. The dependence of workers on capitalists is most graphically seen when a company closes a factory or office, but it also operates through the normal course of employment. Workers enter into social relations in capitalist society which impose a definite logic on their action and thinking. For instance, while workers are formally free to quit their jobs at any time, in practice they are constrained from doing so because of the uncertainty they would face on the capitalist labour market. They usually conclude that they are further ahead to tolerate the devil (employer) they know rather than risk combat with the devil (another employer or unemployment) they don't know. In such a situation the interests of groups of workers become bound up with the interests of particular employers.

Class power can also be conceptualized as inequality. Inequality in resources enables the capitalist class to realize its own objective interests -- interests which are in opposition to the objective interests of other classes. Class power is exercised in this sense even when there is no manifest conflict between classes. It also involves limiting the shape of the political agenda as much as controlling decision-making processes (Lukes, 1974:25). A good example of class power as inequality involves bourgeois influence in the "marketplace of ideas" which has developed in advanced capitalist societies. It is the bourgeoisie, because of its superior resources, which can participate most effectively in this marketplace. As Benjamin Ginsberg notes, this has enabled "privileged strata ... to define the universe of political and social alternatives for the entire society" (1986:89).

It should be noted that these three dimensions of class power are hierarchically related. Command relations involve both inequality and dependence as well as interaction involving domination. And relations of dependence are grounded on inequality of resources. Obviously it would be possible to collapse the three dimensions into a single conceptualization of class power as class inequality. In this thesis, however, it seems useful to analytically separate the three dimensions since they enable us to identify the main mechanisms by which workers experience capitalist domination in contemporary Canada.

Working Class Consent to Capitalist Domination

In general terms, a power relationship between classes with conflicting interests can be exercised through one of two modes:

constraint[6] or influence (Lukes, 1974:32). A parallel dichotomous conceptualization, force/consent, is an important theme in Italian political thought (Femia, 1981:24) and is an essential element in Antonio Gramsci's writings on class power (e.g., 1971:57). Gramsci was aware that the dichotomy between force and consent was inadequate for describing the actual practices of class domination.[7] For instance, in his analysis of Italian history he mentioned that constraint may take a number of forms ranging from "disguised and indirect" to "outright police measures" (1971:61). He also drew the distinction between active and passive consent (1971:12). However, Gramsci never systematically discussed the forms of constraint or forms of consent. As Walter Adamson argues (1980:243), this failure constitutes one of the major shortcomings of Gramsci's political theory.

My interest here is to conceptually clarify the notion of working class consent. The first step toward doing so is to note that influence and consent do not refer to the same theoretical object. Influence is a process, a mode through which class power is exercised. Consent is a specific psychological product of that process -- the subordinate's attitude of acceptance of the relations of class power in

---

[6] Constraint is defined as "the threat or the use of force to prevent, restrict, or dictate the action or thought of others" (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language).

[7] I use domination in a more general sense than often employed by Gramsci. One of the conceptual couplets he used was domination / leadership (e.g., 1971:57) where domination is equivalent to class power exercised through the mode of constraint and leadership is equivalent to class power exercised through the mode of influence. When I use the concept domination, however, it means the practice of capitalist class power regardless of the degree of constraint or influence involved in that practice.

a society. Another related concept is conformity -- the subordinate's behaviour as a result of the processes of influence and constraint.

Max Weber's writings on domination and legitimacy can be used to specify the connections between influence, consent and conformity. In discussing obedience in command relations Weber noted that "the causal chain extending from the command to the actual fact of compliance can be quite varied.... In a concrete case the performance of the command may have been motivated by the ruled's own conviction of its propriety, or by his sense of duty, or by fear, or by 'dull' custom, or by a desire to obtain some benefit for himself" (1968:946-947). Weber's logic can be extended to a more general analysis of power relations between classes. Working class conformity as a consequence of processes of influence can involve a number of distinct states of mind, with the degree of consent associated with each state of mind being quite variable.

Some states of mind involve considerable consent to the domination of the capitalist class. Such active consent can be grounded on either philosophical belief or deference to the capitalist class. Gramsci highlighted the second type of active consent and argued that "this consent is 'historically' caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production" (1971:12).

It is also possible to identify working class conformity which is accompanied by the opposite of consent -- dissent. In such cases the processes of influence have been ineffectual and workers' conformity to bourgeois class power is strictly grounded upon constraint. In most cases it is merely the fear of sanctions, rather than sanctions

themselves, which coerces behavioural compliance from dissenting workers.

Working class conformity is also associated with three states of mind in which consent is either a minor element or equivocal. First, conformity can be grounded in a habituated acceptance of existing social relations. Marx wrote, "The advance of capitalist production develops a working-class, which by education, tradition, habit, looks upon the condition of that mode of production as self-evident laws of Nature.... The dull compulsion of economic relations completes the subjection of the labourer to the capitalist" (1954:689). This economic basis for working class compliance has been emphasized by Anderson (1976-77:41N78) and Abercrombie, Hill and Turner (1980:158-169), among others, and Weber seems to have had Marx's phrase in mind when he wrote of "'dull' custom" in the passage quoted above. It is also important to note that political practices in contemporary capitalist societies have become highly routinized in recent decades. To the extent that the mere exercise of these political practices -- elections, freedom of the press, etc. -- is successfully equated with popular control over bourgeois class power, then these political practices habitually engender working class conformity. It seems to me, however, that routine working class conformity involves at least a vague sense of consent to bourgeois class power. Workers are not simply hypnotized by routine. They live routine social relations, and at some level (if only at a practical and not a discursive level) they are conscious of the structure of those social relations. Their consent can therefore be seen as passive and partial.

Second, working class conformity can be grounded in calculations of economic self-interest. Compliance of this type would seem to fit the situation of relative material prosperity which many members of the working class have experienced in postwar Canada. To put it crudely, compliance is purchased (Femia, 1981:233). Associated with purchased compliance is a passive and highly conditional form of consent -- bourgeois class power is accepted insofar as it materially benefits the worker.

Third, working class conformity can be based on the view that no alternative to the existing organization of society is feasible. In such a case consent is equivocal -- shortcomings of bourgeois domination are acknowledged, but the possibility of transcending those shortcomings is dismissed. Consent amounts to acquiescence where reservations are set aside because of the belief that it is impossible to achieve something better.

It is important to note that working class consent to capitalist domination can usefully be analyzed in three distinctive settings. The first is the workplace -- the setting where workers are dominated by supervisors enforcing capitalist priorities and logic in the labour process. The second is the state -- the setting where the capitalist class dominates the general scope of political debate and decision-making. The third is civil society -- those social settings which are at least partially autonomous from the workplace and state (Gramsci, 1971:208).

In summary, two general points need to be kept in mind when investigating working class consent to capitalist domination. First,

conformity by workers is generated by a variety of processes, and these processes involve different forms of consent. Three broad categories of consent can be identified: active consent, passive consent and absence of consent (dissent). The passive consent category is particularly complex because it can involve a vague and partial consent, a specific but conditional consent or an equivocal consent. Second, although consent is the most important element of the states of mind associated with some types of conformity, this is not the case with other types of conformity. Consequently, in order to understand the political consciousness of conforming workers it is necessary to examine their overall state of mind in relation to the social order, not merely their consent to bourgeois class power. For instance, passive consent can be mixed with indifference, a calculating instrumentality or acquiescent powerlessness. It is important to make these distinctions since they help us to understand the processes generating conformity, and the probable stability of that conformity over time.

Bourgeois Hegemony

In his writings as a political prisoner in Italy from 1926-1935, Antonio Gramsci reflected upon the character of bourgeois class power in Western capitalist countries and the strategy which was necessary to undermine that power. It is almost universally agreed that Gramsci's political theory is highly original and represents a critique of many elements of early 20th century Marxist orthodoxy. Most importantly, he rejected economic determinist views of social development and instead proposed a framework for analysis and action in which political and intellectual/ethical practices are accorded considerable importance

alongside economic factors. Specifically, Gramsci maintained that the consent of subordinated classes was an integral element of bourgeois domination in advanced capitalist countries and must be undermined as a prelude to successful revolutionary action.

Gramsci's key concept is hegemony. Hegemony is commonly defined as a relationship of political predominance among states. Using this common definition we can speak of American hegemony in Central America or Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe. Gramsci's definition of hegemony is different from the common definition in two ways. First, he used it to interpret power relations between social classes rather than states (Williams, 1983:145). And second, unlike the common definition which sees both force and leadership by a state as constituting hegemony,[8] Gramsci presents hegemony as a mode of class power involving leadership or influence.[9]

What does this class leadership involve? Depending upon each one's answer to this question, commentators have come up with sharply different interpretations of Gramsci's notion of hegemony.

---

[8] Here are two dictionary definitions of hegemony:
(1) Websters Third New International: preponderant influence of authority (as of a government or state): leadership, dominance;
(2) Funk and Wagnalls Standard College: domination or leadership; especially the predominant influence of one state over others.

[9] This is not the only use of the concept hegemony in Gramsci's writing, but it is the dominant one (see Anderson, 1976/77:7-44). Furthermore, I believe this is the conception which is of most utility in contemporary social analyses. It is my view that the analysis of power in advanced capitalist societies must start with a consideration of the extraordinary degree of consent to capitalist domination among subordinated classes. I do not mean to suggest that the bourgeoisie's monopoly of the means of repression should be ignored. Nor do I think that coercion is an unimportant mode of class power in contemporary Canada. However, I do think we need to emphasize influence and consent.

One school of interpretation sees hegemony as being synonymous with the spread of ruling class ideology -- it is an ideological hegemony. In this vein Femia describes Gramsci's notion of hegemony as the "ideological ascendancy" or "ideological superiority" of the dominant class (1981:3,24). Boggs maintains, "By hegemony Gramsci meant the permeation throughout civil society -- including a whole range of structures and activities like trade unions, schools, the churches, and the family -- of an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs, morality etc. that is in one way or another supportive of the established order and the class interests that dominate it" (1976:39). And Bocock argues, "I think that for Gramsci hegemonic leadership fundamentally involved producing a world-view, a philosophy and moral outlook, which other subordinate and allied classes, and groups, in a society accepted" (1986:46).

A second school of interpretation sees Gramsci's notion of hegemony as a strategy of alliance building through which a dominant class develops political consent for its domination -- it is a political hegemony. Along this line Showstack Sassoon argues that hegemony "has to do with the way one social group influences other groups, making certain compromises with them in order to gain their consent for its leadership in society as a whole" (1982:12). Buci-Glucksmann offers the clearest statement of this approach: "Hegemony is reducible neither to ideology, nor to the approach of different modes of socialization. It is primarily a political principle and a form of political leadership, that is, a guide to political action, enabling the reformulation of the

question of <u>socialist</u> transformation in the West" (1982:118; emphasis in original).

A third school of interpretation sees Gramsci's notion of hegemony as a situation in which the political leadership of a dominant class sustains, and in turn is sustained by, that class's intellectual and ethical leadership -- it is a political/moral hegemony. Bob Jessop presents a good account of this interpretation:[10]

> <u>Hegemony</u> involves the successful mobilisation and reproduction of the 'active consent' of dominated groups by the ruling class through their exercise of intellectual, moral, and political leadership. This should not be understood in terms of mere indoctrination or false consciousness.... For the maintenance of hegemony involves taking systematic account of popular interests and demands, shifting position and making compromises on secondary issues to maintain support and alliances in an inherently unstable and fragile system of political relations.... Moreover, in addition to this element of political leadership in Gramsci's analysis of bourgeois hegemony ... Gramsci also stresses the element of intellectual and moral leadership involved in the constitution and reproduction of a collective will, a 'national-popular' outlook, a common world-view which is adequate to the needs of social and economic reproduction" (1982:148)

From my own study of Gramsci's writings (1971, 1977, 1978), it appears that the interpretation of hegemony offered by Bob Jessop is most accurate. Gramsci emphasized that both state organizations and associations in civil society make up "the massive structures of the modern democracies" (1971:243). Furthermore, at different points he discussed bourgeois hegemony as either political hegemony or civil hegemony (see Anderson, 1976/77:44). It thus seems reasonable to

---

[10] Hall (1980) also discusses Gramsci's notion of hegemony along this same line.

conclude that Gramsci saw bourgeois hegemony in advanced capitalist countries as being constructed in both political society and civil society. I also believe that Jessop's interpretation is particularly astute in its recognition that hegemony involves much more than ideological indoctrination. Finally, my one argument with Jessop's interpretation is that it fails to emphasize the importance which passive consent can play in the constitution of hegemony.

I have developed a conception of bourgeois hegemony which is grounded on Gramsci's prison writings but which is also informed by contemporary Gramscian scholarship. Bourgeois hegemony is a concept which assists us in interpreting the distinctive mode of capitalist class power in countries like Canada. It represents a general form of class influence which is characterized by the consent of subordinated classes, and which depends upon the continued generation of consent. In a sentence, bourgeois hegemony can be defined as broad public consent to the fundamentally pro-capitalist direction of social life. However, an understanding of bourgeois hegemony must also include the following points:

1. Consent is constructed, and capitalist class power is extended over time, through two complementary elements: political leadership in the sense of fashioning compromises with subordinate classes, and intellectual/ethical leadership.

1.1 Of the two elements of class leadership, political leadership is primary because it forms the basis upon which intellectual/ethical leadership develops. The political leadership of the bourgeoisie is practiced through the state. In Gramsci's words:

> The dominant group is coordinated concretely with the general interests of the subordinate groups, and the life of the State is conceived of as a continuous process of formation and superseding of unstable equilibria (on the juridical plane) between the interests of the fundamental group and those of the subordinate groups -- equilibria in which the interests of the dominant group prevail, but only up to a certain point (1971:182).

1.2 The most developed form of bourgeois hegemony occurs when the bourgeoisie succeed in "bringing about not only a unison of economic and political aims, but also intellectual and moral unity, posing all the questions around which the struggle rages not on a corporate but on a 'universal' plane" (Gramsci, 1971:182).

2. Bourgeois hegemony is a process, not a static condition. It is continually remade due to the impetus of changing social and economic conditions, and as a result of the shifting resources and strategic actions of class and non-class political organizations.

2.1 Both the political leadership and intellectual/moral leadership of the bourgeoisie can be contested.

3. Bourgeois hegemony can involve either the active or passive consent of workers. Passive consent involves some acceptance of the institutions of capitalist power without extensive normative commitment. Active consent involves some degree of intellectual/ethical commitment to dominant values or institutions.

4. Bourgeois hegemony varies in its degree of development over time and across societies. In general terms, the historical forms of hegemony can be analyzed in relation to three ideal types suggested by Joseph Femia: (1) integral hegemony, where a "society would exhibit a substantial degree of 'moral and intellectual unity'" (1981:46);

(2) <u>decadent hegemony</u>, where "cultural and political integration is fragile" (1981:47); and

(3) <u>minimal hegemony</u>, where, although elites from different classes are intellectually/morally united, the masses exhibit only passive consent to the domination of the bourgeoisie (1981:47).

My conception of bourgeois hegemony raises an important question. What is the relationship between hegemony and force in the constitution of capitalist class power in advanced capitalist countries?

Perry Anderson criticizes Gramsci for failing to locate "definitely or precisely the position or the interconnection of repression and ideology within the power structure of advanced capitalism" (1976-77:45). He further argues that Gramsci underestimated "the specificity and stability of the repressive machinery of army and police, and its functional relationship to the representative machinery of suffrage and parliament, within the Western State" (1976-77:52). The consequence of these theoretical shortcomings, in Anderson's estimation, is that much of Gramsci's work allows "the conclusion that bourgeois class power was primarily consensual" (1976-77:45). This is an unpalatable conclusion for Anderson who proposes that "<u>the normal structure of capitalist political power in bourgeois-democratic states</u> is in effect simultaneously and indivisibly <u>dominated by culture and determined by coercion</u>" (1976-77:42; emphasis in original). As a result, "in any final contest, the armed apparatus of repression inexorably displaces the ideological apparatuses of parliamentary representation to re-occupy the dominant position in the structure of capitalist class power" (1976-77:76).

In my judgement Anderson's perspective on the relationship between force and hegemony is flawed because it is mechanistic and unhistorical. It is undoubtedly the case, as Anderson argues, that the enormous power of the contemporary capitalist state rests on two pillars: (1) advanced technology which greatly enhances the means of repression in the hands of the state; (2) widespread consent for the activities of the state (1976-77:55). But how are we to see the relationship between these two factors? Anderson's vision is a rework of the old velvet glove / iron fist analogy. The distinctiveness of the contemporary capitalist state is simply that both the velvet and iron are of extremely high quality. Yet at a fundamental level, according to Anderson, the basis of bourgeois class power is still the same as it always has been -- command of the means of repression. His mechanistic understanding is conveyed by his choice of this explanatory model: "Capitalist power can in this sense be regarded as a topological system with a 'mobile' centre: in any crisis, an objective redeployment occurs, and capital reconcentrates from its representative into its repressive apparatuses" (1976-77:44).

Perry Anderson's view of the character of class domination in contemporary capitalism fails to fully appreciate the dialectical relationship between constraint and hegemony. Surely the development of bourgeois hegemony in recent decades puts limits on the capitalist state's ability to use repressive means, quite aside from the fact that the means of repression are so much more sophisticated. The extent to which this process has taken place in different countries is a matter for concrete investigation. Such an analysis can only proceed when we

abandon the mechanical and unhistorical view of capitalist class power suggested by Anderson.

In my estimation the emphasis on the consensual basis of class power found in Gramsci's writing is not at all an impediment to contemporary analyses of capitalist domination. Gramsci did not ignore constraint as a mode of class power. However, he broke with the orthodox Marxist assumption that processes of class influence were superficial in character and would become unimportant when the conflict between classes 'inevitably' sharpened. Anderson's perspective, unfortunately, is a partial reversion to this earlier dogma.

Alternative Hegemony

The idea of proletarian hegemony among subordinated classes was not original to Gramsci. In an unfinished essay drafted in 1926, Gramsci wrote:

> The Turin communists posed concretely the question of the "hegemony of the proletariat": i.e. of the social basis of the proletarian dictatorship and the workers' State. The proletariat can become the leading and the dominant class to the extent that it succeeds in creating a system of class alliances which allows it to mobilize the majority of the working population against capitalism and the bourgeois state. In Italy, in the real class relations which exist there, this means to the extent that it succeeds in gaining the consent of the broad peasant masses (1978:443).

This passage, with its employment of the idea of peasant consent to working class hegemony, is interpreted as being derivative of Lenin's political thinking (e.g., Laclau and Mouffe, 1985:66; Adamson, 1980:171). Gramsci had neither yet clearly distinguished the two modes of class power -- constraint and influence -- nor yet emphasized the importance of the intellectual/ethical element of hegemonic leadership.

Gramsci's notion of proletarian hegemony underwent considerable refinement during his years in prison. According to Gramsci, an alternative hegemony is built when a leading opposition group in capitalist society is able to unite the economic and political aims of a range of subordinate groups and supply an anti-capitalist vision which intellectually and ethically unites the opposition (1971:181). Some of the general characteristics of an alternative hegemony are the same as those of a bourgeois hegemony: an alternative hegemony involves two complementary elements of leadership; it is a process and can be contested; and, it is variable in its degree of development over time and across societies. At the same time, two important differences must be emphasized.

First, while bourgeois hegemony is a mode of asymmetric class power, an alternative hegemony is not. Consequently, active consent would seem to be a prerequisite for the construction of an alternative hegemony whereas passive consent is a common feature of a bourgeois hegemony. This situation results from the fact that the inequality of resources between the bourgeoisie and subordinate classes tends to "spontaneously" generate passive consent for the pro-capitalist direction of society. In contrast, subordinate classes and groups have resources of similar magnitude and are certainly not linked by relations of social control or dependence.

The second important difference follows from the first. If active consent is a prerequisite for the construction of an alternative hegemony, then the intellectual/ethical element of leadership should play a large role in the construction of an alternative hegemony. By

contrast, in the case of bourgeois hegemony the intellectual/ethical element may or may not be a crucial element of leadership (as the distinction between integral, decadent and minimal hegemony suggests).

Indeed, Gramsci's prison writings point towards the importance of intellectual activity in building an alternative hegemony. He stated that an opposition force can only demonstrate the historical legitimacy of its program "in a series of ideological, religious, philosophical, political, and juridical polemics, whose concreteness can be estimated by the extent to which they are convincing, and shift the previously existing disposition of social forces" (1971:178). Gramsci also argued that the task of the Communist Party as organizer of an alternative hegemony is to be "the proclaimer and organiser of an intellectual and moral reform, which also means creating the terrain for a subsequent development of the national-popular collective will toward the realisation of a superior, total form of modern civilisation" (1971:132-133). Therefore, because of the central role of intellectual/ethical leadership in building an alternative hegemony, such a hegemony is seen as the precursor of an alternative society.

At the same time, it is important to emphasize that Gramsci did not believe that the antagonistic interests of the bourgeoisie and the working class could be resolved through the construction of an alternative hegemony. He wrote, "A social group dominates antagonistic groups, which it tends to 'liquidate', or to subjugate perhaps even by armed force; it leads kindred and allied groups" (1971:57). This comment suggests that the working class and its allies must be prepared to employ defensive, constraining measures against a bourgeoisie which

is desperate to maintain its class domination. Such measures may be necessary when the political struggle reaches the point where the influence of an alternative hegemony is much greater than the influence of a decadent bourgeois hegemony, and the representatives of subordinate classes are about to be, or already have been, elected to govern.

BROAD CHARACTERIZATIONS OF WORKERS' POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Over the past three decades, social researchers have presented a number of distinctive portraits of the typical postwar worker. In Britain, Canada and the United States the starting point for most analyses has been the non-radical posture of the majority of workers. In reviewing this body of research and theory I have developed a simple typology to distinguish four main types of non-radical workers. My analysis can be faulted for glossing over many complexities in this impressive literature. Indeed, it overlooks some of the insights contained in my own discussion of the forms of passive working class consent to capitalist domination. Yet the typology has the virtue of providing a simplified overview of types which can be used to orient the analyses developed throughout the thesis.

As depicted in Figure 1.1, there are two dimensions in the typology. The first concerns the individual worker's consent to capitalist domination -- it can be active or passive. The second concerns the individual worker's material circumstances -- such circumstances can be favourable or unfavourable. The choice of these classification dimensions was quite straightforward -- one or both figure in most explanations of postwar working class conservatism.

Figure 1.1   Characteristic Types of Workers' Non-Radical
Political Consciousness

| | | Material Circumstances | |
		Favourable	Unfavourable
Consent to Capitalist Domination	Active	Embourgeoised	False Consciousness
	Passive	Privatized	Alienated

The upper left cell in Figure 1.1 consists of workers who actively consent to capitalist domination and who enjoy favourable material circumstances. These are embourgeoised workers. Their lifestyle is comfortable and their outlooks are pro-capitalist.

The upper right cell consists of workers who actively consent to capitalist domination but who experience material circumstances which are unfavourable. These are workers with a false consciousness -- false in the sense that it is inconsistent with their own lived experience in capitalist society. In some instances workers with a false consciousness have simply internalized a prestige hierarchy which values the wealth of capitalists and regards their own lowly station as deserved. In other instances the false consciousness may be an expression of an individualist admiration of the wealthy rather than deference. As Richard Tawney explains, "Capitalism is maintained, not only by capitalists, but by those who ... would be capitalists if they could, and ... the injustices survive, not merely because the rich

exploit the poor, but because in their heart, too many of the poor admire the rich" (1964:41-42).

The lower left cell in Figure 1.1 is comprised of workers who experience favourable material circumstances but who exhibit only passive consent for capitalist domination. Privatized workers are highly instrumental in orientation and are largely indifferent to political issues except when their own material comfort is threatened.

The lower right cell is made up of workers who accept the unfavourable aspects of their everyday lives as a normal state of affairs. Their alienation stems from the objective powerlessness of the working class in capitalist society, and is characterized by political disinterest and an absence of critical reflection on the character of society.

It is also useful to develop a classification for the characteristic forms of workers' radical political consciousness. I proceed by suggesting a modified version of Lenin's distinction between trade union consciousness and socialist consciousness (e.g., 1973). E.J. Hobsbawm has explained that trade union consciousness is concerned with the immediate, practical improvement of workers' lives in capitalist society (1971:14-15). These improvements can be seen to involve three basic demands: (1) increasing workers' control over the immediate work process, the organization of the workplace and the strategic direction of the employing firm; (2) reducing economic inequality; and (3) enhancing workers' economic security. To the extent that workers support these demands they can be viewed as possessing a practical socialist consciousness.

A conscious socialist consciousness is a development of a practical socialist consciousness. The same immediate demands are supported. However, in addition there is a recognition that private ownership of capital presents a fundamental impediment to the realization of the demands. Therefore, the practical desire to improve the lot of workers is linked to a critique of the capitalist system. Conscious socialists support public ownership of monopoly capitalist firms and the introduction of institutions which enable and encourage democratic participation in decision-making, both in the workplace and in other areas of society.

It is important to note that workers possessing a practical socialist consciousness do <u>not</u> consciously dissent from capitalist domination. Indeed, they combine practical socialist perspectives with active or passive consent to capitalist domination. In other words, while their practical beliefs are socialist in content, their abstract beliefs about the capitalist system are either vague and inconsistent (when consent is passive) or definitely pro-capitalist in orientation (when consent is active). In the latter case, where abstract beliefs are clearly formed, the mix of political perspectives has been called a dual consciousness (sometimes termed a fragmented or contradictory consciousness). Gramsci (1971), Parkin (1971) and Mann (1973) are among those who have pointed to the importance of this type of worker. Gramsci (1971:326-327) wrote:

> The co-existence of two conceptions of the world ... is not simply a product of self-deception.... [It is] the expression of profounder contrasts of a social historical order. It signifies that the social group may indeed have its own conception of the world, even if

> only embryonic.... But this same group has, for reasons
> of submission and intellectual subordination, adopted a
> conception which is not its own but is borrowed from
> another group; and it affirms this conception verbally
> and believes itself to be following it, because this is
> the conception which it follows in "normal times" --
> that is when its conduct is not independent and
> autonomous, but submissive and subordinate.

Gramsci makes two important points in this passage. First, a dual consciousness is consistent with a worker's normal experience of economic, political and intellectual domination in capitalist society. Second, the basis for the development of a distinctive working class perspective (conscious socialist consciousness) is independent and autonomous action on the part of workers.

PREVIEW

The research reported in this thesis is presented in three Parts. Part One, made up of Chapters 2 through 4, contains studies which employ data from national sample surveys to examine the broad trends and key divisions in workers' political attitudes. The results of these studies suggest issues which deserve more careful scrutiny, and supply the national perspective on workers' political consciousness which is missing in Parts Two and Three.

Chapter 5 is the only chapter in Part Two. It reports results from an original survey undertaken in Hamilton, Ontario in 1987 which aimed to determine the typical ways that individual workers organize their attitudes towards labour unions. In this study I employ a seldom used survey method (the Q sort) and method of data analysis (Q factor

analysis) to gain a perspective on workers' political consciousness which could not be obtained from secondary analyses of national surveys.

Part Three, made up of Chapters 6 through 10, is a study of workers' political consciousness and action during the 1987 strike by the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW). Attitudinal data were gathered from a sample of union members and a sample of strikebreakers in Hamilton, Ontario. These data were supplemented by field observations made during the strike, conversations with union activists, observation of some of the debate during CUPW's Special National Convention in February, 1988 and a study of union documents and news stories relating to the strike.

The studies in the three Parts complement each other methodologically. In Part One I analyze data which are strong in external validity (representativeness). In Parts Two and Three I analyze data which are somewhat stronger in construct validity and internal validity (validity of identified causal relationships) but which are deficient in external validity. My methodological intention in undertaking these different studies is to develop a set of conclusions which are both internally and externally valid.

There are also important substantive reasons for undertaking the studies found in Parts Two and Three. Labour unions are the most visible working class institution in our society. Virtually every adult Canadian has some strong convictions about labour unions, and the role of unions is a regular subject of commentary in the mainstream media. A detailed study of attitudes towards unions thus promises to shed light on a crucial element of workers' political consciousness. I chose to

use Q methodology in the study found in Part Two because it facilitates the investigation of attitude salience and intraindividual attitude structure.

Unlike some students of workers' political consciousness (e.g., Marshall, 1983 and Ollman, 1987), I hold the position that attitudinal data from cross-sectional surveys can be of considerable utility to research efforts. At the same time, it is undoubtedly true that crucial, and unique, insights into workers' political consciousness can be obtained while studying workers' involvement in an intergroup conflict such as a strike. In particular, a strike affords an opportunity to study the relationships between political attitudes and actions, and to assess the impact of strike participation on political consciousness. It thus allows for a dynamic treatment of political consciousness -- a welcome complement to the static treatments characteristic of cross-sectional surveys.

In late 1986, when first formulating a research plan, I decided to look for a strike which involved strikebreakers, because of the high levels of conflict and worker involvement in such disputes. In the spring of 1987 I became aware of Canada Post's intention to employ strikebreakers in the event of a strike by the Letter Carriers Union of Canada (LCUC) or the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) later that year. From media reports on contract negotiations it also seemed likely that there would be one or more strikes in the Post Office in 1987. Consequently, I decided to make preparations to study one of the possible postal strikes rather than some other strike. My decision was motivated by two factors in addition to the anticipated high levels of

conflict and worker involvement. First, the major issues in the 1987 negotiations -- namely, privatization of public services and job security -- were of national significance. This made the situation in the Post Office of considerable interest to me, and I suspected that it would make my research of considerable interest to potential readers. Second, I was aware of the militant record of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (seven national strikes between 1965 and 1981), and was eager to study the political consciousness of the members of this atypically militant union should a strike by CUPW indeed occur. Often research on exceptional groups yields insights which cannot be gained from research on average groups. I believed that a case study of a group of inside postal workers on strike would complement the survey data from broad cross-sections of the working class analyzed in Parts One and Two.

To provide continuity to the thesis I have written short introductions to each Part. Furthermore, the reader will note that common conceptual and operational definitions are employed in different Parts, and that my discussions of results often compare the findings of a chapter to the findings of one or more of the preceding chapters. Finally, a measure of integration is imparted to the thesis by occasional assessments of the major questions identified in this chapter -- the extent of working class consent to capitalist domination, the character of bourgeois hegemony in Canada, and the prospects for building an alternative hegemony in Canadian society. At the same time, it must be realized that in some ways the three Parts, and even different chapters within Parts One and Three, stand on their own. This

reflects the fact that I have attempted to develop a more comprehensive understanding of workers' political consciousness in Canada by coming at this theoretical object from different research directions. I summarize the results of my studies and offer theoretical, methodological and political conclusions in the final chapter of the thesis, Chapter 11.

Table 1.1: Selected Economic Indicators, Postwar Years

	Median Family Income (constant 1986 $)	Health Expenditures (Hospitals, Physicians, Dentists) as percentage of GNP	Unemploy- ment Rate (percent)	Unemploy- ment Pay- ments as percentage of GNP	Federal Government Expenditures as percentage of GNP
1946		2.3	3.4	0.4	22.2
1951	14,000	2.4	2.4	0.4	17.4
1956	18,000[a]	2.7	3.4	0.7	16.3
1961	20,000	3.6	7.1	1.2	18.0
1966	24,000[b]	3.9	3.4	0.5	16.0
1971	29,000	4.9	6.2	0.9	18.0
1976	35,000	4.9	7.1	1.8	19.2
1977	36,000	4.8	8.1	1.9	19.6
1978	36,000	4.7	8.3	1.9	19.8
1979	36,000	4.6	7.4	1.5	19.2
1980	37,000	4.7	7.5	1.5	19.2
1981	36,000	4.8	7.5	1.4	20.0
1982	35,000	5.4	11.0	2.4	22.0
1983	34,000	5.5	11.9	2.6	23.5
1984	34,000	5.3	11.3	2.3	23.6
1985	35,000	5.2	10.5	2.2	24.5
1986	35,000		9.6		23.2
1987			8.9		22.6
1988			7.6[c]		

[a] 1957   [b] 1967   [c] December, 1988

Sources: Canada Year Books, various years
Historical Statistics of Canada, second edition
Statistics Canada catalogue 13-208, Family Incomes
Statistics Canada catalogue 13-001, National Income and
Expenditure Accounts
Statistics Canada, Canadian Economic Observer
Statistics Canada, Canadian Social Trends
Canada, Department of Finance, Quarterly Economic Review

Table 1.2:   Distribution of Total Income of Families and Unattached
             Individuals, by Quintiles, 1965-1987 (percentages)

	Lowest Quintile	Second Quintile	Middle Quintile	Fourth Quintile	Highest Quintile
1965	4.4	11.8	18.0	24.5	41.4
1967	4.2	11.4	17.8	24.6	42.0
1969	4.3	11.0	17.6	24.5	42.6
1971	3.6	10.6	17.6	24.9	43.3
1973	3.9	10.7	17.6	25.1	42.7
1975	4.0	10.6	17.6	25.1	42.6
1977	3.8	10.7	17.9	25.6	42.0
1979	4.2	10.6	17.6	25.3	42.3
1981	4.6	10.9	17.6	25.2	41.8
1983	4.4	10.3	17.1	25.0	43.2
1985	4.7	10.4	17.0	25.0	43.0
1986	4.7	10.4	17.0	24.9	43.0
1987	4.7	10.4	16.9	24.8	43.2

Sources: Canada Year Books, various years
            Statistics Canada, catalogue 13-207, Income Distributions by
               Size in Canada

Table 1.3: Selected Social/Cultural Indicators, Postwar Years

	Full-time Post-secondary Enrolment of 18-24 year olds (percentage of total)	Registered Passenger Cars as percentage of adult population[a]	Average Weekly TV Viewing Hours
1946		14	0
1951	6.0	22	0[d]
1956	6.8[b]	29	
1961	10.6	36	
1966	14.2	42	21.8[e]
1971	18.5	47	22.2
1976	19.5[c]	54	22.2
1977	19.7	56	22.1
1978		56	22.8
1979		56	23.0
1980	19.8	57	24.0
1981	20.5	55	23.6
1982	21.7	56	23.7
1983	23.0	57	23.9
1984	23.7	56	23.6
1985	24.5	57	23.5
1986	25.5		

[a] 14 years or over prior to 1966, 15 years or over after that
[b] 1955 [c] 1975 [d] Television introduced 1952 [e] 1969

Sources: Canada Year Books, various years
Report of the Task Force on Broadcasting Policy, 1986
Statistics Canada, catalogue 87-630, Culture Statistics
Historical Statistics of Canada, second edition
Statistics Canada, catalogue 81-229, Education in Canada

Table 1.4: Immigration by Location of Last Permanent Residence, selected years 1957-1985 (as percentage of all immigrant arrivals)

	Britain	Other Europe	U.S.	Asia	Central America[a]	Other	Total
1957	39	53	4	1	1	3	282,000
1967	28	44	9	9	4	6	223,000
1974	18	23	12	23	12	12	218,000
1980	13	16	7	50	6	8	143,000
1985	5	17	8	46	13	11	84,000

[a] Includes Caribbean
Sources: Historical Statistics of Canada, second edition
Canada Year Books, various years

PART ONE: TRENDS AND DIVISIONS IN WORKERS' POLITICAL ATTITUDES

In the three chapters contained in Part One I undertake a variety of secondary analyses on data from national surveys. My objectives in Chapter 2 are to establish the changes in workers' political attitudes throughout the 1970s and 1980s, and to identify the attitudes where workers are consistently distinct from owners/managers and professionals. The discussion in Chapter 2 is focussed on three questions: (1) Are standard sociological generalizations concerning working class attitudes applicable to the contemporary situation in Canada? (2) Have the political attitudes of Canadian workers shifted towards the Right in recent years? (3) Are new conservative organizations correct when they claim that they represent the viewpoint of ordinary Canadians? The data analyzed in Chapter 2 were originally gathered by the Gallup Poll.

In Chapters 3 and 4 I employ data from two recent national surveys funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada to study the character and generating mechanisms of attitude divisions in the Canadian working class. The relationship between a wide variety of social experiences and political attitudes is the subject of Chapter 3. I begin the chapter by outlining the three basic propositions of the social experiences perspective on attitude variation and argue that these propositions are integral components of recent theorizing on variations in workers' political attitudes. The body of

the chapter consists of detailed empirical analyses aimed at assessing the utility of the social experiences perspective. These analyses enable me to identify the social experiences which are important determinants of a range of political attitudes. It is particularly important that I am able to identify the social experiences which are determinants of the extent of active consent to capitalist domination among Canadian workers.

In Chapter 4 I continue my examination of variation in workers' political attitudes by studying the influence of different social psychological mechanisms on political attitudes. In the first section of the chapter I test the idea that class identification but not egoistic relative deprivation affects political attitudes. In the second section I consider two attitude-consistency explanations of attitude variation. First, I determine the percentage of Canadian workers who possess a political consciousness which is syllogistically organized around Left-wing or Right-wing principles. Second, I assess whether variations in political attitudes are explained by workers' feelings towards the symbolic political labels Left and Right. This latter study proceeds as a test of the likability heuristic hypothesis recently advanced by Sniderman and Tetlock (1986) to account for consistency in political attitudes.

CHAPTER 2: TRENDS IN CANADIAN WORKERS' POLITICAL ATTITUDES
IN THE '70s AND '80s

In this chapter I utilize Gallup Poll data to establish trends
in Canadian workers' political attitudes in the 1970s and 1980s. Two
types of analysis are undertaken. First, the extent of absolute change
in a political attitude is identified by plotting the pattern of
workers' responses to a particular question over time. Both social
scientists and the general public are justifiably suspicious of the
results from opinion poll questions -- they realize that a modest
alteration in question wording may significantly affect the distribution
of responses on an item. However, if the wording of a question is held
constant, then the changes in responses from poll to poll can tell us
something about trends in a political attitude. Second, workers'
political attitudes are examined in comparison to other classes to see
if any differences in class responses are constant from poll to poll.

RATIONALE FOR THE RESEARCH

The first objective of my research with Gallup Poll data is to
simply describe the recent trends in Canadian workers' political
attitudes. The huge opinion polling industry in the United States
(Rossi, 1983:introduction) has generated a massive amount of data over
the past few decades; this situation has enabled social scientists to
compile survey results from commercial and academic sources and track
the trends on a variety of social issues over periods which stretch up

to 50 years (e.g., Maddox and Lilie, 1984; Lipset and Schneider, 1983).
Polling has not been nearly so important to Canadian politics, media
competition or social science -- at least not until the last few years.[1]
Consequently, my use of Canadian Gallup Polls to describe the trends in
a number of political attitudes held by workers fills a gap in our
knowledge of workers' political consciousness.

The research of this chapter also allows me to examine the
present-day applicability to Canada of the standard sociological
generalizations concerning working class attitudes. In Political Man
(1981:92), Seymour Martin Lipset writes:

> 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.

Recently, Steven Brint has suggested a modified version of this
generalization "to encompass the more complicated cleavages of recent
years" (1985:393). He divides economic and non-economic issues into two
categories each. The two categories of economic issues are: (1) welfare
state and business support issues; and (2) equality-related issues and
basic system commitments. The categories of non-economic issues are:
(1) morality and military force issues; and (2) civil liberties and

---

[1] In recent years, political pollsters like Angus Reid (Angus
Reid Associates) and Allan Gregg (Decima Research) have conducted
regular commercial polls alongside their special election work, and
major Canadian mass media have made copyrighted polls an important
feature of their content (e.g., Globe-Environics polls). Thus, the
data for widespread public opinion trend analysis in Canada is currently
being generated.

civil rights issues. Brint identifies American workers as being comparatively liberal on both categories of economic issues and comparatively conservative on both categories of non-economic issues. This is consistent with Lipset's hypothesis. However, on the first category of economic issues -- welfare state and business support issues -- Brint identifies professionals as being equivalent in liberalism to workers (1985:393). In addition, on the first category of non-economic issues -- morality and military force issues -- the business strata is identified as being equivalent in conservatism to workers (1985:394).[2] By assessing across-class differences in a wide range of opinion poll questions I will be able to assess the validity of both versions of this sociological rule of thumb in relation to contemporary Canada. I am particularly interested in determining whether the notion of across-the-board working class conservatism on non-economic issues stands up to empirical scrutiny.

My analysis of opinion poll trends will also enable me to study whether Canadian workers' political attitudes have shifted towards the Right in conjunction with one of the important political developments in recent years. Since the mid-1970s, the battle for the hearts and minds of the public has assumed a much more prominent place in the political struggles in advanced capitalist countries. The initiative for this heightened level of ideological conflict has come from new conservative

---

[2] On equality-related issues and basic system commitments, American workers are identified as more liberal than either professionals or the business strata. On civil liberties and civil rights issues, workers are identified as more conservative than either of the other two classes.

organizations which have set out to reverse what they identify as an anti-capitalist/pro-socialist drift in social life.[3]   While gaining control of governmental power through established political parties has been one strategic objective of the conservative offensive,[4] and promoting Right-wing policy options amongst political leaders and other elites has been another,[5] this movement to strengthen bourgeois hegemony

---

[3] On the emergence of conservative organizations in Britain in the 1970s see Elliott and McCrone, 1985:2.   In Canada, a number of prominent Right-wing organizations were organized in the 1970s. For instance, the Fraser Institute was established in 1974 (Fraser Institute Catalogue of Books, 1986/87:11); the National Citizens' Coalition was officially organized in 1975, although its founder, Colin Brown, had been conducting newspaper advertisement campaigns since 1967 (Fillmore, 1986:6); and, Citizens for Foreign Aid Reform began publishing its newsletter in 1979 (C-FAR Newsletter, #147, January 1, 1986). Barrett (1987) discusses the origins of a number of Right-wing organizations in Canada, although he concentrates on groups which are either openly racist (like the Ku Klux Klan), or closet racists (like C-FAR).

[4] For example, witness the role of Right-wing MPs, anti-abortion activists, Peter Pocklington, Amway distributors and other Rightists in replacing Joe Clark with Brian Mulroney as leader of the Progressive Conservative Party in 1983 (Graham, 1986:121); the prominence of onetime members of extreme Right organizations in the Gaullist-Giscardien government elected in France in 1986 (Manchester Guardian Weekly, May 18, 1986:14); the well-documented support for Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher from Right-wing organizations; and, the support received by the George Bush presidential election campaign in 1988 from extreme Right organizations. (Vice-President Dan Quayle is the son of a big capitalist who has been a supporter of the John Birch Society!)

[5] An important example of this was the Fraser Institute's coaching of the Bennett government in British Columbia prior to its introduction of a wide range of conservative legislation in 1983 (Michael Walker, interview on Morningside, CBC Radio, September 23, 1986). The Fraser Institute also sponsored a major conference on privatization in July, 1987, at which neo-liberal academics, corporate officials, government ministers and government bureaucrats discussed the virtues of privatization. Among the advertised speakers were the Minister Responsible for Privatization in the Vander Zalm government in British Columbia and the top privatization bureaucrat in the federal government's Office of Privatization and Regulatory Affairs.

is also quite self-conscious about a third objective: shifting the political attitudes of the public towards the Right. Margaret Thatcher and her most conservative ministers, for instance, have sought to change public opinion in such a way that it will act as a constraint on any political successors' attempts to reverse Right-wing policy changes (King, 1985:18). In the words of Stuart Hall, they have attempted "to reconstruct the terrain of what is 'taken for granted' in social and political thought -- and so form a new common sense" (1985:119). And in Canada, both the Fraser Institute and the National Citizens' Coalition (NCC) widely distribute political commentaries to Canadian media, produce educational material for members, and organize public forums. In addition, the NCC is well known for taking its policy proposals to the public through periodic newspaper advertisements. More recently, it has orchestrated a high profile legal test case to attract media/public attention.

Has the increased activity of new conservative organizations in Canada in recent years coincided with a shift in the attitudes of Canadian workers towards the Right?[6] While academic researchers in the U.S. (e.g., Navarro, 1986; Maddox and Lilie, 1984) and Britain (e.g., Judge et al., 1983) have empirically addressed parallel questions, I am unaware of any similar research in Canada. My aim, then, is to redress

---

[6] It would also be interesting to determine whether Canadian workers have been swayed by the arguments or symbolic appeals of the various Right-wing groups. Unfortunately the design of my research -- an historical review of opinion poll results -- does not allow me to address this causal question.

this gap in our knowledge of recent developments in Canadian political culture.

My research will also enable me to test one of the major premises in the message disseminated by new conservative organizations -- that they are merely giving voice to what the majority of Canadians already believe. Thus, a membership information brochure listing the 1985 accomplishments of the National Citizens' Coalition claimed "Gallup Poll shows that Canadians overwhelmingly agree with all of National Citizens' Coalition's positions" (emphasis added). And in a March, 1986 talk, Paul Fromm, the director of Citizens for Foreign Aid Reform (C-FAR), offered this analysis:

> We are living in an occupied country where the majority view is not represented at all except from some little person asking a question. In other words, the majority position is accorded the status of a nobody. It is afforded the status of a conquered people where your language, your culture, your views are worthless.

Obviously, the claim by Right-wing organizations to represent the views of the majority of Canadians is an important element of their propaganda strategies. Organizations like the NCC and C-FAR attempt to legitimate their work to both supporters and potential supporters by professing to be standing up for the never-listened-to concerns of the average citizen. Recognizing the propaganda dimension of the Right's claim to be the faithful representative of the majority, however, does not eliminate the necessity of assessing its veracity.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Opinion Poll Questions Selected for Study

Although a number of organizations are now engaged in public opinion polling in Canada, only the Canadian Gallup Poll (formerly known as the Canadian Institute for Public Opinion) has been in the polling business for an extended period of time. Indeed, Gallup Polls have been conducted in Canada for over 40 years. Thus, given my interest in trends in workers' political attitudes in the 1970 to mid-1980s period, Gallup Polls are the only appropriate source of data.

In order to assess whether new conservative organizations are voicing the concerns of the majority of Canadians, Gallup Poll questions related to the issues promoted by those conservative organizations needed to be selected for study. Therefore, before proceeding any further, I should outline my understanding of new conservative organizations in Canada and identify the major tenets of those organizations.

Organizations on the Right can be demarcated in many different ways and, as noted by Stanley Barrett (1987:9-12), there will always be groups which straddle a particular classification scheme. Barrett himself divides conservative organizations into four categories: the radical right, the fringe right, neo-conservatism and legitimate conservatism. My interest is in new conservative organizations which have consciously set out to strengthen bourgeois hegemony in Canada in recent years. I am thus concerned with groups which fall into Barrett's fringe right and neo-conservatism categories. I exclude the radical right (openly anti-Semitic, racist or fascist groups) because it appears

to have sought media attention to attract hardcore supporters rather than to reshape political attitudes (Barrett, 1987:137). I exclude groups of legitimate conservatives who, because they do not maintain fundamental criticisms of the Progressive Conservative Party, do not have the ideological zeal of fringe right and neo-conservative organizations.

The major branches of the new conservative movement in Canada can usefully be distinguished by employing two criteria: (1) ideological roots, and (2) social characteristics of supporters. First, there are the neo-economic liberals of the Fraser Institute who direct much of their work towards the corporate elite, government decision-makers and the academic community. Second, there is the more traditional conservatism of groups such as the National Citizens' Coalition which have voiced populist opposition to 'Big Government' and 'Big Unions', and have championed traditional conservative notions of individual economic responsibility. The NCC has always had support from the business community. In addition, in 1986 the NCC reported that almost half of its supporters were 60 years or older (NCC Overview, November, 1986:1). This demonstrates its appeal to a generation which puts a higher premium on traditional values than other generations. Third, there are the closet racists and fascists who have made a tactical decision to promote their views on mainstream political issues like immigration or foreign aid although they do not hesitate to defend "freedom of expression" for fascists like Ernst Zundel. The groups initiated by Paul Fromm, including C-FAR, fall into this category. Fourth, there are a number of new conservative organizations which have

a religious foundation and stress moral rather than economic issues. The Christian Heritage Party, REAL Women and Renaissance all fall into this category.

Although it is helpful to distinguish the main branches of the new conservative movement, it must also be realized that there is considerable overlap in principles and policy emphasis. For example, (1) C-FAR, the NCC and the Fraser Institute all campaigned in opposition to Canadian sanctions against South Africa throughout 1987; (2) the National Citizens' Coalition 1987 statement of basic principles shows a neo-liberal influence -- "Economic Freedom" is one of the principles -- and lists "Protection of The Family" as another principle; and (3) the Rev. Ken Campbell, leader of Renaissance, holds Right-wing views on a wide range of subjects in addition to the social issues such as school discipline and homosexuality on which Renaissance concentrates (Barrett, 1987:274). Consequently, when I identify a Gallup Poll question as being directly relevant to a policy position championed by one branch of the new conservative movement, this does not mean that the policy position is rejected by organizations in other branches; indeed, the reverse is usually the case.

In Table 2.1, I record the wording of the Gallup Poll questions which have been selected for study. The first two questions -- "Outlaw Strikes Where Public Inconvenienced?" and "Unions in Politics?" -- are relevant to the campaign of the National Citizens' Coalition against 'Big Labour'. "Unions in Politics?" is particularly germane to the NCC-sponsored Merv Lavigne court case. This case, which challenges the right of unions to use dues collected from non-member employees in a

bargaining unit for political purposes, has been the springboard for a dramatic increase in the organization's resources and public profile.[7] "Biggest Threat to Canada in Future?" also relates to the 'Big Labour' focus of the NCC. As well, it is relevant to the stress on limited government which both the NCC and the Fraser Institute have championed, as are the next two questions, "Level of Government Influence?" and "Government's Main Job?". The latter question is particularly interesting because it asks respondents to choose between two different visions of government involvement in the economy, one very interventionist, the other considerably less so.

The next question, "Who is Responsible for Childcare?", straddles two areas of new conservative concern -- the economy and the family. Thus it is relevant to both the neo-liberal economic proposals of the Fraser Institute and the traditional conceptions of women and the family held by moral conservatives. The next three questions, however, focus exclusively on social issues: the role of women in childrearing, school discipline, and premarital sex. These are the sorts of issues which have been the moving force behind the political projects of moral conservatives.

"Black/White Marriage?" and "Level of Immigration?" were chosen for study because they relate to the closet racism and xenophobia of the campaigns run by C-FAR. Finally, "Are Many Union Leaders Agitators?" is

---

[7] The "Campaign '88" leaflet sent to NCC supporters indicates that the money raised for the Merv Lavigne Campaign in 1987 (over $700,000) exceeded the total sum of money raised by the NCC in 1983. Between 1984 and 1987 the voluntary donations to the NCC doubled from $1.05 million to $2.16 million.

relevant to the anti-socialism which is evident in much of the educational material produced by new conservative organizations.

Obviously, the 12 Gallup Poll questions to be analyzed in this chapter do not exhaust the range of concerns of new conservative organizations in Canada. However, I believe they cover a wide enough spectrum of issues to give us a true sense of whether the views of Canadian workers line up with the views of new conservative organizations.

In deciding which opinion poll questions to study I had to take into account a number of practical considerations in addition to question content. First, I was limited to studying questions which were asked on multiple occasions during the time frame of interest. This eliminated questions with relevant content which were asked on only one occasion or which were only asked during a limited range of years. Second, I also excluded questions where a change in question wording occurred between polls, since any differences in response distribution could be due to the change in wording. Third, I could only study questions where data was available for analysis. In my research at the Social Science Data Archives at Carleton University (which archives Canadian Gallup Polls),[8] I sometimes had difficulty in locating polling data for secondary analysis. My usual experience in this regard was

---

[8] While the data on which I carried out secondary analyses were collected by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion (Gallup Poll), codebook preparation and data cleaning were completed by the Carleton University Social Science Data Archives under the auspices of the Machine Readable Archives Division of the Public Archives of Canada. These organizations provided the data, but they cannot be held responsible for the analyses or interpretations presented, nor any problems with the data.

that, although the results for a question had been outlined in Gallup's press releases, I was unable to locate data for the question in the archives.

As a consequence of these three practical considerations, the following minimal criteria were developed for selecting questions for inclusion in this study: a question had to have been asked on at least two occasions between 1970 and 1985; data for a question should begin no later than 1975 and should end no earlier than the early 1980s; and, I was able to undertake a secondary analysis of data (involving a comparison between classes) on at least one of the occasions where a question was asked. In practice I usually managed to exceed these minimal criteria. For 8 of the 12 questions, data from four or more polls in the 1970-85 period is available. For seven of the questions I also have pre-1970 polling data. On all but 2 of the 12 questions I was able to undertake more than a single comparison between classes.

Operationalizing Class

In this research the working class is operationally defined as individuals who fall into one of three Gallup Poll occupational categories: clerical workers, skilled labour and craftsmen, and labourers and service workers. Supervisory employees are not distinguished from non-supervisory employees in the Gallup Poll occupational classification. Consequently, the operational definition of working class utilized in this chapter differs from that in the remainder of the thesis, where only non-supervisory employees are included in the working class. The definition of workers employed in this chapter is also unique in two other ways. First, one of the

occupational categories defined by the Gallup Poll is sales workers. Included in this category is a wide spectrum of occupations, including sales clerks in stores, sales managers, real estate agents and brokers, and insurance agents, brokers and underwriters. Although sales clerks are clearly members of the working class, I chose to exclude this entire occupational category from my analysis since it was impossible to separate the workers from managers and self-employed sales agents.

Second, I have chosen to analyze the responses of the professional/technical occupational category separately in this chapter, even though the category contains some occupations (e.g., dental hygienists and nurses) which are classified as working class in later chapters. The important factor in my decision to exclude this category from the working class is that the majority of occupations in the category (e.g., scientists, academics, physicians, dentists and engineers) are also excluded from the working class in subsequent analyses.

Obviously, whether we characterize professionals and technical workers as a "new class", a contradictory class location, or a distinct stratum of the working class (see Brint, 1984 and Wright, 1985), it is useful to look at how their political attitudes compare to the rest of the working class. At the same time, it is important to note that the Gallup Poll professional/technical occupational category includes self-employed professionals, professional employees with a great deal of job autonomy and technical employees who have regular working class jobs. As a consequence of the mixed-class nature of the professional/technical

occupational category, the comparisons I make between workers and professionals are somewhat inexact.

Finally, I have also chosen to separately analyze the responses of another Gallup Poll occupational category: business executives, owners, managers and administrators. The trends in the political attitudes of owners/managers will be compared to the trends for both workers and professionals.

A few other difficulties in operationalizing class categories were encountered as a result of changes in Gallup Poll occupational questions during the period of study. In the most recent polls (from the middle of 1981 onwards), respondents have been asked for their employment status, for their own occupation and for the occupation of the head of the household. In these polls I assigned all respondents employed full-time to a class category based upon their own occupation, and I assigned other respondents to a class category based upon the occupation of the head of the household. Between 1979 and 1981 the employment status question was not asked, although the two occupation questions were asked. In these polls I assigned all respondents with a job-related occupation category (i.e., not student, housewife, unemployed, etc.) to a class category based upon their own occupation, and I assigned other respondents to a class category based upon the occupation of the head of the household. Prior to early 1979 the only occupation question asked of respondents was occupation of the head of the household. Thus, in the early polls I am forced to use this question to assign people to class categories.

This technical problem could have been handled differently: to maintain operational consistency I could have employed occupation of the head of the household to operationalize class categories throughout my study and ignored the more detailed occupational information available from 1979 onwards. I chose not to do so for two reasons. First, there is a sexist bias involved in classifying each respondent according to the occupation of the head of the household -- women and men are treated differently in the research.[9] I believe it is important to remove such a bias from social science research wherever possible. And second, I was able to check whether this change in how respondents are assigned to class categories affects the pre- and post-1979 distribution of class attitudes: if class trends are inconsistent with whole sample trends on either side of the 1979 change of measurement, then a measurement artifact may be at work. I found no such inconsistency.

Sampling, Sample Sizes, and Statistical Confidence Intervals

Each Gallup Poll is a modified probability survey (except in rural areas where quota sampling is undertaken). Beginning in 1979 the data from Gallup Polls are adjusted to reflect national age and sex distributions. The size of the samples of workers is usually around 400 for the Gallup Polls analyzed here, although the samples of some of the polls in the 1970s are higher and the samples of pre-1970 polls fall below 400.[10] The size of the samples of professionals is usually

---

[9] Eichler terms this a problem of double standards (1988:7).

[10] There are approximately an equal number of men and women in the Gallup samples of workers. I also obtained breakdowns of each poll question for education, union membership, income, age and mother tongue. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to analyze the variation in

between 100 and 150, as is the size of the samples of owners/managers. For samples of 400, the 95% confidence interval around percentages ranging from 30 to 70 is plus or minus 6%. For samples of 200, the 95% confidence interval around percentages ranging from 30 to 70 is plus or minus 8-9%. Clearly a class difference within a single poll or a difference in workers' responses between any two polls must be very large to be statistically significant. As a consequence, I try to rely upon the results of a series of polls whenever establishing a shift in workers' attitudes over time or a stable pattern of class difference. It is highly unlikely that sampling error is the cause of regular patterns of change or stability over a number of polls.

FINDINGS

I have chosen to use graphs to present the polling data of this chapter, since it is much easier to identify trends when data is presented visually. Three different types of graphs are presented in Figures 2.1 through 2.25. For each of the 12 questions a stacked bar graph is used to represent trends in workers' responses.[11] The first graph, Figure 2.1, is an example. Note that the bars are located on a rough time scale within each graph. Two types of graphs are utilized to

_____

attitudes within the working class.

[11] For the question "Black/White Marriage?" I graph the trends for the entire population since data broken down into classes is only available for the March/83 poll (see Figure 2.20). On the other stacked bar graphs, where separate data for workers is not available I use the results for the entire sample as an estimate and indicate this in the headings on the y-axis (e.g., Figure 2.1, heading "Mar/87(est)", where "est" stands for "estimate").

compare the response trends of classes. When class-specific data is available for three or more polls, a line graph is employed. Figure 2.2 is an example: five discrete observations for each class are joined by a line. When class-specific data is only available for one or two polls, however, I use a simple column graph. Figures 2.11 and 2.17 are examples. In both the line and column graphs, observations are not set on a time scale; that is, adjacent observations are equi-distant from one another regardless of the timing of the polls.

I believe that the graphs presented in this chapter are fairly self-explanatory. Thus, in this section of the chapter I concentrate on summarizing findings and do not undertake to describe the results in each and every graph.

Trends in Workers' Political Attitudes in the '70s and '80s

The trends in Canadian workers' political attitudes are summarized in Table 2.2. Three general trends can be identified. First, there is a growing populist opposition to 'Big Government'. On "Biggest Threat to Canada in Future?" (see Figure 2.5), this opposition surged ahead at two junctures (1) during Prime Minister Trudeau's third term in office (1974-79); and (2) during Trudeau's fourth term in office (1980-84). From the early 1970s to the mid-1980s, the percentage of workers choosing the "Big Government" alternative in this question has expanded from the mid-20% range to the mid-40% range. The results for a second question "Level of Government Influence?" (see Figure 2.8) confirm the general growth in populist opposition to government influence, although the extent that opposition has expanded appears more modest on this question than on the previous one.

The second general trend in workers' political attitudes throughout this period is a growing liberalism in judging personal life choices. In the early 1970s the vast majority of Canadian workers believed that married women with young children should stay at home with the children (see Figure 2.14). By 1987 the working class was split between those who believed women in this situation should stay at home and those who believed they should take a job. This sharp trend in social liberalism is also evident on "Premarital Sex?" (see Figure 2.18). While a majority of workers in 1970 thought that premarital sexual relations were wrong, less than one-quarter thought so in 1985. Views of marriages between Whites and Blacks also changed quite markedly (see Figure 2.20). In 1968 a majority of Canadians disapproved of such marriages, but by 1983 this figure had shrunk to about 20%.

The third general trend relates to the pattern of response on "Are Many Union Leaders Agitators?". As illustrated in Figure 2.24, the percentage of workers who believed that too many union leaders were trouble-makers expanded from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s. At that point, over 60% of the working class picked the "trouble-makers" option in this question. This percentage declined sharply between 1975 and 1985, however.[12]

There were two questions where a transitory change in the distribution of workers' attitudes occurred in the early 1980s. The question "Outlaw Strikes Where Public Inconvenienced?" was asked in a

_____

[12] The size of the difference between these two polls is 14% (62% in 1975 vs. 48% in 1985). Even with a ±6% confidence interval around each percentage, then, this difference is significant at the .05 level.

September, 1981 survey, shortly after the Canadian Union of Postal Workers had completed a 42-day strike -- the union's fifth national strike in a decade. Therefore it is not surprising that the percentage of the working class wanting to outlaw public inconvenience strikes in this poll was higher than in polls taken either in the mid-1970s or mid-1980s (see Figure 2.1). Overall, however, there is no general trend on this item -- the working class remains fairly evenly split between those who would and those who would not permit such strikes. A similar 'blip' in workers' opinion is seen in the graph for "Level of Immigration?" (see Figure 2.22). During the economic downturn in the early 1980s, the percentage of workers who wanted to decrease immigration jumped to 60%. However, in polls before and after only 40-45% of workers favoured this option, while a majority of workers favoured leaving immigration the same or increasing it.[13]

Finally, on 4 of the 12 Gallup Poll questions there was no evidence of either a transitory or a general shift in attitude. On two of these questions -- "Government's Main Job?" and "Who is Responsible for Childcare?" (see Figures 2.10 and 2.12) -- there is a fairly even split in working class opinion. This split in viewpoint concerns whether the government should or should not take on an expanded role in social

---

[13] Confirmation of this hard times effect is obtained by analyzing the 1982 and 1985 results for different language group strata of the working class. Language group strata of the working class differ quite markedly in their attitude towards immigration. It is thus important to find that the hard times effect is constant across 3 major language group strata. The percentages of anglophone workers favouring decreased immigration were 66% in 1982 and 50% in 1985 while the comparable percentages for francophone workers were 54%/36% and for other language workers were 45%/28%.

life.   On the other two of these questions a clear majority of the
working class favours a single point of view.   From the 1960s to the
1980s only about 20% of workers have supported union engagement in
political activities (see Figure 2.3).   Furthermore, while the
proportion of the working class who thought public school discipline was
not strict enough grew from the 1950s to the mid-1970s, it did not
markedly change between 1974 and 1984 (see Figure 2.16).

Patterns of Class Difference in Political Attitudes

In Table 2.3 I identify five different patterns of class
difference in political attitudes.   Prior to discussing these patterns,
two preliminary observations are in order.   First, my finding that
workers are not always more conservative than other classes on non-
economic issues runs counter to the rule of thumb generalizations on
workers' attitudes suggested by both Lipset and Brint.   Second, on all
but one of the 12 questions considered in this analysis some sort of
class difference in response is evident.[14]   However, although stable
throughout the period of study, class differences are usually quite
small.

The first pattern finds workers to the Left of the other two
classes.   This pattern is evident on two questions.   On "Biggest Threat
to Canada in Future?", the percentage of workers selecting "Big Labour"
is consistently less than either of the other two classes, although the
difference is quite small (see Figure 2.6).   On "Government's Main Job?"

---

[14] While I only study 12 questions, the patterns of 13 separate
graphs are discussed.   This is because Figures 2.6 and 2.7 are each
taken from responses to the "Biggest Threat to Canada in the Future?"
questions.

the difference between workers and the other classes is more pronounced (see Figure 2.11). Only 16% of professionals selected the "guarantee every person a decent, steady job" option in September, 1982, compared to 44% of workers. Owners/managers were intermediate between the other two classes. Thus, a clear majority of professionals have a meritocratic vision of government involvement in the economy, while workers are split between the meritocratic vision and a practical socialist vision of a full employment economy. I should also note that there are other economic questions asked in Gallup Polls where the same pattern of class difference is evident. (Unfortunately they did not meet my minimal criteria for inclusion as a main question in this study.) For instance, one such question reads: "There has been a lot of talk recently about both the level of government spending and the level of unemployment. In your opinion, which should Ottawa give priority to -- balancing the budget or reducing unemployment?" In surveys conducted in August, 1985 and March, 1984, workers were more likely to choose the "reducing unemployment" option than either of the other two classes.[15]

The second pattern finds workers _and_ professionals to the Left of owners/managers. It is evident on two union-related questions: "Outlaw Strikes Where Public Inconvenienced?" (see Figure 2.2) and "Are Many Union Leaders Agitators?" (see Figure 2.25). Owners/managers tend to reject the legitimacy of labour unions' role in Canadian society to a greater extent than either of the other two classes. Unexpectedly, the

---

[15] The percentages choosing the "reducing unemployment" option were: (1) 1985 -- workers 69%, professionals 51%, managers/owners, 55%; (2) 1984 -- workers 70%, professionals 62%, managers/owners, 65%.

same pattern is also found on a personal lifestyle question: "Premarital Sex?" (see Figure 2.19). This result provides a preliminary indication that the notion of a morally conservative working class is inaccurate. Indeed, on matters of personal lifestyle, generational divisions are much more important than class divisions. Thus, while in 1985 41% of workers 50 years of age or older thought premarital sex was wrong, only 24% of workers between the ages of 30 and 49, and only 12% of workers less than 30 years of age, held the same view.

In the third pattern, workers are intermediate between professionals on the Left and owners/managers on the Right. It is found on "Unions in Politics?" (see Figure 2.4), "Who is Responsible for Childcare?" (see Figure 2.13), and "Black/White Marriage?" (see Figure 2.21). This is a mixed bag of non-economic issues involving, respectively, conceptions of the character of politics, the family and race relations. What is noteworthy is that workers are clearly more liberal than owners/managers in each instance. Again, the notion of a morally conservative working class is called into question.

In the fourth pattern, workers are on the Right. On "Should Women With Young Children Work Outside Home?" (see Figure 2.15) the response pattern of workers is indistinguishable from that of owners/managers while professionals are more liberal. The pattern of class difference on two other questions -- "School Discipline?" and "Level of Immigration?" -- is more difficult to interpret, since I have class breakdowns for only two polls in each case. In 1974, approximately 55% of each class believed that discipline in public schools was not strict enough (see Figure 2.17). In 1984, however, 61%

of workers held this position as opposed to only 53% of owners/managers and 47% of professionals. My tentative conclusion is that workers are to the Right of each of the other classes. This is consistent with the view that, more than other classes, workers tend to stress discipline in childrearing (Lipset, 1981:114). Note, however, that the class differences are fairly small. On "Level of Immigration?", interpretation is complicated by the hard times effect in 1982 (see Figure 2.23). While workers were clearly to the Right of the other two classes in 1982, in 1985 they were to the Right of professionals but indistinguishable from owners/managers. From the 1985 column graph it looks like workers are fairly close to professionals in views on level of immigration. In fact, this is unrepresentative of the overall pattern of results. When the percentage favouring increased immigration is subtracted from the percentage favouring decreased immigration, the results for the three classes are: professionals 16%, workers 31%, owners/managers 33%.

In the fifth pattern there is no difference between the classes. The two questions which fit this pattern both measure opposition to 'Big Government' (see Figures 2.7 and 2.9). It is interesting that the trend of growing opposition to 'Big Government' throughout the 1970s and early 1980s is truly popular in the sense that it is a trend seen in each of the three classes.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

One of my objectives in this chapter was to examine whether rule of thumb sociological generalizations about working class attitudes fit

the contemporary Canadian situation. My data supports the notion that workers are generally to the Left on economic issues. It also supports Brint's suggestion that professionals are as liberal as workers on some economic issues (e.g., level of support for strikes where the public is inconvenienced), but not on others (e.g., conception of government's main job). However, my findings do not support the idea that workers are generally more intolerant than other classes on non-economic issues. Workers are to the Right of both of the other classes on only one of the non-economic questions included in my study -- "School Discipline?". Most commonly, workers are similar to, or to the Left of, owners/managers on non-economic issues, while consistently being to the Right of professionals. The difference between professionals and workers is often not that great, however, and on one question -- "Premarital Sex?" -- the difference was negligible. It seems that while workers' conception of family relations (e.g., "Should Women With Young Children Work Outside Home?") tends to be quite conservative in comparison to professionals, on matters of personal lifestyle their attitudes resemble the relatively more liberal attitudes of professionals rather than the relatively more conservative attitudes of owners/managers.

A second objective of this chapter was to accumulate a base of empirical evidence which could be used to assess the ideological campaigns waged by new conservative organizations in Canada in recent years. I had two goals: (1) to examine trends in workers' political attitudes to determine if the educational efforts of new conservative organizations had coincided with a Rightward shift in the political

culture of Canadian workers; and (2) to see if the policy positions of new conservative organizations truly represented what the organizations often claimed they represented -- the views of average Canadians.

On one of the issues championed by the Right -- opposition to 'Big Government' -- a definite Right-wing shift in workers' attitudes is evident throughout the 1970s and early 1980s. A similar shift occurred in the attitudes of professionals and owners/managers. New conservative organizations have been riding a wave of popular opposition to 'Big Government' which has been gradually building in recent years. This popular opposition to government influence also seems to be reflected in a change in workers' attitudes towards the privatization of PetroCanada. In a July, 1979 Gallup Poll, only 23% of workers favoured the privatization of PetroCanada. However, in three polls taken between March, 1983 and November, 1984, between 37% and 47% of the working class favoured privatization.[16]

The other general trends in workers' political attitudes are liberal rather than conservative in direction. In looking at women's childrearing role, premarital sex and Black/White marriage, Canadian workers, like the members of other classes, have developed increasingly liberal views. Therefore, on matters of personal life choices, moral

---

[16] The question reads, "There has been some talk recently about PetroCanada -- the National Oil Company that is operating as a Canadian Crown Corporation. In your opinion should PetroCanada be sold to the private sector -- that is, the non-government sector -- or not?" It is also important to note that a majority of the working class in the mid-1980s favoured a partial and nationalistic privatization of PetroCanada. Fully 66% of workers agreed with the following question asked in a September, 1985 poll, "It has been suggested that the government sell the refining and retail operations of PetroCanada to Canadian investors. Would you favour or oppose this sale?"

conservatives have been ineffective in reversing what they see as a moral decay in Canadian society -- they have been fighting a losing battle. As well, the continuing growth of approval for marriages between Whites and Blacks signifies that a crucial aspect of the racist view of the world offered by groups like C-FAR is increasingly being rejected.

It is also important to note that on a number of questions the distribution in workers' attitudes did not markedly change throughout this period. Furthermore, on two other questions ("Outlaw Strikes Where Public Inconvenienced?" and "Level of Immigration?") there were no general changes, although transitory shifts in attitude distributions did occur in the early 1980s. Thus, despite the active educational campaigns of new conservative organizations in recent years, the political culture of Canadian workers does not appear to have been substantially altered. Overall splits in viewpoint on many issues are remarkably stable throughout the period of study.

In 1987 the National Citizens' Coalition identified its two major campaigns as sponsoring the Merv Lavigne court case and campaigning in favour of privatization. Undoubtedly, these campaigns were selected with an eye towards Canadian public opinion.[17] As noted above, growing popular disenchantment with 'Big Government' ties into the privatization issue. Furthermore, a solid majority of Canadians oppose union involvement in politics (see Figures 2.3 and 2.4), and the Lavigne case is played to this audience. Discipline in the public

---

[17] Poll results are regularly quoted in the NCC's newsletter Consensus, and the NCC has purchased questions in the Gallup Poll.

schools is another issue where the ideas of new conservative organizations are bound to strike a responsive chord with a great many Canadians. When we look at these three issues, then, the claim by new conservative organizations to represent the views of ordinary Canadians should be viewed as a propaganda claim with a substantial degree of truth attached to it. However, this is not the case for other issues, and it is certainly not the case that the Canadian working class supports the new conservative political agenda in its entirety.

If new conservative organizations do not, in fact, represent the concerns of average Canadians, what accounts for their high profile in recent years? Part of the answer to this question concerns these organizations' concentration on issues where public support is the greatest, or where attitudes are shifting towards the Right. Thus, in attacking the size of government, the political activities of the union movement and the breakdown of traditional patterns of social discipline, Right-wing organizations have seized upon and, to some extent, mobilized attitudes which are widespread in Canada. They seem to have correctly identified where their opportunities for ideological success are the greatest and proceeded to invest a considerable amount of their resources into realizing those opportunities.

The results of this chapter provide an overview of contemporary working class political culture. In the next two chapters I use data from national cross-sectional surveys undertaken in 1982 and 1984 to get a better idea of the factors which generate variation in workers' political attitudes.

Table 2.1: Wording of Gallup Poll Questions

Question Label	Question Wording
Outlaw Strikes Where Public Inconvenienced?	What about strikes in occupations where the public is seriously inconvenienced -- such as strikes by employees of the postal service, airlines, railroads, or the telephone service -- do you think they should, or should not be permitted to strike?
Unions in Politics?	Do you think unions should, or should not engage in political activities?
Biggest Threat to Canada in Future?	Speaking of the future, which do you think will be the biggest threat to Canada in years to come -- Big Business, Big Labour or Big Government?
Level of Government Influence?	Do you think the level of influence the federal government has today on the way of life of the average Canadian is too great, too little or just about right?
Government's Main Job?	Which of these statements do you most agree with: (1) The most important job of the government is to make certain that there are good opportunities for each person to get ahead on his own; (2) The most important job for government is to guarantee every person a decent, steady job.
Who is Responsible for Childcare?	There has been considerable talk recently about the provision of childcare facilities for working mothers. In your opinion, is this primarily the responsibility of the mother and/or family, or should the government share in this responsibility?
Should Women With Young Children Work Outside Home?	Do you think that married women should take a job outside the home, if they have young children?
School Discipline?	Do you think that discipline in the public schools in this area is too strict or not strict enough?
Premarital Sex?	There's a lot of discussion about the way morals are changing in this country. What is your opinion on this -- do you think it is wrong for a man and woman to have sex relations before marriage or not?
Black/White Marriage?	In general, do you approve or disapprove of marriages between Whites and Blacks?

Table 2.1 (continued):   Wording of Gallup Poll Questions

Question Label	Question Wording
Level of Immigration?	If it were your job to plan an immigration policy for Canada at this time, would you be inclined to increase immigration, decrease immigration or keep the number of immigrants at about the current level?
Are Many Union Leaders Agitators?	Some people say there are too many trouble-makers and agitators among union leaders. Others say this talk is only anti-labour propaganda. What are your views on this?

Table 2.2:   Summary of Trends in Workers' Political Attitudes, 1970-85

(1) General Trends

   1. Growing populist opposition to Big Government
        items -- Biggest Threat to Canada in Future?
              -- Level of Government Influence?

   2. Growing liberalism in personal life choices
        items -- Should Women With Young Children Work
                        Outside Home?
              -- Premarital Sex?
              -- Black/White Marriage?

   3. Decrease in percentage seeing union leaders as agitators
        item   -- Are Many Union Leaders Agitators?

(2) Temporary Change in Attitude Distribution

        Attitudes where workers shifted to the Right in the early
        1980s but shifted back again by the mid-1980s
              items -- Outlaw Strikes Where Public Inconvenienced?
                    -- Level of Immigration?

(3) No Trends

   1. Where the working class is split in viewpoint
        items -- Government's Main Job?
              -- Who is Responsible for Childcare?

   2. Where there is a clear majority viewpoint
        items -- Union in Politics? (opposed)
              -- School Discipline? (not strict enough)

Table 2.3:   Patterns of Class Difference in Political Attitudes

Pattern	Questions
1. Workers Most Left	Big Labour option -- Biggest Threat to Canada in Future? Government's Main Job?
2. Workers & Professionals on the Left	Outlaw Strikes Where Public Inconvenienced? Are Many Union Leaders Agitators? Premarital Sex?
3. Workers to the Right of Professionals but to the Left of Owners/Managers	Unions in Politics? Who is Responsible for Childcare? Black/White Marriage?
4. Workers on the Right (on own or with Owners/Managers)	Should Women With Young Children Work Outside Home? School Discipline? Level of Immigration?
5. No Class Differences	Big Government option -- Biggest Threat to Canada in Future? Level of Government Influence?

Figure 2.1   Workers' responses to
"What about strikes in occupations where
the public is seriously
inconvenienced ...?"

Figure 2.2   Class Response Trends to
"What about strikes in occupations where
the public is seriously
inconvenienced...?"

Figure 2.3: Workers' responses to
"Do you think unions should, or should
not engage in political activities?"

Figure 2.4. Class Response Trends to
"Do you think unions should, or should
not engage in political activities?"

Figure 2.5 Workers' responses to
"... which do you think will be the
biggest threat to Canada in years to
come ...?"

Figure 2.6 Class Response Trends to
"... biggest threat to Canada in years
to come ...?"

Figure 2.7 Class Response Trends to
"... biggest threat to Canada in years
to come ...?"

Percentages thinking
big government will be threat

Owners/
Managers

Profession

Workers

Figure 2.8. Workers' responses to
"Do you think the level of influence the
federal government has today on the way
of life of the average Canadian is ...?"

Figure 2.9: Class Response Trends to
"Do you think the level of influence the
federal government has today on the way
of life of the average Canadian is ...?"

Figure 2.10 Canadians' responses on the
most important job of the government
(1) "good opportunities for each person"
(2) "guarantee ... a decent, steady job"

Oct/82

Oct/77

Don't Know

Steady
Job

1954

1947

Opportnity

0   20   40   60   80   100

Figure 2.11: Class Responses (1982) on
whether the government should provide
opportunities or steady jobs

Percentages

100

80

60

Don't
Know

40

Steady
Job

20

0

Opprtunity

Workers   Professionals Owners/Managers

Figure 2.12: Workers' responses to:
"is [childcare] primarily the responsib-
ility of the mother and/or the family,
or should the government share ...?"

Qualified/
Don't Know

Government
Share

Mother/
Family

Figure 2.13: Class Response Trends to
"is [childcare] primarily the responsib-
ility of the mother and/or the family,
or should the government share ...?"

Percentages believing
the government should share

Owners/
Managers

Profession

Workers

Figure 2.14   Workers' responses to-
"Do you think that married women should
take a job outside the home, if they
have young children?"

Figure 2.15: Class Response Trends to-
"Do you think that married women should
take a job outside the home, if they
have young children?"

Percentages believing
they should take a job

Figure 2.16   Workers' responses to
"Do you think that discipline in the
public schools in this area is too
strict or not strict enough?"

Legend:
- Can't Say
- About Right
- Not strict enough
- Too strict

Figure 2.17: Class Response Trends to
"Do you think that discipline in the
public schools in this area is too
strict or not strict enough?"

Percentages believing discipline is not strict enough

Legend:
- Owners/Managers
- Profession
- Workers

Figure 2.18: Workers' responses to
"... do you think it is wrong for a man
and woman to have sex relations before
marriage or not?"

Feb/85

1980(est)

Dec/75

1970(est)

0   20   40   60   80   100

▨ Undecided
▥ Not Wrong
▦ Wrong

Figure 2.19: Class Response Trends to
"... do you think it is wrong for a man
and woman to have sex relations before
marriage or not?"

Percentages believing sex
before marriage to be okay

100

80

60

40

20

0

1975   1985

▨ Owners/
   Managers
▤ Profession
▦ Workers

Figure 2.20 Canadians' responses to:
"In general, do you approve or dis-
approve of marriages between whites and
Blacks?"

Figure 2.21 Class Responses (1983) on
White/Black, Jew/Non-Jew and
Catholic/Protestant Marriages

Fig 2.22: Workers' responses to:
"... increase immigration, decrease
immigration or keep the number of
immigrants at about the current level?"

Figure 2.23: Class Response Trends to:
"... increase immigration, decrease
immigration or keep the number of
immigrants at about the current level?"

Figure 2.24· Workers' responses to:
"... too many trouble-makers and
agitators among union leaders?"

Figure 2.25: Class Response Trends to:
"... too many trouble-makers and
agitators among union leaders?"

CHAPTER 3: SOCIAL EXPERIENCES AND VARIATION IN WORKERS'
POLITICAL ATTITUDES -- EVIDENCE FROM TWO NATIONAL SURVEYS

This chapter is divided into two major sections. In the first section I outline the theoretical notions which inform my investigation of the relationship between workers' social experiences and political attitudes. The second section consists of a fairly detailed quantitative investigation of the links between social experiences and a variety of political attitudes.

THEORETICAL BASIS FOR THE SOCIAL EXPERIENCES PERSPECTIVE

The idea that differences in workers' social experiences generate differences in political perspective is an old one. For over a century the socialist and communist movements have politically and theoretically wrestled with the implications of variation in political attitudes due to differences in workers' material circumstances and cultural backgrounds. It is well beyond the scope of this thesis to trace the history of writing on this question. However, in analyzing different examples of research and commentary employing what I term the social experiences perspective, I have arrived at the conclusion that the theoretical content of analyses in this tradition can often be summarized by one of three basic propositions. The first goal of this section is to simply state these propositions. I then briefly discuss the content of four theoretical approaches which are either directly or indirectly concerned with working class attitude variation. My argument

will be that each of the approaches represents a systematic development of one or more of the basic propositions. I close the section by identifying those categories of social experiences which need to be examined when considering the utility of the social experiences perspective.

Three Basic Propositions of the Social Experiences Perspective

1. Many workers possess only a limited form of working class identity -- an occupational or factory consciousness. Variations in political attitudes occur when different occupational or factory groupings of workers have distinct interests on a particular issue.[1]

2. Workers are members of a number of social groups. Associated with each group membership is a group identity. Variations in political attitudes occur when one section of the working class relates an issue to a particular group identity and another section relates the same issue to another group identity.

3. The dominant institutions in capitalist society have an important effect on the perspectives of workers. According to Frank Parkin (1967:285), working class attitudes are more distinct when they are shielded from the effects of dominant ideology within working class subcultures. Thus, variations in workers' political attitudes result

---

[1] Gramsci identified occupational consciousness as the first moment in the development of collective political consciousness (1971:181). Research on the working class has often pointed to the importance of groups of workers acting on narrow rather than broad interests. For instance, Beynon (1984:98) describes Ford workers in Liverpool in the late 1960s as possessing a factory class consciousness -- the boundary of their political consciousness and militancy was the factory floor. Beynon's analysis of the Ford workers' political consciousness is consistent with the dual consciousness approach discussed in Chapter 1 of the thesis.

from the fact that dominant ideology does not have a uniform impact on the working class.

Recent Theorizing on Variations in Workers' Political Attitudes

I will discuss four different theoretical approaches. Each develops one or more of the three basic propositions just listed.

In 1966 David Lockwood published an influential article (reprinted as Lockwood, 1975) which identified three proletarian ideal types based on distinct occupational communities. The different perspectives on society held by the proletarian traditionalist, deferential traditionalist and privatized worker were seen to originate in the character of their immediate social contexts (1975:16). Lockwood's theoretical model, therefore, employs the first basic proposition. However, the third proposition is also utilized. While the proletarian traditionalist and deferential traditionalist types are characterized by limited, particularistic perspectives which are relatively unaffected by dominant ideology, the privatized worker type is left open to the influence of dominant ideology due to the absence of a community-based working class subculture.

Erik Olin Wright's revised Marxist class conceptualizations (1978, 1985) are also concerned with variation in working class political attitudes (although this is not the immediate object of his analyses). In his first formulation Wright presented a set of criteria which delimited wage labouring proletarians from wage labourers who have some degree of control in the labour process (1978). In his second formulation Wright delimited wage labouring proletarians from wage labourers who hold either organization or skill/credential assets which

are utilized in production (1985). Both formulations narrow the definition of the working class, thus dealing with variation in working class political attitudes by truncating the population to limit variability. In excluding wage labouring supervisors from the working class Wright systematizes an understanding long held by Marxists -- supervisors are a "special kind of wage-labourer" who handle the job of "direct and constant" supervision of workers on behalf of the capitalist (Marx, 1954:314). In excluding expert and semi-credentialed wage labourers from the working class, however, Wright seems to be responding theoretically to the postwar trend of increasing educational differentiation among workers. Although his approach is quite different from Lockwood's ideal type model, I believe that Wright's class models employ the same two basic propositions. He is concerned with the different material conditions of groups of wage labourers (first proposition) and, as his discussion of contradictory class locations indicates, concerned with how some groups of wage labourers are more subject to bourgeois influence than others (third proposition).

Frank Parkin's social closure theory of stratification (1979) also emphasizes the importance of credential divisions amongst wage labourers. Indeed, Parkin argues that there are two main state-enforced devices for exclusionary closure in advanced capitalist societies -- private property (productive capital) and credentials (cultural capital) (Parkin, 1979:48). This leads him to define the dominant class in modern capitalist societies as "comprising those who possess or control productive capital and those who possess a legal monopoly of professional services" (1979:58). Those with legalized credentials

exploit non-credentialed subordinates by restricting the subordinates' access to the rewards and opportunities available to the credentialed (1979:44). This is quite a different view of exploitation and the class structure than that presented by Wright. However, both Wright and Parkin see differences in skill/credentials as being so central to social cleavage in advanced capitalist societies that credentialed wage labourers are excluded from the working or subordinate class. Education and training are identified as important social experiences affecting political consciousness. Parkin has employed the first basic proposition in developing this argument.

Parkin's main theoretical objective is to develop a set of concepts which are equally useful in analyzing interclass and intraclass conflicts, as well as communal conflicts. In recognizing the importance of competing group identities, Parkin's work is a systematic development of the second basic proposition noted above. While there are certainly some important weaknesses in Parkin's theory of stratification,[2] it succeeds in providing a conceptual framework for analyzing conflict between different groups of workers. Parkin argues that workers may resist their exploitation by the dominant class and at the same time practice exclusionary closure towards other workers. Intraclass exclusion may be unintended or intended (1979:57), and may be based on calculations of economic self-interest, political conservatism, or both (1979:94-95). Consequently, Parkin's concepts facilitate an analysis of

---

[2] Parkin does not deal with the origins and character of structured inequalities in capitalist societies. His work is therefore not a general theory of stratification, only a model for understanding group conflict in the realm of distribution.

manifest intraclass conflicts between workers of different nationalities, religions, races or genders.

The final theoretical approach amounts to a more thorough development of the privatized worker ideal type first discussed in Chapter 1 of the thesis. In outlining the characteristics of the privatized worker I draw upon the work of three different social scientists who have written on this approach. The life of the privatized worker is focussed on familial intimacy and consumerism (Alt, 1976:55), or, alternatively, on "personalized contexts of spiritual fulfillment, familial relations and occupational and friendship networks" (Turkel, 1980:219). Exploitation and oppression in the workplace are tolerated as long as there is compensation in personalized contexts (Alt, 1976:55), and public resources and policies are viewed instrumentally as resources for activities under personal control (Turkel, 1980:219).

The privatized individual is little concerned with social and political issues as long as gratification in personalized contexts is not threatened. Hence, in good times he or she is politically withdrawn, disinterested and passive (Turkel, 1980:229-231), and is not particularly cynical about the overall organization of society (Peterson, 1984:484-485). To the extent that the privatized individual has policy preferences, they are neither consistently liberal nor consistently conservative (Peterson, 1984:485).

Workers' privatized attitudes are generated by the character of their material lives in contemporary capitalist societies. Therefore, this theoretical approach is a development of the first basic

proposition. The collective experience of class was formerly sustained by the conjunction of workplace solidarity and community solidarity; workers, by necessity, lived close to where they worked and participated in the low cost leisure activities of class organizations. However, an increasing standard of living and important changes in the organization of urban centres have largely destroyed this overlap between work and community.[3] In suburbia, workers are spatially detached from traditional communities. The inward turn towards the family in this social vacuum is reinforced by the ability to purchase domestic and recreational goods; this makes the social isolation of familial intimacy both feasible, from the standpoint of housework, and gratifying (Alt, 1976:55). The privatized attitudes generated by the transformation of workers' lives off the job are also seen to be fostered by the increasing social isolation of workers on the job due to the prevalence of scientific management techniques of labour control (Alt, 1976:56; Turkel, 1980:220).

Two final points remain to be made about this theoretical approach to understanding variation in workers' political attitudes. First, privatism is often presented as a general process in advanced capitalist societies. However, privatism is also a source of attitude variation amongst workers since it affects some workers more than others. The extent to which workers are privatized depends upon their material circumstances. Second, privatism is highly contingent on two

---

[3] For an interesting case study of this process see Halle, 1984.

material factors -- a high or at least rising standard of living, and at least a certain degree of individual opportunity (Peterson, 1984:485).

Categories of Social Experiences

By stating the three basic propositions of the social experiences perspective and reviewing theoretical approaches which build upon the propositions, I am now in a position to identify the categories of social experiences which need to be measured and related to political attitudes in this study. In rough terms I intend to examine five categories of workers' social experiences: (1) immediate social experiences at work; (2) immediate social experiences at home; (3) class networks; (4) experience of society-wide trends; and (5) membership in other important social groups. In each category a few variables will be examined. Obviously, I am unable to undertake a totally comprehensive study of the social experiences perspective since there are innumerable social experiences which may influence political attitudes. However, I think this study will be comprehensive in the sense that I made every attempt to include measures of those social experiences which have been discussed in recent theorizing on variation in working class attitudes. Furthermore, in comparison to other empirical studies of working class attitude variation which utilize survey data (e.g., Johnston, 1987; Tanner and Cockerill, 1986; Blackburn and Mann, 1975), a wider spectrum of workers' social experiences will be considered here.

THE STUDY

Comparison to Previous Studies

The research reported in this chapter complements a recent study undertaken by William Johnston (1987). In the 1980s a number of published articles have examined the sources of variation in Canadians' political attitudes utilizing data from national surveys (e.g., Ornstein et al., 1980; Johnston and Ornstein, 1982 and 1985; Matthews and Davis, 1985; Pratt, 1987). Johnston's 1987 article, however, is the first to focus on variation in workers' attitudes utilizing a national data set.

Like Johnston I aim to use national sample survey data to assess whether major differences in social experiences are important determinants of Canadian workers' political attitudes. My research extends Johnston's work in the sense that I employ data from more recent surveys. While his data source was the 1979 Social Change in Canada survey, I utilize data from the 1982 Canadian Class Structure survey[4] and the 1984 Canadian National Election survey[5]. I am thus able to see whether Johnston's findings hold up in the latter two surveys.

---

[4] Data from the 1982 Canadian Class Structure Study, which was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, were made available by John Myles on behalf of the Principal Investigators through the Carleton University Social Science Data Archives. The original collectors of the data and SSHRCC bear no responsibility for the analyses and interpretations presented here.

[5] Data from the 1984 Canadian National Election Study, which was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, were made available by the Study's Principal Investigators. The data were collected by R.D. Lambert, S.D. Brown, J.E. Curtis, B.J. Kay and J.M. Wilson. The original collectors of the data and SSHRCC bear no responsibility for the analyses and interpretations presented here.

At the same time my research differs from Johnston's in a number of ways. In my view these differences allow a fuller evaluation of the social experiences perspective on variation in workers' political attitudes. First, whereas Johnston restricted his study of political consciousness to two economic attitudes, I examine a wider range of political attitudes. The extent to which I can measure different dimensions of workers' political consciousness is obviously limited by the range of items included in the 1982 and 1984 surveys. Given this limitation, however, I proceeded to analyze all those dimensions of political consciousness which could be measured with a multi-item index. Thus, I assess the effects of social experiences on a variety of economic, social and government-related attitudes. Furthermore, I also develop measures of underlying dimensions of political consciousness (what I call second-order political attitudes) to assist in assessing general patterns of attitude division due to differing social experiences.

Second, whereas Johnston restricted his analysis of workers' social experiences to five variables (ethnicity, occupation, religion, gender and region), I examine a wider spectrum of social experiences (23 independent variables for each of the 1982 and 1984 surveys).[6] Third, Johnston's study is quite weak in its treatment of differences in the job experiences of workers -- only a dichotomous skill level variable is

---

[6] I do not look at ethnicity, however, beyond taking account of Quebec/rest of Canada differences. Relatively few workers in either sample were non-English and non-French in ethnic background. Rather than develop large, meaningless categories of ethnicity (e.g., European versus non-European) I chose to neglect this factor.

employed in his analyses (1987:320). In contrast, a number of different dimensions of workers' job experiences are considered in my research, thus giving us a better picture of the effects of job experiences on variation in workers' political attitudes. Fourth, I have designed my research so that I can make general comparisons of results between two surveys. Thus, where the results from the two surveys coincide I will have greater confidence in concluding that an important source of attitude division in the Canadian working class has been identified.

Defining the Working Class

The unweighted sample size of the 1982 Class Structure Study is 2577. The Principal Investigators divided respondents between nine classes using Wright's 1978 criteria. In this classification wage labourers are split between decision managers, adviser managers, supervisors, semi-autonomous workers and the working class. Approximately 45% of the total unweighted sample was classified as working class. It is data for this subsample of 1147 which are analyzed in this thesis. The cases are weighted so that the sample parallels census information on the distribution of the adult Canadian population by age, region and sex (weighted sample size = 1142).

The weighted sample size of the 1984 National Election Study is 3380.[7] In my research with this data set I also tried to apply Wright's 1978 criteria when defining class membership. The working class is

---

[7] The data are weighted so that the sample parallels census information on the distribution of the adult Canadian population by region, community size, sex and age.

operationally defined as being made up of those employed individuals[8] who work for someone else, have limited or no supervisory responsibilities, do not hold a managerial position and do not work in a professional capacity with a great deal of job autonomy. Approximately 44% of the total weighted sample was classified as working class. It is data for this subsample of 1478 which are analyzed in this thesis.[9]

I thus employ a fairly restrictive operational definition of the working class and, as a consequence, fewer than half of the respondents in each of the 1982 and 1984 surveys figure in my analyses. The study could just as easily have been undertaken with larger working class subsamples based on a less restrictive definition of the working class. Indeed, I expect that a less restrictive definition would have yielded subsamples with greater divisions in political attitudes than the subsamples analyzed here. In operationalizing working class membership, however, I was interested in using a Marxist relations-of-production criterion to identify the core of the working class. Although some analysts may argue that I excluded too many from the working class, few would dispute the fact that I have identified the core of the working

---

[8] Both part-time and full-time employees are included in this group.

[9] Housewives were asked about their previous experience in the labour force in the 1982 Class Structure survey but not in the 1984 National Election survey. They are thus included in the 1982 working class sample (on the basis of previously holding a working class job) and excluded from the 1984 working class sample (on the basis of incomplete information). In the 1984 National Election survey I did not assign housewives to a class on the basis of husband's class for two practical reasons: (1) the size of the working class sample was already more than large enough for quantitative analyses; and (2) women were already well represented in the sample (44% of the weighted sample size of 1478).

class as defined by Marx. In my mind, the most important features of my operationalization of class are: (1) the working class subsamples from both the 1982 and 1984 surveys are defined in approximately the same fashion; and (2) the operational definition of the working class utilized in my research is very similar to the definition employed in William Johnston's study (1987:319).

Indicators of Different Dimensions of Political Consciousness

1. Political Attitudes Measured in the 1982 Class Structure Survey

More than 30 political attitude questions were asked as part of the Canadian Class Structure survey. I was interested in utilizing as much of this data as was possible in my investigation of the attitude stratification of the Canadian working class. At the same time I was aware that working with such a large number of separate indicators would be hopelessly cumbersome and that random measurement error represents a relatively large proportion of the variance in single item indicators. Fortunately, it appeared to me that most items were theoretically related to other items in the survey -- small groups of items could be seen as indicators of underlying attitude constructs. As a result I decided to proceed by using factor analysis to guide the construction of summated indexes which would more reliably measure these underlying attitude constructs.[10]

---

[10] An important reason for my use of the technique of factor analysis, therefore, was data reduction. However, I assumed a model of factorial causation (Kim and Mueller, 1978a:43) and had a clear idea of which items indicated the same construct before proceeding. My use of factor analysis in this instance can be seen as containing elements of both the exploratory and confirmatory approaches (see Bollen, 1985:2) even though I call it exploratory factor analysis in Table 3.1.

My first step was to undertake a preliminary factor analysis with 33 items. Most of the items were measured on four-point likert scales with 19 of them worded in a liberal direction, nine in a conservative direction and five being non-directional in wording.[11] I recoded all items so that liberal responses had high scores and conservative responses had low scores. The results of the preliminary analysis allowed me to identify six items which were either not empirically associated with other items in the survey or difficult to interpret in terms of an underlying attitude construct. I then carried out a second factor analysis with the other 27 items. Eight factors with an eigenvalue greater than one were extracted using the principal axis method and obliquely rotated using the oblimin method. Each of the eight factors was readily interpretable as a latent attitude construct. The results of this factor analysis along with the name I assigned to each construct are reported in Table 3.1. Using the factor analysis results I constructed eight summated index indicators of the attitude constructs. The alpha reliabilities for these indexes (also recorded in Table 3.1) are quite modest in size -- they range from a low of .44 to a high of .64. However, these indexes are certainly more reliable measures than single item indicators.

---

[11] The predominance of items worded in a liberal direction shows that the Principal Investigators in the 1982 Class Structure Study did not attempt to measure the same construct with an equal number of oppositely worded questions. I thus anticipate that correlations between similarly worded indicators of the same construct are in part due to response acquiescence. The magnitude of this source of systematic measurement error is usually modest, however, and I do not expect it to undermine the substantive findings of my analyses.

The factor correlation matrix from this analysis gives us a picture of the structural relations between the eight attitude constructs (see Table 3.2). The pattern of correlations suggests that these attitude constructs are themselves determined by latent attitude constructs at a second order of abstraction. To assess this possibility I factor analyzed the factor correlation matrix (see Kim and Mueller, 1978b:77). Four factors with an eigenvalue greater than one were extracted using the principal axis method and rotated obliquely using the oblimin method. The results of this second-order factor analysis are reported in Table 3.3. This second-order factor analysis allowed me to construct four summated index indicators of the second-order attitude constructs. One of the indicators -- Equality for Women -- is identical to an indicator of a first-order attitude construct. The other second-order index indicators -- Economic Radicalism, Economic Humanitarianism and Authoritarian Individualism -- represent combinations of two or three first-order indexes. In subsequent empirical analyses, the indicators of second-order attitude constructs are utilized wherever general treatments of workers' political consciousness are called for. Because of the limited range of attitude items included in the original survey, these indicators of second-order constructs are only moderately reliable. However, I use them since they are the best available indicators of general dimensions of political consciousness.

2. Political Attitudes Measured in the 1984 National Election Survey

Many of the attitude items in the 1984 National Election survey are specifically concerned with the election or with party politics. At the same time, over 50 other likert-scale items measure respondents'

attitudes towards a wide range of more general political issues. Employing the same rationale and techniques that guided my construction of summated indexes from the 1982 Class Structure data, I constructed nine index indicators of first-order attitude constructs (see Table 3.4) and five index indicators of second-order attitude constructs (see Tables 3.7 and 3.8).

Forty-one different items were utilized in constructing the indexes. I proceeded by dividing the items into two groups. The first group, comprised of 18 items, is concerned with a range of political policy issues. The second group, comprised of 23 items, is broadly concerned with political participation and political efficacy. My division follows the conception of political culture proposed by Ornstein et al. (1980:255), with the first group of items belonging to the "ideological" layer of political culture and the second group belonging to the "system of government" layer.

Eight of the "ideological" layer items were worded in a liberal direction, eight were worded in a conservative direction and the other two had non-directional wording. I standardized the coding of all items so that liberal responses had high scores and conservative responses had low scores. The 18 items were then factor analyzed. Five factors with an eigenvalue of at least one were extracted using the principal axis method and obliquely rotated using the oblimin method. Each factor indicated a conceptually distinct latent attitude. The names assigned to the first-order attitude constructs are recorded in Table 3.4, as are the alpha reliabilities of the summated index indicators of each construct. The structural relations between these first-order

constructs are reported in Table 3.5. This factor correlation matrix was itself factor analyzed; the results for this analysis are found in Table 3.7.[12] Based upon this analysis I constructed summated index indicators of the second-order constructs. The alpha reliabilities of these indexes are not very large (.48 to .62, see Table 3.7). Still, they are the best available indicators of second-order attitude constructs relating to the "ideological" layer of political culture.

Of the 23 items relating to the "system of government" layer of political culture, 14 were worded in an alienated direction, four were worded in a non-alienated direction and five were non-directional in wording. I coded all items such that alienated or low participation responses were scored high and non-alienated or high participation responses were scored low. Factors were extracted using the principal axis method[13] and rotated obliquely using the oblimin method. This analysis produced four interpretable factors. As recorded in Table 3.4, the alpha reliabilities of the summated index indicators of these first-order attitude constructs range from .72 to .82. The correlations between factors (see Table 3.6) were then factor analyzed to assist in

---

[12] Factors were extracted using the principal axis method and rotated obliquely using the oblimin method. Only two eigenvalues were greater than 1. However, three values were located on the slope of the eigenvalue plot so I chose to extract and rotate three factors. (I also examined a two factor solution. One of the first-order constructs -- Economic Justice -- did not have a substantial loading on either of the factors in this solution.)

[13] There were six factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1 but the distinct content of two of the factors was not easily interpretable. In addition, the plot of eigenvalues revealed that only four values were located on the slope of the plot. I thus chose to extract and rotate four factors.

identifying attitude constructs at a second order of abstraction. Two factors were extracted using the principal axis method and obliquely rotated using the oblimin method. As recorded in Table 3.8, the alpha reliabilities of the summated index indicators of these two second-order attitude constructs are very large -- .8 or larger in each case.

Indicators of Social Experiences

My aim in operationalizing the independent variables in this study was to develop indicators which were roughly the same for each data set. In Appendix 1 I report the operational definitions of the social experience variables examined in this chapter along with descriptive statistics for each variable. Appendix 1 is set up to facilitate a comparison of operational definitions across data sets. In many cases the definitions are virtually identical but in a few cases they differ substantially, and these differences in operationalization may affect the results of the study.

In three cases I use a summated index to measure an independent variable. I report the construction of these indexes here rather than in Appendix 1. The first two indexes were constructed from 12 items included in the 1982 Class Structure survey which asked each respondent to subjectively assess the different skill requirements of her/his job. I factor analyzed the items (Q68a to Q68h, Q70, Q71a to Q71c) and was able to identify two distinct skill dimensions.[14] Ten items loaded on the first factor and two items loaded on the second factor. The items

_____

[14] There were two factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1. They accounted for 40% of the common variance. Two factors were extracted using the principal axis method and orthogonally rotated using the varimax method.

with the highest factor loadings on the first factor measured a respondent's subjective assessment of how much her/his job requires abstract knowledge, decision-making and understanding based upon experience. The 10 items were summated into a Mental Skill Index (alpha reliability = .84). The items loading on the second factor measured a respondent's subjective assessment of how much her/his job requires skilled work with hands and use of hands. The two items were summated into a Manual Skill Index (alpha reliability = .69). The third summated index was constructed from two items in the 1984 National Election survey. Each respondent was asked to report the formal educational attainment of her/his father (Var429) and mother (Var430). The items were summated into a Parents' Education index (alpha reliability = .74).

One other independent variable deserves special mention -- Spouse Non-Working Class. This is a dummy variable where the reference category (Coded 0) is a composite residual category in both surveys. The residual category is comprised of all those individuals who do not have a spouse who is a member of the paid labour force and is employed in a non-working class job. The residual category makes up 86% of the 1982 sample and 83% of the 1984 sample. Spouse Non-Working Class is one indicator of an individual's class networks.

Data Analysis

The relationship between different social experiences and each dimension of workers' political consciousness was first assessed by examining Pearson correlation coefficients. A series of multiple regression analyses were then undertaken with both second-order and first-order political attitudes serving as the dependent variables.

Thus, for the 1982 Class Structure data there were 11 separate regression runs and for the 1984 National Election data there were 13 separate regression runs. (In each data set one of the first-order attitudes is also a second-order attitude.) A social experience variable was included in a regression run if its correlation with the dependent variable was significant at the .01 level (two-tailed test).[15] This fairly stringent criterion for including a variable in a multivariate analysis was adopted because I was interested in arriving at a parsimonious picture of the major social experience determinants of workers' political attitudes. The residuals from each regression run were studied to assess if there were major violations of the assumptions of the multiple regression technique (see Norusis, 1985:24-29). In most analyses there did not appear to be major assumption violations. In 3 of the 24 regression runs, however, the distribution of residuals was not normal. In each case the dependent variable was an index made up of just two items (Big Business Power and Opportunities for Poor from the 1982 Class Structure survey and Vote Cynicism from the 1984 National Election survey). Because the results of multiple regression analyses for these three indexes are questionable, and because the information recorded in these indexes is summarized in second-order indexes, I do not report results involving these indexes in this chapter. I also do not report results for five other first-order indexes (Help

---

[15] In some cases a dummy variable was included in a regression analysis even though the correlation coefficient was not significant at the .01 level. I did so when it appeared that the correlation coefficient did not represent the influence of the dummy variable because of the composition of the reference category.

Disadvantaged from the 1982 data set; and Unemployment Bum, Social Libertarianism, Government Mistrust and Non-Participation in Informal Politics from the 1984 data set) since the information from analyses involving these variables does not add to the understanding gained from considering analyses involving the relevant second-order indexes.

One additional multiple regression analysis was undertaken for each of the remaining indicators of political attitudes. In this case correlations were corrected for attenuation due to random measurement error before undertaking the regression. The results for these analyses are recorded in the "Beta" columns of Tables 3.11, 3.12, 3.13 and 3.14. The uncorrected correlations between political attitudes and social experiences are also reported in these tables (the "r" columns).

A number of social experience variables are in dummy variable format. I report Beta coefficients for these variables even though the interpretation of Beta coefficients appropriate for continuous independent variables does not apply to dummy independent variables (Fox, 1984:85). My data analysis objective is to assess the relative importance of each independent variable in an analysis, not to supply a prediction-type interpretation of its independent effect on a dependent variable. Given my objective, I believe the reporting of Beta coefficients in conjunction with dummy variables is appropriate.

FINDINGS

Univariate Statistics for Political Attitudes

It will be useful to briefly consider the univariate statistics for each attitude index before I turn to an examination of the

relationship between social experiences and different dimensions of workers' political consciousness. These statistics, presented in Tables 3.9 (for indexes measured in the 1982 Class Structure survey) and 3.10 (for indexes measured in the 1984 National Election survey), can give us an idea of the character of the distribution of a political attitude amongst Canadian workers.

Two lines in each table are particularly useful for interpreting the character of attitude distribution. The first such line is a record of the mean of an index. In itself the magnitude of the mean has no significance because it is dependent upon the scaling of items and number of items in an index. However, each mean can be compared to the value of the mid-point of the index scale (line above the mean line in each table) to get an idea of the general tendency in the direction of workers' attitudes. The second such line records the relative group dissensus -- a statistic similar to the coefficient of variation.[16] By comparing the size of the relative group dissensus on different indexes we are able to identify the indexes on which there is more or less variation in each of the two samples.

Looking at the mean lines in Tables 3.9 and 3.10, there are four second-order indexes where the mean is quite a distance above the index mid-point, two second-order indexes where the mean is quite a distance

---

[16] The coefficient of variation (standard deviation/mean) could not be used here to compare variation on each index since the value of each index mean is partly dependent upon the arbitrary direction in which items are coded. Ideally it would be advisable to calculate two coefficients of variation for each index (one for each possible coding scheme) and use the average of the two as a measure of variability. My measure of relative group dissensus approximates this average; the mid-point of each index scale is used as the denominator in the calculation.

below the index mid-point, and three second-order indexes where the mean and mid-point are quite close. Canadian workers tend to support economic justice/economic humanitarianism, equality for women and an authoritarian individualist perspective. They also tend to be interested and involved in informal politics although alienated from government. These are interesting tendencies and are consistent with the analysis of Gallup Poll questions presented in the last chapter. Yet it must be remembered that the mean for an index relative to an index mid-point is highly dependent upon the specific wording of the items in an index. In other words, a modest alteration in question wording of items can greatly affect the general tendency of index distribution.[17] Thus, it is important not to overemphasize the significance of the general tendency of workers' responses on any particular index.

The relative group dissensus gives us another picture of the character of attitude distribution. On four second-order indexes this descriptive statistic is less than 20% -- Economic Radicalism, Authoritarian Individualism, Economic Justice and Alienation from Government. Variability in the samples is relatively less on these indexes. This means that there is less variation to explain in the multivariate analyses to be discussed later in this chapter. In contrast, on two second-order indexes the relative group dissensus

---

[17] In contrast, the indexes constructed in this chapter are much better suited to assessing the relationship between political attitudes and social experiences. Modest changes in item wording, which may have a strong impact on marginal distributions, should not affect the social experience / political attitude relationship.

statistic is almost 25% -- Moral/Defence Liberalism and Political Disinterest/Non-Participation. There is relatively more variation to explain in these indexes.

The Effects of Workers' Social Experiences on Political Attitudes

Over the next several pages I will be referring to the correlation coefficients, Beta coefficients and coefficients of determination which are recorded in Tables 3.11 to 3.14. My analysis will be centred on the social experience variables -- I will discuss the effect of each variable across the spectrum of political attitudes. Before proceeding with these analyses, however, it will be useful to consider the range in the coefficients of determination reported in the tables.

Social experiences account for a much greater percentage of the variation in some political attitudes than others. For second-order indexes the range in the coefficients of determination reported in Tables 3.11 and 3.13 is .22 with the high value being .32 (for Authoritarian Individualism, Table 3.11) and the low value being .11 (for Economic Humanitarianism, Table 3.11).[18] It is useful to divide the second-order indexes into three categories according to the percentage of variation explained by social experience variables. In the first category are two political attitudes where 25% or more of the variation is explained by different aspects of workers' social experience. Both of these attitudes -- Authoritarian Individualism from

---

[18] An analysis of the coefficients of determination for multiple regression runs involving first-order indexes is not reported here. Such an analysis is generally consistent with the analysis for second-order indexes.

the 1982 Class Structure survey and Moral/Defence Liberalism from the 1984 National Election survey -- are concerned with social, not economic, issues. In the second category are four political attitudes where between 15% and 25% of the variation is explained by social experience variables. In this category are two economic attitudes -- Economic Radicalism (1982 survey) and Economic Individualism (1984 survey) -- along with Equality for Women (1982 survey) and Political Disinterest/Non-Participation (1984 survey). In the third category are the remaining three second-order political attitudes; each has a coefficient of determination of less than .15. Two of these attitudes are very similar in content -- Economic Humanitarianism (1982 survey) and Economic Justice (1984 survey). The other attitude in this category is Alienation from Government (1984 survey).

In analyzing this patterning of the coefficients of determination I examined the relationship between the relative group dissensus on each index (reported in Tables 3.9 and 3.10) and the size of the coefficient of determination. In the 1984 survey a positive relationship was clearly evident -- the two indexes with the smallest coefficients of determination also had the least overall variation. However, the relationship did not hold for the indexes measured in the 1982 survey; indeed, the relative group dissensus for Economic Humanitarianism was the highest even though the coefficient of determination was the lowest. Therefore, I conclude that the patterning of the coefficients of determination is largely due to the content differences between the political attitudes rather than the differences in variability between indexes. This conclusion is supported by the

fact that in those three cases where a second-order index measured in the 1982 survey is somewhat comparable in content to an index measured in the 1984 survey,[19] social experience variables account for approximately the same amount of variation.

1. Class Networks

Both of the class network variables measured in this study -- Working Class Background and Spouse Non-Working Class -- have important effects on a number of political attitudes. Working Class Background is the more important of the two variables. In multivariate analyses it was the single most important determinant of the second-order attitude Economic Radicalism (1982 survey) and, in addition, was an important determinant of Economic Humanitarianism (1982 survey), Economic Justice (1984 survey) and Alienation from Government (1984 survey). In summary, workers from working class backgrounds are more Left in their economic views than other workers, and are somewhat more alienated from government. It is noteworthy that this aspect of workers' social experience influences both practical and abstract economic attitudes. As shown in Table 3.12, Working Class Background is an important determinant of both the practical first-order attitude Strike Sympathies and the more abstract first-order attitude Capitalist Economic Organization.

Spouse Non-Working Class has a more limited, albeit important, influence on workers' political attitudes. It is a minor determinant of

---

[19] The three comparisons between surveys are: (1) Economic Humanitarianism (1982) and Economic Justice (1984); (2) Authoritarian Individualism (1982) and Moral/Defence Liberalism (1984); and (3) Economic Radicalism (1982) and Economic Individualism (1984).

Economic Radicalism (see Table 3.11), Economic Individualism and Political Disinterest/Non-Participation (see Table 3.13). This variable is also an important determinant of two union-related first-order attitudes -- Strike Sympathies (1982 survey, Table 3.12) and General Union (1984 survey, Table 3.14). In the multiple regression analysis with Strike Sympathies as the dependent variable, Spouse Non-Working Class was the fourth most important determinant, exceeded only by two union experience variables and Working Class Background. In the multiple regression analysis with General Union as the dependent variable (see Table 3.14), Spouse Non-Working Class was the second most important determinant, exceeded only by Union Member. In summary, workers with non-working class spouses are less sympathetic towards unions, somewhat more conservative in their economic views, and more interested and involved in politics.

Two final observations about the effects of these two class network variables are in order. First, they have important influences on the economic and government-related attitudes measured in this study but not the social attitudes Authoritarian Individualism, Moral/Defence Liberalism and Equality for Women. Second, it seems clear that a broad range of class experience must be considered when analyzing workers' political consciousness. Workers with "mixed" class histories tend to be more conservative in economic views and pro-system of government than other workers even when a range of other social experiences are held constant in multiple regression analyses.

2. Job Characteristics and Economic Sector

Comparison of the effects of job characteristics on political attitudes between the 1982 and 1984 surveys is complicated by the different ways that workers' immediate job experiences are measured (see Appendix 1). As a consequence, probably the easiest place to begin my interpretation is with a variable with which the reader is familiar: the Blue Collar/White Collar occupational division. In the 1982 Class Structure survey this variable had a statistically significant correlation with all eight of the indexes reported in Tables 3.11 and 3.12. However, when other variables were held constant in multivariate analyses it was only an important determinant of economic attitudes -- Economic Radicalism and Economic Humanitarianism among the second-order indexes and Strike Sympathies and Capitalist Economic Organization among the first-order indexes. It is of interest that this broad occupational division affects both practical and abstract economic attitudes and that it is an important determinant even when the technical content of jobs is measured and held constant. In summary, blue collar workers are more Left in their economic attitudes than white collar workers. It would seem that blue collar and white collar workers generally tend to view the economic organization of Canadian society in different ways.

Separate measures of the mental and manual skill dimensions of a worker's job were also made in the 1982 Class Structure survey. Somewhat surprisingly, the first of these variables had next to no impact on variation in political attitudes while the second was an important determinant of only one second-order attitude -- Economic Radicalism. In that case workers with manual skill jobs were more

economically radical than workers in jobs which did not involve manual skills (see Table 3.11).

In the 1984 National Election survey job characteristics were measured by dividing respondents among three categories: Skilled Manual, Nonskilled Manual and Non-manual. The Nonskilled Manual variable had statistically significant associations with four of five second-order attitudes, while the Skilled Manual variable was moderately associated with three of the second-order attitudes (see Table 3.13).[20] In multivariate analyses Nonskilled Manual and Skilled Manual were the two most important determinants of Economic Justice and were important determinants of Economic Individualism (see Table 3.13). This result is consistent with my finding from the 1982 survey that the blue collar/white collar division is an important source of variation in economic attitudes. As well, Nonskilled Manual was a determinant of Alienation from Government and Political Disinterest/Non-Participation -- nonskilled manual workers tended to be more alienated from government and less interested in politics. Finally, skilled manual workers tended to be more conservative on moral issues than either nonskilled manual or nonmanual workers.

---

[20] The correlation coefficients for the Skilled Manual dummy variable must be interpreted carefully. The reference group for this dummy variable is made up of both nonskilled manual workers and nonmanual workers. When the means of the three occupational groups on an attitude are rank ordered, with skilled manual workers in the middle, a correlation coefficient does not capture the distinctiveness of skilled manual workers. This is because the joint mean of nonskilled manual workers and nonmanual workers is quite similar to the mean of skilled manual workers. In such a case, the importance of the Skilled Manual dummy variable is best seen in a multiple regression analysis where both Skilled Manual and Nonskilled Manual are entered, with nonmanual workers forming the reference category.

In the 1984 survey a worker's job input was also measured. This can be seen as an indicator which partially covers the same conceptual territory as the Mental Skill index measured in the 1982 survey. Job Input had a statistically significant correlation with only two political attitudes -- Alienation from Government and Political Disinterest / Non-Participation -- and was only an important determinant of the latter dimension of political consciousness in multivariate analyses. Workers lacking job input tended to be higher in political disinterest (see Table 3.13). This finding is consistent with the notion that a lack of occupational self-direction has important influences on workers' values and intellectual functioning (Kohn and Schooler, 1983:185-186).

In summary, broad occupational divisions among workers have a much more important influence on political consciousness than variations in the mental and manual content of jobs. It thus appears that the technical character of jobs is not nearly as important to the development of political consciousness as the recognition that workers have of the place of certain types of jobs in the class structure.

I also considered the effect of two other job characteristics -- Years on Current Job and Personal Income -- on political attitudes. The first of these variables was only measured in the 1982 Class Structure survey. In multivariate analyses workers who had spent a longer time at their current job tended to be more economically radical, but also less economically humanitarian and less sympathetic in attitude towards the poor (see Tables 3.11 and 3.12). This finding suggests that the economic radicalism of high-seniority workers may be based on a radical

self-interest rather than a class perspective. They would be prime candidates to not only practice usurpationary closure towards an employer, but also exclusionary closure towards less privileged members of the working class (see Parkin, 1979).

Personal Income was measured in both surveys. In only one case was it an important determinant of a second-order political attitude: workers higher in income were less alienated from government even when a number of other social experience variables were held constant. This finding suggests that the compensating benefits of a high wage or salary tend to increase workers' support for the system of government, and is consistent with one aspect of the privatized worker type.

Finally, the influences of two indicators of economic sector on political attitudes were also examined. Company Size, which was measured in both surveys, did not have a consistent pattern of determination across the surveys. Profit Sector, which was measured in the 1982 survey, was an important determinant of only Capitalist Economic Organization. Workers employed in the profit sector were more likely to be anti-capitalist in attitude than workers employed in the public sector, even when the effects of other social experiences were held constant (see Table 3.12). Perhaps direct experience with capitalist companies pushes some profit sector workers towards an anti-capitalist perspective.

3. Key Worker Experiences

Union involvement and unemployment were hypothesized to be key experiences which would shape workers' political consciousness. One of the surprises of this study is the small impact of these variables on

political attitudes. Unemployment, which was measured in both surveys, has small associations with all the first-order and second-order attitudes and was not an important determinant in any multivariate analysis. Union membership, which was also measured in both surveys, had a very limited impact on political consciousness. Union members were much more sympathetic towards strikes and unions (see Tables 3.12 and 3.14), but were indistinguishable from non-union workers on other political attitudes. Another aspect of union experience, however, had a somewhat more generalized influence on political consciousness. Strike participation, which was measured in the 1982 survey, was a major determinant of Economic Radicalism. Workers who had been on strike tended to be more economically radical than other workers. This suggests that active involvement in union struggles rather than passive union membership is crucial to the development of Left-wing economic perspectives among workers. I return to this issue in Chapter 5 of the thesis.

4. Home Situation

The home environment of workers is a crucial feature of the explanation of workers' political consciousness provided by privatism theorists. Both Housing Tenure and Family Income were measured in the 1982 and 1984 surveys. The first variable did not have a major impact upon any of the dimensions of political consciousness measured in this study. Family Income, though, was a major determinant of Economic Justice in the 1984 survey: in a multivariate analysis workers with higher family income were less likely to favour economic justice than workers with lower family incomes (see Table 3.13). It is important to

put an asterisk beside this finding, however, since Family Income was not associated with the economic attitudes measured in the 1982 survey. This is an inconsistency in results across surveys where I would expect to find consistency.

5. Society-Wide Trends

Two of the society-wide trend variables -- age and education -- each had important effects on a number of workers' political attitudes. Age was a major determinant of Equality for Women and Authoritarian Traditionalism in the 1982 Class Structure survey (see Tables 3.11 and 3.12), and was a major determinant of Economic Individualism, Moral/Defence Liberalism and Political Disinterest / Non-Participation in the 1984 National Election survey (see Table 3.13). With the effects of other social experiences held constant, older workers tended to be more socially conservative, more economically individualist and more interested in politics than younger workers. It is noteworthy that generational differences have a minimal impact on workers' economic attitudes, even though they are an important determinant of variation in other dimensions of workers' political consciousness.

Education was measured in both surveys. In addition, Parents' Education was measured in the 1984 survey.[21] Education was significantly correlated with six of nine second-order indexes and in five cases was an important determinant in the multiple regression analysis. In both surveys, workers with higher levels of education were more economically conservative than workers with less education. In the

_____

[21] It was only measured for a split sample in the 1982 survey and I chose not to analyze this data.

1982 survey this difference applied to both the practical Strike Sympathies first-order attitude and the abstract Capitalist Economic Organization first-order attitude (see Table 3.12). But workers with higher levels of education were also less traditionalist than workers with lower levels of education (see Tables 3.11 and 3.12), and were less likely to blame welfare recipients (see Table 3.12). Finally, workers with higher levels of education were less alienated and more politically involved than workers with less education (see Table 3.13). Overall, education differences were an important source of variation in a number of the political attitudes considered in this study, and workers with higher levels of education tended to exhibit a pattern of attitudes quite distinct from workers with lower levels of education. This is clearly a very important social cleavage in the working class, especially given the increasing educational differentiation in Canada noted in Chapter 1. I further study the effects of education on workers' political consciousness in Part Three of the thesis.[22]

The third variable in the society-wide trends category -- Urban Childhood -- was a determinant of only one second-order attitude in the two surveys. Workers who grew up in a rural area were more authoritarian individualist in perspective than workers who grew up in a city or town.

_____

[22] Parents' Education was a more important determinant than Education in only one of the multiple regression runs reported in Tables 3.13 and 3.14 -- Moral/Defence Liberalism.

6. Gender

Gender was significantly correlated with only three of the nine second-order attitudes measured in this study (see Tables 3.11 and 3.13). As would be expected, gender was the major determinant of Equality for Women with women workers tending to be more supportive of equality than men workers. Gender was also an important determinant of Moral/Defence Liberalism (1984 survey) and Economic Humanitarianism (1982 survey). Women were distinctly more liberal than men in their views on moral and defence issues. This finding is consistent with the theory that women's traditional socialization as nurturers has created a distinctive humanitarian political ethos (see Kopinak, 1987:20). However, I also found that Canadian working class women tended to be less economically humanitarian than working class men. Overall, my results suggest that there is no generalized gender gap in the political attitudes of Canadian workers, although some important differences do exist.

7. Region

As has been found in previous national survey research on political attitudes (e.g., Ornstein et al., 1980; Johnston, 1987), the attitudes of respondents living in Quebec tended to be quite different from the attitudes of respondents living in the rest of Canada. In this study the attitudes of Quebec workers were very distinct in the 1982 Class Structure survey and somewhat distinct in the 1984 National Election survey. The difference in results between the surveys is perplexing, but the key point is that there is a degree of consistency

in the results. Clearly this regional division is an important source of variation in the political attitudes of Canadian workers.

Looking first at the multivariate results for the 1982 survey, the Quebec Region dummy variable was the most important determinant of the second-order index Authoritarian Individualism as well as the two first-order attitudes which comprise this index, Welfare Bum and Authoritarian Traditionalism (see Tables 3.11 and 3.12). Quebec workers were more liberal in perspective than workers from other provinces. The Quebec Region dummy variable was also a major determinant of two out of the other three second-order attitudes and was the most important determinant of the first-order attitude Capitalist Economic Organization. In summary, Quebec workers were distinctly more liberal than other workers on social issues and more critical of capitalist economic organization. Interestingly, they were also less humanitarian on economic issues.[23]

In the 1984 survey the Quebec Region dummy variable was significantly correlated with only three of the indexes listed in Tables 3.13 and 3.14. It was an important determinant of Moral/Defence Liberalism and Military Defence and a minor determinant of Political Disinterest / Non-Participation. In summary, Quebec workers were more

---

[23] It is difficult to know how to interpret this finding. One possibility is that Quebec workers who are either conscious or practical socialists tend to think that the government or employers, not other workers, should help the needy. The other possibility is that Quebec workers are more self-interested than other workers. I favour the former interpretation since it is consistent with the general economic Leftism of the Quebec workers in this sample.

liberal than other workers on social issues, and slightly less interested in politics.

Therefore, in both the 1982 and 1984 surveys Quebec workers were more liberal on social issues than other workers. At the same time, when the results of the two surveys are compared across different economic attitudes, no consistent pattern emerges. In interpreting this situation it is important to note that Quebec workers were to the Left of other workers on economic issues in the 1979 Social Change in Canada survey (Johnston, 1987). Therefore, my best guess is that the 1982 results reflect a real phenomenon rather than sampling error. It is also interesting that Quebec residents were lower in political participation than respondents from other regions in the 1977 Social Change in Canada survey (Ornstein, 1980); this finding is consistent with my results from the 1984 National Election survey.

Only one other consistent regional effect emerged in this study. In the 1982 survey, B.C. workers were more sympathetic in attitude towards those on welfare than the workers in any other region except Quebec (see Table 3.12). In the 1984 survey, B.C. workers were more liberal on moral and defence issues that the workers in any other region except Quebec (see Table 3.13). As well, in the 1982 survey B.C. workers were more sympathetic towards strikes than workers in any other region. Overall, then, B.C. workers appear to be somewhat distinctive in attitude from other Canadian workers, although not nearly as distinctive as Quebec workers.

8. Religion

In considering the results for the variable labelled Roman Catholic it is important to note an important difference in operational definitions between the 1982 and 1984 surveys (see Appendix 1). In the 1982 Class Structure survey this dummy variable is a vector made up of the 32% of the sample who are _practicing_ Roman Catholics. In the 1984 National Election survey it is a vector made up of the 52% of the sample who identify themselves as Roman Catholics.

In the 1982 survey the only religion variable I constructed was Roman Catholic. It did not have an important effect on any of the political attitudes. In the 1984 survey both Roman Catholic and No Religion were measured. Both of these dummy variables were important determinants of Moral/Defence Liberalism and Economic Individualism. Roman Catholic and No Religion respondents were more liberal in their social views than other respondents, and were also more collectivist in their economic orientation. At the same time, religion did not influence the other three second-order attitudes in this survey.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The social experiences perspective on variation in working class political attitudes has been empirically studied in this chapter. A number of social experience variables I looked at did not have a significant impact on the political attitudes of workers. Among the variables which fall into this group are housing tenure and unemployment experience. Other social experience variables had a limited impact -- they were determinants of one or two dimensions of political

consciousness but not other dimensions. Variables in this group include union membership and gender. Finally, some social experience variables had an influence on a wide range of political attitudes. These important determinants were found in four different categories of social experiences: class networks, job characteristics, society-wide trends and region.

Class network and job characteristic variables had important influences on economic and government-related attitudes, but not social attitudes. Blue collar workers and workers tied to working class networks tended to be distinctly more Left in their economic perspectives, as well as somewhat more alienated from government and somewhat less involved in politics. Two society-wide trend variables, education and age, had a different pattern of determination on political attitudes. Education had a generalized influence, affecting economic, social and government-related attitudes. Specifically, workers with higher levels of education were more conservative in their economic views, more liberal on social issues, less alienated from government and more politically involved. The influence of age was narrower, primarily affecting social attitudes and political participation. Older workers were more conservative in social perspective and more involved in politics. Finally, an analysis of the impact of region of residence showed that Quebec workers tend to be quite distinct in political perspective from workers in other regions, while B.C. workers tend to be somewhat distinct. Quebec workers were very liberal on social issues and apparently somewhat to the Left on economic issues. B.C. workers

were also Left on social issues and the most sympathetic towards strikes
of all Canadian workers.

It is important to note that each of the three basic
propositions of the social experiences perspective receives some support
from this study. The first proposition traces variations in workers'
political attitudes to differences in occupational or factory
consciousness. My finding that broad occupational differences influence
economic and government-related attitudes is consistent with this
proposition. Blue collar workers, particularly those who hold
nonskilled jobs, are more Left in their economic attitudes and more
alienated from government. Indeed, in multivariate analyses involving
the 1982 Class Structure data set, the Blue Collar dummy variable was a
major determinant of the Capitalist Economic Organization attitude as
well as political attitudes with a more practical focus. This indicates
that broad occupational differences are related to the degree of active
consent to capitalist domination in addition to the general direction of
economic and government-related political consciousness.

The second proposition argues that variations in political
consciousness are due to the existence of alternative group identities
among workers. In this study I identified both national and
generational identities as important sources of attitude division in the
working class. It must be reiterated, however, that age did not affect
economic attitudes. In contrast, the Quebec Region dummy variable was
an important determinant of a wide range of political attitudes and,
indeed, was the single most important determinant of Capitalist Economic
Organization. This indicates that Quebec workers are much less likely

to actively consent to capitalist domination than workers in the rest of the country.

The third proposition linked variations in workers' political attitudes to the degree of participation in working class subcultures. The importance of class network variables in my investigation sustains this proposition. Workers with "mixed" class experience tend to be more Right on economic issues and less alienated from government than other workers. It is especially noteworthy that Working Class Background is an important determinant of Capitalist Economic Organization -- when workers have a working class background they are less likely to actively consent to capitalist domination. The importance of Education as a determinant of workers' political consciousness also lends support to the third proposition. Workers with higher levels of education have been exposed to variants of the dominant ideology during their educational years. As a consequence, they are much more likely to have assimilated pro-capitalist perspectives and to actively consent to capitalist domination.

In fact, the social experience which has the greatest overall impact on workers' political attitudes is education. This finding is particularly significant when it is remembered that the definition of working class adopted in this study excludes many high education wage labourers from the study sample, thus attenuating the actual impact of education on political attitudes in the working class. In assessing the impact of education it is important to recall that this is a society-wide trend variable. As discussed in Chapter 1, the amount of formal education obtained by children from all classes has dramatically risen

during the postwar years, and many workers value post-secondary education for their children as much as owners or professionals. It seems likely that, barring an economic crisis that is much more severe than anything which has been experienced in Canada this century, the education levels of the Canadian working class will continue to rise in coming years, and the distinctive attitudes of high education workers will become more prevalent. I found that workers higher in education are less alienated from the system of government, higher in political interest, more liberal on social issues and less likely to support working class struggle. The importance of education in this study of variation in workers' political attitudes is consistent with its importance in much contemporary social theory, including the works of Erik Olin Wright and Frank Parkin.

In William Johnston's recent study, a dichotomous measure of occupational skill was not related to variation in Canadian workers' views on redistribution and social welfare spending (1987:323). I set out in this research to better assess the impact of differences in job characteristics on workers' political attitudes. My surprising finding was that broad divisions in job experiences (e.g., blue collar vs. white collar) had a much more important effect on political attitudes than measures of the technical content of jobs. Since job characteristics were important determinants of a range of political attitudes in both the 1982 Class Structure survey and the 1984 National Election survey, I suspect that Johnston's finding of no relationship does not represent the importance of occupational divisions in the generation of workers' political attitudes.

The important effects of Working Class Background and Spouse Non-Working Class on workers' political attitudes point to the necessity of considering workers' total class experience in studying the generation of political consciousness. Many Canadian workers have non-working class experience, either as a child growing up, at some point in their own working life, or vicariously through a spouse. Such experience tends to shift workers' economic attitudes to the Right.

Both generational and national divisions in the Canadian working class are also important determinants of political consciousness. Of these two alternative types of group identity, nationality is the more important. This finding is consistent with the results of previous studies and accords with the view that there exist two distinctive national political cultures in Canada -- Quebecois and English Canadian (e.g., Graham, 1986:9-21).

In closing this investigation of the social experiences perspective it will be useful to put this detailed empirical analysis in context. It must be emphasized that social experience variables explained only a small amount of the variation in some political attitudes. For instance, the adjusted coefficient of determination for the analysis involving Economic Justice is .11, for the analysis involving Alienation from Government is .11, and for the analysis involving Capitalist Economic Organization is .15. Consequently, when the major determinants of these political attitudes are described, it must be remembered that the vast amount of variation is unexplained, even with corrections for random measurement error taken into account.

In Parts Two and Three of the thesis I undertake further studies of the relationship between workers' social experiences and political consciousness. The results of this chapter point to those social experiences which deserve the most careful scrutiny: class networks, the blue collar/white collar occupational division, age and education.[24]

---

[24] The designs of the studies in Parts Two and Three do not allow me to study the effects of region on workers' political consciousness.

Table 3.1: First-Order Political Attitude Constructs,
Working Class, 1982 Canadian Class Structure Survey

Construct Name/ Alpha of the Summated Index	Item Labels and Wording[a] (factor loadings in exploratory factor analysis)
Strike Sympathies (alpha = .44)	Q137c) During a strike, management should be prohibited by law from hiring workers to take the place of strikers. (.56) Q137f) Striking workers are generally justified in physically preventing strikebreakers from entering the place of work. (.50) Q142) Imagine that workers in some firm are out on strike over working conditions and wages. Which of the following outcomes would you like to see occur? (1) The workers win their most important demands; (2) The workers win some of their demands and make some concessions; (3) The workers win only a few of their demands and make major concessions; (4) The workers go back to work without winning any of their demands.(.32)
Big Business Power (alpha = .48)	Q137g) Big corporations have far too much power in Canadian society today. (.49) Q137a) Corporations benefit owners at the expense of workers and consumers. (.31)
Capitalist Economic Organization (alpha = .48)	Q137d) It is possible for a modern society to run effectively without the profit motive. (.51) Q139i) The energy crisis will not be fully solved until the government controls the major energy companies. (.43) Q139d) One of the main reasons for poverty is that the economy is based on private ownership and profits. (.39) Q137e) If given the chance, the non-management employees at the place where you work could run things without bosses. (.16)
Welfare Bum (alpha = .51)	Q139c) One of the main reasons for poverty is that many poor people simply do not want to work. (.55) Q144i) For the most part, welfare is simply a way of giving away money to people who don't want to work. (.54) Q139a) One of the main reasons for poverty is that some people are not intelligent enough to compete in this modern world. (.36) Q139e) One of the main reasons for poverty is that in every society some people have to be on the bottom and some on the top. (.23)

Table 3.1 (continued)

Construct Name/ Alpha of the Summated Index	Item Labels and Wording[a] (factor loadings in exploratory factor analysis)
Authoritarian Traditionalism (alpha = .50)	Q139h) If parents disciplined their children more firmly, there would be less crime. (.53) Q139f) In order to reduce crime, the courts should give criminals stiffer punishments. (.49) Q144d) It is better for the family if the husband is the principal breadwinner outside the home and the wife has primary responsibility for the home and children. (.39) Q137b) In any industrial society it will always be necessary to have a division between those experts who make decisions and people who carry out those decisions. (.32) Q140) Do you think that on the Canadian Forces the government should be spending (a great deal more / somewhat more / same / somewhat less / a great deal less)? (.21)
Equality for Women (alpha = .64)	Q144g) Ideally there should be as many women as men in important positions in government and business. (.89) Q144f) There are not enough women in responsible positions in government and private business. (.74) Q144e) If both husband and wife work, they should share equally in the housework and children. (.30) Q144l) Day care ought to be made readily available for the children of women working outside the home. (.25)
Help Disadvantaged (alpha = .56)	Q144k) If necessary, taxes should be raised to provide adequate welfare benefits for those unable to work. (.75) Q144h) If necessary, taxes should be raised to provide adequate pensions for the elderly. (.57) Q144b) If necessary, the unemployment insurance contributions of those who have jobs should be increased to provide adequate benefits for the unemployed. (.36)
Opportunities for Poor (alpha = .51)	Q139b) One of the main reasons for poverty is lack of education and job opportunities for the poor. (.72) Q139g) In order to reduce crime, education and job opportunities for the poor need to be increased. (.42)

[a] The item labels are taken from the Canadian Class Structure Study codebook.

Table 3.2:   Structural Relations, First-Order Political Attitude
Constructs, Canadian Class Structure Survey[a]

Construct Name	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
(1) Capitalist Economic Organization	1.0							
(2) Strike Sympathies	.27	1.0						
(3) Big Business Power	.23	.25	1.0					
(4) Help Disadvantaged	.14	.03	.03	1.0				
(5) Opportunities for Poor	.09	.18	.04	.22	1.0			
(6) Equality for Women	-.02	.07	.28	.21	.11	1.0		
(7) Authoritarian Traditionalism	.12	.07	.06	-.04	-.18	.12	1.0	
(8) Welfare Bum	-.03	.00	.04	.11	-.01	.06	.32	1.0

[a] This is the factor correlation matrix.

Table 3.3:   Second-Order Political Attitude Constructs,
Canadian Class Structure Survey

Construct Name/ Alpha of the Summated Index	First-Order Construct (factor loadings in exploratory factor analysis)
Economic Radicalism (alpha = .60, 9 item indicators)	Capitalist Economic Organization (.59) Strike Sympathies (.50) Big Business Power (.40)
Economic Humanitarianism (alpha = .54, 5 item indicators)	Help Disadvantaged (.64) Opportunities for Poor (.35)
Equality for Women (alpha = .64, 4 item indicators)	Equality for Women (.72)
Authoritarian Individualism[a] (alpha = .63, 9 item indicators)	Authoritarian Traditionalism (.80) Welfare Bum (.41)

[a] The items in this index are reverse coded so that libertarian collectivist responses are scored high.

Table 3.4: First-Order Political Attitude Constructs,
Working Class, 1984 National Election Survey

Construct Name/ Alpha of the Summated Index	Item Labels and Wording[a] (factor loadings in exploratory factor analysis)
Economic Justice (alpha = .54)	V324) The difference between the rich and poor is too great in Canada. (.54) V330) The government should see to it that older and retired people have enough money to live on. (.44) V322) The government should see that everyone has adequate housing. (.44) V323) Doctors and hospitals should not be allowed to extra bill or charge patients more than what the government health plans pay them. (.42) V332) The government should increase the employment opportunities available to women. (.40) V329) People with high incomes should pay a greater share of the taxes than they do now. (.38) V327) It is not the responsibility of government to assure jobs for unemployed Canadians. (.14)
General View on Unions (alpha = .54)	V337) Some people say that there are certain groups that have too much power in Canada and that other groups don't have enough power. What is your opinion? Do you think that the following groups of people have too much power, about the right amount of power, or not enough power? The labour unions. (.59) V025) What has been the effect of labour unions on how you and your family are doing these days -- very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, very negative, or is there no connection? (.55) V326) During a strike, management should not be allowed to hire workers to take the place of strikers. (.41) V325) Government employees should not have the right to strike. (.36)
Unemployment Bum (alpha = .60)	V278) (There has been a lot of unemployment in Canada over the past few years. Here are some reasons that some people say are the causes of high unemployment. I'd like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each reason, and how much.) People are not willing to work hard enough. (.61) V280) People expect to be paid too much. (.57) V282) People are not willing to move to where the jobs are. (.45)

Table 3.4 (continued)

Construct Name/ Alpha of the Summated Index	Item Labels and Wording[a] (factor loadings in exploratory factor analysis)
Social Libertarianism (alpha = .46)	V335) The decision to have an abortion should be the responsibility of the pregnant woman. (.46) V336) People who are homosexuals should be permitted to teach school. (.45) (Note: A third item is included in the index as presented in Chapter 7) V334) Pornographic magazines and movies should be censored.
Military Defence (alpha = .56)	V328) Canada should increase its military contributions to NATO. (.65) V331) The U.S. and its allies should aim for superiority in nuclear weapons. (.57)
Deferential Powerlessness (alpha = .82)	V349) People like me don't have any say about what the government in (NAME PROVINCE) does. (.70) V348) Sometimes, (NAME PROVINCE) politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. (.64) V032) People like me don't have any say about what the government in Ottawa does. (.61) V347) I don't think the (NAME PROVINCE) government cares much about what people like me think. (.60) V031) Sometimes, Federal politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. (.60) V030) I don't think the Federal Government cares much about what people like me think. (.55) V346) Generally, those elected to the (PROVINCE NAME) legislature soon lose touch with the people. (.48) V034) Many people in the Federal Government are dishonest. (.47) V352) People in the (NAME PROVINCE) government waste a lot of the money we pay in taxes. (.46) V035) People in the Federal Government waste a lot of the money we pay in taxes. (.46) V029) Generally, those elected to Parliament soon lose touch with the people. (.40) V351) Many people in the government here in (NAME PROVINCE) are dishonest. (.36)

Table 3.4 (continued)

Construct Name/ Alpha of the Summated Index	Item Labels and Wording[a] (factor loadings in exploratory factor analysis)
Government Mistrust (alpha = .72)	V354) Most of the people running the government here in (NAME PROVINCE) are smart people who usually know what they are doing. (.59) V037) Most of the people running the Federal Government are smart people who usually know what they are doing. (.52) V353) Most of the time we can trust people in the (NAME PROVINCE) government to do what is right. (.62) V036) Most of the time we can trust people in the Federal Government to do what is right. (.56)
Non-Participation in Informal Politics (alpha = .82)	V017) Do you pay much attention to politics generally -- that is, from day to day, when there isn't a big election campaign going on? Would you say that you follow politics very closely, fairly closely, or not much at all? (.80) V039) How often do you watch programs about politics on TV (often/sometimes/seldom/never)? (.71) V038) How often do you read about politics in the newspapers and magazines? (.67) V016) We have found that people sometimes don't pay too much attention to elections. How about yourself? Were you very interested in the recent federal election, fairly interested, slightly interested, or not at all interested in it? (.65) V040) How often do you discuss politics with other people? (.62)
Vote Cynicism (alpha = .78)	V033) So many other people vote in Federal elections that it does not matter very much whether I vote or not. (.84) V350) So many other people vote in (NAME PROVINCE) provincial elections that it doesn't matter very much whether I vote or not. (.74)

[a] The item labels are taken from the 1984 National Election Study codebook.

Table 3.5: Structural Relations, First-Order Economic and Social
Attitude Constructs, 1984 National Election Survey[a]

Construct Name	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) Economic Justice	1.0				
(2) General Union	.13	1.0			
(3) Unemployment Bum	.10	.33	1.0		
(4) Military Defence	.05	.04	.13	1.0	
(5) Social Libertarianism	.09	.13	.21	.26	1.0

[a] This is the factor correlation matrix.

Table 3.6: Structural Relations, First-Order Government
Attitude Constructs, 1984 National Election Survey[a]

Construct Name	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
(1) Deferential Powerlessness	1.0			
(2) Government Mistrust	.33	1.0		
(3) Non-Participation in Informal Politics	.29	.04	1.0	
(4) Vote Cynicism	.37	.07	.36	1.0

[a] This is the factor correlation matrix.

Table 3.7: Second-Order Economic and Social Attitude Constructs,
1984 National Election Survey

Construct Name/ Alpha of the Summated Index	First-Order Construct (factor loadings in exploratory factor analysis)
Economic Justice (alpha = .54, 7 item indicators)	Economic Justice (.31)
Economic Individualism[a] (alpha = .62, 7 item indicators)	Unemployment Bum (.60) General Union (.54)
Moral and Defence Liberalism (alpha = .48, 4 item indicators)	Military Defence (.51) Social Libertarianism (.49)

[a] Economic collectivist responses are scored high in this index.

Table 3.8: Second-Order Government Attitude constructs,
1984 National Election Survey

Construct Name/ Alpha of the Summated Index	First-Order Construct (factor loadings in exploratory factor analysis)
Alienation from Government (alpha = .86, 11 item indicators)	Government Mistrust (.58) Deferential Powerlessness (.51)
Political Disinterest/ Non-Participation (alpha = .80, 7 item indicators)	Vote Cynicism (.66) Informal Political Non-Participation (.56)

Table 3.9: Univariate Statistics for Political Attitudes, Working Class,
1982 Class Structure Survey

	ER	EH	EfW	AI(r)	STRK	CE(r)	WB(r)	AT(r)
				Political Attitudes				
N	986	1101	1086	1020	1083	1022	1104	1038
Items in the index	9	5	4	9	3	4	4	5
Mid-point of index scale (MP)	22.5	12.5	10.0	23.0	7.5	10.0	10.0	13.0
Mean	23.8	14.4	13.1	20.7	8.0	9.5	9.9	10.8
% high on index	24.9%	51.2%	75.9%	6.6%	41.5%	21.7%	26.7%	5.8%
% low on index	11.3%	8.2%	2.7%	31.6%	22.9%	35.1%	28.2%	48.5%
Standard Deviation (SD)	4.26	2.76	2.20	4.52	1.98	2.59	2.54	2.90
Relative group dissensus (SD/MP %)	18.9%	22.1%	22.0%	19.7%	26.4%	25.9%	25.4%	22.3%

KEY to Political Attitudes: ER -- Economic Radicalism
  EH -- Economic Humanitarianism   EfW -- Equality for Women
  AI(r) -- Authoritarian Individualism (reverse coded)   STRK -- Strike Sympathies
  CE(r) -- Capitalist Economic Organization (reverse coded)   WB(r) -- Welfare Bum (reverse
  AT(r) -- Authoritarian Traditionalism (reverse coded)   coded)

Table 3.10: Univariate Statistics for Political Attitudes, Working Class,
1984 National Election Survey

	EJ	EI(r)	MDL	ALIEN	NP	UNION	MD(r)	DEFP
				Political Attitudes				
N	1103	1288	1478	1084	1357	1135	1478	1084
Items in the index	7	7	4	16	7	4	2	12
Mid-point of index scale (MP)	17.5	17.5	10.0	40.0	18.0	10.0	5.0	30.0
Mean	23.3	17.0	11.1	44.3	15.2	10.7	5.6	35.0
% high on index	81.9%	18.6%	40.2%	33.8%	10.3%	35.8%	46.6%	49.1%
% low on index	1.0%	27.0%	14.0%	6.5%	49.9%	17.0%	20.3%	6.6%
Standard Deviation (SD)	3.08	3.83	2.48	7.86	4.46	2.16	1.61	6.71
Relative group dissensus (SD/MP %)	17.6%	21.9%	24.8%	19.6%	24.8%	21.6%	32.2%	22.4%

KEY to Political Attitudes: EJ -- Economic Justice
  EI(r) -- Economic Individualism (reverse coded)   MDL -- Moral/Defence Liberalism
  ALIEN -- Alienation from Government   NP -- Political Disinterest
  UNION -- General Union   MD(r) -- Military Defence (reverse coded)
  DEFP -- Deferential Powerlessness

NOTE: A number of attitude items had a large percentage of missing values. To preserve cases I
chose to substitute the mean for a variable for a missing value when constructing the Military
Defence and Moral/Defence Liberalism indexes. The same procedure was utilized with 4 of the 7
variables in Economic Individualism, 8 of the 16 variables in Alienation from Government, and 8 of
the 12 variables in Deferential Powerlessness.

Table 3.11: Relationship between Social Background and Second-Order Political
Attitude Constructs, Working Class, 1982 Class Structure Survey

	Economic Radicalism		Economic Humanitarian		Authorit Individual		Equality Women	
	r	Beta	r	Beta	r	Beta	r	Beta
A) Class Networks								
1. Working Class Background	.16	.22	.09	.12	.03		.05	
2. Spouse Non-Working Class	-.11	-.08	-.05		.02		.00	
B) Job Characteristics								
3. Mental Skill Index	-.09		-.02		-.03		.01	
4. Manual Skill Index	.10	.13	.00		-.14	-.07	.03	
5. Blue Collar	.21	.12	.09	.08	-.11	-.02	-.09	.01
6. Years Current Job (Lg10)	.12	.08	-.12	-.13	-.12	-.07	-.09	
7. Personal Income (Lg10)	.03		.00		.00		-.11	.01
C) Economic Sector								
8. Company Size (Lg10)	.08		-.03		.00		-.12	-.10
9. Profit Sector	.04		.04		-.05		-.03	
D) Key Worker Experiences								
10. Union Member	.16	.05	-.01		.02		-.05	
11. Ever on Strike	.21	.17	-.01		.06		-.06	
12. Unemployed	.01		.07		.00		.04	
E) Home Situation								
13. Homeownership	-.03		-.04		-.13	-.06	-.10	-.05
14. Family Income (Lg10)	-.05		-.02		-.01		-.07	
F) Society-Wide Trends								
15. Age	-.04		-.04		-.23	-.19	-.14	-.15
16. Urban Childhood	.00		.04		.11	.08	.05	
17. Education	-.18	-.14	-.01		.22	.20	.02	
G) Gender								
18. Female	-.02		-.10	-.14	.07		.27	.32
H) Region								
19. Atlantic	.04		.04		-.10	.00	.02	
20. Quebec	.10	.12	-.14	-.14	.32	.40	-.02	
21. Prairies	-.05		.10	.08	-.08		-.05	
22. B.C.	.02		.04		.03		.04	
I) Religion								
23. Roman Catholic	.06		-.11	-.07	.03		-.02	
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.22(.21)		.11(.10)		.32(.31)		.15(.15)	

Notes: 1. Reported correlations are uncorrected for random measurement error.
2. The multiple regression analyses are based upon correlations corrected
for random measurement error.

Table 3.12: Relationship between Social Background and Selected First-Order
Political Attitude Constructs, Working Class, 1982 Class Structure Survey

	Strike Sympathies		Capitalist Econ Organiz		Welfare Bum		Authoritarian Traditionalism	
	r	Beta	r	Beta	r	Beta	r	Beta
A) Class Networks								
1. Working Class Background	.15	.22	.10	.15	-.01		.05	
2. Spouse Non-Working Class	-.15	-.16	-.07		.03		.00	
B) Job Characteristics								
3. Mental Skill Index	-.07		-.10	.00	.04		-.07	
4. Manual Skill Index	.12	.14	.07		-.09	-.05	-.12	-.05
5. Blue Collar	.18	.10	.14	.12	-.10	-.05	-.09	-.01
6. Years Current Job (Lg10)	.11	.07	.10	.09	-.13	-.17	-.10	
7. Personal Income (Lg10)	.11	-.07	-.02		-.02		.00	
C) Economic Sector								
8. Company Size (Lg10)	.14	.03	.05		.02		-.01	
9. Profit Sector	.02		.09	.09	-.03		-.04	
D) Key Worker Experiences								
10. Union Member	.30	.28	.02		.00		.02	
11. Ever on Strike	.29	.24	.08	.06	.04		.05	
12. Unemployed	-.06		.02		.04		-.03	
E) Home Situation								
13. Homeownership	-.05		-.05		-.06		-.16	-.04
14. Family Income (Lg10)	.02		-.08		.00		-.03	
F) Society-Wide Trends								
15. Age	-.04		-.05		-.10	.00	-.28	-.33
16. Urban Childhood	.04		-.01		.08	.05	.11	.08
17. Education	-.11	-.09	-.15	-.13	.15	.16	.21	.20
G) Gender								
18. Female	-.11	.02	.01		.06		.07	
H) Region								
19. Atlantic	.02		.04		-.08		-.09	.00
20. Quebec	-.01		.17	.21	.19	.32	.32	.45
21. Prairies	-.05		-.03		-.04		-.09	
22. B.C.	.09	.09	-.01		.10	.18	-.02	
I) Religion								
23. Roman Catholic	-.01		.06		.06		-.01	
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.41(.39)		.16(.15)		.19(.18)		.43(.43)	

Notes: 1. Reported correlations are uncorrected for random measurement error.
2. The multiple regression analyses are based upon correlations corrected
for random measurement error.

Table 3.13: Relationship between Social Background and Second-Order Political
Attitude Constructs, Working Class, 1984 National Election Survey

	Economic Justice		Economic Individualism		Moral/Defence Liberalism		Alienation Government		Political Disinterest	
	r	Beta	r	Beta	r	Beta	r	Beta	r	Beta
A) Class Networks										
1. Working Class Background	.13	.13	.02		.02		.10	.08	.11	.04
2. Spouse Non-Working Class	-.05		-.11	-.10	.00		-.07		-.17	-.09
B) Job Characteristics										
3. Skilled Manual Worker	.08	.16	.06	.08	-.08	-.09	-.02		-.04	
4. Nonskilled Manual Worker	.13	.19	.08	.12	.00		.19	.08	.22	.10
5. Job Input	.04		.03		-.05		.11	.05	.13	.03
6. Personal Income (Lg10)	-.07		.02		-.11	-.03	-.12	-.10	-.14	-.02
C) Economic Sector										
7. Company Size	-.04		.12	.09	-.11	-.08	-.05		-.13	-.03
D) Key Worker Experiences										
8. Union Member	.05		.29	.32	.00		.00		-.07	-.08
9. Unemployed in Past Year	.06		.06		.07	.01	.07		.05	
E) Home Situation										
10. Outright Homeowner	.07		.02		.07	-.01	-.05		.02	
11. Mortgaged Homeowner	-.02		.04		.04		.04		.02	
12. Family Income (Lg10)	-.15	-.14	.04		.00		-.10	-.01	-.01	
F) Society-Wide Trends										
13. Age	.02		-.12	-.14	-.19	-.18	-.01		-.22	-.33
14. Urban Childhood	-.03		.06		.08	.01	-.07		-.02	
15. Parents' Education	-.10	-.01	.06		.12	.10	-.16	-.06	-.10	-.07
16. Education	-.14	-.07	.03		.14	.04	-.26	-.20	-.20	-.24
G) Gender										
17. Female	-.03		-.06		.16	.17	.02		.06	
H) Region										
18. Atlantic	.05		.01		-.13	-.11	.01		.04	
19. Quebec	.06		.02		.14	.18	-.01		.09	.04
20. Prairies	-.06		-.05		-.01	.01	-.03		-.03	
21. B.C.	.00		-.01		.07	.09	.04		-.04	
I) Religion										
22. Roman Catholic	.07		.06	.09	.08	.13	.08	.04	.11	.02
23. No Religion	-.05		.10	.16	.14	.23	-.05		-.03	
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.12(.11)		.22(.21)		.27(.26)		.12(.11)		.22(.21)	

Notes: 1. Reported correlations are uncorrected for random measurement error.
2. The multiple regression analyses are based upon correlations corrected
for random measurement error.

Table 3.14: Relationship between Social Background and Selected First-Order
Political Attitude Constructs, Working Class, 1984 National Election Survey

	General Union		Military Defence		Deferential Powerlessness	
	r	Beta	r	Beta	r	Beta
A) Class Networks						
1. Working Class Background	.01		.04		.12	.09
2. Spouse Non-Working Class	-.11	-.14	-.03		-.07	
B) Job Characteristics						
3. Skilled Manual Worker	.06		-.03		-.01	
4. Nonskilled Manual Worker	.06		.00		.23	.09
5. Job Input	-.02		-.06		.13	.05
6. Personal Income (Lg10)	.10	-.05	-.13	-.08	-.12	-.11
C) Economic Sector						
7. Company Size	.15	.08	-.15	-.11	-.06	
D) Key Worker Experiences						
8. Union Member	.32	.41	.00		-.03	
9. Unemployed in Past Year	-.01		.08	.04	.04	
E) Home Situation						
10. Outright Homeowner	-.02		.02		-.06	
11. Mortgaged Homeowner	.01		.01		.04	
12. Family Income (Lg10)	.04		-.07		-.13	-.02
F) Society-Wide Trends						
13. Age	-.06		-.14	-.09	.02	
14. Urban Childhood	.04		.00		-.11	-.04
15. Parents' Education	.01		.02		-.20	-.08
16. Education	.00		.08	.07	-.32	-.25
G) Gender						
17. Female	-.10	-.06	.10	.09	.01	
H) Region						
18. Atlantic	.02		-.07		.03	
19. Quebec	-.03		.21	.20	.00	
20. Prairies	-.07		-.01		-.05	
21. B.C.	.00		.02		-.01	
I) Religion						
22. Roman Catholic	.02		.19	.14	.10	-.05
23. No Religion	.06		.05		-.09	-.01
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.22(.21)		.17(.16)		.18(.17)	

Notes: 1. Reported correlations are uncorrected for random measurement error.
2. The multiple regression analyses are based upon correlations corrected
for random measurement error.

CHAPTER 4: FURTHER STUDIES OF THE VARIATION IN WORKERS'
POLITICAL ATTITUDES

In the previous chapter I examined the influence of workers' social experiences on variation in political attitudes. In this chapter I consider the effects of different social psychological processes on workers' political attitudes. I begin by looking at the relationship between egoistic relative deprivation, class identification and political attitudes. In the second section of the chapter I turn my attention to two attitude-consistency explanations of working class attitudinal variation. The first focuses on the syllogistic structuring of political attitudes from first principles while the second hypothesizes that affective responses to key political groups are central to how individuals organize their political views.

THE IMPACT OF RELATIVE DEPRIVATION ON WORKERS' POLITICAL ATTITUDES

Theory and Research Objectives

Two major forms of relative deprivation were distinguished by Runciman (1966:34). His distinction between egoistic relative deprivation and fraternalistic relative deprivation has been refined in a recent article by Walker and Pettigrew (1984). In egoistic relative deprivation the individual self is compared to some referent, and the perceived difference between self and referent is the basis for a sense of relative deprivation. Walker and Pettigrew note that the referent in such comparisons can be the individual self (either a past condition, an

ideal conception or a future projection), an in-group or an out-group (1984:306). In fraternalistic relative deprivation a group to which an individual belongs is compared to some out-group, and the perceived difference between in-group and out-group is the basis for a sense of relative deprivation.

Therefore, fraternalistic relative deprivation involves group categorization, in-group identification, sympathy for the plight of other group members, and a notion of relational inequality between in-group and out-group. Fraternalistic relative deprivation involves a collective, not an individual, sense of injustice. It is therefore quite reasonable to expect that fraternalistic relative deprivation will be more closely related to political attitudes and actions than egoistic relative deprivation. Indeed, after reviewing the results of relative deprivation research over the past two decades, Walker and Pettigrew surmise "that it is fraternalistic, not egoistic, RD [relative deprivation] that is important as a cause of social attitudes and behaviour" (1984:305). They also offer the proposition that "generally, intra- and interpersonal comparisons [the bases for egoistic relative deprivation] will lead to individual-level behaviour, and group comparisons [the bases for fraternalistic relative deprivation] to group-level behaviour" (1984:306).

In contrasting the importance of egoistic and fraternalistic relative deprivation to political attitudes and actions, Walker and Pettigrew have neglected two important points. First, even if we accept that fraternalistic relative deprivation should generally be more important than egoistic relative deprivation, this does not mean that

egoistic relative deprivation is necessarily unimportant. It may be that both personal and group comparisons form the basis for an individual's general sense of injustice and consequent political views and actions. Second, it is likely that egoistic relative deprivation is important to the development of some political attitudes but not others. Therefore, rather than theoretically dismissing egoistic relative deprivation as irrelevant to political attitudes and action, it seems more useful to empirically investigate where it tends to have an effect and where it does not.

In fact, a number of research studies have identified a relationship between egoistic relative deprivation and political attitudes. Portes and Ross found a measure of egoistic relative deprivation to be a major direct determinant of Chilean slum dwellers' structural blame for the problems of the poor and an indirect determinant of an index measuring support for revolutionary action (1974:49-50). Isaac et al. (1980:206) discovered that egoistic relative deprivation was an important determinant of the political protest orientation of Blacks in an industrial U.S. city, but not Whites. In a study of the attitudes of youths in London, England, Gaskell and Smith (1984) found that egoistic relative deprivation had an influence on some political attitudes but not others. Egoistic relative deprivation has thus been found to have an important but variable impact on political attitudes in past studies. Unfortunately, no study has attempted to map the influence of egoistic relative deprivation over a range of political attitudes so that a more systematic appraisal of its pattern of

influence can be gained. This is one of the tasks undertaken in this section.

I would have also liked to compare the influences of egoistic relative deprivation and fraternalistic relative deprivation on workers' political attitudes. Unfortunately, no measures of fraternalistic relative deprivation are available to me from either the 1982 Class Structure survey or 1984 National Election survey. Thus, I am forced to compare egoistic relative deprivation to a more elementary measure of group consciousness -- class identification. Where egoistic relative deprivation is substantively associated with a political attitude I study (1) whether the association remains substantive when the effect of class identification is controlled; and (2) whether egoistic relative deprivation and class identification have an interaction effect on the political attitude.

Study Methods

1. Data

A number of the items in the 1984 National Election survey can be utilized to measure different aspects of egoistic relative deprivation. Comparable items were not included in the 1982 Canadian Class Structure survey, so the analyses in this section are restricted to the 1984 survey. The political attitudes considered in my analyses were introduced in Chapter 3 (see Tables 3.4, 3.7 and 3.8). The data are for the working class subsample of 1478 cases identified in Chapter 3.

2. Operationalizing Egoistic Relative Deprivation

The information collected in the 1984 National Election survey allows me to measure four distinct categories of workers' egoistic relative economic deprivation. In each case the general referent in the comparisons is the self.[1] In the first category the referent is the individual's expected future economic situation. In the second category the referent is the individual's past economic situation. In the third category the referent is the individual's conception of deserved economic situation. In the fourth category the referent is the individual's conception of the best or most satisfactory economic situation. In addition, I am able to measure egoistic relative job deprivation where the referent is expected future job security. The operational definitions of these different measures of egoistic relative deprivation are summarized in Appendix 2. Where an item in the survey was only presented to employed respondents, I have substituted the mean for missing values. Each measure of egoistic relative deprivation is coded such that unfavourable comparisons (which would lead to a sense of deprivation) are scored high.

3. Operationalizing Class Identification

A class identification variable was constructed from three items in the National Election survey (Var307, Var308 and Var309). It is a

---

[1] It is important to note that the self-to-self comparison is only one of the possible types of comparison which have been identified as a basis for the development of a sense of egoistic relative deprivation (see Walker and Pettrigrew, 1984). The operational definitions I employ are quite similar to those employed by Gaskell and Smith (1984:125), who themselves cite a number of studies which have measured egoistic relative deprivation in a similar fashion.

five category ordinal index. The category scored as "5" is made up of respondents who indicated that they closely identify with the working or the lower class (33% of the sample). The other categories, in descending order, are: identify with the working or the lower class but not closely (12%); identify with the middle class but not closely (14%); closely identify with the middle class (33%); and identify with the upper or upper-middle class (7%).

Findings and Discussion

The correlations between the different measures of egoistic relative deprivation and second-order political attitudes are recorded in Table 4.1. The correlations between Class Identification and political attitudes are also recorded. Class Identification has a statistically significant correlation with all five political attitudes. The correlations are largest with Economic Justice and Alienation from Government, and are positive in direction in all but one case (Moral/Defence Liberalism). Workers who identify with the working class tend to be more Left on economic issues, more alienated from government, lower in political interest and more socially conservative than workers who are not working class identifiers.

A quick scan of Table 4.1 reveals that the seven measures of egoistic relative deprivation tend to be consistently associated with only two of the second-order political attitudes -- Economic Justice and Alienation from Government. While there is some variation from this general pattern, I restrict my attention here to the general pattern. Workers with higher levels of egoistic relative deprivation tend to

favour greater economic equality and are more alienated from government than other workers.

The data reviewed so far indicate that (1) while class identification has a more generalized impact on workers' political attitudes than egoistic relative deprivation, (2) egoistic relative deprivation has a substantive association with some political attitudes. It is of some interest that egoistic relative deprivation is associated with the two second-order political attitudes -- Economic Justice and Alienation from Government -- which have the largest associations with class identification. Therefore, to sort out the impact of class identification and egoistic relative deprivation independent of each other, a multivariate analysis is required.

Table 4.2 reports the results of two multiple regression runs. Nine independent variables are included in each analysis: Class Identification, four different measures of egoistic relative deprivation, and four interaction terms. My expectations were: (1) consistent with the view of Walker and Pettigrew (1984), the measure of Class Identification would be an important determinant in both analyses; (2) contrary to the view of Walker and Pettigrew, and consistent with the findings of other studies, the measures of egoistic relative deprivation would also be important determinants in both analyses; and (3) any interaction effects would be positive, indicating that working class identification in combination with a sense of egoistic relative deprivation has an extraordinary impact upon workers' political attitudes.

As expected, Class Identification is an important predictor in both of the analyses reported in Table 4.2. However, while it is clearly the most important determinant of Alienation from Government, it is just one of the significant determinants of Economic Justice. This indicates that Canadian workers' views on issues of economic justice are strongly influenced by egoistic relative deprivation independent of class identification. Intrapersonal comparisons clearly have an important influence on this dimension of workers' political consciousness. It would thus seem that the development of certain practical socialist perspectives can be grounded upon egoistic relative deprivation. At the same time, it must be remembered that Class Identification has a much more sweeping impact upon workers' political consciousness. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis advanced by Walker and Pettigrew (1984).

The results in Table 4.2 demonstrate the value of measuring different aspects of egoistic relative deprivation. In the first regression run, three of the four egoistic relative deprivation measures are important determinants -- each measure is associated with Economic Justice independent of the effects of the other two measures. This reveals that different workers adopt different intrapersonal referents, and that different types of intrapersonal comparison tend to influence views on economic justice.

The size and direction of the interaction effects were quite surprising. In each of the four cases where a measure of egoistic relative deprivation was an important positive determinant (three cases in the first regression run and one case in the second regression run),

the companion interaction term was an important negative determinant. This finding directly contradicts my expectation that when egoistic relative deprivation combines with class identification, a qualitative breakthrough in political consciousness results. The nature of the relationship between class identification and egoistic relative deprivation deserves more careful scrutiny.

Finally, the measures of egoistic relative deprivation and class identification were able to explain modest amounts of the variation in Economic Justice and Alienation from Government (R-squared = .08 and .12 respectively). These amounts compare very favourably to the variation explained by social experiences (see Table 3.13 in Chapter 3 and remember that correlations were corrected for random measurement error in the analyses reported in Table 3.13).

To understand variations in workers' political consciousness, it is obviously necessary to go beyond the social experiences perspective. The analysis in this section has demonstrated the importance of social psychological states of mind which either (1) intervene between social experiences and political attitudes, or (2) are products of the same socialization processes which generate underlying political attitudes. A very different type of study than that undertaken here is required to sort out this issue of causal relationships.

THE INFLUENCE OF ATTITUDE-CONSISTENCY PROCESSES

In this section I shift my attention to the organizing mechanisms of attitude consistency. The theories examined in this section come from the psychological social psychology literature. Two

distinct processes are studied. First, I consider the extent to which workers' attitudes are syllogistically structured from first principles. Second, I examine the extent to which feelings towards strategic political groups are the bases for attitude organization.

Theoretical Perspectives

1. Internalization of the tenets of political philosophies

This mechanism pertains to an understanding of how attitudes are consistently organized either by the principles of a dominant social philosophy or by the principles of an oppositional philosophy. Starting with the first case, workers may consciously adjust and develop their entire range of political attitudes to be consistent with fundamental capitalist values. Sniderman and Tetlock (1986:80) identify this form of attitude consistency as syllogistic; core capitalist principles would form the major premise in each deductive development of a specific political attitude. For two reasons, however, it seems unlikely that this generative mechanism results in much individual attitude consistency outside of a small, ideologically committed, conservative political stratum of workers. First, in capitalist society workers are not educated to be systematic social thinkers. As well, the subtle and not so subtle disparities between many capitalist values and the experiences of workers presents an insuperable barrier to the integration of workers' attitudes around bourgeois principles. In other words, it is more likely that workers will possess a dual consciousness, or an alienated consciousness, than a false consciousness.

There will also be few workers whose attitudes are syllogistically structured by the core principles of an oppositional

social philosophy. As Lenin argued, workers are not likely to spontaneously develop such an oppositional philosophy; a period of formal re-education is required to develop a systematic critique of the social organization of capitalist society (1973:37). Such an education has been traditionally offered to workers by socialist or communist political parties which, because of their sense of mission and emphasis on political education, allow individuals to break away from the influence of factors which encourage active or passive consent to capitalist domination.

In contemporary Canada, however, no such political parties have a mass basis in the working class. The most Left-wing of the major parties, the New Democratic Party, is neither a socialist party nor a party which seeks to educate and mobilize the working class. The absence of alternative socialist institutions in Canadian society has two important effects. First, it limits the number of socialist-thinking workers. Second, it leaves the oppositional attitudes of the few such workers open to the influence of continual bourgeois propaganda without the support of a consistent, alternative propaganda thrust. This even further limits the likelihood that Canadian workers will have attitudes syllogistically structured around central anti-capitalist principles. At the same time, because the rejection of capitalist values is a much more self-conscious process than the internalization of those values in contemporary Canada, workers who favour anti-capitalist values are more likely to have syllogistically linked such central attitudes to peripheral attitudes than workers who favour capitalist values.

2. Likes and Dislikes of Strategic Political Groups

Some of the most interesting recent research on attitude organization begins with the insight that social likes and dislikes can exist relatively independently of cognitions. Zajonc's investigation of affective responses to physical stimuli suggests that feelings are not strictly developed on the basis of cognitive recognition, discrimination and categorization (1980:159). The independence of likes and dislikes is furthered by a second process: when an attitude object is encountered many times, the response to it becomes habitual; this automated affective reaction may have different properties than first reactions (Zajonc, 1980:160N14). Three other generalizations about the character of affect also strengthen this interpretation of its relationship to cognitions: feelings can be activated by internal as well as external cues; affect can be learned by associating an attitude object with an affect-laden symbol; and likes and dislikes can be transferred to other attitude objects along established networks of association (Bandura, 1986:185-186).

Of course, that social likes and dislikes are relatively autonomous from cognitions does not mean that they will necessarily be more important than cognitions in shaping attitude organization. Zajonc has also suggested certain characteristics of affect which are efficacious in organizing attitudes. Among them are: (1) affective reactions are inescapable -- they occur without effort; (2) affective judgements tend to be irrevocable and may even persist after the original cognitive basis has been invalidated; and, (3) affect implicates the self (1980:154-157). It thus seems that liking and

disliking social objects is a universal process which is highly salient to an individual. It is a basis on which more specific attitudes develop, and it is a basis which endures over time.

Sniderman and Tetlock (1986) have made a specific proposal on how likes and dislikes organize political attitudes. They base their suggestion on some earlier work of Conover and Feldman (1981:623), who argue that ideological self-identification is dependent upon having positive feelings towards either liberals or conservatives. These feelings are themselves largely dependent upon the feelings which individuals have towards important symbolic groups such as labour unions. Continuing on this affect-centred line of theorizing, Sniderman and Tetlock argue that people's attitudes are organized according to a social psychological mechanism which they call the likability heuristic (1986:85). An individual's attitude on a specific issue will be more or less liberal (or conservative) depending on two factors: (1) ideological self-identification; and (2) the size of the difference in their feelings between liberals and conservatives (1986:86). This is an entirely affect-based explanation since, following from Conover and Feldman, ideological self-identification is seen to be grounded on feelings towards symbolic political groups. Sniderman and Tetlock conclude that "the likability heuristic allows citizens who are unable or unmotivated to master a political ideology to mimic it" (1986:89).

Sniderman and Tetlock's position, therefore, is that political attitudes are organized by an already existing structure of feeling towards strategic political groups. This is an important and thought-provoking proposition, but it is also narrowly psychological, since the

pattern of likes and dislikes towards strategic political groups in a society is taken as a given rather than being a focus of investigation. This explanatory limitation must always be kept in mind when considering the utility of this line of theorizing.

The likability heuristic can be applied to both conservative and oppositional workers. As Gramsci notes, an important stage in the development of workers' consciousness of class occurs when workers realize the importance of acting to defend their organizations (1971:181). In so doing they reject negative evaluations of unions or other working class groups, and develop positive feelings which are subversive simply because of their potential to be the affective centrepiece of an alternative conception of social life. It seems likely that any determined collective action by workers is, to at least some extent, built around alternative feelings towards common political symbols. Those who wish to build an alternative to bourgeois hegemony must recognize the importance of overturning the structure of existing social likes and dislikes.[2]

Organization From First Principles

1. Research Strategy and Method

Four of the items in the 1982 Class Structure survey measured

---

[2] But socialist political action must go a step further. If socialist change is to amount to more than the mere replacement of one set of stereotypes of loyalty with a second set, then every effort should be made to limit the extent to which affect is primary in the organization of attitudes. The importance of rational understanding must be stressed and the ideological manipulation of affect-laden symbols should be curtailed.

respondents' views of the capitalist system of economic organization.[3]
As explained in the last chapter, these items were summated to form the
Capitalist Economic Organization index (see Table 3.1). I use this
index as a basis for my assessment of the extent of syllogistic
structuring of political attitudes.

As recorded in Table 3.9, 21.7% of Canadian workers were high
(anti-capitalist) on this index and 35.1% were low (pro-capitalist). If
workers syllogistically organize their political attitudes, then I would
expect those who are anti-capitalist to be consistently Left on other
political attitudes and those who are pro-capitalist to be consistently
Right on other political attitudes. To test this proposition I examined
attitude consistency across five wide-ranging political attitudes --
Capitalist Economic Organization, Strike Sympathies, Welfare Bum,
Authoritarian Traditionalism (all first-order attitudes) and Economic
Humanitarianism (a second-order attitude). On the first three of these
indexes there was considerable group dissensus (see Table 3.9) -- a
substantial minority of the sample was high on each index and a
substantial minority was low.   Consequently the same high/low cutting
points reported in Table 3.9 were employed in this analysis.   However,
on the other two indexes there was only a limited amount of dissensus.
On Authoritarian Traditionalism only 5.8% of the sample was high (Left)
while on Economic Humanitarianism only 8.2% of the sample was low
(Right). I thus decided to proceed by redefining the high/low cutting

---

[3] No comparable items are contained in the 1984 National
Election survey.

points for these two indexes. In each case I divided the range of scores into two at approximately the midpoint of the distribution.

I proceeded with two hypotheses based on the theoretical arguments presented in the last subsection. First, I expected that only a small percentage of pro-capitalist workers would be consistently Right-wing in political perspective and only a small percentage of anti-capitalist workers would be consistently Left-wing in political perspective. Second, I expected that a greater percentage of anti-capitalist workers would be consistent in political perspective than pro-capitalist workers.

2. Results and Discussion

Only 26 workers out of a total weighted sample of 1142 were identified as consistently Left-wing in perspective. This represents 11.7% of the total number of anti-capitalist workers and a mere 2.3% of the entire sample.

Only 17 workers were identified as consistently Right-wing in perspective. This represents 4.7% of the total number of pro-capitalist workers and a mere 1.5% of the entire sample.

These results are consistent with expectations, but surprising nevertheless. Very few workers show evidence of a syllogistic organization of attitudes. It seems clear that the consistently Left-wing and consistently Right-wing strata of the working class are remarkably tiny in size. It is important to note, however, that a much greater percentage of workers who are anti-capitalist on the Capitalist Economic Organization index possess a consistently organized set of attitudes than workers who are pro-capitalist on the same index (11.7%

vs. 4.7%). This lends support to the argument that the rejection of capitalist values is a much more self-conscious process than the internalization of those values in contemporary Canada. It also means that the consistently Left-wing stratum of the working class is larger than the consistently Right-wing stratum, despite the fact that support for core capitalist principles far outweighs opposition to those principles.

Organization Based on the Likability Heuristic

1. Research Strategy and Methods

The terms "liberal" and "conservative" are used quite differently by the American and Canadian publics. In the United States they indicate general political orientations irrespective of political party affiliation. In Canada they are labels associated with two of the three major political parties. As a consequence, it is inappropriate to test the version of the likability heuristic suggested by Sniderman and Tetlock (1986). Instead I will examine a modified version where "Left" and "Right" are substituted for "Liberal" and "Conservative" as symbolic reference points. Lambert, Curtis, Brown and Kay (1986) have shown that while only about 60% of Canadian adults respond to standard survey questions on Left and Right, those who do respond hold sensible and consistent definitions of these political terms (p. 547,559). My substitution thus seems reasonable.

Data to test the likability heuristic is available from the 1984 National Election survey. Respondents were asked to place themselves on a 7 point scale where 1 = Left and 7 = Right (Var507). I use a reverse coded version of this variable as a measure of Left/Right Self-

Identification.[4]   They were also asked to place their feelings towards "Left-wingers" (Var284) and "Right-wingers" (Var285) on a 0-100 feeling thermometer scale.   I subtracted the latter variable from the former variable to get a measure of Left/Right Affect.[5]   In addition I constructed an interaction term, as suggested by Sniderman and Tetlock, by multiplying Left/Right Self-Identification and Left/Right Affect.[6]

My data analysis strategy is straightforward -- I simply correlated the three Left/Right variables with the five second-order political attitudes listed in Table 4.3.   If affect towards strategic political groups (as summarized by affect towards the labels Left and Right) is instrumental in organizing one or more dimensions of workers' political consciousness, then positive correlations should be observed. Furthermore, if the likability heuristic suggested by Sniderman and Tetlock is valid, then the correlation of the interaction term with a political attitude should be larger than the correlation of either Left/Right Self-Identification or Left/Right Affect with the same political attitude.   In other words, a worker's political attitudes will be more Left is she/he both self-identifies with the Left and feels much more positive towards the Left than the Right.   This combination of factors is measured by the interaction term.

---

[4] No Opinion responses (42.7% of the sample) were assigned a score of 4 -- the midpoint of the scale.

[5] Mixed Feeling, No Feeling and Don't Know responses were assigned a score of 50 on these two variables.

[6] As would be expected, these three Left/Right measures are highly correlated.   Left/Right Self-Identification has a correlation of .55 with Left/Right Affect and .46 with the interaction term. The correlation between Left/Right Affect and the interaction term is .88.

2. Results and Discussion

The correlations between the three Left/Right ideology measures and the five second-order political attitudes are reported in Table 4.3. Three patterns of association are readily apparent. First, correlations with Political Disinterest/Non-Participation are negligible. Workers on the Left are no more likely to be concerned with political issues than workers on the Right.[7] Second, there are small positive correlations with Economic Justice and Alienation from Government. Workers on the Left are more favourable towards economic equality and redistribution, and are more alienated from government. However, contrary to the hypothesis of Sniderman and Tetlock, in both cases the interaction term has the smallest association among the three Left/Right ideology measures. It thus appears that while affect for the Left and Right political labels is very modestly associated with workers' positions on these two attitudes, Sniderman and Tetlock's likability heuristic does not accurately depict the nature of the relationship. Third, there are somewhat larger positive correlations with Economic Individualism and Moral/Defence Liberalism. Workers on the Left favour economic collectivism and are more liberal on moral and defence issues. Importantly, in each case the interaction term has the largest

---

[7] Further empirical analysis shows that workers on the Left and Right, taken together as a politicized group, are higher in political interest than workers in the centre. I standardized both Left/Right Self-Identification and Left/Right Affect, multiplied them together, and then correlated the standardized interaction term with Political Disinterest/Non-Participation. The correlation was -.14. In the standardized interaction variable both Left-wing workers (who have positive standardized scores on the two input variables) and Right-wing workers (who have negative standardized scores) are found at the positive end of the measurement scale.

correlation. This finding is consistent with the likability heuristic notion of attitude organization.

It is useful to compare these findings to those of Lambert, Curtis, Brown and Kay (1986). These researchers used the same data set to investigate the Left/Right beliefs of adult Canadians and found that "there is little evidence of policy differences associated with left and right in the general population" (1986:561). They also found that, even among respondents with high levels of education, there was no connection between policy preferences on moral issues and Left/Right beliefs. This leads them to question Ogmundson's hypothesis (1975:572) that the Left and Right political labels are relevant to how Canadians look at social and religious issues (1986:561).

My findings are quite different from those of Lambert, Curtis, Brown and Kay. First, I found evidence of widespread policy differences associated with Left and Right in the Canadian working class. Second, I found that feelings for the Left and Right political labels were associated with policy preferences on moral issues. Fortunately, it is fairly easy to account for the differences in empirical results. The data analysis of Lambert, Curtis, Brown and Kay was limited on two counts. First, they use factor analysis to assess the relationship between Left/Right Self-Identification and beliefs on 15 policy issues. In making use of factor analysis in this way, their implicit causal assumption is that each of these 16 items is an effect indicator of one or more underlying attitude dimensions. Their objective is to infer whether Left/Right Self-Identification is an important component of any of the underlying attitude dimensions (1986:545). I employ a different

causal model -- underlying attitude dimensions are first identified and then these attitude dimensions are correlated with measures of Left/Right feeling. My view is that Lambert, Curtis, Brown and Kay have employed a theoretically misspecified model -- Left/Right Self-Identification is not an effect indicator of the attitude dimensions which emerge from their factor analysis. Second, in assessing the relationships between Left/Right beliefs and policy issues Lambert, Curtis, Brown and Kay used only one measure of Left/Right belief -- Left/Right Self-Identification. In comparison I employ three measures. This enables me to obtain a more accurate understanding of the relationships.[8]

CONCLUSIONS

The results reported in Table 4.3 are quite interesting when compared to the results in Table 4.1. Egoistic relative deprivation is moderately associated with two second-order political attitudes, Economic Justice and Alienation from Government, which in turn are only weakly associated with Left/Right feeling. However, egoistic relative deprivation is not associated with two second-order political attitudes, Economic Individualism and Moral/Defence Liberalism, which are more strongly associated with Left/Right feeling. This indicates an

---

[8] In my study Left/Right Self Identification has a correlation of only .06 with the first-order political attitude Social Libertarianism. This is consistent with the conclusion of Lambert, Curtis, Brown and Kay. However, the correlation of Social Libertarianism with Left/Right Affect is .10 and with the interaction term is .14. This demonstrates the importance of the measurement approach taken in this thesis -- an important relationship was identified which was missed in the earlier study.

alternation of social psychological processes -- feelings of intrapersonal deprivation are an important determinant of some political attitudes in the working class, while feelings towards strategic political groups underlie the development of other political attitudes.

Somewhat complicating the pattern, however, is the fact that class identification is correlated with all four of the second-order attitudes. It is moderately associated with Economic Justice and Alienation from Government, thus complementing the influence of egoistic relative deprivation. It is weakly associated with Economic Individualism and Moral/Defence Liberalism. In the former case the effect of class identification is consistent with the effect of Left/Right Feeling -- working class identification and positive feelings for the Left each tend to be associated with economic collectivism. Yet in the latter case the effects of the two determinants run counter to each other -- working class identification tends to be associated with conservative positions on moral and defence issues while a positive feeling for the Left tends to be associated with liberal positions. This demonstrates that class identification and feelings for Left and Right are distinct social psychological phenomena with independent implications for the shape of workers' political consciousness.

It is useful at this point to recall one of the major findings of Chapter 3: class network and job characteristic variables had important influences on economic and government-related attitudes, but not social attitudes. This pattern of determination is largely repeated for egoistic relative deprivation and class identification. It thus seems that basic working class experiences -- command relations in blue

collar jobs, the consciousness of class engendered in working class homes, and the development of a sense of egoistic relative deprivation -- lead to more egalitarian economic thinking and a disillusionment with the system of government. Workers tend to develop practical socialist perspectives in these areas quite independent of a conscious recognition that their perspectives are Left in character.

The variation in other political attitudes, however, is much more due to political and ideological processes than basic working class experiences. Consequently, a worker's affect for Left and Right is a better predictor of her/his basic economic values (as measured by Economic Individualism) or moral/defence views than either a worker's objective deprivation or subjective sense of relative deprivation.

It seems to me that this dichotomy in the determination of workers' political attitudes is a key finding in Part One of the thesis. On the one hand, what Gramsci calls "the 'spontaneous' feelings of the masses" (1971:198) are certainly evident when we study Canadian workers' political consciousness. As shown in Chapter 2, the working class as a whole tends to favour greater economic equality and redistribution than other classes. Furthermore, as shown in Chapter 3 and this chapter, it is workers with quintessential working class experience who tend to be the proponents of such practical socialist measures. On the other hand, political attitudes like Economic Individualism and Moral/Defence Liberalism appear to be politically and ideologically constructed rather than 'spontaneously' generated by the deprivation of working class life and workers' elemental sense of justice.

Table 4.1: Correlations of Egoistic Relative Deprivation and
Class Identification with Second-Order Political Attitudes[a]

| | Political Attitudes | | | | |
	EJ	EI(r)	MDL	ALIEN	NP
(A) Class Identification	.18	.12	-.08	.24	.12
(B) Egoistic Relative Deprivation					
Future Economic Referent					
1. GRFD	.06	.10	-.05	.09	.02
2. RFDI	.09	.07	-.03	.20	.02
Past Economic Referent					
3. RPDI	.13	.03	-.01	.22	.04
Deserved Economic Referent					
4. RDD	.15	-.02	.06	.12	.04
Best Economic Referent					
5. GRD	.14	.03	.02	.10	.04
6. RSD	.16	.08	.07	.18	.10
Future Job Referent					
7. RFJD	.17	.05	-.01	.08	.08

[a] Entries are Pearson correlation coefficients uncorrected for random
measurement error.

KEY to Political Attitudes:
   EJ -- Economic Justice
  EI(r) -- Economic Individualism (reverse coded)
   MDL -- Moral/Defence Liberalism
  ALIEN -- Alienation from Government
   NP -- Political Disinterest/Non-Participation

KEY to Egoistic Relative Deprivation Measures:
  GRFD -- General Relative Future Deprivation
  RFDI -- Relative Future Deprivation Index
  RPDI -- Relative Past Deprivation Index
  RDD -- Relative Deserved Deprivation
  GRD -- General Relative Deprivation
  RSD -- Relative Satisfaction Deprivation
  RFJD -- Relative Future Job Deprivation

Table 4.2: Regression Analyses with Egoistic and Fraternalistic
Relative Deprivation Measures as Determinants

| Independent Variables[a] | Dependent Variables | | | |
| | Economic Justice | | Alienation from Govt | |
	b(SE b)	Beta	b(SE b)	Beta
(A) Class Identification	.45(.16)	.21	1.8(.41)	.33
(B) Egoistic RD				
1. Future Economic, RFDI	.34(.17)	.18	.55(.42)	.11
2. Past Economic, RPDI	.43(.17)	.22	.15(.42)	.03
3. Deserved Economic, RDD	.17(.20)	.08	.18(.51)	.03
4. Future Job, RFJD	.71(.26)	.22	1.6(.65)	.20
(C) Interactions				
1. A by B1	-.08(.04)	-.17	.03(.11)	.03
2. A by B2	-.09(.04)	-.17	.16(.11)	.12
3. A by B3	.02(.06)	.03	-.02(.14)	-.01
4. A by B4	-.08(.07)	-.12	-.38(.18)	-.23
R-Squared	.08		.12	

[a] See Table 4.1 for the key to egoistic relative deprivation measures

Table 4.3: Associations Between Left/Right Ideology Measures and
Second-Order Political Attitudes[a]

| Left/Right Ideology Measures | Political Attitudes | | | | |
	EJ	EI(r)	MDL	ALIEN	NP
1. Left/Right Self-Identification[b]	.12	.15	.12	.09	.04
2. Left/Right Affect[b]	.09	.19	.16	.12	.05
3. Interaction 1x2[b]	.08	.20	.19	.06	-.02

[a] Entries are Pearson correlation coefficients uncorrected for random
measurement error
[b] Left responses are scored high

KEY to Political Attitudes (taken from the 1984 National Election
survey):
       EJ -- Economic Justice
    EI(r) -- Economic Individualism (reverse coded)
     MDL -- Moral/Defence Liberalism
   ALIEN -- Alienation from Government
      NP -- Political Disinterest/Non-Participation

PART TWO: HOW WORKERS ORGANIZE THEIR VIEWS ON UNIONS

This Part of the thesis consists of a single chapter which reports the results of an original survey undertaken in 1987. As described in Chapter 5, I utilize a particular type of question and data analysis technique (the Q sort and Q factor analysis) to study the typical ways that workers organize their attitudes towards labour unions. Attitude salience and intraindividual attitude structure are the focal points of my investigation.

To a large extent, Part Two can be read and understood independently of the material in Part One. However, there are four important connections between the Parts. First, two of the first-order political attitudes studied in Chapter 3 (Strike Sympathies, 1982 Class Structure survey; General View on Unions, 1984 National Election survey) were concerned with union issues. In multivariate analyses I found that experiences with unions were by far the most important determinants of these attitudes. In Chapter 5 I build upon this finding by studying eight different kinds of experience with unions in relation to the intraindividual structuring of workers' attitudes towards unions. This analysis helps us to better understand what aspects of union experience are crucial in promoting pro-union perspectives among workers.

Second, one of the thought-provoking findings in Chapter 3 was that merely belonging to a union was not nearly as important a determinant of the second-order attitude Economic Radicalism as having

ever been on strike. By measuring a variety of union experience variables in Part Two, I am able to further investigate the relative importance of passive and active union involvement in shaping workers' political consciousness.

Third, in Chapter 4 I studied the relationship between affect for the Left and the Right, and political attitudes. My major finding was that while certain political attitudes have important links to feelings for these political labels, others do not. In the upcoming chapter I continue my investigation of the role of affect in organizing workers' political attitudes. Specifically, I consider the proposition that each typical way of looking at labour unions has a distinctive affective tag attached to it. In other words, I investigate the closeness of the relationship between social cognition and affect at the intraindividual level of attitude structure.

Finally, the analyses in Chapter 5 enable me to extend some of the conclusions formulated in Part One and develop a fresh perspective on the extent and character of working class consent to capitalist domination in Canadian society.

CHAPTER 5: HOW WORKERS ORGANIZE THEIR VIEWS ON UNIONS
-- IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR SCHEMATA

A number of recent quantitative studies have investigated the interindividual structure of attitudes towards labour unions (Fiorito, 1987; McShane, 1985; Furnham, 1984; Krahn and Lowe, 1984a, 1984b; Kochan, 1979). Two general findings stand out. First, attitudes towards unions are multidimensional, with different dimensions being centred on different union activities. This means that many individuals are not simply pro-union or anti-union -- they may support labour unions' role in one domain of social life but oppose unions' role in another (Kochan, 1979:24; Furnham, 1984:435; Krahn and Lowe, 1984b:155-156). Second, although different dimensions of attitudes towards unions can be distinguished, they are usually moderately intercorrelated (see McShane, 1985:291; Krahn and Lowe, 1984b:157). This suggests that a general attitude towards labour unions underlies the union attitude dimensions. While these findings are valuable, we have no measure of the salience of each specific union attitude to the individual. That is, we lack a general description of the characteristic ways that individuals organize their attitudes towards unions.

Another gap concerns theory. Research on attitudes towards unions has tended to investigate theoretical questions about the social determinants of those attitudes. When it comes to attitude structure, however, theoretical considerations have largely been neglected (but see Fiorito, 1987 and Craft and Abboushi, 1983 for exceptions to this

171

generalization). In investigating the characteristic ways that individuals organize their attitudes towards unions, it is possible to draw upon some contemporary psychological theory concerned with the schema concept (Fiske, 1984:60; Lau and Sears, 1986:349).

A schema is a generic knowledge structure which is used by individuals to efficiently process new information and retrieve memories. A schema consists of a category label at a higher level and associated attributes at a lower level. "The attributes are all tightly linked to the label and somewhat more loosely linked to each other" (Fiske, 1986:44). The schema concept is primarily concerned with social cognition. However, Susan Fiske has extended the concept to include affect. "There are affective tags for each of the schema's attributes and for the top-level label as well. The top-level affective tag can act as a proxy for the lower level tags; it is a 'precomputed' summary of the perceiver's reaction to the schema's attributes as a whole" (1986:46). Findings on the interindividual structure of attitudes towards unions may, therefore, reflect the existence of distinct labour union schemata at the intraindividual level which differ both in content and affect. This possibility deserves investigation.

In this chapter of the thesis I investigate the salience of different union attitudes for individual workers. In other words, I examine the intraindividual structure of workers' attitudes towards labour unions. A number of specific tasks are undertaken in the course of the study. First, as part of the research design I classify attitudes towards labour unions into six major content domains, each of which relates to a distinctive set of union activities. My argument is

that a comprehensive consideration of workers' attitudes towards unions must include empirical indicators of each domain. Second, I employ Q methodology[1] to map the typical ways that individual workers organize their attitudes towards unions across these six domains of content. The object of my analysis, then, is the entire spectrum of attitudes subsumed under the social category "labour unions". The patterns of attitude structure uncovered in the analysis can be interpreted as indicators of general union schemata (Lau and Sears, 1986:360). Third, I examine whether there are differences in the affect attached to each schema. This amounts to a test of Fiske's proposition that different schemata centred on the same social category will have distinctive affective tags. And fourth, I undertake two more traditional sociological analyses. Multiple regression models are used (1) to assess the impact of direct and indirect experiences with unions on the tendency to hold each union schema; and (2) to determine the effects of both social background variables and union schemata loadings on two practical union attitudes. The results of the second analysis are used to assess whether the union schemata identified in the study are meaningful; that is, whether they are central to the process whereby workers develop specific union issue positions. I conclude the chapter by reflecting upon the significance of this detailed quantitative study to an understanding of working class consent to capitalist domination in Canada and attitude divisions in the Canadian working class.

---

[1] Q methodology is discussed later in this chapter.

STUDY DESIGN AND METHODS

Measuring Union Schemata Using Q Methodology

Some of the most enlightening studies of workers' individual attitude structures have relied upon qualitative methods (e.g., Lane, 1962; Sennett and Cobb, 1973; Wells, 1984). In these studies extended interviews with nonprobability samples of workers were undertaken. The data from the interviews were then used to illustrate a theoretical argument about the structure of individuals' attitudes. The strength of these qualitative studies is their richness of argument -- the reader has the sense that the complexity and contradictoriness of individual attitudes have been subtly explored. At the same time, this approach to studying intraindividual attitude structure has two obvious weaknesses. First, since no theory testing is involved, it cannot be determined whether the final interpretation of attitude structure owes more to the original theoretical proclivities of the investigators or to the respondents' attitude structures. Second, since the samples of respondents are nonprobability, the general applicability of the findings is uncertain.

My major objective in this study is to identify systematically the typical ways that workers organize their attitudes towards labour unions. In light of the weaknesses of qualitative studies of individual attitude structure, I have chosen to employ a survey instrument (the Q sort) and a technique of data analysis (Q factor analysis) which, although not widely used by social scientists, appear to be well suited to my research objective.

In the interviews, participants were asked to sort 48 one sentence statements about unions into one of eleven categories labelled from -5 (Most Disagree) to +5 (Most Agree). The statements are listed in Appendix 3. A sorting tree was used as an interview aid and constrained the distribution; that is, participants were asked to put two statements in the most extreme categories, eight in the middle category, and three, four, five and six statements respectively in the two sets of intermediate categories moving from either extreme to middle.[2] For data analysis the Q sort results were transformed to a 0 (Most Disagree) to 10 (Most Agree) scale. I should note at this point that if a participant had completed the Q sort exactly as requested the mean score over the 48 items would have been 5.000 with a standard deviation of 2.609. Only 7 of the 100 Q sorts fit this pattern. Before carrying out the study I was aware of Steven R. Brown's assertion that "as a purely statistical matter, it usually makes little difference whether a person follows the forced distribution exactly or deviates from it within broad tolerances" (1980:201-203). With this in mind,

---

[2] A copy of the interview schedule used in this survey study can be found in Appendix 4. Note the 11 column sorting tree on the last page of this schedule. The study participant physically sorted the 48 statements about unions onto a 70 cm. x 30 cm. version of this sorting tree outlined on a laminated piece of bristol board. The bristol board version of the sorting tree differed from the miniature version shown in the interview schedule in one way: above the -5 column were the words "Most Disagree"; above the 0 column were the words "Neither Agree Nor Disagree"; and above the +5 column were the words "Most Agree". The statements about unions were typed on separate laminated cards. Before each interview the cards were shuffled. The participant was asked to set the cards into the small rectangles in the sorting tree. Please note that the vertical dimension is not used in the sorting exercise. The only reason a participant was asked to lay the cards out in columns rather than pile them up is so that s/he could review her/his choices and make changes during the interview.

interviewers told participants that it didn't matter if they deviated from the sorting tree pattern slightly. Most of the 93 who deviated from the sorting tree pattern did so in a minor way: only three participants had Q sort means below 4.0 and only two had Q sort means above 6.0.

It is useful to note the broad differences between an interview involving a Q sort and the typical survey interview which employs closed-ended questions to generate quantitative data. While undertaking a Q sort, a study participant is quite involved in the process of investigation. This is because participants have the freedom to consider items in relation to one another and are able to revise their choices at any time during the Q sort. Indeed, the unit of measurement in a Q sort is "importance to me" (Brown, 1980:15). The intention in the interview is to tap the individual's entire subjectivity in relation to the domain of content. Q methodology is "more gestaltist and wholistic, rather than analytic and atomistic" (Brown, 1980:14). Because of this, participants usually find it to be an interesting and challenging exercise (Kerlinger, 1964:594). My view is that the game quality of the Q sort makes it a more humanistic and intellectually challenging technique than standard surveys involving reams of closed-ended questions.

The data matrix produced by a series of Q sorts is unique in that there is a common measuring unit ("importance to me") underpinning each participant's scores over the set of items (Brown, 1980:19). This enables the investigator to calculate correlation coefficients between persons and factor analyze the interrelationships between persons across

items (Q factor analysis).[3]   In Q factor analysis, factor loadings

indicate which subjects load on which factors.   Factor scores are

constructed by factor weighting original Q sort scores and summing them

across all participants.   The magnitude and direction of the factor

scores reveal which items characterize the views of the individuals who

load on each factor (1980:243,262).

To my knowledge, this study is the first to investigate workers'

union schemata utilizing Q methodology. In proceeding I have benefitted

from the summaries of Q methodological studies outlined in Brown (1980)

and the research of Conover and Feldman (1984), who utilized Q

methodology to measure schemata in different political domains.

The Sample of Statements about Labour Unions

The population of interest in Q studies is "the corpus of

verbiage uttered vis-a-vis the subject matter under investigation"

(Brown, 1980:173).   In this study the population is the entire range of

statements referring to the category label "labour unions".   Sampling

involves selecting a representative subset of these statements. I

proceeded to define the population and select a sample of statements

after conducting an extensive review of past research on attitudes

towards unions. In accomplishing this task I borrowed a number of ideas

and phrases from previous studies. Particularly useful were the items

in Uphoff and Dunnette's Union Attitude Scale (Robinson et al.,

---

[3] Zeller and Carmines (1980:45-46) summarize the types of
factor analysis. However, the impression they leave is that the same
data matrix is appropriate for all types of factor analysis. Brown
(1980:13) emphasizes that this is an erroneous idea: "a single matrix of
data may properly be factored by columns and again by rows only under
the very special condition of universality of measuring unit."

1969:287-288), and the items included in Furnham's study of attitudes towards unions (1984:429-431). In addition, a number of the statements are original.

Figure 5.1: A Categorization of Attitudes Towards Unions

```
                                              Attitude Direction

Areas of Union                            Favourable  Unfavourable
  Activities                              <---------------------->
```

1. Unions as a line of defence for workers

2. Unions as powerful organizations in society

3. How unions are directed

4. Unions as collectivist organizations

5. Unions as conflict groups

6. Unions in politics

At an early stage in my literature review I came to the conclusion that the population of statements regarding labour unions can be divided into a number of separate categories, each of which relates to a distinctive set of union activities. A few individuals knowledgeable about attitudes towards unions were asked to comment on the validity of my initial categorization of union activities as well as the validity of the statements within each category. Based upon these comments, I produced a sample of 60 statements, 10 relating to each category of union activity listed in Figure 5.1. In pretests I found that the time involved in sorting the 60 statements tried the patience of a participant. Consequently, two statements from each category were dropped, leaving the final sample of 48 statements recorded in Appendix

3. It should be noted that the sampling method employed in this study is judgmental, as all Q samples are.

The first area of union activity listed in Figure 5.1 encompasses the protection unions provide for workers. Unions are seen as a line of defence; that is, they protect living standards and somewhat limit the ability of managements to act arbitrarily in dealings with employees. In examining the interindividual structure of attitudes towards unions, Krahn and Lowe (1984a; 1984b) and Kochan (1979) each identified an instrumental beliefs or business unionism factor which references this set of union activities. Second, unions are seen as powerful organizations which exercise a general influence on social life. A number of quantitative studies have identified this dimension of the public's attitudes towards unions (Krahn and Lowe, 1984b:155; Kochan, 1979:24; McShane, 1985:289; Fiorito, 1987:278).

How unions are directed is a third category of union activity. It encompasses the relationship between leaders and members in unions, and the ethics of union leaders. In developing this category I have collapsed the internal governance and union leadership conceptual dimensions of union activity identified by Craft and Abboushi (1983:300-301). Fourth, unions are seen as collectivist organizations. This area of union activities is, of course, the focal point of the current Right-wing challenges to the legal rights of unions in Canada, the United States and other countries. At issue are mandatory union membership in closed shops, the union right to discipline members for crossing picket lines, and the individual right to refuse to pay dues for all but contract administration services.

Fifth, unions are seen as conflict groups. McShane (1985:289-290) used factor analysis to distinguish a job action (conflict) attitude dimension from a union power attitude dimension in a study of the interindividual structure of attitudes towards unions. The sixth category of union activity concerns labour unions' participation in politics. As I conceptualize it, this category of union activity concerns generalized union involvement in the political process rather than defence-related political action.[4] Most Canadian unions are associated with the social democratic New Democratic Party, and involve themselves in a variety of political campaigns.

The 48 statements sorted by study participants embody my theoretical ideas about the categories of attitudes towards unions. In this sense the Q sort was structured. The finding that attitudes towards unions are domain structured at the interindividual level leads me to believe that intraindividual general union schemata may also, to some extent, be centred on certain domains. This hypothesis can only be tested by ensuring that study participants sort a representative sample of statements from each of the major areas of labour union activity. Consequently, the 48 statements included in the sample are equally divided between the six categories, with half of the statements in each category worded in a positive direction and the other half worded in a negative direction.

With one exception, the statements seemed to be readily understood by study participants. The exception was, "One of the

---

[4] On this distinction see Fiorito, 1987:278.

economic myths in our society is that union demands are a primary cause

of unemployment and inflation." Many participants were not familiar

with the phrase "economic myths" and did not realize that the first part

of the sentence negates the second part.   Hence I think it is likely

that there is a large degree of measurement error associated with the

placement of this item in the Q sorts.   For this reason I do not

consider it when analyzing the content of different union schemata.

Study Participants and Interviewing

In deciding who should be approached to participate in the

study, my main objective was to interview a diverse enough group of

workers (18 years of age or older) to be able to map accurately the

typical ways that Canadian workers organize their attitudes towards

labour unions. To meet this objective a door-to-door survey in the city

of Hamilton, Ontario, was undertaken in the summer of 1987.

Located at the head of Lake Ontario, Hamilton is the site of the

main production facilities of Canada's two largest steel producers,

Dofasco and Stelco. The city is home to about 300,000 people, although

it serves as an urban centre for a population double that in size.

Stelco was unionized following a major union recognition strike in 1946.

Dofasco has been successful in resisting all attempts to unionize its

Hamilton workforce. This polarity in the state of labour relations at

Dofasco and Stelco has meant that the value of labour unions has long

been a subject of debate and controversy for the workers of Hamilton. I

thus anticipate that a survey in Hamilton will yield the full range of

different ways that Canadian workers organize their views on unions.

Because I was only interested in interviewing working class respondents, the survey was restricted to residents of census tracts with below median household incomes -- I assumed that the proportion of workers in these census tracts would be much higher than in census tracts with above median household incomes. Furthermore, working class respondents were filtered from non-working class respondents at the beginning of each interview.

The initial sampling frame was made up of 55 census tracts. These census tracts were stratified by income and proportionately sampled using a table of random numbers. In each of the 12 census tracts which were thus chosen, a starting point for interviewing was randomly chosen, as was the direction of the route to be followed. Interviewers went door to door in the census tract from that starting point. The interviewing objective was to conduct interviews in a census tract for one working day, or until eight Q sorts were completed, whichever came last. In 10 of the 12 census tracts, Q sorts were completed by between 8 and 11 individuals. Fewer interviews were completed in the final two census tracts since fieldwork was discontinued when 100 total Q sorts were obtained. The 100 interviews were conducted on 21 separate days between July 17 and September 5, 1987. The principal investigator carried out interviews on all 21 days of fieldwork. A research assistant also carried out interviews on nine of those days.[5]

No answers were obtained at about half of the addresses called at by interviewers. This high proportion reflects the fact that the interview period overlapped with many people's summer vacations. In addition, on a number of days, interviewing took place on weekday mornings and afternoons — times when many individuals would be at work. No callbacks were made to the "no answer" addresses. Answers were obtained at 655 addresses. At 243 of these addresses (37%) someone agreed to be interviewed. In most cases, the person who answered the door was interviewed, although in a few cases they were not old enough or were not interested and someone else in the household stepped forward. All of these participants were asked some screening questions as well as a few social background and union attitude questions. This usually took about 10 minutes. Supervisors, managers, professionals and business owners were not asked any further questions since the study's objective was to determine how workers organized their attitudes towards labour unions.[6] In addition, a number of workers did not want to complete the Q sort when informed that it would take an additional 20 or 30 minutes of their time.

Two tendencies were quite noticeable in interviewing. On the one hand, many union members were very cordial after the subject of the study was introduced. In most cases they were willing to carry out the

---

[6] Class membership was assigned on the basis of the participant's relationship to the means of production, except in the following circumstances: (1) when the interviewer estimated that 75% or more of a family's income came from non-working class activity, a participant was excluded from the working class even if he or she was employed as a worker; (2) individuals who were presently not part of the labour force were assigned to the working class if the main wage earner in the family held a working class job.

Q sort. On the other hand, the few cases of overt hostility experienced by the interviewers seemed to involve individuals who displaced their dislike for unions onto the interviewer. These people would say something like, "I hate unions", and indicate to the interviewer that he or she was quite unwelcome. These interview tendencies suggest that pro-union individuals are overrepresented in the sample and anti-union individuals are underrepresented. However, since not all anti-union individuals refused to be interviewed, I do not believe this sampling bias adversely affects my goal to map the typical general union schemata utilized by members of the Canadian working class.

Some characteristics of the sample of workers can be noted: (1) gender -- 39 women and 61 men; (2) age -- mean = 41 years, standard deviation = 16 years; (3) job type -- 59 manual workers and 41 nonmanual workers; and (4) union membership -- 41 presently union members, 24 had been union members in the past, and 35 had never been union members.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data from the study were initially keypunched in a conventional manner: columns in the data matrix represented variables (statements in the Q sort) and rows represented cases (participants). The data from the Q sort were then transposed using the Transpose procedure of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). In effect, transposition exchanges variables for cases and vice versa.

For 5 of the 100 Q sorts, there were one or two missing values. In each case a mistake by the interviewer was the source of the measurement error. Missing values were replaced by the individual's mean score on the Q sort.

I should note that the <u>transposed</u> matrix contains more variables (participants) than cases (statements in each Q sort). In general, practitioners of factor analysis recommend that the number of cases should greatly exceed the number of variables. However, Rummel states, "When the interest is only in <u>describing</u> data variability, then a factor analysis will yield such a description regardless of variables exceeding cases in number" (1970:220). His recommendation fits the use of factor analysis in this study. Because the number of variables (100) exceeded the number of cases (48), squared multiple correlation coefficients could not be calculated and 52 negative eigenvalues (100 minus 48) were found during factor extraction. To complete the analysis the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX) used the maximum off-diagonal elements of the correlation matrix as initial communality estimates and replaced negative eigenvalues by 0.

The Q factor analysis proceeded by utilizing the Factor Analysis procedure in SPSSX with the transposed data matrix. Factors were extracted using the Unweighted Least Squares (ULS) method.[7] A scree plot indicated a four step scree. The first four factors, accounting for 51.3% of the variance, were on the slope of the eigenvalue plot. The next three factors were at the first step of the scree. They accounted for an additional 9.0% of the variance. The next five factors were at the second step of the scree and accounted for an additional

---

[7] I also undertook a comparative analysis using the Principal Components method. The results were consistent with the analysis involving the ULS method. The latter is reported since it is based on an assumption of factorial causation which I believe to be applicable here.

11.4% of the variance. I decided to rotate seven factors. This is in keeping with the scree plot results and accords with Brown's practical suggestion regarding the number of factors to rotate in Q factor studies (1980:223). An oblique rotational method, oblimin, was utilized so that relationships between union schemata could better be identified.[8]

FINDINGS

Content, Structure and Distribution of Union Schemata

For each of the seven rotated factors, 48 different factor scores were calculated (1 for each of the 48 items in the Q sort). The content of the union schema shared by the individuals loading on a factor can be determined by examining the array of 48 factor scores -- the larger the absolute value of a factor score, the more a particular item is representative of the content of a union schema. The largest factor scores in the arrays for different factors are presented in Table 5.1. On the basis of the pattern of factor scores a content label was attached to each factor. This label attempts to summarize the central perspective on labour unions characteristic of each union schema.

The first factor is labelled as "Politically active defence organizations". Five of the items in the Unions as a Line of Defence

---

[8] I also examined the results when five or 12 factors were obliquely rotated. In the 12 factor solution, eight of the factors had five or fewer Q sorts with loadings greater than or equal to .40 in absolute value. The content of a number of the factors in this analysis was difficult to interpret. The results of the five factor solution, however, were generally consistent with the seven factor solution. I chose to use the seven factor solution because it provides slightly more information about the characteristic ways that workers organize their attitudes about unions.

for Workers category had large factor scores for the first factor (see Table 5.1). In each case the content direction was pro-union. In addition, a political role for unions was an important component of this schema. Thus, a large positive factor score (+1.9) was associated with the "Give unions more policy say" item and a negative factor score (-1.2) was associated with the "Unions are too involved in political action" item. Overall, although this schema includes pro-union perspectives across the entire content domain, items from the Unions as a Line of Defence for Workers and Unions as Powerful Organizations in Society categories mainly define its orientation.

The second factor is labelled as "Generally disruptive in society". As recorded in Table 5.1, the items which most characterize this factor are: "Union leaders less self-interested than other elites" (-2.3); "Intimidation of scabs is justified" (-2.3); "Unions protect lazy but others don't need" (+2.1); "Unions need the strike weapon" (-2.0); and "Labour unions too powerful" (+1.8). This anti-union schema is thus not category-centred. Instead, the disruptive impact of unions, no matter the area of social life, is of concern.

The third factor is labelled as "Necessary evil". In this schema, the economic protection offered by unions is mildly recognized and the need for union security is acknowledged. It is noteworthy that this schema is characterized by a strong objection to protection for scabs. At the same time, anti-union perspectives are expressed on other items. For instance, the individual right to withhold political dues is supported and unions are seen as being too involved in politics. Furthermore, unlike other pro-union schemata identified in this study,

items from the "How unions are directed" domain are not integral to the content of the "Necessary evil" schema.

The fourth factor is labelled as "Interfere with individual rights". Opposition to the collectivist thrust of unions is central to the content of this perspective. The items which characterize this schema are: "Individual right to withhold political dues" (+2.7); "Protection of the individual right to scab" (+2.7); and, "Closed shop principle" (-2.5). In addition, denial of the financial benefits of unions is a central component of this anti-union schema.

The fifth factor is labelled as "Economic defence organizations". More than half of the items which characterize the content of this schema come from the Unions as a Line of Defence for Workers and How Unions are Directed categories. In all cases the defensive capabilities and organizational integrity of unions are supported. However, at the same time there is no support for labour union power in society and broad political action by unions. Indeed, union affiliation with pro-labour parties is opposed.

The sixth factor is labelled as "Legitimate but too prone to conflict". The content of this schema centres on unions' role as a conflict group. The main items characterizing the factor are: "If unions disobey the law, put into trusteeship" (+2.8); "Picket line violence caused by police/management" (-1.8); "Unions use goon tactics on the picket line" (+1.5); and, "Unions should ignore a bad labour law" (-1.5). It is important to note that the legitimacy of union action, including strike action, is not denied in this schema. What is salient, however, are union excesses in conflict situations.

The content of the seventh factor was not easily interpretable. This makes me think that it represents a combination of fairly idiosyncratic Q sorts rather than a characteristic way that workers organize their views on unions. I followed Brown's advice (1980:223) and simply disregarded the insignificant seventh factor after rotation.[9]

It is worth mentioning at this point that a number of items included in the Q sort were not useful in distinguishing schemata. For instance, items such as "Unions run in dictatorial fashion" and "Unions neglect bargaining for political issues" did not have a high factor score in any schema. As well, some of the items were of the "motherhood" variety. Thus, regardless of schema, workers tended to agree that a majority of union members support union leaders. Similarly, regardless of schema, there was disagreement with the notion that socialists are using unions to destroy the country. I find it interesting that items which depict unions as out-of-control and extremist did not figure in any of the schemata with anti-union content.

The relationships between schemata are shown by the factor correlation matrix reported in Table 5.2. The schema "Politically active defence organizations" is associated with all other schemata. The correlation with the schema "Economic defence organizations" is by far the largest (.43). This is consistent with the overlap in schema content noted above. The correlations of "Politically active defence

---

[9] One other aspect of the factor analytical results should be mentioned. Most of the factor loadings on factors 5 and 6 were negative. Therefore, to interpret the content of these schemata I reversed the sign of each factor score relating to these factors. In the other analyses reported in this chapter I also worked with the mirror images of the empirically identified factors 5 and 6.

organizations" with the "Necessary evil" and "Legitimate but too prone
to conflict" schemata are moderately positive and the correlations with
the "Generally disruptive in society" and "Interfere with individual
rights" schemata are moderately negative.

The majority of other factor correlations are quite small,
demonstrating that the schemata are distinctive in content. However,
two areas of schemata association are important to note. First, the
"Legitimate but too prone to conflict" and "Necessary evil" schemata are
each positively correlated with the "Economic defence organizations"
schema. It thus appears that the contents of these three schemata,
along with the content of the "Politically active defence organizations"
schema, are somewhat overlapping. Second, "Generally disruptive in
society" is the only schema to be positively correlated with the
"Interfere with individual rights" schema (r=.16). This points to a
content overlap between these two schemata.

Further information on the structure of union schemata is
reported in Table 5.3. As can be seen from comparing the "Positive
Loading" and "Negative Loading" columns, the schemata do not tend to be
bipolar. This indicates that the intraindividual attitude structures of
pro-union and anti-union workers do not tend to be mirror images of one
another. The main exception to this generalization is the "Interfere
with individual rights" schema. Two Q sorts loaded negatively on this
factor -- these workers had a "Defend workers' collective rights"
perspective on labour unions.

The distribution of the union schemata among the sample of 100
workers is also shown in Table 5.3. A Q sort was judged to be

characterized by a schema if its factor loading was significant at the .01 level[10] and it loaded more strongly on that factor than any other factor.

Almost one-third of the sample loaded on the "Politically active defence organizations" schema. As noted in my discussion of study participation, workers sympathetic to labour unions appeared to be more willing to participate in the survey than other workers. Consequently, I suspect that the percentage of the Hamilton working class holding this schema is overestimated by my study. At the same time, it is unlikely that sampling bias alone accounts for the finding that more than 2.5 times as many Q sorts load on the "Politically active defence organizations" schema than load on any other union schema. At the substantive level what strikes me as being particularly important is that the minority of workers who regard union involvement in politics as a priority share a common union schema. In contrast, those who oppose, or are cool towards, union political involvement are split among a number of distinct schemata, each with its own emphasis. This may be a case where a united minority can have a greater influence on working class politics than a majority split between a number of perspectives.

Between 6% and 13% of the sample loaded on the remaining five major union schemata. Altogether, only 15% of the sample positively loaded on the two union schemata with consistent anti-union content

---

[10] A factor loading of .37 is significant at the .01 level. The standard error of a factor loading is equal to $1/(N)^{1/2}$, where N = the number of items in the Q sort (Brown, 1980:222). In this case the standard error of a factor loading = 1/6.928 = .144 and a loading is significant at the .01 level if it exceeds 2.58(.144) = .37.

("Generally disruptive in society" and "Interfere with individual rights"). I was particularly interested to find that a mere 4% of the sample loaded positively on the "Interfere with individual rights" schema. This perspective on labour unions, despite being championed by Canadian Right-wing organizations like the National Citizens' Coalition in recent years, is not salient to a large segment of the working class. (It seems safe to draw this conclusion even after taking into account the undersampling of anti-union workers in this study.)

A further 22% of the sample is unclassified. The unclassified group includes those who employ a well-defined idiosyncratic schema in organizing their attitudes towards unions, and those whose attitudes towards unions are not schematically organized (Conover and Feldman, 1984:109N8). The methodology employed in this study does not allow me to empirically distinguish these sections of the unclassified group.

Affective Tags on Union Schemata

Susan Fiske has theorized that there is an affective tag attached to a schema's label which summarizes the affective tags attached to each schema attribute (1986:46). If this idea is correct, then the average affect towards unions of individuals employing different union schemata should be markedly different. Alternatively, if schematic understanding and affect are relatively independent of each other, then the between-schema-variation in feeling towards unions should be substantively insignificant.

Two measures of general affective response to labour unions were employed in this study. The first is McShane's General Union Attitude,

an eight item index (1986:409).[11] The alpha reliability for the index

is a very high .94, identical to the reliability coefficient obtained in

McShane's original study (1986:408). The second is a Union Feeling

Index which measures affective response to labour unions using a 0-100

feeling thermometer scale. Two items are included in the index --

feeling towards the labour movement and feeling about the people who run

labour unions.[12] The alpha reliability for the Union Feeling Index is

.83 and its correlation with General Union Attitude is .74.

The affective tags on union schemata are reported in Table 5.4.

Individuals with negative loadings on a schema are excluded from this

table. (Hence, N=96.) The schemata can be divided into three groups

based upon their general affective tags. First, two schemata are

definitely pro-union -- "Politically active defence organizations" and

"Economic defence organizations" -- with the former schema having a

higher mean on both measures of affect towards unions.[13] Second, two

schemata are definitely anti-union -- "Interfere with individual rights"

---

[11] The eight items in the index are Q13 to Q20 in the interview
schedule found in Appendix 4.

[12] The second of these items is taken from the 1984 Canadian
National Election Study (Lambert et al., 1986:167). The two items in
the index are Q9 and Q10 in the interview schedule found in Appendix 4.

[13] Note that the mean of the "Politically active defence
organizations" schema on McShane's General Union Attitude is very close
to the index maximum, and the standard deviation is very low compared to
the standard deviations for other schemata. On the Union Feeling Index,
however, the mean of this schema is quite a distance from the index
maximum and the standard deviation is of the same order as the standard
deviations for other schemata. This suggests that McShane's General
Union Attitude is a truncated measure of affect -- it is not capable of
measuring variation in affective response to unions at the pro-union end
of the scale.

and "Generally disruptive in society" -- with the latter schema having a lower mean on both measures of affect towards unions. Third, the other two schemata are neutral to slightly positive in affect, with "Necessary evil" being more favourable towards unions than "Legitimate but too prone to conflict". Both of these schemata have mean scores on the two measures of affective response to unions in the same range as the mean score of the unclassified group.

The findings reported in Table 5.4 demonstrate that union schemata differ quite markedly in affective tags. Indeed, more than half of the variation in affective response to unions can be explained by individual variation in factor loadings on schemata. When General Union Attitude was regressed against variables made up of individual factor loadings on each of the six schemata, the adjusted coefficient of determination was .68. In a similar analysis with the Union Feeling Index as the dependent variable, the adjusted coefficient of determination was .58. In each multiple regression analysis the effects of the variables defining the two pro-union and two anti-union schemata were significant at the .05 level.

Therefore, affect towards unions is not a free-standing dimension of workers' political consciousness. While it can be invoked by the mere mention of the category label "labour unions", in the structure of individual consciousness it tends to be closely connected to a schematic understanding of unions. Fiske's theory of the

relationship between schemata and affective tags is supported by this finding.

Union Experiences and Union Schemata

1. Measures of Social Background

I now turn to an examination of the effects of direct and indirect experiences with unions on the development of workers' union schemata. This is an exploratory investigation. Confirmation of the relationships identified here must await a study involving a larger sample.

Previous research has had limited success in explaining variation in different attitudes towards unions.[14] On a consistent basis, however, experience with unions and union members has been identified as a major determinant of attitudes towards unions (Krahn and Lowe, 1984a:103; McShane, 1985:293; Kochan, 1979:24; Tables 3.12 and 3.14 in Chapter 3). Consequently, I have chosen to focus on the relationship between union experience and the development of union schemata.

Eight different measures of experience with unions are considered here. Four of them are concerned with an individual's direct experience. Of the 100 workers in the sample, 41 were currently union

---

[14] The explained variance in multiple regression analyses is in the 10% range in the studies of Kochan (1979:24) and Krahn and Lowe (1984a:103). Members of different classes are sampled in both of these studies. McShane (1985:293) reports explained variances of between 18% and 28% in a study of the attitudes towards unions of members of an Ontario public sector union local. I was able to explain 39% of the variation in Canadian workers' Strike Sympathies but only 21% of the variation in a measure of workers' General Union attitude (see Tables 3.12 and 3.14 in Chapter 3 of this thesis).

members, 24 were not union members at present but had been in the past, and the remaining 35 had never been union members. The first two categories were transformed into the dummy variables, "Presently a union member" and "Union member in the past". The other variables concerned with direct union experience are "Ever on strike" and "Ever a union leader". Thirty-seven percent of the sample had been on strike at some time, while 17% had acted in a leadership position in a union.

Four measures of indirect union experience are also considered. The first focuses on the community context in which a worker develops attitudes about unions. Krahn and Lowe (1984a:103) found that residents of Winnipeg were more favourable toward the defensive activities of labour unions than residents of Edmonton, even after a number of individual-level factors, such as union membership and occupation, were controlled. They speculate that the history of working class struggle in Winnipeg has "left a permanent mark on the collective conscience of the Winnipeg population" (1984:107). Hamilton, too, has a long history of working class struggle and is widely recognized as a union city. If this collective heritage has an important influence on Hamilton workers' contemporary attitudes towards unions independent of other union experiences, workers born and raised in Hamilton (45% of the sample) should tend to hold pro-union schemata more so than workers who have moved to Hamilton at some point in their life. The "Born in Hamilton" variable was constructed to test this hypothesis.

The other three measures of indirect union experience focus on political socialization by family and friends. "Grew up in a union family" is a measure of parental attitudes towards unions. Thirty-seven

percent of the sample reported that their upbringing had been in a union family. I also measured how many of each participant's close friends or immediate family members were presently union members. Answers were scored on a 0 to 3 scale with the highest value representing 3 or more. Finally, whether a participant's spouse was a union member was measured separately (13% of the sample fell into this category).

In addition to union experience, I also considered four other aspects of each participant's social background. Two of the factors, age and education, were identified as society-wide trend variables in Chapter 3. In previous multivariate studies age has had a positive effect on support for unions' defensive activities (Kochan, 1979:24; Krahn and Lowe, 1984a:103) and a negative effect on support for unions' activities as powerful organizations (Kochan, 1979:24; McShane, 1985:293). At the same time, education has not shown any consistent effects on attitudes towards unions. Note, however, that in the multivariate analyses reported in Chapter 3, education was an important determinant of many dimensions of workers' political consciousness, including sympathies for strikes. Canadian workers with higher levels of education are less sympathetic towards strikes.

The other two social factors consider variations in workers' on-the-job experiences. Occupational differences have proven to be important determinants of attitudes towards unions in previous studies, with individuals in white collar jobs being less supportive of union activities (Kochan, 1979:24; Krahn and Lowe, 1984a:103). My own research, reported in Chapter 3, is consistent with this finding -- blue collar workers were found to be to the Left of white collar workers on a

range of economic attitudes, including sympathies for strikes. In this study I consider the influence of manual and non-manual work on the development of union schemata (59% of the sample described their work as manual). In addition, the influence of employment status is assessed (50% of the sample were employed full-time).

2. Bivariate Associations

Table 5.5 reports the correlations between these social background variables and factor loading variables which identify the extent to which an individual's general views on unions resemble a particular schema. By assessing these correlations we can see whether variation in social background is associated with the tendency to hold a particular union schema.

A cross-section of indicators of union experience are substantively correlated with only two of the six union schemata. The correlations are positive with "Politically active defence organizations" (#1), and negative with "Interfere with individual rights" (#4). The four dimensions of union experience which have the strongest associations are: Ever a union leader, Ever on strike, Grew up in a union family, and Regular interaction with union members. It is worthy of notice that both direct and indirect union experiences are included in this list.

Each of the other social background variables are substantively associated with one or more schema variables. The correlation pattern for the Manual worker variable parallels that of the union experience variables. The other social background variables, however, have different correlation patterns. Age is positively associated with the

schema "Economic defence organizations" (#5), and negatively associated with "Interfere with individual rights" (#4) and "Legitimate but too prone to conflict" (#6). Education is associated with the same three schemata, but in a reverse direction. Finally, those employed full-time are more likely to hold the "Necessary evil" schema (#3) and less likely to hold the "Legitimate but too prone to conflict" schema (#6).

3. An Interpretation of Multiple Regression Analyses

The effects of experience with unions on the development of union schemata were further explored using multiple regression analyses. The individual factor loadings on union schemata were the dependent variables in six regression runs. All social background variables with a correlation of at least .1 in magnitude were included in an equation. The results of these analyses are reported in Table 5.6, although only major determinants are listed.

One general finding stands out: a wide variety of union experience variables have a substantial impact in only two analyses, and in each case the coefficient of determination is quite high compared to the other analyses. In the regression run involving "Interfere with individual rights" (R^2 = .27), five of the eight major determinants were union experience variables. In the run involving "Politically active defence organizations", three of the four major determinants were union experience variables.

We can understand this finding by recognizing that direct or indirect experience with unions quite often introduces a worker to the philosophy and principles of the union movement. In some cases this introduction may be formal in character (e.g., union meetings and

courses), but it is usually imparted informally. Many workers cannot help but be affected when they spend their working or away-from-work lives rubbing shoulders with individuals who are solidly pro-union in perspective.

As a consequence of this learning, some workers develop a strong commitment to the union movement. Such a commitment necessarily involves the development of a critical perspective on dominant views of unions in Canadian society. In other words, it entails the adoption of an oppositional perspective (i.e., opposition to dominant views of unions). The main oppositional schema identified in this study is "Politically active defence organizations", although the mirror image of the "Interfere with individual rights" schema can also be seen in this light.

Eight aspects of workers' experiences with unions were measured in this study. It is interesting that the two union membership variables "Presently a union member" and "Union member in the past" do not have a major influence on the development of workers' union schemata. Instead, more intensive direct experience with unions -- acting in a leadership role or participating in a strike -- are important determinants. Similarly, simply being born and raised in Hamilton does not have a major influence on union schemata development. However, more intensive indirect experiences with unions -- growing up in a union family and having regular interaction with union members away from work -- are important determinants.

As recorded in Table 5.6, experience with unions has a minimal impact on the schema "Generally disruptive in society", and little or no

impact on the development of three of the union schemata -- "Economic defence organizations", "Necessary evil" and "Legitimate but too prone to conflict". This means that the tendency to hold one of these four characteristic ways of looking at unions is not strongly related to the extent of workers' experience with unions. This is an interesting finding which deserves further investigation.

Based upon the results reported in Table 5.6, I have called the schema "Politically active defence organizations" an oppositional schema. I have also slotted the mirror image of the schema "Interfere with individual rights" into this category. The other schemata make up a residual grouping. I believe it is useful to think of them as different variants of the dominant ideology on labour unions. The dominant ideology union schemata range quite extensively in content and affective tag. I am thus proposing that the dominant ideology on unions not be conceptualized as a monolithic package -- it is more accurately depicted as distinctive and conflicting views of labour unions, each widely promoted and held in Canadian society. However, the schemata are similar in denying the legitimacy of union political activism.

In all of the analyses reported in Table 5.6, one or more of the society-wide trend or work experience variables are important determinants. I will briefly note two major findings regarding these variables. First, the effect of manual work largely parallels the effects of union experience variables on schemata development -- it is a positive determinant of "Politically active defence organizations" and a negative determinant of "Interfere with individual rights" and "Generally disruptive in society". This suggests that, independent of

union involvement, the development of perspectives favourable to unions among workers is encouraged in manual work environments. Second, education is a major, positive determinant of the "Interfere with individual rights" schema. It would seem that criticisms of the collective thrust of union activities are most salient for workers with higher levels of education. This is an important finding, and adds to our understanding of the impact of educational differentiation on the working class. It will be remembered that education was the single most important determinant of workers' political attitudes in the analyses described in Chapter 3. The objections of Hamilton workers with higher levels of education to the collectivist thrust of unions is consistent with the national finding (from the 1982 Class Structure survey) that workers with higher levels of education are less sympathetic towards strikes.

Union Schemata and Workers' Positions on Specific Union Issues

How does a worker form a position on a specific union issue? According to schema theory there are three main steps in the process of specific attitude formation. First, the issue is categorized. Second, the schema related to this category is cued. Third, a position on the specific union issue is derived from this schematic understanding. If this theory of specific attitude formation is correct, and if this study has uncovered meaningful patterns of individual attitude structure, then union schemata loadings should be important predictors of workers' positions on specific union issues. The objective in this subsection is to test this hypothesis.

Two union issues are considered. The first is willingness to be a union member.[15] This issue is framed at the same general level of abstraction as the union schemata identified in this study. The second issue is feeling towards the inside postal workers union, CUPW.[16] This issue is not framed at the unions-in-general level.

In the quantitative analyses undertaken here, the effects of social background variables on specific issue positions are considered along with the effects of union schemata. This will give us a sense of the relative importance of these two types of determinants. In addition, I hypothesize that the six union schemata identified in this study are intervening variables between social background and specific issue position. If this hypothesis is correct, then in path analytical models much of the effect of social background variables on specific issue positions should be indirect.

The results of the two path analyses are reported in Table 5.7. A large portion of the variation in willingness to be a union member was explained in the first analysis (R^2=.63). The three most important determinants of this specific issue are union schemata variables: "Politically active defence organizations", "Generally disruptive in society" and "Economic defence organizations". Furthermore, in the cases of the union experience variables "Ever a union leader" (direct effect = -.03, indirect effect = .17) and "Grew up in a union family (direct effect = .03, indirect effect = .12), as well as the "Manual

[15] This is one of the items from McShane's General Union Attitude (1986:409). It is Q15 in Appendix 4.

[16] This is Q11 in Appendix 4.

Worker" dummy variable (direct effect = .07, indirect effect = .12), indirect effects are far greater than direct effects. Indeed, in only one case is the direct effect of a union experience variable noticeably greater than its indirect effect ("Union member in the past" -- direct effect = .13, indirect effect = .03). In sum, the results of this path analysis (1) confirm that the union schemata identified in this study are meaningful to this issue; and (2) lend support to the hypothesis that much of the effect of social background on willingness to be a union member is through the causally intervening step of union schemata development.

A much smaller portion of the variation in feeling towards CUPW was explained ($R^2=.34$). There are also two other important differences between this analysis and the one involving willingness to be in a labour union. First, the effects of union schemata variables are not nearly as large. Indeed, only "Politically active defence organizations" is among the three largest determinants. Second, in no case does the indirect effect of a social background variable outweigh its direct effect. In sum, the results of this path analysis suggest that mention of CUPW cues a set of schemata and affective tags which have not been measured in this study.

My hypothesis is that CUPW is categorized as a militant, powerful, public sector union by many workers rather than as a typical example of a labour union. Since political action by unions is only strongly supported by workers holding the "Politically active defence organizations" schema, it is to be expected that many workers who generally look upon unions favourably will look upon CUPW unfavourably.

Furthermore, it is likely that a schema which is specifically related to this type of union will be cued rather than one of the general union schemata measured in this study. In conclusion, what a worker believes to be salient about unions-in-general will not necessarily be what the same worker believes to be salient about a union like CUPW.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

At this point a summary of the findings of this investigation may be useful. I set out to identify the characteristic ways that Canadian workers organize their attitudes towards labour unions. Union attitudes were analytically divided into six major areas, and eight statements indicating the content of each area were developed. One hundred study participants, members of the working class in Hamilton, Ontario, were contacted during a 1987 door-to-door survey. Each sorted these statements into 1 of 11 categories ranging from "Most Disagree" to "Most Agree". The data were then analyzed using the Q factor technique. Six factors were rotated and interpreted. Each empirically identified factor represents a general union schema -- a typical way that individual workers organize their attitudes towards unions. Seventy-eight percent of the sample were classified as holding a perspective on unions which is characterized by one of the six schemata.

Having identified these union schemata, I proceeded to examine whether they were meaningful cognitive structures or merely an artificial construction of this particular methodology. The union schemata were found to differ quite markedly in affective tag. Indeed, over half the variation in affect for unions was explained by the

variables representing individual factor loadings on each schema. This suggests that the contents of the union schemata identified in this study underlie many workers' responses to unions at a feeling level.

Two hypotheses were also tested in this chapter. First, I suggested that general union schemata are centred on certain content domains; that is, a limited range of union activities were hypothesized to be particularly important in shaping typical overall views on unions. This hypothesis was partially supported. The content of the "Interfere with individual rights" schema was dominated by items concerned with unions as collectivist organizations and the content of the "Legitimate but too prone to conflict" schema was dominated by items concerned with unions as a conflict group. On the other hand, the content of the "Generally disruptive in society" schema included items which cut across the different categories of union activity, and the content of each of the other three schemata was centred on two or more domains of activity. Thus, the intraindividual structure of workers' attitudes towards unions tends to be somewhat domain-centred. However, the contents of union schemata are usually defined by items drawn from more than one category of union activity.

The second hypothesis was based on Susan Fiske's theory of the relationship between social cognition and affect (1986:46). In her view, there is an affective tag attached to a schema label which summarizes the affect for schema attributes. In assessing the differences between the six union schemata in affect, then, I was testing Fiske's notion that affect and social cognition should be closely related. My findings support her theory. Thus, although affect

towards unions is cued with social categorization, it tends to be closely connected to well-defined perspectives on union activities in the structure of individual political consciousness.

I also explored the relationship between experiences with unions and the development of union schemata. I found that union experience variables were important determinants of some schemata, but not others. This led me to classify the union schemata into two broad groupings: oppositional schemata and a broad residual category of schemata. Experience with labour unions tends to promote the development of oppositional schemata, but is not particularly important in promoting the development of any of the other schemata. These two broad groupings of schemata also differ in one other general way: oppositional schemata involve support for unions' involvement in politics, but such is not the case for any of the schemata in the residual category.

I believe it is useful to think of the schemata in the residual category as different variants of the dominant ideology on labour unions. These schemata range quite extensively in content and affective tag, but are alike in being unassociated with workers' practical involvement in unions. I infer that the main social source of the dominant ideology schemata are the dominant institutions in Canadian society.

Another important finding is that the development of oppositional union schemata is promoted by intensive, rather than casual, experiences with unions. Thus, growing up in a union family, being a union leader, and having regular interaction with union members away from work were major determinants of the schema "Politically active

defence organizations". Simply being a union member, or being born and raised in Hamilton, did not have an independent effect on the development of this perspective. This suggests that workers do not develop an oppositional perspective on unions in a passive, osmosis-like process; instead, active participation in unions or active contact with union members seem to be crucial social experiences.

The schemata identified in this study relate to labour unions at the most general level of abstraction. Consequently, they are particularly relevant to the development of positions on union issues at a comparable level of generality. For issues involving specific union activity, however, these schemata are not as relevant. This was demonstrated by my analysis of the effects of union schemata and social background on variation in workers' feelings towards the Canadian Union of Postal Workers. In future investigations it will be useful to outline the schemata associated with union issues at various levels of generality. My suspicion is that such an analysis will reveal a hierarchic structuring of schemata, with the schemata identified in this study located at the apex of different hierarchies.

In closing, I should comment on the fact that two major divisions in workers' views on unions have been identified in the analyses of this chapter. The first division relates to the affective tags attached to different union schemata. Two union schemata were very positive in affect, two were negative, and two were neutral to mildly positive. More than half of the study participants who were classified as holding one of the six typical perspectives on unions hold a union schema with a very positive affective tag, while only 15% hold one of

the two schemata with very negative affective tags. The second division
involves two criteria: (1) the social sources of the union schemata; and
(2) support for union political action. Schemata which are associated
with union experience, and which are characterized by support for
political action by unions, are classified as oppositional schemata.
The remaining schemata are classified as different variants of the
dominant ideology on unions.   The percentage of study participants
holding a dominant ideology schema (over 40%) was greater than the
percentage holding an oppositional perspective (33%).

We thus have a situation where a large majority of this sample
of workers has positive general feelings for labour unions, but only a
minority holds an oppositional union schema.   What accounts for this
finding? In the past 45 years labour unions have become institutionally
established in our society, largely through the development of
legislation which formalizes their place in labour relations.   I would
argue that as this institutional change has taken place, the dominant
ideology on unions has developed to reflect the new reality.
Consequently, we now have a number of distinct variants of a dominant
ideology on unions. Some of these variants are distinctly anti-union in
content and affect -- they are premised on the rejection of the
institutionalization of unions in Canadian society. However, the other
variants are consistent with the institutionalization of unions -- the
current arrangement is seen as legitimate and beneficial to working
people, although it may have drawbacks.   Dominant ideology on unions
thus consists of distinctive and somewhat conflicting views of unions,
each of which is widely promoted through different institutions in

Canadian society. At the same time, none of the variants of this dominant ideology see labour unions as a political movement aimed at shifting existing institutional arrangements in workers' favour. Only the oppositional perspective on unions, held by a minority of the working class and grounded in the practice of the labour movement, grants the legitimacy of political action by unions.

If the analysis just outlined is correct, then it seems necessary to recognize that it is simply not possible to unambiguously slot workers into mutually exclusive categories of active consent, passive consent, and absence of consent. (See Chapter 1 for a discussion of the forms of consent to capitalist domination.) For instance, workers who view labour unions as "Economic defence organizations" tend to uphold a pro-worker/anti-employer viewpoint on the economic struggle between labour and capital. However, these workers also deny the legitimacy of labour unions mounting a political challenge to the existing structure of power in Canadian society. This type of dual consciousness will be studied in more depth in Part Three.

Table 5.1: Items Characterizing Workers' Union Schemata[a]

	FACTORS[b]					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Unions as a Line of Defence for Workers						
1) Needed to fight employer selfishness	+2.2					-1.0
2) Not necessary since bosses fair	-1.2		-1.3		-1.2	
3) Improve standard of living	+1.8		+1.2		+1.4	
4) Financially better off with no unions	-2.5		-1.5	+1.8		
5) Protect working people	+1.5				+1.5	
6) Protect lazy but others don't need		+2.1	+1.4		-1.0	
7) Keep supervisors in line				-1.2	+1.6	
8) Not much value for union dues				+1.8	-1.3	
2. Unions as Powerful Organizations in Society						
1) Union influence positive for country	+1.2					
2) Labour unions too powerful	-1.2	+1.8				
3) Give unions more policy say	+1.9	-1.6				
4) Government policies favour unions	-1.1					
5) Unions promote efficiency				-1.0	+1.2	
6) Unions interfere with labour efficiency	-1.0	+1.4				
7) Myth that unions cause unemployment	+1.7	+1.5			-1.5	
8) Unions impose too many restrictions			+1.0			
3. How Unions are Directed						
1) Union leaders less self-interested		-2.3	-1.1			
2) Union leaders out for themselves	-1.2				-1.8	
3) Union activists bring to light impt problems						
4) Union activists are chronic complainers	-1.4				-1.3	-1.6
5) Unions more responsive than other groups				-1.1		
6) Unions run in dictatorial fashion						-1.1
7) Majority of union members support leaders	+1.4	+2.2			+1.0	+2.0
8) Many union leaders are corrupt		+1.3			-1.9	
4. Unions as Collectivist Organizations						
1) Dues spending is a group decision						+1.8
2) Individual right to withhold political dues			+2.3	+2.7		
3) Intimidation of scabs is justified		-2.3	+1.1			
4) Individual right to scab should be protected			-2.2	+2.7	+1.7	+1.3
5) Unions promotes safe work environment		-1.2				+1.2
6) Unions promote complacency on job	-1.5					-1.9
7) Closed shop principle		-1.3	+1.6	-2.5		+1.4
8) Workers have more freedom without unions	-1.4		-1.0	+1.8	-1.1	

Table 5.1 (continued): Items Characterizing Workers' Union Schemata[a]

	FACTORS[b]					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Unions as Conflict Groups						
1) Picket line violence caused by police/management			-1.1			-1.9
2) Unions use goon tactics on picket lines						+1.5
3) Labour conflicts due to fundamental differences	+1.1	+1.3	+1.2			
4) Most labour conflicts initiated by agitators				-1.3	+1.1	-1.7
5) If labour law is bad, unions should ignore		-1.8	-1.5			-1.5
6) If unions disobey law, put into trusteeship		+1.7				+2.8
7) Unions need the strike weapon	+1.4	-2.0			+1.5	
8) Most strikes due to a union's unreasonableness			-2.1			-2.0
6. Unions in Politics						
1) Unions affiliate with pro-labour parties			-1.0	-1.5	-1.8	
2) Unions too involved in political action	-1.2		+1.6			
3) Unions politically help women/minorities				-1.0	+1.1	+1.9
4) Unions neglect bargaining for political issues						
5) Unions speak for working class					+1.2	
6) Unions are the vehicle of socialist union leaders			-1.4			-1.2
7) Union newspapers more reliable than mainstream			-1.9			
8) Union newspapers just propaganda						

[a]   Entries are factor scores calculated using the regression method in SPSSX. Only factor scores greater than or equal to 1.0 in absolute value are reported in this table.

[b]   Factor labels are 1 -- "Politically active defence organizations"
                          2 -- "Generally disruptive in society"
                          3 -- "Necessary evil"
                          4 -- "Interfere with individual rights"
                          5 -- "Economic defence organizations"
                          6 -- "Legitimate but too prone to conflict"

Table 5.2:   Structural Relationships Between Union Schemata[a]

Schema	(1)	(5)	(3)	(6)	(4)
(1) Politically active defence organizations					
(5) Economic defence organizations	.43				
(3) Necessary evil	.19	.19			
(6) Legitimate but too prone to conflict	.25	.30	.09		
(4) Interfere with individual rights	-.20	-.07	-.05	-.03	
(2) Generally disruptive in society	-.17	.00	.12	.04	.16

[a] This is the factor correlation matrix

Table 5.3:   Distribution of Union Schemata

Schema	Sample Percentage Loading on Schema	Percentage Positive Loading	Percentage Negative Loading
(1) Politically active defence organizations	32	31	1
(5) Economic defence organizations	13	13	0
(3) Necessary evil	9	9	0
(6) Legitimate but too prone to conflict	7	6	1
(4) Interfere with individual rights	6	4	2
(2) Generally disruptive in society	11	11	0

Unclassified -- 22 percent

Table 5.4:   Affective Tags on Union Schemata

Schema	McShane's General Union Attitude[a]			Union Feeling Index[b]	
	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(1) Politically active defence organizations	31	53.0	3.4	150	29
(5) Economic defence organizations	13	49.2	6.6	127	35
(3) Necessary evil	9	44.4	6.5	108	25
(6) Legitimate but too prone to conflict	6	42.2	8.3	96	31
*** Unclassified	22	39.1	14.6	110	42
(4) Interfere with individual rights	4	32.0	9.5	70	41
(2) Generally disruptive in society	11	26.5	11.4	64	35

[a] Scale range 8-56. Alpha reliability = .94 for N=100.
[b] Scale range 0-200. Alpha reliability = .83 for N=100.

Table 5.5: Correlations Between Social Background Variables and
Individual Factor Loadings on Union Schemata

Social Background	Union Schemata 1	5	3	6	4	2	Mean	SD
1. Society-Wide Trends								
1) Age	.07	.14	-.04	-.19	-.11	-.02	41.0	15.5
2) Education (1-8 scale)	.05	-.12	.08	.10	.24	.02	4.9	1.9
2. Work Experience								
1) Manual worker	.21	-.04	.02	-.12	-.23	-.11	.59	.49
2) Employed full-time	-.05	-.03	.21	-.13	.00	.05	.50	.50
3. Direct Union Experience								
1) Presently a union member	.17	.03	.18	-.12	-.10	-.12	.41	.49
2) Union member in the past	.02	.12	.01	-.01	-.10	-.02	.24	.43
3) Ever on strike	.23	.04	.06	-.20	-.32	-.13	.37	.49
4) Ever a union leader	.29	.09	.06	-.11	-.34	-.24	.17	.38
4. Indirect Union Experience								
1) Born in Hamilton	.10	.08	.03	.01	.08	-.03	.45	.50
2) Grew up in union family	.23	.06	-.09	-.01	-.11	-.09	.37	.48
3) Regular interaction with union members (0-3 scale)	.23	-.06	.13	.09	-.18	-.03	1.96	1.14
4) Spouse a union member	.04	-.12	-.04	.10	-.11	-.14	.13	.34

Table 5.6: Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses, Schemata Factor Loadings as Dependent

Dependent Variable	R-squared[a]	Major Determinants (Beta coefficients in brackets)
(1) Politically active defence organizations	.23(.17)	Grew up in union family(.25) Ever a union leader(.22) Manual worker(.19) Interaction with union members(.17)
(5) Economic defence organizations	.05(.00)	Union member in the past(.12) Education(-.10) Age(.09)
(3) Necessary evil	.06(.03)	Employed full-time(.16) Presently a union member(.12)
(6) Legitimate but too prone to conflict	.09(.01)	Employed full-time(-.19) Age(-.14) Spouse a union member(.10) Ever on strike(-.08)
(4) Interfere with individual rights	.27(.18)	Ever a union leader(-.24) Ever on strike(-.21) Education(.17) Manual worker(-.16) Grew up in union family(-.14) Spouse a union member(-.12) Interaction with union members(-.13) Age(.10)
(2) Generally disruptive in society	.09(.04)	Ever a union leader(-.21) Spouse a union member(-.15) Manual worker(-.10) Presently a union member(-.09)

[a] Adjusted R-squared is in brackets.

Table 5.7: Path Analytical Models --
Specific Issue Positions Regressed on Social Background Variables and Union Schemata

Independent Variables	"If I had to choose, I probably would not be a member of a labour union" (reverse coded)			"Your feeling towards the inside postal workers union, CUPW."		
	Direct Effect	Indirect Effect	Total Effect	Direct Effect	Indirect Effect	Total Effect
FIRST BLOCK, SOCIAL BACKGROUND						
1. Society-Wide Trends						
1) Age	X	-.01	-.01	-.24	.01	-.23
2) Education (1-8 scale)	-.07	-.03	-.10	X	-.01	-.01
2. Work Experience						
1) Manual worker	.07	.12	.18	X	.06	.06
2) Employed full-time	-.11	-.02	-.14	X	-.01	-.01
3. Direct Union Experience						
1) Presently a union member	.07	.06	.14	X	.03	.03
2) Union member in the past	.13	.03	.15	-.11	.02	-.09
3) Ever on strike	.00	.03	.03	.04	.01	.05
4) Ever a union leader	-.03	.17	.15	.27	.08	.35
4. Indirect Union Experience						
1) Born in Hamilton	.05	.03	.07	.10	.02	.12
2) Grew up in union family	.03	.12	.15	X	.07	.07
3) Regular interaction with union members (0-3 scale)	X	.08	.08	.05	.04	.10
4) Spouse a union member	X	.05	.05	X	.00	.00
SECOND BLOCK, UNION SCHEMATA FACTOR LOADINGS						
1) Politically active defence organizations	.41		.41	.29		.29
5) Economic defence organizations	.20		.20	.13		.13
3) Necessary evil	.01		.01	-.07		-.07
6) Legitimate but too prone to conflict	.13		.13	X		X
4) Interfere with individual rights	-.11		-.11	.02		.02
2) Generally disruptive in society	-.29		-.29	-.09		-.09
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.63(.55)			.34(.24)		

X Variable not included in the regression run

PART THREE: WORKERS' POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND STRIKE ACTION

In Part Three of the thesis I present a case study conducted at the time of a major Canadian strike. This is not your average strike study. I set out with some unique research objectives, and the final product of my efforts is in large part shaped by the constraints of those objectives. Hence, it seems appropriate to make these research objectives clear at the very beginning of my discussion.

First, I planned to measure the political consciousness of strike participants using many of the attitude indicators employed in recent national sample surveys (see Chapter 3, Tables 3.1 and 3.4). This measurement strategy facilitates comparisons between the samples interviewed in this case study and national samples of workers. It also yields more systematic quantitative data on workers' political consciousness than is usually found in strike studies, where the immediate issues of the day tend to dominate the researcher's agenda.

Second, I put a priority on collecting uniform data from a sample of strikers rather than pursuing conversations with as many participants as possible or attempting to develop an in-depth understanding of the psyches of a handful of participants. As explained in Chapter 6, I use a nonprobability sampling procedure in the case study. However, I am not content to accept the prevailing sociological view that relationships observed in small nonprobability samples cannot be generalized. By conscientiously applying a quota structure to my

216

sampling, I believe I have secured samples which are representative of the leaders in the union local I studied (N=18) and quite likely representative of the rank-and-file union participants (N=27).

Third, I wanted to supplement data from structured interviews with field observations and informal conversations with workers during the strike. This meant that I geared my fieldwork towards those individuals who comprised my study samples. At times I was tempted to break from this pattern and investigate other interesting events and personalities in the strike. However, the demands of trying to get to know and systematically keep tabs on 45 individuals kept me from breaking with my initial research plan.

Fourth, I set out to measure behavioural and attitudinal differences in workers' responses to the strike. This necessitated a different sort of approach than if I had chosen to construct a general impression of how the strike affected workers. It also meant that my focus was constantly on the workers. I had neither the time nor the inclination to interview the other actors in the dispute -- management, police or spectators. Instead, I wanted to observe how workers dealt with the members of these other groups, and what they thought and felt about the intergroup relations.

In summary, this is not your average strike study because it is not a study of a strike at all! Indeed, it is a study of workers' political consciousness in the context of a critical Canadian labour struggle.

The results of the case study are contained in five chapters (6 to 10). In Chapter 6 I present considerable introductory material and

background information. The chapter's aims are: (1) to present an overview of the issues in dispute during the strike; (2) to convey a picture of workers' experiences during the strike; (3) to reintroduce two of the major themes of my dissertation — working class consent to capitalist domination, and the prospects for building an alternative hegemony in Canadian society — in terms of strike developments; and (4) to outline the study's methodology.

In Chapter 7 I begin a systematic assessment of workers' political consciousness in the context of the strike. I compare the political attitudes of four groups: the leaders of the striking union local, rank-and-file strike participants, union leaders who were respondents in recent national surveys, and union rank-and-file who were respondents in those same surveys. I attempt to explain major differences in political attitudes by drawing upon both Marxist theoretical perspectives and the results from open-ended attitude questions contained in my interviews with strikers.

Understanding the role of political consciousness in influencing workers' actions in the strike is the focus of Chapter 8. My specific research question is this: to what extent can we understand the actions of strike participants — both striking union members and strikebreaker recruits (scabs) — by looking at their political attitudes? In the first section of Chapter 8 I consider the bases for the strike participation of the scab recruits. In the second section of the chapter I concentrate on the strike participation of union members. The influence of political attitudes and identities on different dimensions of strike participation is compared to the influence of a number of

group-level and individual-level factors which have been hypothesized to affect strike participation. My quantitative analyses, therefore, are multivariate. I use data from my field research to assist in understanding key quantitative findings.

Short-term attitude change is the subject of Chapter 9. I consider two questions. First, in what way did participation in the strike change the political beliefs and feelings of union members? Second, which groups of union members were most affected by the strike and which groups were least affected? My data on attitude change come from interviews conducted about three months after the strike's conclusion. Again, I meld quantitative and qualitative data in my analyses.

In Chapter 10 I conclude the case study by addressing three puzzling questions which were raised in Chapter 6. This allows me to deepen my analyses of the character of working class consent to capitalist domination and the prospects for constructing an alternative hegemony in Canada. To some extent the conclusion is based on an assessment of information found in Chapters 6 to 9. However, I also present important new data gathered during a study of union activity in the months after the strike's end.

CHAPTER 6: AN INTRODUCTION TO A STUDY OF
WORKERS' POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND ACTION
DURING THE 1987 STRIKE BY THE CANADIAN UNION OF POSTAL WORKERS

"This has been the toughest strike we've ever been through," a
veteran of eight national postal strikes in the past 22 years wearily
told me on the last day of the 1987 strike.   For the second time in a
decade, a federal government had retracted the right to strike of the
Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) by passing back-to-work
legislation. In 1978, when the government threatened wholesale firings,
the union had defied such legislation for eight days before asking
members to return to work.   In 1987 the legal penalties for defiance
were much more severe. They included minimum fines of $500 per day for
union members and $10,000 per day for union officials (Article 10.1, Act
C-86 of the Second Session, Thirty-third Parliament). Furthermore, from
the first day of the strike, the Canada Post Corporation had accumulated
experience in how to manage the processing of mail utilizing a labour
force made up of poorly trained strikebreakers. It thus appeared that
the government and crown corporation had a contingency plan in place
should the severe penalties in the back-to-work bill not stop the
strike: they would fire defiant postal workers en masse, hoping that
their strikebreaking operation could be made efficient enough to at
least move business mail without too much delay.   Faced with this
situation, the national leadership of CUPW informed local unions late on
the afternoon of October 16, 1987 that "while it would be morally

justifiable to defy this legislation ... it would not be justifiable to permit the Conservative government to destroy the Canadian Union of Postal Workers." Workers were instructed to return to work as ordered by Act C-86, 17 days after the first union strike action had taken place.

The 1987 CUPW strike was quite different from any of the other seven national strikes fought by inside postal workers. For one thing, this was the first strike where the employer had hired scabs to do the work of union members. As a consequence, even though veteran CUPW members had often walked a picket line, this was the first time that their picket line had been challenged by management and police. Picket line skirmishes were an entirely new experience for the workers.

The strike was also unique in that it was entirely a defensive action by the union. CUPW was primarily fighting to maintain job security clauses secured in previous collective agreements and to stop Canada Post Corp. from privatizing the wicket service jobs held by 4200 CUPW members across the country. Without question, Canada Post was on the offensive against the union in this set of contract negotiations. The impetus for the corporation's strategy was created by the election of Brian Mulroney and the Progressive Conservative Party in September, 1984. After taking power, the Mulroney cabinet moved to impose its political priorities on Canada Post, a crown corporation which reports to the cabinet. This resulted in the resignation of Canada Post President Michael Warren in August, 1985; the exclusion of the Canada Post Board of Directors from any role in corporate planning (Stewart-Patterson, 1987:272); the adoption, in late 1986, of a five year

business plan which instructed the corporation to begin a process that would see most postal retail services in both rural and urban areas closed or contracted out to the private sector; and the formulation of postal policy in close consultation with a group of Right-wing Tory backbenchers supportive of the philosophy of the National Citizen's Coalition (Stewart-Patterson, 1987:273). Thus, while in many policy areas the first-term Mulroney government of 1984-88 backed away from the demands of new conservative organizations like the National Citizen's Coalition and the Fraser Institute, it agreed to a strongly pro-business, anti-union plan for the Post Office. This is the context for the fruitless negotiations between CUPW and Canada Post from August 1986 to August 1987, the mounting of a multi-million dollar strikebreaking operation by the corporation, and the speedy withdrawal of CUPW's right to strike by the federal government.

It was my privilege to be able to experience the 1987 strike alongside members of the Hamilton local of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers. Of course, as a researcher I was not fighting to save wicket service jobs or to defend the gains that my union had fought for and won over the years. Neither did I have the considerable weight of responsibility felt by the local union leadership as they tried to do what was best for the membership in a time of high emotions and fast-paced events. At the same time, I think I experienced enough of the strike, and talked to a wide enough cross section of the membership, to be able to understand the importance of this struggle for most union members. In the next few chapters I attempt to convey a sense of

strikers' feelings about the strike at the same time as I analyze the relationships between political consciousness and strike action.

I should make clear at the outset of this grouping of five chapters that my research was not driven by an overriding concern with either of two questions which seem to capture the imagination of large numbers of Canadians: "What's wrong with the Post Office?" and "Why are those postal workers so militant?"[1] As well, I did not aim to produce a chronicle of the strike from the workers' standpoint. This work is neither a study of the Canadian Post Office nor a study of a postal strike. Instead, as emphasized in the introduction to Part Three, it is a study of workers' political consciousness in the context of the 1987 CUPW strike. Thus, while much information about the Post Office and the 1987 strike is presented in this and the succeeding four chapters, I do so in order to explore the behavioural effects and dynamics of workers' political consciousness. My overall intention is to accumulate a body of evidence which can help us to better understand the character of bourgeois hegemony in contemporary Canada and the prospects for building an alternative hegemony.

---

[1] David Stewart-Patterson (1987) has recently supplied a business journalist's answer to the first question. A Ph.D. thesis in preparation by David Lewis of the Department of Sociology at McMaster University promises to be a more insightful examination of the state of the Post Office. It is based upon a detailed study of the state of labour-management relations in the Hamilton Post Office in 1985-86. To the second question Steven Reynolds has contributed a solid M.A. thesis. "The history of collective bargaining in the Post Office," he writes, "can be written almost exclusively from the perspective of a management bent on the one hand, on implementing technological changes and on the other a refractory union equally bent on resisting these changes" (1981:xiii-xiv). For understanding CUPW's struggle in its formative years, the biography of former national president Joe Davidson is indispensable (Davidson and Deverell, 1978).

I undertake three separate tasks in the remainder of this chapter. First, I reintroduce the major themes of the thesis through an analysis of some important events associated with the struggles of inside postal workers. In reintroducing these themes I strive to convey a sense of workers' picket line and on-the-job experiences, and to outline the political implications of the strike. Second, I present a chronological summary of the major pre-strike, strike and post-strike events. Third, I describe the methodology of the study.

REFLECTIONS ON MAJOR THEMES

Bystander Inaction as a Form of Consent

It was early evening on October 14, 1987. A convoy of three buses carrying strikebreakers had just pulled into the loading area behind the Main Post Office in downtown Hamilton. Police had halted the buses just before they reached the Post Office so that union representatives could climb aboard and briefly talk to the scabs. In exchange, striking members of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers had let the buses cross their picket line with a minimum of resistance -- lots of yelling, an egg or two splattered against a window, and a little banging on the buses as they went by. The incoming cargo on the old school buses was 100 strikebreakers recruited by Canada Post to process mail during the strike. After these people hurried into the Post Office through a loading dock door, about 30 scab workers hustled out of the building onto the buses, having just completed a 12 hour shift. As soon as the scabs were on board, the buses moved off Post Office property via

a side entrance. As they did, battle lines were reforming at the main entrance.

Fifty picketers, mostly workers who handled and processed mail on the afternoon shift, linked arms and slowly circled, blocking the entrance to the loading docks. The strikers' spirits were buoyant and determined. A small mail van, which had tried to sneak across the picket line behind the buses, had just been turned away. At 9:30 on the previous evening many of the same people had been on the line when a transport truck had been turned back -- the first such success at the Main Post Office during the strike. Now a convoy of tractor trailers carrying mail from other cities was scheduled to arrive. Confronting the strikers, however, was an intimidating sight. Thirty-five uniformed police stood shoulder to shoulder on the street side of the picket line, waiting for the order to charge the strikers' line.

But a third group was also present at the scene. Behind the police, and separated from the confrontation by five lanes of traffic, was a huge group of onlookers. In the lull before the transport trucks arrived, one of the picketers attempted to tip the balance of forces in favour of the striking postal workers. "Hey, why don't you people come over here and join our picket line," he yelled across the road. "Come on over. Don't just stand there. We need your help. If you join us, the cops won't be able to move us." A second picketer also encouraged the crowd of onlookers to join the strikers' ranks. My first reaction was to smile at this spontaneous attempt to organize a coalition of forces. For one thing, its brazenness cut through some of the tension on the picket line. As well, judging from the looks on faces across the

road, it made the spectators realize that personally witnessing a police attack on striking workers is different from watching the 11 o'clock TV news footage of "a strike incident". But more than anything else I smiled because the request for help had a utopian flavour to it. I just could not see any of the onlookers abandoning their spectator role and choosing to cross the road to join the struggle. And they didn't.

The tail end of the evening rush hour was still crawling by on Main Street when the transport trucks arrived. The police quickly moved on the strikers. They split the line in the centre and drove picketers back and towards either side. When picketers tried to break free and circle around to the front of the skirmish they were grabbed and thrown back. To one observer, who had witnessed a similar assault earlier in the strike, at a distance of 30 metres it looked like the police were just smoothly rolling up a snowball. Poetic images were, however, the luxury of those who kept their distance. In the centre of the melee picketers had been smashed into each other, stepped on, and had to fight to keep their balance. Picketers were shoved or thrown against the walls bordering the driveway. Some fell. A few strikers suffered bruises or sprains in the confrontation. In addition, a number of the police made a special effort to grab women by the breasts when pushing them aside. A union member told me that in a picket line skirmish earlier in the strike a cop had grabbed her by the shirt close to her breast by putting his hand underneath the coat she was wearing. She immediately complained about his action. His response was to shove his hand even higher. The sexual assaults on women strikers therefore did not seem to be accidental.

With the help of the 35 police officers the three transports were successful in cracking the strikers' line. After they left, a group of trucks used to shuttle mail within Hamilton were marshalled to cross the picket line. Using a tactic which postal workers in nearby London, Ontario had effectively employed the previous day, picketers decided to sit down when the police moved on them a second time. After a brief moment of hesitation, the police started dragging picketers out of the way. Some of the women strikers were handled very roughly, and one striker narrowly missed being struck by a truck tire while she lay on the ground, dazed after having been roughly dragged by the police.

This sequence of events gives rise to an interesting question. Would support from a number of the bystanders have made any difference to what eventually transpired? In an immediate sense, extra bodies on the picket line would certainly have made a difference. I make this assertion based on what happened on the CUPW picket line in Hamilton at other times. On the two occasions during the strike when a spirited group of picketers at the Main Post Office clearly outnumbered the police, police officials chose to turn away trucks and scab buses rather than launch an assault. I observed a similar logic to local policing of strikes on June 19, 1987 when 150 members of the Letter Carriers Union of Canada (LCUC) prevented any movement of mail into or out of the Bulk Mail Facility in Hamilton. In fact, after the picket line events of October 14 just described, the police's labour relations officer admitted to a union executive member that he would have turned buses and trucks away if there had been greater numbers of picketers on the line.

In the longterm, however, a few extra bodies would have made not one iota of difference to the course of the strike. I have no direct knowledge of the thoughts and feelings of the spectators who ignored the strikers' requests for assistance that evening. However, it seems reasonable to assume that many of them were aware that joining the picket line at that moment would not influence the eventual outcome of the strike. What factors would have lead them to such a conclusion?

First, police and management had a spectrum of options available to them should the number of picketers at the Main Post Office become unwieldy. In other cities, police with riot gear were deployed and a large number of picketers were arrested. In Hamilton, however, it was likely that police would simply counsel Canada Post management to keep its trucks and buses away from the line until the number of picketers dropped. Failing this, as they did in a number of cities during the CUPW strike and on June 19, 1987 in Hamilton during the LCUC strike, Canada Post could go before a judge to obtain an injunction restricting the number of picketers. (At the injunction hearing in Hamilton on the evening of June 19, police cooperated with management by providing testimony on picket line incidents during that day.) Therefore, the best outcome a large group of picketers could achieve would be to keep the trucks and buses at bay for a few minutes or a few hours.

Second, legislation to end the strike and impose compulsory mediation/arbitration had already been introduced and would soon become law. The spectators, like everyone involved in the dispute, had at least a vague understanding that this picket line skirmish was a

ritualized expression of conflictive intergroup relations rather than a strategically important battle.

It is important not to overlook some of the obvious reasons which undoubtedly caused many bystanders to hold back from participation in the picket line skirmish of October 14, 1987. Anti-CUPW spectators would have been cheering for the police to bash the strikers but good. Elderly spectators would have justifiably wanted to steer clear of the jostling and violence. Some spectators would have been on a tight schedule and only stopped for a brief look. But more than any of these factors, the strikers' power deficit and the longterm inconsequence of this particular skirmish seem to me to be the most important causes of the spectators' inaction. This inaction is a type of passive consent. The bystanders' consent to police and management domination on the picket line stems from the appraisal that immediate action would be ineffective in changing the overall course of events.

Of course, the group who gawked at the police attack on the picket line on October 14, 1987 were not the only spectators to this labour dispute. Hundreds of individuals caught a fleeting glimpse of the events I have described while they drove by on Main St. Tens of thousands of workers in Hamilton, many of them union members themselves, would have been aware of the strikebreaking operation being run by Canada Post through news reports. Yet throughout the strike, CUPW members received very little picket line support. This surprised me (and also surprised many CUPW members), given Hamilton's reputation as a union city. Indeed, the sharp contrast between the remarkable solidarity of the strikers and the very limited support they received

from other workers is one of my enduring impressions of the 17-day conflict.

I am sure that the inaction of Hamilton union members at large is to some extent grounded in the same type of passive consent that froze the October 14 bystanders. However, this is only a partial explanation, and the question deserves some careful analysis. I address it again in Chapter 10.

Workers' Experiences of Management Domination in the Post Office

Hamilton postal workers are continually frustrated by their employer's refusal to organize the workplace in a way that would enable them to do as good a job as they know they could do.[2] Workers' suggestions are almost always ignored, and new methods are introduced by managers who know much less about moving mail than many CUPW members. "We can't do our job because management has been doing so many stupid

---

[2] This finding is consistent with what Don Wells discovered in a study of assembly line workers at Ford in Oakville in the late 1970s (Wells, 1984:453). It runs counter to the view that a great many postal workers don't give a damn about the job they do -- a view which underpins many pro-business attacks on CUPW and its members. David Stewart-Patterson's recent book perpetuates this view (1987:94-97, 291). The evidence gathered by Wells' study and by my own indicates that semi-skilled, unionized workers generally take considerable interest in the quality of the work they do. It would seem that even when workers are extremely alienated due to the social organization of the labour process, they still tend to take a great interest in product quality.

Commenting on such seemingly contradictory responses in workers, James Rinehart points out, "Under capitalism work is a unity of production for profitable exchange, and of the production of useful goods and services" (1987:157). The first aspect of capitalist production -- pursuit of profit -- generates alienation, while the second aspect -- production of useful goods and services -- generates workers' concerns for product quality. It seems likely that concern for product quality would be greatest amongst workers producing a good or service which is sold directly to the public. Automobiles and postal service fit this category.

things," is the way one union member described the situation in early 1988. CUPW workers in retail services were particularly frustrated in 1986 and 1987. During this period Canada Post management had been paving the way for the attempt to franchise retail services by neglecting its retail operations. For instance, it had been very difficult for retail outlets to get stock. Perhaps the absurdity of this situation is best shown by the fact that for approximately six months the Main Post Office in Hamilton did not have any change of address packages in stock. In addition, the philatelic counter at the Main Post Office was systematically neglected. The result was a precipitous drop in sales.[3] Furthermore, some retail services were not properly staffed. This forced customers to wait in line for long periods, and, in the case of the experimental Westcliffe Mall outlet, even forced the wicket clerk to close the store on lunch break because no other staff was on duty.

1987 was also a period of unprecedented management harassment of CUPW members in Hamilton; this harassment intensified following the strike. It involved all the usual features of a management crackdown: warning employees whose attendance records were less than the best; stopping workers from skimming newspapers when working on machines; closely monitoring the length of breaks; cancelling the extra half hour which had traditionally been given for a special Christmas lunch; hassling people about low production days without inquiring into the mechanical condition of machinery; and putting a disciplinary note on a

---

[3] One postal worker estimated that sales declined from a peak of $1 million to only $250 thousand in 1987.

worker's file for even a trivial violation of a rule. But there was also an extremely mean-spirited side to the harassment. Shortly after the strike, management decided that it would no longer allow employees to work strictly on light duties for medical reasons, although this had been the previous policy. In one case a worker was forced to start working on the Letter Sorting Machine (LSM) even though for years management had respected a doctor's note which asked for her to be excused from this type of heavy job. At the very same time as this harassment was being initiated, the corporation was using a number of non-union, casual employees as mail coders on the same shift. Due to her considerable experience, the CUPW member would have been more productive as a mail coder than the casual employees. Furthermore, she was capable of doing the coding job without physically hurting herself. In light of the fact that there was no production need for the CUPW member to have to work on the LSM, it seems clear that the objective of the exercise was to make her job so trying that she would be forced to resign. Other union members, who for either physical or psychological reasons had previously been on light duties, were harassed in exactly the same way.[4]

A second example of the mean-spiritedness of the management crackdown also deserves mention. Under the contract signed in 1985 and in effect throughout the period of my study, management was

---

[4] Harassment of this type also occurred in other cities. In early February, 1988, the corporation sent a letter to all employees on "modified duties" in Toronto. It informed them that "they will be transferred to another job, if one is available, or 'released for incapacity'" (Canadian Tribune, Feb.8/88:8).

contractually obliged to offer CUPW members overtime before calling in casual employees. In June, 1987, workers were informed that they would only be offered two hours of overtime a day since Canada Post was worried about the adverse health effects if they worked any longer than 10 hours. The contract stipulates that overtime should be offered either just before or just after the employee's regular shift. Before the strike, for those working the day shift this meant having the option to work from 3 to 5 p.m. if overtime was offered. But after the strike, management informed day shift workers that overtime would only be available for them before a shift. This meant that those interested in overtime got a phone call at 4 a.m. asking them whether they would like to come in by 5 a.m. to work two hours of overtime. And that's only half of it! In the past, when day shift workers were offered overtime on a mid-week day off they could work the overtime on their usual shift -- days. In a policy adopted after the strike, however, they were only offered such overtime on night shift. Thus, if they were to accept this overtime they would have to switch from working days to working nights to working days again all in the space of three days. As one worker noted, this harassment campaign belied management's supposed concern for workers' health and well-being.

Thus, the day-to-day work situation of CUPW members in Hamilton at the beginning of 1988 was fairly bleak. Management's intended and unintended incompetence was often obstructing the workers' best efforts to do a good job, and their intelligence and dignity were consistently being insulted by a combination of petty and serious harassment. One veteran employee commented that workers were on the defensive like never

before in the past 15 years: management was often ignoring the collective agreement and acting as if the Post Office was not even a union shop. As I will describe in Chapter 9, the situation had developed to the point where many of those workers who had in the past wanted to get a supervisory job in the Post Office now expressed no interest in such a move. Amongst many employees there had been a massive loss of faith in, and loyalty to, the employer. In such circumstances it hardly seems interesting to ask why some CUPW members have a militant on-the-job attitude. Instead, what is genuinely puzzling is, why are not more CUPW members on-the-job militants? I pursue this question in Chapters 9 and 10. My answer allows me to offer an interpretation of the character of management domination in the Hamilton Post Office.

Building an Alternative Hegemony Around the Issues of Postal Work and Postal Service

The issues at stake in the 1987 CUPW strike were of enormous consequence, both for postal workers and for the future of the Post Office as an institution which provides public service. The major role of the Mulroney cabinet in directing the confrontation was evident from the daily, 8:30 a.m. meetings between Canada Post President Don Lander and the Minister Responsible for the Post Office, Harvie Andre (Toronto Star, Sept. 29/87:A18). Aside from any political gains the government hoped to make by bashing an unpopular union, the employer had two major objectives. First, Canada Post management wanted to roll back some of the important gains that CUPW had made in previous negotiations. In a speech in Hamilton on October 15, 1987, CUPW's national president Jean-

Claude Parrot offered this assessment of Canada Post's negotiating position: "We're facing a situation today where, if workers accepted the last proposal of Canada Post which was made after 15 months of negotiation, after going through the conciliation process, and after going through the strike, then we would be going back on 15 or 20 years of negotiations. Everything we have done in the last 15 or 20 years, they want to take it away." The most important rollbacks sought by management were weakening the job security provisions of postal workers and making casual labour a larger component of the Post Office workforce. Securing these rollbacks would allow Canada Post to redeploy or lay off workers affected by centralization of mail sortation and the introduction of Optical Character Reader (OCR) machines which can read handwritten postal codes. Second, the strike was intended to break CUPW's resistance to the plans to privatize most of the retail services currently operated by Canada Post.

The Canada Post/Mulroney government strike strategy consisted of the following four elements: (1) a refusal to consider CUPW's objections to Canada Post's business plan at the negotiating table; (2) squashing CUPW's right to strike by introducing back-to-work legislation at a time when even spokespeople for the National Association of Major Mail Users and the Canadian Federation of Independent Business saw no reason to end the strike (Toronto Star, Oct. 7/87:A22); (3) limiting the possibility of an illegal strike by CUPW by introducing a set of repressive penalties for disobeying the law, including a section which barred union officials from holding union office for five years if they broke the

law[5]; and, (4) spending tens of millions of dollars[6] to recruit and provide rudimentary training for a scab workforce numbering in the thousands -- a workforce which was primarily meant to intimidate CUPW members should they have any thoughts of defying the back-to-work legislation, but which could also be quickly called upon to make a serious attempt to move mail in the eventuality that CUPW defied the legislation and challenged the government to find some way to keep Canada Post operational.[7]

It is important to realize that the Mulroney government was not simply repressing a union whose members' economic interests and demands were incompatible with its own economic policies. In attacking CUPW, the government was repressing a union which had developed a program of demands and a strategy which clearly opposed the political direction of

---

[5] In a letter to CUPW's National Chief Steward on October 8, 1987, union lawyer Paul Cavalluzzo called this provision "the most repressive and intrusive labour law I have seen outside of totalitarian countries. One would have thought it had come out of South Africa, the Soviet Union or Chile."

[6] CUPW estimated the labour and security costs of the strikebreaking operation to be $59 million. The union's estimate is based upon the figures contained in "confidential documents such as invoices and contracts obtained from an unidentified source" (Globe & Mail, Feb.19/88:A9).

[7] According to my interpretation, Canada Post was employing scabs during CUPW's legal strike not, as its advertisements claimed, because it was concerned about its "clear responsibility to keep your mail moving" (Hamilton Spectator, Oct. 5/87:A3), but because it felt it needed a strikebreaking operation to quell the militancy of CUPW members. CUPW president Jean-Claude Parrot argued that the main purpose of the strikebreakers was to provoke picket line violence and give the government an excuse for introducing its back-to-work law (Toronto Star, Oct. 18/87:B1). I don't doubt that this was a consideration of the Mulroney cabinet and Canada Post management, but in relation to all the possible directions that a strike could have gone it seems too limited an objective to have been a main purpose.

the Tories. Instead of merely objecting to Canada Post's plan to privatize retail services, cut back other public services and further gear postal operations towards large business customers, the union presented an alternative plan for the future of the Post Office which entailed "a vision of a service- and worker-oriented Post Office" (Conciliation Brief I, 1987:2). Significantly, this plan was not without practical substance. In February, 1984, the union and employer had agreed to undertake an experiment in which a few special retail outlets would be set up by Canada Post, and staffed by CUPW members, in order to test the economics of this approach to retail services (Conciliation Brief I, 1987:45). Additional outlets were opened in 1986 and 1987. The "New Directions" Canada Post outlet in Hamilton's Centre Mall is one such retail experiment. A second experiment, confined to 1984, allowed customers to order, pay for and pick up Consumers Distributing goods at postal stations (Conciliation Brief I, 1987:45). It demonstrated the feasibility of expanding the range of services offered at postal wickets. Since both experiments proved to be profitable for Canada Post (Conciliation Brief II, 1987:33-34), the union could offer the makings of an alternative business plan with proven profit potential. It is also important to note that the CUPW national leadership was very conscious of its role as a political opposition which offered an alternative. "Trade unionists have to regain the initiative," implored Jean-Claude Parrot to union audiences in the period immediately after the strike, "to fight for something rather than against something, to put our own vision on the agenda of the kind of society we want ... a country where jobs and security will

take precedence over profits and property" (<u>Canadian Tribune</u>, Jan. 25/88:7).

In fighting to put its alternative plans for the Post Office on the national political agenda, the union's leadership had the opportunity to link the struggle of CUPW members with a broad cross-section of groups who are being adversely affected by Canada Post's business plan. This included the 9,500 members of the Canadian Postmasters and Assistants Association (CPAA) who would lose their jobs or suffer huge pay cuts as Canada Post closes or privatizes rural Post Offices in coming years (<u>Hamilton Spectator</u>, Oct. 20/87:B2); the residents of rural areas where Post Offices are being closed, who are being organized by the grassroots movement Rural Dignity of Canada to fight for the preservation of their communities (<u>Toronto Star</u>, Oct. 21/87:A9); the 5,000 Rural Route Mail Couriers (RRMCs) who would be forced to bid for their mail routes every five years under Canada Post's cost-cutting plans (CUPW Bulletin 86-89/112, May 11, 1987)[8]; residents of new subdivisions who are demanding letter carrier service equivalent to that received by residents of older urban areas[9]; and urban postal

---

[8] RRMCs sought the right to unionize with the help of the Canadian Labour Congress and different postal unions. On April 29, 1987 the Canada Labour Relations Board ruled that, as dependent contractors, the RRMCs are Canada Post employees and have the right to unionize (CUPW Bulletin 86-89/112, May 11, 1987). Canada Post, which argues that the RRMCs are independent contractors, appealed this ruling to the Federal Court of Canada where it was overturned in late 1987 (<u>Hamilton Spectator</u>, Dec. 23/87:A4). In May, 1988 the Supreme Court of Canada refused to hear an appeal of the Federal Court decision (<u>Hamilton Spectator</u>, May 26/88:A1).

[9] The lobby group Residents Against Mailboxes (RAM) was founded in April, 1987 and held a national organizing convention in April, 1988. Representatives from 21 cities attended (<u>Globe & Mail</u>, April 25/88:A13).

customers who object to the inconvenience of travelling to, and the poor service received at, new "call for" sub Post Offices run by private businesses (e.g., letter, Globe & Mail, Oct. 9/87:A6).

When it reluctantly ended the strike, the national leadership of CUPW announced plans for a National Program of Action in opposition to Canada Post's privatization plans. In a bulletin to members in late October, 1987, National Secretary-Treasurer Caroline Lee wrote: "We must build public consciousness and support for CUPW's vision of a postal system that is service-oriented and not a target for private enterprise -- in the labour movement at all levels, in community groups, among anti-poverty groups, women's groups, political parties, municipal governments, rural support groups -- in short, everywhere we have the potential for a sympathetic response" (CUPW Bulletin 86-89/192, Oct. 26/87). In early December twelve union members were hired to serve as regional coordinators for the Program of Action.[10] Union locals were informed that "in the next few months, the area coordinators will be visiting the locals to assist in the setting up of local structures to facilitate full membership participation in local activities" (CUPW Bulletin 86-89/205, Dec. 2/87). A budget of $2 million was established for the national campaign (CUPW Bulletin 86-89/214, Dec. 18/87).

It seems clear that, as originally conceived, CUPW's National Program of Action represented a concerted attempt to build support for an alternative plan for the future of the Post Office. At the very least it can be seen as an ambitious campaign of public advocacy and

---

[10] An additional regional coordinator was hired in February, 1988.

coalition building. However, it is also useful to view the National Program of Action as a fledgling attempt to build an alternative hegemony, albeit only in relation to postal issues and priorities. An alternative hegemony comes about when a leading opposition group in a capitalist society is able to unite the economic and political aims of a range of subordinate groups and supply a vision which intellectually and morally unites the opposition (see Chapter 1 for more discussion of this concept). In relation to a single issue -- postal service -- this would seem to be a fair characterization of the efforts of CUPW's national leadership. Their aim was to politically unite a wide range of groups which are being hurt by the plans of Canada Post Corp. and the Mulroney government, while promoting a socialist vision of the Post Office's place in Canadian society. While this is certainly a campaign to change a government policy, it is also a campaign which challenges bourgeois hegemony: Canadians were being asked to decide between (1) a big business-oriented, profit-first Post Office, and (2) a people-oriented, service-first Post Office.

A consideration of CUPW's National Program of Action thus affords an opportunity to identify some of the difficulties which confront a union's attempt to organize even a limited alternative hegemony in Canadian society. In Chapter 10 I will probe the objective constraints and strategic predicaments which bedeviled the CUPW national leadership as it oriented its actions towards a far-reaching political objective. In fact, at the same time as the national leadership was trying to launch its nationwide political action campaign, considerable energy at the local union level of CUPW was being directed towards

building an internal opposition movement. For instance, the executive of the Hamilton local of CUPW had serious reservations about the priorities and performance of the national leadership, and in the months after the end of the strike its main priority was internal union reform. I will thus be able to offer a perspective on the union's strategic predicaments based upon my conversations with the union executives and members of a dissident local.

ISSUES AND EVENTS, 1987 CUPW STRIKE

I have prepared two charts to assist the reader in understanding the issues and events dealt with in this case study of the 1987 CUPW strike. The first chart outlines events at the national level between the regular CUPW National Convention held in April, 1986 and the Special CUPW National Convention held in February, 1988.[11] The second chart details what happened during the immediate strike period in Hamilton.[12] The material on the sequence of events in Hamilton during the strike stands on its own and I offer no further commentary. I think it will be useful, however, to provide an overview of the national events outlined in the first chart.

The most important group of events reported in Chart 1.1 relates to the struggle between the union and employer. As noted at the

---

[11] The information in this chart was compiled from a variety of CUPW publications, newspapers, bulletins and internal union correspondence passed on to me by the Hamilton executive, as well as from press clippings.

[12] Information in this chart is based upon my own field notes taken during the strike, and press clippings.

beginning of this chapter, the major issues in dispute were (1) the employer's demands for contract rollbacks in the area of job security, and (2) the employer's plans to privatize its retail operations, thus eliminating wicket service jobs held by CUPW members.

A second group of events in Chart 1.1 concerns new initiatives taken by the national leadership of CUPW. These include a failed attempt to smoothly merge CUPW with the Union of Postal Communications Employees (UPCE)[13] in 1986; pressing the Canada Labour Relations Board to rule that letter carriers and mail processing workers should be in a common bargaining unit; mounting a campaign in 1987 to sign UPCE members into CUPW when PSAC refused to back the merger plans; continuing efforts to organize low-paid postal cleaners who are employed by private contractors in major postal plants; the 1987 purchase of the office building where the union had been renting space; and, as already introduced at some length, the launching of the National Program of Action at the end of 1987.

The third group of events relates to ongoing internal union disputes. For the most part these involve the national leadership on the one side and the Montreal local's leadership on the other side. At the same time, leaders in some other union locals in Quebec and Ontario were also quite critical of the national leadership. Indeed, between the end of the 1987 strike and the Special Convention in February, 1988, much of the energy of the Hamilton local's executive was directed towards organizing the dissident movement in southwestern Ontario.

---

[13] UPCE is a division of the Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC).

Chart 1.1 Key National Events -- 1987 CUPW Strike

April, 1986	CUPW National Convention held. Clement Morel challenges Jean-Claude Parrot for president.
June	Ratification vote on contract demands. 56% favour.
June	Canadian Labour Congress (CLC) rep on Canada Post Board is fired by Mulroney government.
July 2	Notice to bargain served by union.
July 20	CUPW union officials from Quebec demand that the national leadership revise contract demands.
July 21	Union prevented from presenting demands to Canada Post when the Ottawa meeting location is picketed by CUPW members from Montreal.
August 25	CLC announces national campaign on postal issues.
September	Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) ratifies a merger agreement between the Union of Postal Communications Employees (UPCE) and CUPW.
September	Bulletin opposing some contract demands is sent across country. Signed by Clement Morel who is on Negotiation Committee for the Quebec region.
Sept. 30	Collective agreement expires.
Oct. 16	CUPW requests a Conciliation Officer to assist with negotiations. First meeting in December.
November	CUPW members vote on CUPW/UPCE merger agreement. 70% approval. 81% approval outside Montreal.
December	Canada Post Corporate Plan adopted by Mulroney cabinet. Calls for eliminating 8700 jobs.
Jan. 8, 1987	CUPW postal cleaners at the South Central postal plant in Toronto go on strike. Private employer.
Feb. 10	Canada Post announces franchise plans: 50 in 1987.
February	More opposition bulletins sent out by Clement Morel.
Feb. 27	Claude Foisy appointed as Conciliation Commissioner. First meeting, March 2.
Feb. 28	Postal station in Willowdale shopping mall closed.
March 2	Franchise opened by Shoppers Drug Mart in same Willowdale shopping mall.
March 11	Representatives of UPCE start a campaign to sign membership into CUPW, with CUPW backing.
mid-March	UPCE put into trusteeship by the PSAC.
March 19	Clement Morel fired from Negotiation Committee.
March 31	CUPW buys the building in Ottawa where it had been renting space. Pays for purchase with $3.2 million taken from strike defence fund.
April	Letter Carrier President Bob McGarry is fired from Canada Post Board by the Mulroney government.
April 23	Montreal local goes to court to impede CUPW in signing up members of UPCE. Slight success.
May 6	CUPW formally asks the Canada Labour Relations Board (CLRB) to continue its review of the bargaining units in the Post Office. The national leadership's initial

	submission to the CLRB was that there should be a single operational unit (including all CUPW and LCUC members).
May 15, 1987	Montreal local goes to court to get Morel reinstated as negotiator. Unsuccessful.
June 4	Montreal local gets preliminary injunction against using strike defence fund to buy office building.
June 9	Postal cleaners strike ends. Top wage $7/hour.
June 15	Grievance on Willowdale franchise goes ahead before CLRB.
June 16	Rotating strikes by Letter Carriers Union begin.
July 4	Tentative agreement signed by Letter Carriers.
August	CUPW strike vote conducted. 75% in favour. 90% in favour outside Montreal.
August	Conciliation Commissioner Foisy finishes hearings.
September	Canada Post launches a major public relations campaign advocating support for corporate policies: colour brochure to all addresses, series of at least 4 full page newspaper ads.
Sept. 1	Certification hearings for UPCE groups wishing to join CUPW begin.
Sept. 1	CLRB rules that franchise workers in Willowdale should get union pay.
Sept. 8	Arbitrator rules: strikebreakers get union pay while being trained.
Sept. 18	Advertisements for strikebreakers begin, Toronto.
Sept. 19 & 20	CUPW local presidents and national executive have strategy meeting. Held in Winnipeg to avoid any attempts at disruption by Montreal local.
Sept. 22	Foisy's Conciliation Report released.
Sept. 30	Rotating walkouts begun by union. Montreal local on general strike.
Oct. 8	Back-to-work legislation introduced in parliament.
Oct. 8	Most major locals called out on strike.
Oct. 9	Strike becomes national.
Oct. 15	Back-to-work bill passes in House of Commons.
Oct. 16	National CUPW leadership advises workers to obey the back-to-work bill.
Oct. 17	Back-to-work bill takes effect.
Nov. 10	First meeting with Mediator-Arbitrator Cossette.
Nov. 16	Montreal local gets permanent injunction against using strike defence fund to buy building.
Nov. 26	National leadership announces that a Special National Convention will take place in Feb/88 to deal with internal union disputes.
Dec. 2	Regional coordinators for the National Program of Action are hired.
Jan. 16, 1988	Special Ontario Regional Conference held in Toronto.
Jan. 29	Federal Court of Appeal upholds CLRB ruling on union pay for Willowdale franchise workers.
Feb. 21-23	Special National Convention held in Toronto.

Chart 1.2   Key Events in Hamilton During the Strike

Sept. 23, 1987   Advertisement appears in Hamilton Spectator for scab
                 bus drivers: $25/hour.
Sept. 24   Security guard and security investigator ads
                 prominent in Hamilton Spectator: Pinkerton's,
                 Wackenhut, CDI Temporary Services.
Sept. 25   Radio advertisements for strikebreakers begin.
Sept. 28   Canada Post using storefront office at 1160 Main
                 St. East to interview and train scab workers.
October 1
  1 a.m.   Night shift in Hamilton called out on strike.
  4 a.m.   First police assault on picket line. Strikers
                 dragged on ground and thrown around by 12 police.
                 Transport trucks cross line.
  5:30 a.m.   Two scab buses bring in 50 strikebreakers. Picket
                 line broken by 25 police.
  6:00 p.m.   Three scab buses bring in 50 strikebreakers, take
                 out 50 others. 20 police break line on Main St.
                 Twenty others wait in reserve -- used to get buses
                 out on Hughson St. Two strikers arrested -- egg
                 throwing. Charges laid against one.
  10:55 p.m.   Picket line pulled down.
  11:00 p.m.   Night shift locked out. Mail trucks move in and out
                 with no picket line.
October 2
  5:00 a.m.   Fresh shift of scabs moved in, others out.
  7:00 a.m.   Day shift locked out. At Bulk Mail Facility (BMF), 21
                 workers stage sit-in in lunch room.
  9:00 a.m.   Group of strikers confront managers in charge of
                 processing and wickets. Demand explanation
                 for why they can't work.
  11:00 a.m.   Union informed that lock-out ends at 3:00 p.m.
  1:30 p.m.   Three buses take away scabs.
  3:00 p.m.   Strikers' pay cheques are released. BMF sit-in ends.
                 Afternoon shift reports for work.
October 8
  9:45 p.m.   Afternoon shift called out on strike.
October 9
  4:00 a.m.   Scab buses cross the line. 30 police on hand.
  4:45 a.m.   Some Hamilton strikers join Burlington line.
  6:30 p.m.   Two buses carry in 80 scabs. 35 police. One
                 striker arrested and charged -- egg throwing.
October 10
  6:30 a.m.   Scabs moved out, none in. Few picketers, 6 police.
  3:30 p.m.   Picket lines pulled down for long weekend.
October 10 & 11 With picket line down, Canada Post brings mail from
                 throughout SW Ontario to Hamilton along with
                 management personnel. One union executive member
                 organizes makeshift picketing.

October 12, 1987
   6:30 p.m.   Buses carry 100 scabs across a small picket line.

October 13
   4:30 a.m.   Buses move 35 scabs in, 100 out.
   5:00 a.m.   Some strikers follow buses to Centre Mall where
                    scabs are dropped. One scab threatens them
                    with crowbar.
   6:00 p.m.   Buses move 100 scabs in, 35 out.
   9:30 p.m.   Group of 60 picketers turn away transport truck.
October 14
   5:45 a.m.   Police allow union reps to go on buses to speak to
                    scabs. No scabs get off. Picketers let
                    buses cross line. 35 in, 100 out.
 12:30 p.m.   Picketers at BMF turn away transport.
   6:00 p.m.   Union reps again go on buses to speak to scabs. No
                    scabs get off. Buses allowed to cross line. 100 in,
                    35 out.
   6:30 p.m.   35 police assault picket line to get 3 transports
                    across.
   7:30 p.m.   Picketers sit down when trucks attempt to cross
                    line. Police drag picketers out of the way. One
                    striker almost run over.
October 15
  ·4:00 a.m.   Three strikers go to Limeridge Mall to mingle with
                    scabs waiting to be picked up.
   6:15 a.m.   Same strikers go on buses to speak to scabs.
                    Canada Post security disrupts talks.
                    100 scabs in, 100 scabs out.
   6:00 p.m.   Jean-Claude Parrot joins 60 strikers on the line.
                    Police make a symbolic effort to break line, then
                    turn scab buses away.
   7:30 p.m.   Parrot delivers speech at Hamilton and District
                    Labour Council. 40 CUPW members attend.
   8:00 p.m.   Scabs moved in and out.
October 16
   4:15 a.m.   Scabs moved in and out, followed by transports.
   6:30 p.m.   Buses move scabs in and out. Picket line down.
October 17
 12:30 a.m.   Scabs moved out, less than an hour before the
                    back-to-work law takes effect.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Preliminary research for this case study was undertaken in June, 1987 during the series of rotating strikes by the Letter Carriers Union of Canada (LCUC). In addition to carefully following the progress of the strike in the press, I spoke to and observed Hamilton LCUC members on their picket lines. On June 17 I joined about 30 union members in a late afternoon demonstration outside Canada Post's recruiting and training centre for strikebreakers at 1160 Main St. East, Hamilton. During the first day of the strike in Hamilton, Friday June 19, I was on the picket line at the Bulk Mail Facility in Hamilton from before 8 a.m. until 11:30 a.m. and again for three hours in the afternoon. The striking letter carriers and mail truck drivers, numbering as high as 200, prevented any mail from moving to Hamilton postal stations that day. On the second and final day of walkouts in Hamilton, Wednesday June 24, I spent the morning on the picket line at Postal Station E (Westdale) and part of the afternoon at the Main Post Office. My observations of picket line confrontations and conversations with LCUC strikers both oriented me to the state of union/employer relations in the Post Office, and led me to decide to make the preparations necessary for a study of workers' political consciousness and action during the strike by members of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers (CUPW) some three months later.

A Sample of CUPW Members

In August, 1987 I contacted the executive of the Hamilton local of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers and presented a proposal "to interview about 40 of your members at some point before CUPW is in a

legal strike   position and then re-interview them both during the strike (if it happens) and after the strike is completed". The issue of how to contact potential study participants was discussed during a meeting with the Hamilton executive in mid-September.   My first   preference, to contact about 60 individuals randomly chosen from the local's membership list, was rejected because personal information on CUPW members is confidential.   Thus, I was only able to put together a study sample by asking for volunteers. I prepared a one page leaflet (see Appendix 5) which introduced my study and asked for study volunteers.   The union executive sent copies of this leaflet to stewards in the Hamilton local during the week of September 21. Some stewards distributed the leaflet directly to members while others left it in locations such as lunch rooms where CUPW members would see it.   Most of the inside postal workers I spoke to during the strike had at least glanced at the leaflet.

The Hamilton local went on strike early in the morning of October 1. Up until that point I had been contacted by, and had conducted telephone interviews with, only eight postal workers. I was able to personally introduce myself to a number of CUPW members who were on the picket line on October 1. Some of these individuals volunteered to be interviewed, and I had completed 16   additional telephone interviews by October 12 on days when Hamilton CUPW members were not picketing. I met other CUPW members during my times on the picket line between October 8 and October 16.   A number of these individuals volunteered to participate. I was thus able to interview a further 21

CUPW members from then until the end of October. My sample of CUPW members numbers 45 for this first round of interviews.

The sample of 45 CUPW members is made up of individuals who volunteered to participate after reading the initial leaflet or volunteered to participate after personally meeting me on the picket line; a few of this latter group offered to do an interview without being prompted, but most agreed only after being encouraged. Because the sample is in no way probablistic, considerable effort must be expended in determining just how well this group of individuals represents the population of 350 CUPW members in the local. As I spoke to and encouraged people to participate in the project, I attempted to stratify the sample in such a way that it contained sizeable proportions of men and women; union leaders and rank-and-file; and workers on different shifts. Fifty-eight percent of the sample are women. As of the end of January, 1988, 203 of the 351 members of CUPW in the Hamilton local were women (58%). The sample is thus representative of the current distribution of men and women in the local. As might be expected, union leaders are overrepresented in the sample. Individuals who have been or are active as a steward or union executive member make up 40% of those interviewed. This split allows me to make comparisons between leaders and rank-and-file members. Finally, slightly more than half of the sample were afternoon shift workers at the time of the strike. This is consistent with the fact that the afternoon shift was the largest at Hamilton's Main Post Office. At the same time, 19 workers who were on the day or night shifts at the time of the strike are also included in the sample.

I am aware of two major limitations in the sample's representation of the Hamilton membership. First, all but two of those interviewed work at either the Main Post Office or the Bulk Mail Facility. The Hamilton local also takes in six postal stations and two retail outlets in Hamilton, and affiliated Post Offices in Ancaster, Stoney Creek and Grimsby. For the most part CUPW members prefer to work in postal stations or small Post Offices, and employees with more seniority apply for these jobs. As a consequence, my sample is not representative of inside postal workers who began their employment in the 1950s or 1960s. On a February, 1988 seniority list, 5% of the Hamilton membership have a seniority date in the 1950s but none of them are included in the sample. Members whose seniority dates from the 1960s made up 14% of the membership and 9% of the sample. In comparison, workers who have seniority dates ranging from 1970 to June, 1981 (before the beginning of the last strike) made up 60% of the membership and 69% of the sample; and workers with seniority dates from August, 1981 until the end of January, 1988 made up 21% of the membership and 22% of the sample. To compensate for the gap in my data due to the exclusion of long-term employees, I talked to a few of these individuals during the strike and interviewed a key informant on the history of the Hamilton local. Furthermore, although I have largely excluded long-term Post Office employees, on the whole my sample is not unrepresentative since it reflects the great preponderance of workers with less than 20 years seniority in the current Hamilton membership.

A second weakness in the sample involves the underrepresentation of CUPW members who did not participate in the strike. If individuals

did not respond to my initial leaflet, and did not do any picketing, then there was a zero percent chance of them being included in the study sample. I attempted to estimate the effect of this sampling bias by reviewing the strike participation and union sympathies of the entire population of night shift workers at the Main Post Office. Two members of the union executive provided the information for this review. At the time that the picket schedule was drawn up just before the strike there were 47 CUPW members on this shift. Forty percent of them were regular picketers during the strike, 40% were occasional picketers and 20% did not picket. Six night shift people were included in my sample -- four regular picketers and two occasional picketers. Thus, as I expected, the sample included both regular and occasional picketers with regular picketers forming a larger percentage. The executive members also informed me of the characteristics of the non-picketing group on this shift who are not represented in the sample. One-third of them were on sick or maternity leave and would have been expected to join the picket line in other circumstances. The other six non-picketers fell into these categories: two individuals oriented towards management; two individuals who had recently transferred to Hamilton from other cities and were "unknown quantities" to the executive; one individual with social behavioural problems; and one individual who is highly family centred but not anti-union. My sample of Hamilton CUPW members therefore excludes those inside postal workers so strongly oriented towards management or private life that they did not participate in this strike at all. This is a definite weakness. It is reassuring to note, however, that on this particular shift only 6% of the employees fell

into one of these two categories. I suspect that the method of sampling used in this study has yielded a more representative sample here than it would have in many other strikes simply because such a high percentage of the Hamilton CUPW membership were at least occasional strike participants.

Data from the Sample of CUPW Members

As outlined in the previous section, I surveyed 45 CUPW members in September or October, 1987. Follow-up telephone interviews were undertaken with these individuals in December, 1987 and January, 1988. All but one of the original sample of 45 participated. Additional data on the respondents was gathered through observation of their actions on the picket line during the strike. I thus have interview and observational data from the immediate strike period, and interview data from a period 2-3 months after the strike's end. The two interview schedules are found in Appendices 6 and 7.

Additional Information and Analysis Concerning the Strike

The executive of the Hamilton local of CUPW allowed me full access to the union membership during the strike. On October 1 and 2 and again between October 8 and 16, I spent many hours on the CUPW picket lines and in the union strike headquarters on John St. across from the Main Post Office. I recorded details of events, one-on-one conversations and group discussions in a diary, and have drawn upon these firsthand observations when formulating my ideas and writing this case study.

The local union executive was also very helpful in other ways. I was provided with virtually all the union documentation on the strike

which was available, and executive members were always willing to conscientiously and candidly answer the many questions I put to them both during the strike and in the regular contact I had with them in the months following the strike. The assistance of Hamilton executive members was especially helpful when I attended the opening day of CUPW's Special National Convention as an observer. In addition, a number of the participants in the study did not restrict their comments to the questions included in the interview schedules. All the extra comments proved interesting, and a few opened my eyes to important issues which to that point my research had neglected.

A Sample of Scab Workers

In the Hamilton area, Canada Post radio advertisements for "replacement workers" began appearing on or about September 25, 1987. Individuals who called the number given in the advertisement were offered a job interview at the same temporary Canada Post office located at 1160 Main St. East which had been utilized during the LCUC strike in June. At 8 a.m. on Monday, September 28, I arrived at this strikebreaker recruiting and training centre. For over nine hours spread over that day and the next I stood on the sidewalk in front of the centre. If a person went towards the door of the office I introduced myself, explained I was doing a survey of replacement workers, and asked the person whether he or she would be willing to fill out a survey form. About two thirds of the people who identified themselves as applicants for jobs as replacement workers took the survey form. Some of these individuals were arriving for job interviews while others were being paid $4.50 an hour to take part in a 16 hour (4 hours

per day for four days) training course to learn how to code letters (a key punch operation which puts a bar code on the letter face). Altogether, 99 forms were distributed along with stamped, self-addressed envelopes. Twenty-two of the forms were returned. This represents an approximate overall response rate of 15% for the individuals who arrived at the recruitment centre while I was there.

I have no systematic way of assessing the extent to which this small sample of scabs is representative of the population of scabs recruited in Hamilton. However, a few casual observations will provide some insight. When discussing the people getting off of scab buses in Hamilton, CUPW members continually commented on two observations: (1) how young the majority were; and (2) how many of the people looked to be low in income. Fifty percent of the sample were 25 years of age or less. This percentage is substantial, but I had expected it to be slightly higher -- perhaps young people were less likely to return the survey than older people. At the same time, sixty-eight percent of the sample reported a personal income in 1986 of less than $10,000; 55% were a little or very dissatisfied with their material standard of living; and over three quarters of the scab sample had been unemployed for some time in the past year. This indicates that the sample approximates the apparent economic disadvantage of those who worked as scabs in Hamilton.

Data from the Sample of Scab Workers

I have completed surveys from 22 people who applied for a job as a replacement worker in Hamilton on September 28 or 29. The attitude questions in this survey are identical to questions asked in the first interview with CUPW members. In addition, the survey contains a number

of items designed to identify both the reasons why these individuals chose to apply for strikebreaker jobs and their social backgrounds. The survey schedule can be found in Appendix 8.

CHAPTER 7: HOW THE CONTINUING STRUGGLE HAS SHAPED THE
POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS OF CUPW MEMBERS

My intention in this chapter is to generate a general description of the political consciousness of CUPW members in Hamilton at the time of the 1987 strike. In formulating this description I make a series of comparisons. A comparative approach is possible because participants in this case study responded to attitude indicators which were taken from the 1982 Class Structure survey and the 1984 National Election survey. This allows me to compare (1) the political attitudes of the leaders of the CUPW local in Hamilton to the political attitudes of Canadian workers who are likewise union leaders, and (2) the political attitudes of the rank-and-file in the CUPW local in Hamilton to the political attitudes of Canadian workers who are likewise union rank-and-file. In addition, I compare the attitudes of CUPW union leaders and rank-and-file in Hamilton. The comparisons are in terms of three summary measures: mean on an attitude index, average individual attitude consistency on an attitude index, and group consensus on an attitude index. I use both Marxist theory and data from open-ended questions included in my interviews with Hamilton CUPW members to explain major differences in political consciousness.

The attitude data from Hamilton CUPW members comes from my first round of interviews in September or October, 1987. These interviews were conducted either just before, during or just after CUPW's 17-day strike. Consequently, to some extent these data are influenced by the

256

exceptional circumstances of the strike. I expect that this is especially true for those attitudes which directly relate to strike issues and actors (e.g., Strike Sympathies and Alienation from Government). I also expect that the political attitudes of CUPW members have been influenced by their prestrike experiences as postal workers. The key prestrike experiences include accelerating changes in the organization of the labour process which have markedly deskilled the jobs of most postal clerks, worker/management struggles on the shopfloor, previous national strikes (at the time of the 1987 strike, 79% of Hamilton's inside postal workers had participated in at least one other national strike), and union involvement.

The design of my research does not allow me to separate the influences of prestrike and strike experiences on Hamilton CUPW members' political attitudes. This poses a problem of interpretation. When I find that Hamilton CUPW members are quite distinct on a particular attitude from unionized workers in Canada taken as a whole, I am unable to empirically establish whether this is due to immediate strike effects or to the effects of a history of post office employment and CUPW struggle. My own view is that, given the very general content of most of the attitude indicators considered in this chapter (see Chapter 3, Tables 3.1 and 3.4 for exact wording), history effects will usually be the most important source of attitude differences.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND EXPECTATIONS

Classical Marxist Conceptions of the Development of Workers' Political Consciousness

We can turn to classical Marxist theory in order to get some sense of how the political attitudes of Hamilton CUPW members might differ from the political attitudes of Canadian union members as a whole. In the Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels identified four major factors as necessary conditions for the widespread development of Left-wing perspectives among workers: (1) workers' common experiences of alienating on-the-job relations in large, capitalist enterprises; (2) intercapitalist competition and economic crises which threaten the jobs and livelihood of workers; (3) workers' participation in collective struggles aimed at improving their situation; and (4) the national coordination of workers' struggles by a socialist leadership. According to Marx and Engels, the working class is alienated in the capitalist workplace since jobs have "lost all individual character, and, consequently, all charm" due to the extensive use of machinery and a detailed division of labour (1972:39). At the same time, the concentration of workers in factories allows workers to develop a group consciousness and provides the objective potential for mass action (1972:41). This potential is realized when, in response to an employer's attacks on their jobs and living standards, workers join together to fight for their interests (1972:42). The workplace struggles of workers are given strategic political direction when nationally coordinated by a socialist leadership (1972:42).

In the pamphlet "On Strikes", Lenin suggests how participation in strike struggles affects workers' political consciousness. In a strike, workers learn to speak up for their rights and to look beyond their personal situations to the situations of fellow workers (1960:315). A strike also "teaches them not to think of their own employer alone and not of their own immediate workmates alone but of all the employers, the whole class of capitalists and the whole class of workers" (1960:316). In addition, a strike often opens workers' eyes to the role of the courts, police and government in defending the interests of the powerful in capitalist society (1960:316).

These classical Marxist conceptions are useful to my investigation since the factors which they highlight approximately fit the contemporary experience of inside postal workers in Canada. First, in the past two decades the introduction of new machinery has deskilled mail sorters' jobs and led to increasing levels of on-the-job alienation. As well, most mail in the country passes through large facilities employing hundreds of workers under one roof.[1] Second, employees of the Post Office have been seriously affected by the ongoing

---

[1] There are only about 200 CUPW members at Hamilton's Main Post Office, spread over three shifts. While this is a small number of workers in comparison to postal plants in larger cities, I believe the Marxist conception is still applicable to the conditions of Hamilton's inside postal workers. This is because, unlike the situation often found in small enterprises, Hamilton CUPW members have a definite sense that they are independent of management. One Hamilton postal worker told me that she noticed this feature of the work environment her first week on the job. At the Post Office, workers would say what they thought. In contrast, on her previous jobs workers always had to tread softly and think twice about what they said to supervisors. "This is the only place I've ever worked where women don't have tension headaches from having to kiss ass all the time," she noted.

capitalist economic crisis and intercapitalist competition. The issues

in the recent strike are ample evidence of this. The Mulroney cabinet's

decision to try to get the Post Office out of the direct provision of

retail services represents both an attempt to cut back on state

subsidies for public services in rural areas and a buckling to pressure

from small and large capitalists seeking to increase retail profits in

urban areas. Third, CUPW members have been through many struggles since

1965. This is graphically illustrated by the eight national strikes

conducted by the union. And fourth, since 1974 the union has been led

by committed socialists. Both Joe Davidson from 1974-77 and Jean-Claude

Parrot in the period from 1977 onwards did not shy away from letting the

public or the CUPW membership know their political leanings.[2]   CUPW's

internal newspapers have reflected the socialist orientation of the

---

[2] The following exchange between Joe Davidson and a CBC
television journalist demonstrates Davidson's willingness to make his
socialist politics perfectly clear. It is taken from a feature on the
CUPW leader first broadcast at the time of his retirement in 1977 and
rebroadcast in 1985 after he died (Program: the fifth estate).
     Davidson: I have been accused of being an old fashioned trade
unionist.... I think that one of the problems with the trade union
movement today is they've become too legal thinking. They try to
resolve everything through legalities. And you know, really, the
employer in the past and today only listens to and respects muscle....
I certainly don't think that the average capitalist has any compunction
or any thought for his workers. And this is exemplified in the Post
Office. The machines in the Post Office have better working conditions
than the human beings.
     Interviewer: But it's not capitalists in the Post Office. It's
the government; it's the people; it's us.
     Davidson: Yeah? The people? What people? You're not going to
tell me that the governments in Canada are people's governments.
Certainly they are elected by the people, but they're not workers'
governments. They're working for big business. There's no doubt in my
mind about that.... I don't think Canadians are awake to the realities
of the political problems in this country enough. I think there should
be a workers' party in this country.

national leaders, especially in the Parrot era. This has meant that socialist ideas have at least been on the discussion table in CUPW — a situation which is not that common in the contemporary Canadian union movement.

When we look at the experiences of union members across Canada, the conditions identified by Marx, Engels and Lenin will rarely be found in the same concentrations as they are found in the experiences of CUPW members. Consequently, these classical Marxist conceptions of the development of workers' political consciousness led me to think that Hamilton CUPW members will be quite distinct in political consciousness from national union members.

Specific Expectations

1. Comparisons of Group Means

The following hypotheses guide my comparisons of group means:

(1) CUPW union leaders in Hamilton will be more Left in their attitudes than union leaders from across the country.

(2) The CUPW rank-and-file in Hamilton will be more Left in their attitudes than union rank-and-file from across the country.

(3) CUPW union leaders in Hamilton will be more Left in their attitudes than the rank-and-file in their own union local.[3]

---

[3] In three cases the form of the hypotheses outlined here must be altered. For General Union Sentiment, the sample of CUPW members is compared to a sample of Hamilton workers rather than a national sample. On Alienation from Government, it is hypothesized that CUPW members are more alienated. And on Non-Participation in Informal Politics, it is hypothesized that CUPW members are more politically active. Details on all of the political attitudes are provided in the Data section of this chapter.

The logic of the first two hypotheses is straightforward. In each case I assume that, insofar as political consciousness is affected, the most significant difference in the background and experience of the two groups concerns the circumstances of CUPW members' work and union life. Is such a simplifying assumption justifiable? I partially answered this question by statistically considering whether the observed differences in attitudes between groups may be spurious -- due to the differential impact of age and education on each group. The adjustments resulting from this statistical analysis are reported in the tables presented in Appendix 9. In no case was an observed difference in attitude found to be spurious.

The third hypothesis is also based on the classical Marxist conceptions of the development of workers' political consciousness. The attitudes of CUPW union leaders are expected to be more to the Left than the attitudes of CUPW rank-and-filers due to their greater involvement in union struggles and greater exposure to the union's political education. In combination, the three hypotheses predict that, when we compare Hamilton CUPW members to union members in Canada as a whole, the spectrum of political consciousness among CUPW members has been shifted in a Left-wing direction.

I should note that my expectations run counter to a popular notion of CUPW's record of union militancy. Over the years it has often been argued that the CUPW rank-and-file is quite unexceptional in political consciousness while the union's militant record is due to the

influence of a relatively small group of radical leaders.[4]   If we find that the rank-and-file members of the CUPW local in Hamilton are generally to the Left of national rank-and-file unionists, then the validity of this popular view of CUPW will be called into question.

2. Comparisons of Groups on Average Individual Attitude Consistency

The two attitude-consistency explanations of working class attitude variation examined in Chapter 4 can be used to guide my investigation of the average individual attitude consistency of different groups. In Chapter 4 I discovered that few Canadian workers syllogistically organize their political attitudes. However, I also discovered that there was a much higher level of syllogistic structuring among anti-capitalist workers than among pro-capitalist workers, presumably because the rejection of capitalist values is a much more self-conscious process than the internalization of those values in our society. If CUPW members in Hamilton have self-consciously taken up Left perspectives, then I expect to find that they are more consistent in their attitudes than other union members. A relatively high level of average individual attitude consistency, therefore, will be interpreted as an indicator of some syllogistic attitude structuring among CUPW members.

_____

[4] David Stewart-Patterson (1987:112-128) considers two versions of this popular notion. Both conceive of the CUPW membership as being made up of a mass of "non-political" rank-and-filers and the "militant minorities" who lead the union. They differ in whether they see the "militant minorities" as being motivated by radical political ideology or radical self-interest. He accepts the latter view (1987:127). My research relates to both versions of the "militant minorities" thesis.

It is possible for CUPW members to be more Left in political attitudes but no more consistent in thinking than other union members. Such a result would be congruent with the second attitude-consistency mechanism examined in Chapter 4 -- consistency based on likes and dislikes of strategic social and political groups. If CUPW members have largely gained Left perspectives as a byproduct of developing a liking for and allegiance to oppositional social groups, then I would not expect them to be any more consistent in their attitudes than other union members.

3. Comparisons of the Attitude Consensus in Different Groups

My expectations for differences in group consensus are somewhat complicated. The group standard deviation is used as a basis for summarizing the consensus in a group. The presence of "extreme" cases in a group, relative to the mean, greatly increases the group standard deviation. Now, according to the logic of the classical Marxist conceptions which are guiding my investigation, two processes are in operation which would influence a summary measure of group consensus. First, due to work as an inside postal worker and involvement in CUPW, those members who start out with Right views will tend to move to the Left faster than the group as a whole. This is a consensus-promoting process. But second, some workers will adopt a strong socialist perspective. This is a dissensus-promoting process since many inside postal workers do not have a strong socialist perspective. I have no solid basis for making an a priori prediction as to which of these two processes will be most important. Thus, no general hypothesis guides my examination of the results. At the same time I do have a

methodologically informed expectation. On those indexes where the overall mean is to the Left, individuals with a strong socialist perspective will have a much smaller effect on the group standard deviation than on indexes where the overall mean is further away from the "Left ceiling". Consequently, on three indexes[5] -- General Union Sentiment, Big Business Power and Alienation from Government -- I predict that CUPW leaders and members will be more consensual than other union members due to the Left ceiling effect.

DATA SOURCES AND ANALYSIS

Results from five different surveys are considered in this chapter. All of these surveys have already been introduced and discussed in the thesis. In addition, all but one of the attitude indexes I analyze were introduced in Tables 3.1 and 3.4 in Chapter 3.[6] The exception is General Union Sentiment which is made up of four items from McShane's General Union Attitude (see Chapter 5).[7] As I mentioned

---

[5] For each of these indexes, the grand mean for all cases was at least 33% of the way between the index midpoint and Left ceiling.

[6] However, two of the indexes are slightly altered. As I note in Table 3.4, Chapter 3, the version of the Social Libertarianism index considered in this chapter contains an additional item on the censorship of pornographic magazines and movies. As well, a much shortened version of the Alienation From Government index is analyzed in this chapter. It is made up of three items from the original 11-item index: (1) People like me don't have any say about what the government in Ottawa does; (2) I don't think the Federal Government cares much about what people like me think; and (3) Generally, those elected to Parliament soon lose touch with the people.

[7] The four items are: (1) If I had to choose, I probably would not be a member of a labour union; (2) I am proud of the labour movement in this country; (3) Employees are considerably better off when they belong to a labour union; and (4) Unions are an embarrassment to our

at the beginning of the chapter, the reason I am able to make comparisons across surveys is that most of the background attitude items included in my interviews of CUPW members in Hamilton were taken from the surveys discussed in earlier chapters.

The data analyzed in this chapter are found in the 10 tables which comprise Appendix 9. In Tables A9.1 and A9.3 to A9.10, I compare the responses of different groups to identical items at different points of time between 1982 and 1987. I interpret any observed differences as reflecting differences in the social and political situations of the groups rather than changes over time. I make this important simplifying assumption for two reasons. First, with the data available I have no way to separate group effects from time effects. Second, as shown in Chapter 2 of the thesis, on most social and political issues there have not been huge shifts in the distribution of working class thinking over the past 15 years. At the same time, I myself am somewhat skeptical of the assumption that there has been absolutely no change in workers' political attitudes over time. For this reason I do not pay any attention to fairly small differences between groups -- they could very easily be due to changes in the general economic and political situation between surveys.

There is also a second reason for being cautious when interpreting the results of comparisons involving groups of union leaders. I was unable to consistently operationalize this concept because of variations in the information available from each survey. In

society. The alpha reliability for the index is .83 (N=255).

the study of Hamilton CUPW members, this group is made up of individuals who are currently or have been a CUPW steward or CUPW executive. In the survey of Hamilton workers reported in Chapter 5, this group is composed of individuals who have ever served as a union steward or official in a union. In the 1982 Canadian Class Structure survey, the group of union leaders is made up workers who affirmatively responded to the question, "Have you ever been a union official, such as a shop steward, or run for a union office?" Thus, the items used to operationalize the groups of union leaders are quite similar in these three studies. Unfortunately, no comparable item was included in the 1984 National Election survey. In this latter survey, the union leader group is made up of working class union members who say they attend three or more union meetings per year. How will this inconsistency in operationalization affect the results of comparisons involving union leaders reported in this chapter? My suspicion is that the operationalized category of union leaders taken from the 1984 National Election survey includes most of the workers who genuinely take a leading role in their unions as well as a number of other union members. This is demonstrated by the finding that the union leaders group makes up 31% of all unionized workers in the 1984 National Election survey but only 18% of the unionized workers in the 1982 Canadian Class Structure survey. Thus, this problem will tend to make the group of union leaders from the 1984 survey less distinctive in attitudes than it would have been if operationalized better. But the adverse influence of this methodological bias must not be overstated, for two reasons. First, the union leaders group is "contaminated" with the most involved of the rank-and-file members. And second, the data

from the 1984 election study is used in only 5 of the 11 comparisons analyzed in this chapter.

Because three of the five surveys considered in this chapter involve probability sampling, I am able to take some statistical information into account in my comparison of group means. I have calculated 95% confidence intervals around the group means from those surveys involving probability sampling. The upper 95% confidence limit is used when comparing the attitudes of national union leaders or national union rank-and-file to the attitudes of CUPW leaders or CUPW rank-and-file. To take an example, the mean of CUPW leaders on the Strike Sympathies index must be greater than the upper 95% confidence limit of the mean of national union leaders in order for me to declare that CUPW leaders are to the Left of national union leaders on this political attitude. Unfortunately, my samples of Hamilton CUPW leaders and rank-and-file are nonprobability and no statistical justification exists for calculating confidence intervals. I do not regard this situation as a weakness of any magnitude, however. The sampling of Hamilton CUPW members (as described in Chapter 6) was thorough and I have confidence that the sample means for Hamilton CUPW leaders and rank-and-file are reasonably accurate point estimates of the respective population means.

A summary of the comparisons of group means is outlined in Table 7.1. When a difference between groups in the expected direction was identified, I distinguished relatively large differences from relatively small differences. A difference of at least 0.5 standard deviation units is regarded as a large difference.

.

A summary of the comparisons of average individual attitude consistency is outlined in Table 7.2. Groups were judged to be different in average individual attitude consistency only if there was at least a 20% difference between the groups.

A summary of the comparisons of attitude consensus is outlined in Table 7.3. A group was judged to be more consensual if its standard deviation on an index is no more than 80% of the standard deviation of the comparison group.

RESULTS

Comparisons of Group Means

A summary of the group mean comparisons undertaken in this study is presented in Table 7.1. I will discuss the results presented in that table in some detail. As a prelude to my discussion, however, it is worth noting that the data strongly supports the expectation outlined in the previous section: the spectrum of political consciousness among Hamilton CUPW members is to the Left of Canadian union members as a whole. At the same time, there are a few interesting exceptions to this main pattern. I pay close attention to these exceptions in order to better understand the character of Hamilton CUPW members' political attitudes.

On 10 of the 11 political attitudes considered in this study, Hamilton CUPW leaders are to the Left of union leaders from across the country. It is of considerable interest to identify the attitudes on which the CUPW leaders clearly stand apart. First, there is a much harder edge of support for workers on strike. For instance, while only

22% of national union leaders hoped that workers would win their most important demands in a strike struggle, 72% of the CUPW leaders expressed this preference (see Table A9.1 in Appendix 9).[8] Second, CUPW leaders are clearly more critical of one aspect of capitalist economic organization. While 44% of national union leaders believed bosses are unnecessary where they work, 83% of CUPW leaders believed this to be the case at the Post Office (see Table A9.4). But the majority of CUPW leaders were not consistently anti-capitalist -- only 39% believed the profit motive is unnecessary for economic organization, and only 35% believed the government should control the major energy companies. On these items, the CUPW leaders did not markedly differ from the national union leaders.

Third, there is a strong difference in the two groups' attitudes towards the poor (see Table A9.6). Less than 10% of CUPW leaders blamed the poor or those on welfare for the poor's economic troubles, while between 40% and 50% of national union leaders took this position. The fourth major difference in political consciousness between the two groups of leaders involves their views on gay rights and the censorship of pornography (see Table A9.7). Eighty-two percent of Hamilton CUPW

---

[8] The exact wording of this item is recorded in Table 3.1 in Chapter 3. This is a best-choice question with respondents being asked to pick between four alternatives. While only 22% of national union leaders chose the option most sympathetic to striking workers ("The workers win their most important demands"), 70% chose the next most favourable option ("The workers win some of their demands and make some concessions"). This indicates that the majority of national union leaders are somewhat conciliatory towards management, at least when considering a hypothetical strike situation. In contrast, only 28% of the leaders in the Hamilton CUPW local chose the second, conciliatory, option.

leaders approved of homosexuals teaching school in comparison to only 43% of national union leaders. Furthermore, while 71% of national union leaders favoured censoring pornography, only 38% of Hamilton CUPW leaders concurred. The Hamilton CUPW leaders are clearly more liberal on these personal freedom/morality issues.

Fifth, over half of the CUPW leaders identified themselves as being to the Left of Centre on the political spectrum, compared to only 16% of national union leaders (see Table A9.10). Furthermore, on the Left/Right Feeling index (which measures the difference in feelings for Left-wingers and Right-wingers), 39% of CUPW leaders were high on the index, compared to only 10% of the other group of union leaders.

There was only one attitude where CUPW leaders did not differ from other union leaders — General Union Sentiment (see Table A9.2). Little importance should be placed on this finding, however. A sample of Hamilton union leaders comprises the comparison group in this case. Because the sample size for this group is small ($N = 27$), the 95% confidence interval around the mean is relatively large.[9] The mean for Hamilton CUPW leaders on General Union Sentiment just falls within this extended 95% confidence interval.

Just as Hamilton CUPW leaders are to the Left of union leaders across the country, the CUPW rank-and-file in Hamilton are to the Left of national rank-and-file union members. On 9 of 11 hypothesis tests,

---

[9] It will be recalled that the size of the 95% confidence interval around the population mean is dependent upon three factors: the sample mean, the variability in the sample, and the sample size. The upper 95% confidence limit = sample mean + $(t_{.05})$ (standard error of the sample mean). The value of $t_{.05}$ decreases as the sample size increases.

the mean of rank-and-file CUPW members was different from the mean of national rank-and-file union members in the expected direction. Once again, it is important to pay attention to differences on specific attitudes.

On three indexes, CUPW members were strongly to the Left of other union members. First, a sharp difference existed in attitudes towards the poor. While between 55% and 60% of national rank-and-file union members blamed the poor and those on welfare for the poor's economic difficulties, only 20% to 25% of the CUPW rank-and-file expressed the same position (see Table A9.6). Second, the Hamilton CUPW rank-and-file were clearly more socially libertarian than their national counterparts. This is especially evident in the item which considers whether homosexuals should be allowed to teach school: 92% of CUPW members agreed in comparison to only 51% of national union members (see Table A9.7). Third, there were more than three times the number of Left self-identifiers among the CUPW rank-and-file than among the national rank-and-file: 33% versus 10% (see Table A9.10).

It is also important to analyze the indexes where no difference between the two groups was found. First, CUPW members' views of Left-wingers and Right-wingers were not much different from the views expressed by national union members. The means on the Left/Right Feeling index were approximately the same, and the percentages of each group which were high on the index and low on the index were very similar (see Table A9.10). Second, and most interesting, CUPW rank-and-filers were not any more anti-capitalist than national union rank-and-filers (see Table A9.4). In fact, on two items in the Capitalist

Economic Organization index, they were considerably more supportive of capitalism. Only 11% of the CUPW members felt the profit motive was unnecessary, as distinct from 37% of the national union rank-and-file. And only 30% believed that the government should control the major energy companies in distinction to 42% of those in the comparison group.[10]   Thus, the Hamilton CUPW rank-and-file are to the Left of national rank-and-file union members on all attitudes except those which involve taking a self-consciously radical position.

The final set of comparisons in Table 7.1 involves Hamilton CUPW leaders and rank-and-file members. CUPW leaders were to the Left of the rank-and-file in their own union on 10 of the 11 attitudes. Major differences between the two groups were found on six indexes. First, there was a higher level of support for militant strike action among leaders (see Table A9.1).   Second, CUPW leaders were stronger in their support for unions. Not a single union leader said she or he would choose not to be in a union in comparison to 18% of the rank-and-file (see Table A9.2). Third, opposition to the power of big business was unanimous among the union leaders while a small percentage of the union rank-and-file did not support this view (see Table A9.3).   Fourth, the

------

[10] Not too much weight should be put on the difference between the groups on the second item.   As recorded in Table A9.4, the percentage agreeing that the government should control the major energy companies fell between 30% and 35% for the groups surveyed in 1987 and between 40% and 45% for the groups surveyed in 1982. If we remember that the 1982 Canadian Class Structure survey took place when energy issues were much more in the limelight (high energy prices, the National Energy Program, etc.) than in 1987, then it seems reasonable to argue that the observed difference in attitude is due to a change in economic and political conditions.   This is a case where the simplifying assumption introduced earlier in this chapter (no changes in attitudes over time) does not seem appropriate.

CUPW leaders were much less likely to accept poverty or to blame the poor for their economic state. For instance, while 63% of the rank-and-file said that poverty was natural in society, only 22% of CUPW leaders concurred (see Table A9.6). Fifth, Hamilton CUPW leaders were considerably to the Left of rank-and-filers on the measure of Left/Right Self-Identification and the index of Left/Right Feeling (see Table A9.10).

On two of the remaining five political attitudes the two groups were virtually indistinguishable in central tendency: Authoritarian Traditionalism and Alienation from Government.[11] In the previous comparisons involving these attitudes, both Hamilton CUPW leaders and rank-and-file members were identified as being somewhat to the Left of the comparable groups of national union members. The fact that the two groups of CUPW members themselves do not differ on these two attitudes suggests that factors other than formal union involvement account for the differences between Hamilton CUPW members and national union members on Authoritarian Traditionalism and Alienation from Government.

How the Continuing Struggle Forces CUPW Members to Critically Examine the Dominant Occupational Merit Hierarchy and the Merit/Pay Relationship

Through an extensive analysis of quantitative data I have demonstrated that both CUPW leaders and rank-and-file members in Hamilton are quite distinct in political consciousness from labour union

---

[11] In Table 7.1, CUPW leaders are recorded as being to the Left of the CUPW rank-and-file on Alienation from Government. However, the means for the two groups on Alienation from Government are 9.8 and 9.6 respectively. It must be remembered that no confidence intervals can be calculated for these means, so the point estimates must be used when comparing the groups. This accounts for the Yes entry in Table 7.1 even though the means are not substantively different.

leaders and members across the country. In developing a schematic understanding of this finding, the classical Marxist conceptions of the development of workers' political consciousness are very useful. However, it is necessary to draw upon interview data to get a better appreciation of some of the specific factors which have pushed the political views of inside postal workers in Hamilton towards the Left.

My analysis in this subsection starts from what is perhaps the most distinctive aspect of Hamilton CUPW members' political consciousness: they are much less likely to blame the poor for the poor's economic difficulties. This is a particularly important finding because (1) there is no reason to suspect that this is a strike-induced 'blip' in consciousness, and (2) it indicates a difference in viewpoint on the economic organization of Canadian society which is not obviously related to postal workers' immediate economic interests. The problem to be addressed, therefore, is how the continuing struggle of CUPW members has shaped their views on the plight of the poor in Canada.

"THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES" is the motto of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers. This motto certainly applies to inside postal workers' on-the-job experiences and their relationships with the employer and federal government. In the course of my discussions with Hamilton CUPW members I learned that the motto also aptly applies to each and every worker's social interactions outside the workplace. Whether at a family gathering, at the hairstylist's or waiting for a bus, CUPW members must be prepared to respond to often antagonistic comments about the state of the Post Office, the tactics of their union and the quality of their own work ethic. Many CUPW members attempt to get some respite from such

encounters by not letting strangers and casual acquaintances know where they work. However, such a strategy can only decrease, not eliminate, the necessity for CUPW members to engage in political discussions centred on postal issues.

One of the complaints often voiced about inside postal workers is that they are overpaid in comparison to other semi-skilled workers in Canada. Small and large capitalists object to the over $13 per hour paid to postal workers because it stimulates discontent among their own lower paid employees (Toronto Star, October 18/87:B1). Furthermore, many workers themselves seem to think that postal workers are overpaid. Workers making less than postal workers often think the gap in wages is unjustified. Workers making more than postal workers often think the gap in wages should be more. I think it is fair to say that the majority view amongst Canadians is that the pay of postal workers is out-of-line with the effort and abilities needed to do postal work. Behind this criticism is a rough hierarchic ordering of the typical merit required to accomplish different jobs in Canadian society. I call this the dominant occupational merit hierarchy. In addition, it is assumed by those who think postal workers are overpaid that pay should reflect the merit of a job.[12]

---

[12] The merit of a job is defined as the typical effort and ability required to do the job. It is different from the merit of any particular individual doing the job. I have consciously chosen to use the concept occupational merit rather the concept occupational prestige. Although the concept occupational prestige has played an important role in the social stratification literature, in my view it has not been adequately defined. Therefore, I see no advantage in using the concept occupational prestige.

Knowing that Hamilton CUPW members would have often encountered the argument that they are overpaid, I was interested in learning how they tended to respond. Would they accept the prevailing conception of the merit of different jobs? If not, on what basis would they oppose this conception? Would they accept the assumption that pay should be based on the skill and effort required to accomplish a job? I investigated these issues by asking the following questions in my second round of interviews with Hamilton CUPW members:

> Thinking about the wages and benefits inside postal workers receive for their labour, do you think that members of CUPW are underpaid, overpaid or paid about right for the work they do?

> As you are well aware, many people in Canadian society don't have much sympathy for inside postal workers. One of the arguments I've heard such people make many times is that, compared to workers in similar jobs, postal workers are overpaid. How do you respond to that kind of reasoning?

Ten of forty-four study participants (23%) stated that inside postal workers are overpaid. Only 7% felt that postal workers are underpaid while the others believed that postal workers receive about the right pay. A union leader was somewhat sheepish when admitting that she thought inside postal workers are overpaid. "Don't tell anyone," she said, "but I think we're overpaid when I compare my wages to those of a fireman and look at the skill, training and risks involved." At the same time, she admitted that she never publicly defended this position. When acquaintances argued that postal workers are overpaid, she would attempt to justify her wages by pointing to the undesirable aspects of the job like monotony and shift work. Indeed, this was a typical response from the Hamilton CUPW members who thought themselves

to be overpaid. On the surface such a response appears to be dishonest face-saving -- the CUPW member would secretly agree with a person but still engage in an argument. In fact, the action reflects two distinct and compatible beliefs: (1) that postal workers are overpaid; and (2) that the extent to which postal workers are overpaid is usually exaggerated since most people have a badly distorted view of what a postal clerk's job involves.

Amongst the 77% of Hamilton CUPW members who disagreed that postal workers are overpaid, three basic forms of argument were used to defend their rate of pay. The first was based on the premise that the media and public did not have enough knowledge to properly slot postal work into an occupational merit hierarchy. The skills and responsibilities of a postal clerk's job were mentioned by some of the CUPW members who put forward this position. Others emphasized that, contrary to the popular impression, they had to work very hard on the job. The implication of this first form of argument is that the dominant occupational merit hierarchy is inadequate because it undervalues the work of postal workers.

The second form of argument was based on the premise that factors other than merit need to be taken into account when evaluating pay levels. Those who set out this position maintained that the unpleasant conditions of postal work, including tight supervision, monotony, and shift work, should be offset by higher pay rates. A number of CUPW members said that their standard response to individuals who claimed they were overpaid was along the lines of "you try working

in the Post Office for a couple of weeks and see if you still think the same way."

The third form of argument was based on the premise that the justness of workers' wages should be determined by assessing workers' needs, not by ranking jobs on an occupational merit hierarchy. A quarter of the sample offered a version of this argument, usually with considerable conviction. A selection of quotes, each from a different CUPW member, will convey this point.

> You've got the wrong question. The whole idea of earning what you are paid went out in the 1960s. With inflation, people have to be paid according to what it costs to live.

> Workers are mistaken when they make this type of comparison. If someone is underpaid it's not right to lessen another worker's pay. Instead, the underpaid person's wage should be raised. People forget what it costs to live. It's hard to raise a family on what a postal worker makes.

> I don't look at other workers and think some people are overpaid. I don't begrudge those making more. I have sympathy for those making less -- everybody needs a certain basic amount of money to put a roof over their head, to buy clothing and food.

> I don't see pay as a reward for a type of labour. I just see it as a means.... People need to make enough to survive and then enjoy the benefits of life.

The views of Hamilton CUPW members on the justness of their own rate of pay can help us understand their views on the plight of the poor. The idea that the poor are the authors of their own misfortune is congruent with the idea that pay should be based strictly on merit. It is easy to see, therefore, that the many Hamilton CUPW members who reject the latter notion will not have much difficulty in rejecting the

former notion. This generalization applies to both the group of members who outright reject the idea that pay should be based on merit (third form of argument on the overpaid question) and the group which thinks that criteria in addition to merit should be taken into account when establishing justified pay levels (second form of argument). I believe that those CUPW members who merely want to revise the dominant occupational merit hierarchy (first form of argument) will also be likely to question harsh views of the poor. The approach of this group is to assert the merit of the work done by CUPW members. In developing this position they have been forced to confront and systematically reject such dominant ideas as those that claim postal workers are lazy, postal workers have an easy job, etc. -- exactly the same thrust of ideas which are often levelled against the poor and people on welfare. Their critical understanding of the dominant view of work and workers in the Post Office can quite easily be generalized to a critical understanding of the situation of the poor.

CUPW members live in a society in which a great many people are liable to express misinformed and antagonistic comments about a very important part of their lives -- their work. In deciding how to respond to such comments they are forced to criticize the assumptions of their antagonists. This process of continuing struggle in routine social interaction is bound to have important effects on inside postal workers' underlying political attitudes. In this section I have outlined the three major forms of argument favoured by Hamilton CUPW members when countering the opinion that postal workers are overpaid. These arguments are premised on critical reevaluations of the dominant

occupational merit hierarchy or the merit/pay relationship. I believe that the hesitancy of most CUPW members to blame the poor for the poor's economic difficulties is a byproduct of the critical perspectives they have developed on the merit of their own work and how much they should be paid.

Comparisons of Average Individual Attitude Consistency

I now turn to the comparisons of average individual attitude consistency which are summarized in Table 7.2. In 6 out of 10 cases, CUPW leaders in Hamilton are more consistent than national union leaders. On the same six attitudes the CUPW leaders are more consistent than the CUPW rank-and-file. However, the rank-and-file in the Hamilton CUPW local are more consistent than national union rank-and-file in only 1 out of 10 cases. These results indicate that there is an important difference between the Hamilton CUPW leaders and rank-and-file in terms of attitude organization. Specifically, on certain political attitudes the CUPW leaders exhibit a much higher level of attitude consistency than any of the other groups included in the study. In contrast, the level of attitude consistency among the CUPW rank-and-file is indistinguishable from that of union rank-and-file from across the country. It thus appears that while the Leftward shift of Hamilton CUPW leaders' political attitudes is in part associated with a syllogistic organization of attitudes, this is not the case for the Leftward shift in the political attitudes of the Hamilton CUPW rank-and-file.[13]

---

[13] My interpretation of the attitude consistency of CUPW leaders as evidence of a syllogistic organization of attitudes does not explain how the syllogistic organization and concomitant attitude consistency develops. Perhaps the development of more consistent

It is also worthwhile to note that Hamilton CUPW leaders are not any more consistent than other groups on Capitalist Economic Organization and Left/Right Feeling. This suggests that there are definite limits on the extent of syllogistic attitude organization among the CUPW leaders. Specifically, this attitude-consistency mechanism is operative in relation to practical attitudes, especially those that deal with practical economic issues. However, when it comes to economic and political philosophy, the CUPW leaders in Hamilton are no more likely to syllogistically organize their thinking than workers in other groups.

Comparisons of Attitude Consensus

A summary of the results of comparisons of attitude consensus can be found in Table 7.3. Hamilton CUPW leaders are more consensual than national union leaders on 4 of 11 attitudes but more dissensual on one attitude. They are also more consensual than the Hamilton CUPW rank-and-file on 5 of 11 attitudes but more dissensual on three attitudes. In contrast, the CUPW rank-and-file are more consensual than the national union rank-and-file on 5 of 11 attitudes but are never more dissensual. This summary suggests that both the consensus-promoting and dissensus-promoting processes discussed earlier in this chapter influence the interindividual attitude structure of Hamilton CUPW leaders, while only the consensus-promoting process influences the interindividual attitude structure of the CUPW rank-and-file.

---

attitudes is a rational process which proceeds as CUPW leaders attain a better understanding of political values and principles. However, it is also possible that it is a rationalizing process whereby CUPW leaders bring their attitudes in line with their actions as union leaders (see Archibald, 1978:8). I suspect that both processes are involved in making the attitudes of CUPW leaders more consistent.

Two other general comments can be made on the results of group consensus comparisons. The first concerns my methodologically based expectation that the consensus-promoting process would dominate on attitudes where the overall group mean is shifted to the Left (General Union Sentiment, Big Business Power and Alienation from Government). These attitudes make up two of the four cases where CUPW leaders are more consensual than national union leaders and three of the five cases where CUPW leaders are more consensual than the CUPW rank-and-file. However, these attitudes only make up one of the five cases where the CUPW rank-and-file is more consensual than national rank-and-file union members. This methodologically informed expectation is thus of only limited utility for understanding the factors generating consensus amongst the CUPW rank-and-file.

Second, it is useful to carefully examine those attitudes where the CUPW rank-and-file are actually more consensual than Hamilton CUPW leaders. On Capitalist Economic Organization the result is due to the fact that a much higher percentage of CUPW leaders are anti-capitalist on the index (41% of the leaders vs. 17% of the rank-and-file) while about 30% of each group are pro-capitalist (see Table A9.4). This finding is consistent with the dissensus-creating process I expected to influence my measure of group consensus; that is, a large percentage of CUPW leaders have a strong socialist perspective on this attitude. However, on the other two attitudes (Authoritarian Traditionalism and Social Libertarianism), larger percentages of leaders were found in both the high and low scale extremes (see Tables A9.5 and A9.7). This reveals that some Hamilton CUPW leaders are Left on practical economic

issues but conservative in their thinking on social/moral issues. Such a finding suggests that classical Marxist conceptions of the development of workers' political consciousness are only of limited utility for understanding the factors which promote Left views among workers on social issues. This conclusion is consistent with the multivariate analyses reported in Tables 3.12 and 3.13 in Chapter 3 -- job characteristics, class networks and union experience were relatively unimportant determinants of attitudes such as Authoritarian Traditionalism and Moral/Defence Liberalism.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The data analyzed in this chapter allow me to sketch a general description of the political consciousness of Hamilton CUPW members at the time of the 1987 strike.

The entire spectrum of political consciousness among CUPW members was found to have been shifted in a Left direction. This is consistent with the classical Marxist conceptions of the development of workers' political consciousness which guided my investigation. It also belies the popular view of the CUPW rank-and-file as politically unexceptional.

The Hamilton CUPW rank-and-file were to the Left of union rank-and-file across the country on all attitudes examined in this research except Capitalist Economic Organization and Left/Right Feeling. This indicates that CUPW rank-and-file members were no more likely to be consciously socialist than national union rank-and-file members, even

though they were more likely to be Left on a range of attitudes about practical economic and social policy issues.

It is useful to think of the Hamilton CUPW membership as exhibiting two levels of socialist political consciousness at the time of the 1987 strike. First, all of the leaders and many of the rank-and-file possessed a practical socialist consciousness, although there was certainly individual variation in the extent of its development. There is thus an important continuity in attitude between CUPW leaders and rank-and-file. This continuity is illustrated by the fact that on all but two of the attitudes considered in this study, a gradient of group means was in evidence,[14] with the CUPW leaders and rank-and-file adjacent at one end of the gradient. Consequently, the gap which exists between CUPW leaders and rank-and-file on most attitudes seems to be the product of a process of politicization operating across the entire membership. Indeed, the gap in attitudes between CUPW leaders and rank-and-file on practical policy issues is not nearly as important as the gap between CUPW members and other Canadian union members.

Second, there was a much higher proportion of conscious socialists among the CUPW leaders than the rank-and-file. This is a discontinuity in consciousness between the two groups. It was evident on two attitudes — Capitalist Economic Organization and Left/Right Feeling — where the central tendency of the CUPW rank-and-file was similar to that of national union members and quite distinct from the more Left central tendency of CUPW leaders. It seems that a socialist

---

[14] This data is recorded in the tables found in Appendix 9.

politicization process is a feature of CUPW union life for union leaders. But the development of a socialist consciousness among some leaders is not a miraculous conversion. The evidence indicates that it is experienced as a logical outgrowth of the heightened concern for economic justice and workers' rights which is a product of rank-and-file participation in CUPW.

One of the unique aspects of the job of an inside postal worker is the keen interest which the media and Canadian public take in the condition of Canada Post and postal service. Negative evaluations of postal workers and CUPW abound, and CUPW members must regularly argue against misinformed and anti-union opinions in the course of routine social interaction. In this chapter I examined how Hamilton CUPW members respond to the view that postal workers are overpaid. My analysis indicates that the majority of Hamilton CUPW members hold opinions which are critical of either or both the dominant conception of how occupations are ranked by merit and the notion that pay should be based on merit. These critical views are congruent with the reluctance of CUPW members to blame the poor for the poor's economic difficulties. I see this analysis as an illustration of how CUPW members' continuing participation in struggle is likely to influence a variety of dimensions of political consciousness.

Some of the attitudes of Hamilton CUPW union leaders were considerably more consistent than either national union leaders or the rank-and-file in their own union. This evidence of syllogistic structuring is consistent with the identification of a significant proportion of the CUPW leaders as conscious socialists. At the same

time, the extent to which CUPW leaders' attitudes are structured in this "derivation from first principles" manner should not be overstated. Relatively high levels of average individual consistency were found on more concrete attitudes, not on the indexes measuring beliefs about capitalist economic organization or feelings about Left-wingers and Right-wingers. It would thus seem that, while CUPW leaders are more consistent on some dimensions of their practical socialist consciousness, on average they are no more consistent, and sometimes even less consistent, than other workers when considering indicators of economic and political philosophy.

The results of this study have led to a rejection of the hypothesis that CUPW rank-and-filers' attitudes are syllogistically structured. At the outset of this chapter I suggested an alternative hypothesis: any shift towards the Left by CUPW members may be organized around the adoption of an alternative set of social likes and dislikes. Evidence from one attitude question supports this hypothesis. Respondents in different surveys were asked to use a 0 to 100 feeling thermometer to indicate their feeling towards "the people who run the labour unions".[15] The mean for Hamilton CUPW leaders was 73, for Hamilton union leaders 67, for Hamilton CUPW rank-and-file 64, for national union leaders 62, and for both Hamilton and national union rank-and-file 51 (data not in a table). The key finding here is the large difference in means between the CUPW rank-and-file on the one hand and the other two groups of union rank-and-file members on the other

---

[15] This item is V294 in the 1984 National Election Study codebook.

hand. This is preliminary indication of a different distribution of social likes and dislikes in the two groups.

I also compared the interindividual structure of political consciousness in different groups. In general, CUPW leaders tended to be more consensual than national union leaders and CUPW rank-and-file tended to be more consensual than national union rank-and-file. This finding is congruent with the widespread development of practical socialist consciousness in both groups -- the range of political opinion has been narrowed through the secondary socialization of many union members who initially held conservative perspectives. However, the comparisons of group consensus between Hamilton CUPW leaders and rank-and-file members lead to a mixed conclusion. On five practical attitudes (four economic and one system of government), Hamilton CUPW leaders are more consensual. This simply means that practical socialist consciousness is more highly developed among the CUPW leaders than the CUPW rank-and-file. On three other attitudes, however, Hamilton CUPW leaders are more dissensual. In the case of one attitude (Capitalist Economic Organization), this indicates that there are many more conscious anti-capitalists among the CUPW leaders. In the case of two other attitudes (Authoritarian Traditionalism and Social Libertarianism), however, it indicates two things: (1) the (expected) presence of a greater percentage of workers holding Left-wing views on these social attitudes among the CUPW leaders; and (2) the (unexpected) presence of a greater percentage of workers holding Right-wing views on

these same social attitudes among the CUPW leaders.[16]   I interpret the latter finding as demonstrating that a Left-wing consciousness on economic issues and active union involvement are not   incompatible with conservative views on social issues, even though such a combination of viewpoint is not the norm among CUPW leaders in Hamilton.

My discussion has tried to point out both the continuities and dissimilarities in political consciousness between leaders and rank-and-file members in the Hamilton local of CUPW.   Those leaders with conscious socialist perspectives certainly share the practical socialist perspectives of the majority of union members.   Yet in being conscious of their political orientation, they are also unique. At the same time it is important to emphasize that the popular view of the reason for CUPW's record of militancy does not fit the situation in the Hamilton local; that is, this is not a union local where a militant minority of leaders manipulates a passive, apolitical majority.   Instead, the Hamilton local of CUPW can accurately be portrayed as being led by a mixture of conscious and practical socialists who are supported by a union membership which tends to uphold Left-wing perspectives on a range of practical issues.

---

[16] See the "Percentage high on index" and "Percentage low on index" rows in Tables A9.5 (Authoritarian Traditionalism) and A9.7 (Social Libertarianism).

Table 7.1: Summary of Group Mean Comparisons

Hypotheses

Political Attitudes	CUPW Leaders To Left of[a] National Union Leaders	CUPW Rank&File To Left of[a] National Union Rank&File	CUPW Leaders To Left of[a] CUPW Rank&File
1) Strike Sympathies	Yes*	Yes	Yes*
2) General Union Sentiment	No	Yes	Yes*
3) Big Business Power	Yes	Yes	Yes*
4) Capitalist Economic Organization	Yes	No	Yes
5) Authoritarian Traditionalism	Yes	Yes	No
6) Welfare Bum	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*
7) Social Libertarianism	Yes*	Yes*	Yes
8) Non-Participation in Informal Politics	Yes	Yes	Yes
9) Alienation from Government	Yes	Yes	Yes
10) Left Self-Identification	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*
11) Left/Right Feeling	Yes*	No	Yes*
Summary	5 Yes* 5 Yes 1 No	3 Yes* 6 Yes 2 No	6 Yes* 4 Yes 1 No

[a] On Non-Participation in Informal Politics the first group is hypothesized to be higher in political participation. On Alienation from Government the first group is hypothesized to be higher in alienation.

* Difference between two groups is greater than half a standard deviation.

Table 7.2: Summary of Comparisons on
Average Individual Attitude Consistency

Hypotheses

Political Attitudes	CUPW Leaders More Consistent Than National Union Leaders	CUPW Rank&File More Consistent Than National Union Rank&File	CUPW Leaders More Consistent Than CUPW Rank&File
1) Strike Sympathies	Yes	No	Yes
2) General Union Sentiment	Yes	No	Yes
3) Big Business Power	Yes	No	Yes
4) Capitalist Economic Organization	No	No	No
5) Authoritarian Traditionalism	No	No	No
6) Welfare Bum	Yes	No	Yes
7) Social Libertarianism	Yes	No	Yes
8) Non-Participation in Informal Politics	No	No	No
9) Alienation from Government	Yes	No	Yes
10) Left Self-Identification	--	--	--
11) Left/Right Feeling	No	Yes	No
Summary	6 Yes 4 No	1 Yes 9 No	6 Yes 4 No

Table 7.3: Summary of Group Consensus Comparisons

Comparisons

Political Attitudes	CUPW Leaders (Group 1) vs. National Union Leaders (Group 4)	CUPW Rank&File (Group 2) vs. National Union Rank&File (Group 5)	CUPW Leaders (Group 1) vs. CUPW Rank&File (Group 2)
1) Strike Sympathies	1 > 4	2 = 5	1 > 2
2) General Union Sentiment	1 > 4	2 > 5	1 > 2
3) Big Business Power	1 > 4	2 = 5	1 > 2
4) Capitalist Economic Organization	1 = 4	2 = 5	1 < 2
5) Authoritarian Traditionalism	1 = 4	2 = 5	1 < 2
6) Welfare Bum	1 = 4	2 = 5	1 > 2
7) Social Libertarianism	1 < 4	2 > 5	1 < 2
8) Non-Participation in Informal Politics	1 = 4	2 > 5	1 = 2
9) Alienation from Government	1 = 4	2 = 5	1 > 2
10) Left Self-Identification	1 > 4	2 > 5	1 = 2
11) Left/Right Feeling	1 = 4	2 > 5	1 = 2
Summary	4 [1 > 4] 6 [1 = 4] 1 [1 < 4]	5 [2 > 5] 6 [2 = 5]	5 [1 > 2] 3 [1 = 2] 3 [1 < 2]

CHAPTER 8:   THE INFLUENCE OF POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND IDENTITIES
ON WORKERS' STRIKE PARTICIPATION

In this chapter I consider the extent to which workers' actions during the 1987 CUPW strike can be explained by their underlying political perspectives.   Workers' participation in the strike varied along two distinct axes. First, when CUPW members went on strike, other workers who had responded to Canada Post's advertisements for strikebreakers temporarily took over the union members' mail processing jobs.   Second, among CUPW members in Hamilton there was considerable variation in strike involvement. Consequently, I am able to pose two distinct research questions: (1) To what extent do differences in political attitudes explain the different actions of strikers and strikebreakers?   (2) To what extent can variations in the participation of CUPW members in the strike be explained by differences in their underlying political perspectives? In addressing the latter question I use multiple regression analyses to estimate the effects of political attitudes independent of the effects of a range of other explanatory variables.

COMPLEXITIES OF THE ATTITUDE/ACTION LINK DURING A STRIKE

Studies of the relationship between attitudes and behaviour traditionally concern themselves with a single social action involving a minimal amount of effort and time commitment.   Furthermore, the action is undertaken in a context devoid of any group pressures other than

293

those artificially created by the study methods. For instance, in both the field experiment conducted by Brannon et al. (1973) and the classroom experiment of Borgida and Campbell (1982), participants were presented with the opportunity to sign a petition. Whether the petition was signed or not was the measure of social action analyzed in each study.

In contrast, workers' actions during the 1987 CUPW strike stretched over a period of time, often entailed considerable amounts of time and energy, and were undertaken in a context which involved considerable intragroup pressures and intergroup conflict.[1] Moreover, a range of actions were undertaken by the strikers and strikebreakers. Some were discrete, such as the decision by individuals to apply for jobs as strikebreakers. Others were continuing actions, such as CUPW members' ongoing participation in picketing or their ongoing response to the buses filled with scabs.

The complexity of workers' actions during the strike creates three separate research problems. First, given everything that happened, what forms of strike participation should be studied? Since I designed the research as a comparison of strikers and strikebreakers, my first answer to this question came easily. But amongst the strikers, a variety of different social actions could be considered. Rather than

---

[1] The group context in which CUPW members lived during the strike had two main features. First, most strikers experienced peer pressure from coworkers to participate in the strike and were phoned at home by union leaders as a reminder to undertake picket duty. Second, during the strike there were definite lines of demarcation between groups -- CUPW members stood together on the picket line in face-to-face conflict with strikebreakers, local management, special security hired by Canada Post, and the police.

arbitrarily limit my analysis, in this chapter I will consider the variation in three different dimensions of CUPW members' strike participation.

A second problem involves the measurement of the social action of strikers. Quite simply, so much happened on the picket line in relatively short periods of confrontation that I was unable to make observations on everything I wanted to observe. For instance, I attempted to measure how each individual in the sample tended to act when the scab buses crossed the line. However, since day shift workers never had scabs cross their picket lines (due to the fact that the scabs were working 12 hour shifts), since I was unable to be on the picket line each time the buses arrived, and since it was hard to make systematic observations while being thrown aside by the police, I was only able to complete this measurement for 33 individuals. In addition, I believe that the observations for some individuals are inadequate. For this reason I chose not to use this particular behavioural measure (response to scabs) in any quantitative analyses. Fortunately, I was able to make sufficient observations to construct what I believe to be an accurate behavioural measure of CUPW members' overall strike involvement.

The third problem concerns whether to accept only behavioural observations as indicators of action. A more comprehensive account of strike participation can be gained by also considering union members' reports of how they felt during the strike and self-evaluations of their strike support. Obviously, there are problems with this category of indicator: people may report how they felt and thought in a way which

makes them look good to the investigator, and the assumption that strike-specific attitudes are proxies for unobserved forms of participation can certainly be questioned. At the same time, I believe that our understanding is enhanced by analyzing a range of forms of strike participation. To do so, both types of indicators are employed here: independent observations of action, and union members' retrospective reports on their attitudes during the strike.

It has been suggested that one of the important steps in research on the link between attitudes and action is to define and measure attitudes which people see as relevant to a particular situation (Menzies, 1982:110,115). In most cases this suggestion means that researchers should concern themselves with situational attitudes rather than general attitudes (Rokeach, 1968; Fazio and Zanna, 1981:196). Such an approach is clearly inappropriate in this study, since the link between underlying political perspectives and action is what is at issue! Therefore, my substantive interests allow me to skirt the methodological debate which has characterized studies solely concerned with the attitude/action link. However, my research is relevant to this methodological debate in one way: a number of situational attitudes are considered along with background attitudes. This allows me to compare the relative influence of the two types of attitudes on workers' actions in the strike.

Finally, a comment is in order on how I conceptualize the relationship between political consciousness and strike action. Individuals bring definite political perspectives with them into a strike. These perspectives influence individuals' involvement in the

strike and interpretation of strike events, as do a range of other factors. From the earliest stages of the strike, strike involvement may in turn influence political consciousness. Thus, at an abstract level we should acknowledge that political consciousness is both a cause and consequence of strike action, and strike action is both a consequence and cause of political consciousness. However, at a working level I assume that background political attitudes are fairly stable over time, even during events as dramatic as the 1987 CUPW strike. Consequently, I treat background political attitudes as explanatory variables throughout this chapter and the next.

UNDERSTANDING THE ACTION OF STRIKEBREAKERS

When asked why they applied for a job as a strikebreaker, 17 of the 22 individuals included in my survey first listed some sort of economic reason. Eight of them stressed that they "needed" the job or money. The other nine were attracted by the "good pay" ($13.25/hour). The economic circumstances of the majority of scab recruits are demonstrated by some additional evidence. Fifty-five percent of them were dissatisfied with their material standard of living. In contrast, when asked the same question only 30% of CUPW members expressed dissatisfaction; an identical 30% of non-union workers in the 1984 National Election survey were dissatisfied. Forty-one percent of the strikebreakers reported that their standard of living was worse now than a year ago as opposed to only 21% of the non-union workers in the 1984 national survey. Seventy-seven percent of the strikebreakers also indicated that they had been unemployed and wanting to work at some

point in the past year; for 50% of them the period of unemployment was three months or longer. Only 30% of non-union worker respondents in the 1984 national study had been unemployed in the year preceding the survey. Finally, 68 percent of the sample of scabs reported a before taxes 1986 income of less than $10,000.

Canada Post advertisements used but one incentive to lure workers to their scab recruitment centres: $13.25/hour. People were promised a quick fix of cash to take on the strikebreaker job. I doubt it surprises anyone, then, that most of the applicants for these jobs seemed to be motivated by the need to subsist or a desire to substantially improve their personal finances over a very short period of time. Abject or relative need propelled workers to respond to Canada Post's cash enticement. The vast majority of the applicants were trying to get by on very low incomes -- $500 or $1000 was going to have a substantially positive impact on each of their lives.

Given this economic foundation for people choosing to act as strikebreakers, is there also an attitudinal basis for the action? That is, is there an elective affinity between strikebreakers' background attitudes and their action in the 1987 strike? I pursue this question by comparing the background attitudes of strikebreakers to two different groups: non-union worker respondents in national surveys and rank-and-file CUPW members. I expected to find a distinct difference in attitudes in the second comparison: due to the Left politicization experienced by postal workers (see Chapter 7), scabs would be to the Right of the CUPW rank-and-file. I was uncertain, however, as to how similar or different the scabs would be from other non-union workers.

I also was uncertain as to how the attitude consistency of the strikebreakers would compare to the other two groups. In the previous chapter we discovered that the attitudes of the CUPW rank-and-file are not syllogistically structured, even though they are to the Left of the national union rank-and-file. I assume that the attitudes of national non-union workers are likewise not syllogistically structured. Consequently, if a number of scabs are consciously Right-wing in orientation, then I expect that the average individual attitude consistency in this group will be greater than either the CUPW rank-and-file or national non-union workers. If, however, there are few conscious Right-wing scabs, then I expect to find no differences in attitude consistency. I test directional hypotheses which are consistent with the former expectation.

In order to better understand the attitudes of scabs, I also examine the distribution of responses on some original attitude measures which were included in the survey, and consider the correlates of political attitudes. My major finding is that there were two groups of scabs: needy economic recruits and anti-union mercenaries. As well, I summarize information on the social background of the strikebreakers. Finally, I conclude the section by assessing the implications of my analysis of the bases for strikebreaker action for our understanding of that type of passive consent to capitalist domination which is grounded on calculations of economic self-interest.

The Attitudes of Strikebreakers in Comparative Perspective

Data are available to compare the mean response of strikebreakers to the CUPW rank-and-file and national non-union workers

on seven political attitudes. The results of these comparisons are summarized in Table 8.1.[2] Strikebreakers were to the Right of CUPW members on all seven attitudes, with large differences found on three attitudes: Strike Sympathies, General Union Sentiment and Big Business Power. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis I outlined above. However, the strikebreaker group was only to the Right of national non-union workers in two comparisons: Strike Sympathies and Capitalist Economic Organization. The difference on Strike Sympathies was quite large, but was entirely due to differences in viewpoint on strikebreakers. Fully 62% of national non-union workers favoured outlawing strikebreakers compared to only 5% (1 out of 22) scabs, and while 26% of national non-union workers believed striking workers are justified in physically preventing strikebreakers from entering the workplace, only 14% of the strikebreaker sample concurred. These differences are totally unsurprising and are more than likely circumstantial in character. I think it is probable that any fundamental cleavage in political consciousness would also have been observed on the other items in the Strike Sympathies index.

The difference between strikebreakers and national non-union workers on Capitalist Economic Organization was not as large. However, the strikebreakers were more pro-capitalist in orientation on each of the four items in the index. As a result, over half of the strikebreakers were low (to the Right) on this index compared to only about a third of the national non-union workers. This is an interesting

---

[2] The summaries found in Tables 8.1 and 8.2 are based on data contained in Tables A9.1 to A9.6 and A9.10 in Appendix 9.

finding since it points to the presence of a relatively high percentage of consciously pro-capitalist workers among the strikebreakers.

The results of comparisons of average individual attitude consistency are summarized in Table 8.2. Strikebreakers do not tend to be more consistent in their thinking than the CUPW rank-and-file, but they are more consistent than national non-union workers on two practical economic attitudes -- General Union Sentiment and Big Business Power. An interesting finding is not shown in Table 8.2, however. The strikebreakers are somewhat more consistent than each of the other two groups on Capitalist Economic Organization. Indeed, on this attitude they are ranked highest in individual consistency among the six groups for which I have data.[3] Given that strikebreakers tend to be more pro-capitalist than either the CUPW rank-and-file or national non-union workers, and given their relatively high level of individual attitude consistency on Capitalist Economic Organization, it appears that a greater percentage of consistently pro-capitalist individuals are found in the strikebreaker group than are found in the other groups.

In summary, the political attitudes of strikebreakers are not that different from the political attitudes of national non-union workers. The main exception to this generalization concerns Capitalist Economic Organization where strikebreakers are both to the Right and more consistent. However, as I expected the political attitudes of strikebreakers tend to be to the Right of rank-and-file CUPW members in Hamilton.

---

[3] This information is recorded in Table A9.4 of Appendix 9.

Differences Among Strikebreakers: Needy Economic Recruits and
Anti-Union Mercenaries

Strikebreakers answered two items which indicated their general
ideological orientation. When asked for their feelings towards CUPW,
27% reported a dislike for the union, 9% a like, and 64% indicated that
they had no feeling for the union. When asked to record their position
on a 7 point Left/Right scale, 9% put themselves on the Right, 14% put
themselves on the Left, 27% located themselves in the Centre, and 50%
indicated that they didn't know where to put themselves. It seems clear
from these results that the majority of the scabs do not have firmly
established anti-union or Right-wing sympathies (or firmly established
pro-union or Left-wing sympathies, for that matter). At the same time,
based on the responses to these two questions, a minority of the scabs
(32%) can be classified as consciously anti-union. I then proceeded to
investigate whether the anti-union minority systematically differed from
other scabs in terms of attitudes and social background.

First, the anti-union group was only substantially to the Right
of other scabs on one of the background attitudes which I measured --
General Union Attitude (correlation between this attitude and the anti-
union group dummy variable = -.34). However, they were also clearly
distinguished from the majority of strikebreakers in terms of knowledge
of the strike issues. Altogether, 59% of the scabs correctly identified
one or more of the main strike issues as privatization, job security or
union-busting. Each member of the anti-union minority had knowledge of
at least one of the main strike issues in comparison to only 40% of the
other strikebreakers.

Second, the educational background, unemployment history and economic circumstances of the anti-union scabs are clearly different from the others (data not in a table). Seventy-one percent of the anti-union group had post-secondary education in comparison to only 20% of the majority group. A key difference concerns the unemployment histories of the two groups. Over the year preceding the survey, 86% of the anti-union group had experienced <u>two or fewer</u> months of unemployment, while 67% of the other scabs had endured <u>more than two</u> months of unemployment. And while 58% of the anti-union group had a personal income greater than $10,000 in 1986, only 20% of the rest of the scabs could report the same thing. Given the difference in income levels, it is not surprising that the anti-union group were less likely to be dissatisfied with their current material standard of living than other scabs (correlation between material dissatisfaction and the anti-union group dummy variable = -.20).

Third, the two groupings of scabs reported sharply different levels of contact with union members. Fully 67% of the majority grouping have a close friend who belongs to a labour union, in comparison to only 14% of the anti-union group.

The small anti-union group were thus socially and economically quite distinct from the other scabs. It seems clear that, although they may have been out of work at the present time, they had both the educational background and labour force experience which would have allowed them to secure some sort of regular job at a rate of pay above the minimum wage. This suggests that it was not merely economic need which caused them to apply for work as strikebreakers. My hypothesis is

that, while their current employment circumstances made the strikebreaking job feasible and monetarily attractive, it was an anti-union orientation which underpinned their strike participation. Consequently, I call this grouping of strikebreakers anti-union mercenaries.

I identified anti-union mercenaries on the basis of their responses to two items. Some additional evidence indicates that this operational procedure may have underestimated the size of the consciously anti-union group. Analyzing the responses of all strikebreakers, both personal income (r = -.53) and education (r = -.57) showed a strong negative association with Capitalist Economic Organization (reverse coded); that is, support for capitalist economic organization tended to be strongest among strikebreakers who had larger personal incomes and more education. In addition, a large gap between the income which strikebreakers believed they deserved and what it was in 1986 (this is a measure of egoistic relative deprivation) was positively associated with General Union Sentiment (r=.48) and Capitalist Economic Organization (r=.24); that is, support for capitalist economic organization and opposition to labour unions tended to be strongest among strikebreakers who did not possess a sense of egoistic relative deprivation. It thus seems clear that those strikebreakers with more formal education, a higher income level, and a stronger sense that they are getting what they deserve from the economic system tended to be distinct in political attitudes from other strikebreakers.

My tentative conclusion is that the scab recruits can be divided into two groups. Anti-union mercenaries were very aware of the dispute between Canada Post and CUPW, and were looking to help bash a union while they grabbed some quick cash. In contrast, the other scabs tended to be in much more economic difficulty and were not usually aware of the strike issues. They became strikebreakers because the high hourly rate of pay offered by Canada Post seemed too good to pass by. I call these scabs needy economic recruits.

Passive Consent and the Cash Calculation

I have outlined a number of the characteristics of strikebreakers, but the picture is still incomplete. As recorded in Table 8.3[4], the young and unmarried were overrepresented among strikebreakers in comparison to a national sample of non-union workers. Of the 13 individuals in my sample who were 29 years old or younger, three were students. Two of these individuals were anti-union mercenaries while the other naively believed that working as a strikebreaker was going to help her in getting a full time job with Canada Post. Five of the young people in the sample were unemployed and looking for work. Another was a single mother. The others were working in low-paying jobs. Thus, economically disadvantaged young people were prominent among the strikebreakers recruited by Canada Post.

It is also interesting to note that not all the scabs were Hamilton residents — almost a fifth of them resided in smaller communities surrounding Hamilton. Of those strikebreakers who lived in

---

[4] Data presented at the beginning of this section are also summarized in Table 8.3.

Hamilton, 44% had resided in the city for three years or less. People had moved to Hamilton from smaller communities in Ontario, from the Caribbean, and from locations in both Western and Atlantic Canada. Two additional social groupings of workers susceptible to strikebreaker recruitment have thus been identified: residents of nearby small communities with limited job opportunities, and workers who have recently migrated to Hamilton from more distant centres.

Needy economic recruits among the strikebreakers are thus largely drawn from economically marginalized sectors of the working class. To most of them, the logic of CUPW members' strike action is incomprehensible -- given what little they have now, the chance to work for $13.25 per hour seems like heaven on earth. Thus, a number of scabs offered comments similar to this one: "They [CUPW members] can work if they want to. Why should we pass up a good chance they're throwing away?"

In thinking along these lines, the economic recruits among the strikebreakers are, in fact, not thinking much differently than most of the new regular employees hired by Canada Post. As one CUPW member indicated to me, for the first six months to a year new employees are usually wide-eyed and compliant at the Post Office. Because they've never made so much money in their lives, "the big bucks keep them happy". Nevertheless, the CUPW member explained, "working is not all money". Consequently, after the novelty of decent-sized cheques wears off, new employees tend to pay increasing attention to the problems at the Post Office and begin to understand the logic behind the unions' demands and actions. At the same time, as I describe below, the lure of

personal economic gain can generate passive consent to employer domination even among long-time postal workers.

My research has shown that the economic recruits among the strikebreakers were certainly not on an ideological crusade against CUPW. Their consent to the strikebreaking campaign of Canada Post management and the Progressive Conservative government was clearly passive. Indeed, the majority of the economic recruits did not even comprehend the main strike issues. My view is that these individuals were mobilized by Canada Post against CUPW for two reasons. First, their immediate economic interests were quite different from those of CUPW members. Knowing this, Canada Post exploited the economic difficulties of the scabs for the corporation's ends.[5] And second, the idea of acting against their own immediate economic interests was quite inconceivable to the strikebreakers. For one thing, they had no economic alternatives. For another thing, the unconscionable pursuit of cash is widely lauded in capitalist society and can very easily be seen as the only sensible course of action.

An interesting incident during the 1987 Letter Carriers' strike in Hamilton relates to the issue of relations between marginalized and unionized workers.[6] On the morning of June 19 a station wagon carrying three strikebreakers tried to cross a picket line at the Main Post Office. It was stopped by a large contingent of LCUC picketers. The

---

[5] This analysis is consistent with the view put forward by Marx and Engels (1972:44) on the role of the lumpen proletariat in the struggle between the capitalist and working classes.

[6] Details are from The Hamilton Spectator, June 20/87:B1, and a personal conversation with a LCUC member involved in the dispute.

strikers alternatively intimidated and tried to reason with the scabs. After a few minutes one of the strikebreakers gave up and got out of the car. The other two remained in the vehicle, no doubt waiting for police to show up and clear a path for them. They told the strikers that they needed the money offered by Canada Post. After a while a collection for the scabs was taken up on the picket line. The strikebreakers were then offered $60 if they would get out of the car and go home. After another hour's wait for a police escort, the scabs decided to take up the offer. They abandoned Canada Post's vehicle on Main Street, split the $60 and left the scene.

The money collected on the picket line that day was obviously a token amount. Given the helpless situation the scabs found themselves in that morning, however, it was enough to entice them to give up the strikebreaker role. Collecting money for the scabs was a stroke of genius on the part of the LCUC picket captain -- it not only appealed to the strikebreakers but caught the fancy of the press and resulted in some sympathetic news coverage for the strikers. Yet, at another level it was a symbol of union members' willingness to understand and respond to the plight of marginalized workers. Such gestures by union members, if organized on an ongoing basis and widely promoted as a symbol of working class solidarity, would have two effects: (1) provide needed economic assistance; and (2) supply an example of workers looking beyond their own immediate economic interests to the plight of other workers. The symbolic impact of such gestures would be maximized if they were included as an organized part of the actions undertaken by workers on strike. It would be a political expression of an ideal of social

unionism: workers should focus and act upon their common interests rather than their own, immediate, economic interests[7] (and, as a consequence, often perpetuate or extend capitalist domination). The reality is that as long as the capitalist class can purchase the consent of some workers, it is able to divide the working class and increase the likelihood of achieving its immediate objectives in a struggle.

As my research progressed it was fairly easy for me to excuse the calculating cash mentality of the economic recruits among the strikebreakers. On the sidewalk outside Canada Post's strikebreaker recruiting centre in Hamilton, a few strikebreaker applicants stopped to chat with me on September 28 and 29, 1987. Immediate economic need clearly motivated their decisions to apply for the job. However, I was taken aback by the extent to which calculations of immediate economic self-interest figured in the actions of unionized workers during the strike. Three examples will serve to show how a consciousness centred on cash calculations generated passive worker consent to the domination of Canada Post management, but paradoxically, also generated a wave of militancy among the CUPW membership.

-----

[7] One aspect of CUPW's National Program of Action attempted to build working class solidarity along the lines described in this paragraph. On February 18, 1987 the union's 1st National Vice-President, Daryl Tingley, wrote:

> Locals have been asked to organize activities which will show our solidarity with the millions of Canadian workers who are faced with poverty and unemployment. Fundraisers and solidarity events will raise money for food banks, anti-poverty groups, women's shelters, unemployed workers groups, etc. Local bulletins and press releases will outline the Union's proposals for a postal service which offers improved and expanded services and creates jobs for Canadians (CUPW Bulletin, 86-89/236).

First, a number of the mail service couriers in Hamilton (members of the LCUC) agreed to work overtime while the CUPW strike was ongoing. Their rationale for the action was three fold: (1) they wanted the money; (2) Canada Post would just call in temporary workers to do the work if they refused the overtime, so the work would get done regardless of their decision; (3) other factors such as the inconvenience posed to Canada Post if no regular drivers would work overtime, or the value of spending their off-work time on the CUPW picket line, were inconsequential. What is fascinating is that the couriers could rationalize working the overtime even though they had just been through a difficult strike with the same employer, and were therefore very aware of the strike issues; they had benefitted from an overtime ban observed by CUPW members during their own strike; and, whenever you talked to them, they seemed to be genuinely supportive of the CUPW action. Yet, in spite of how they rationalized their action, my conclusion can only be that the thirst for cash led them to assist Canada Post (albeit in a very minor way) in running its strikebreaking operation. Their consent to management domination was passive and unintended, but very real in its effects on the balance of forces in the strike.

Second, the tendency to put one's own economic advantage ahead of all other considerations was also in evidence among some CUPW members. Article 7.24 of the CUPW National Constitution specifies that "strike pay shall be provided starting the third week of a general labour dispute." Given the union's initial strike strategy of rotating walkouts, and the government's quick indication that it intended to

legislate an end to the strike, it was apparent to CUPW members that the dispute would more than likely not last long enough for any strike pay to be issued. Several Hamilton CUPW members told me that they believed some of their coworkers who weren't stalwarts on the picket line would have been out there on a regular basis if there had been a chance to collect strike pay. I also noticed that a few strikers were hedging their bets on whether the strike would last long enough for strike pay to be issued. The National Constitution (Articles 7.26 and 7.27) stipulates that CUPW members are only entitled to strike pay if they take part in strike activities. Every week during a dispute, union locals are required to prepare a list of those members who have fulfilled their commitments. In Hamilton, union members were required to sign a log book in the strike headquarters so that the local executive could keep track of who was participating. More than a few CUPW members seemed to make only a courtesy call to the picket line each day. However, they would make sure to sign the union's log book so that if and when strike pay was released they would qualify. The likelihood of no strike pay thus kept some workers on the sidelines of the strike struggle, and other workers limited their strike participation to the minimum effort required to qualify for strike pay should it be issued. In taking on no or limited strike participation, these CUPW workers passively consented to the domination of management and the government.

Third, the importance of "the almighty dollar" to the actions of many CUPW members was demonstrated by their outraged response to the overtime restrictions imposed by Canada Post in June, 1987 (described in Chapter 6). In negotiating a contract clause which required the

employer to offer overtime to union members before calling in casual employees, the intention of CUPW was to give the employer a powerful financial incentive to hire permanent workers. The average hourly labour cost of a full-time CUPW member in 1987 was $24.89 when benefits were added to wages. Casual employees were paid $13.25 per hour with no benefits. "However, when the cost of overtime that must be paid to full-time regular employees before casual employees can be hired is calculated," noted Conciliation Commissioner Claude Foisy in his September 21, 1987 report, "the hourly cost of such employees exceeds that of the full-time employees." (p. 7).[8] This is exactly what the union intended. The fact that members had the opportunity to make a lot of overtime pay as a result of this contract clause was a means to an end, not the union's end in itself.

In the summer of 1987, after Canada Post announced that it would be offering them only two hours of overtime a day before calling in casual employees, Hamilton CUPW members filed hundreds of grievances. This was an unprecedented number of grievances in the Hamilton local where, before the mid-1980s, a few dozen grievance every year had been the norm. Undoubtedly, some of the CUPW members filing the grievances were motivated by a concern for the balance between regular and casual employees. At the same time, I do not believe it is coincidental that members fought so hard to defend the collective agreement when their opportunities to make about $20 per hour in overtime wages were at stake. This is an example of where cash calculations underpinned a

---

[8] Casuals are employed on an irregular, call-in basis by the Canada Post Corporation.

surge of militancy in the Hamilton CUPW local in the period immediately preceding the strike. In itself, this militancy certainly does not represent consent to the domination of Canada Post management. However, it does reflect a limitation in the resistance of many Hamilton CUPW members. When dissent is based on cash calculations it can very easily be turned into its opposite. After all, it is Canada Post management which has the power to offer or withhold a carrot stick like overtime pay. Thus, worker dissent grounded on calculations of economic self-interest is naturally unstable and transitory, and can in many circumstances be defused by management if it so desires.[9] A calculating cash mentality is generally to the advantage of an employer since cash can be used to either divide or placate workers.

My research indicates that, in employing a calculating cash mentality, the economic recruits among the strikebreakers were not that different from many workers on the union side of this strike struggle. This means that a Manichean interpretation of the conflict between scabs and union members is inappropriate.

UNDERSTANDING THE STRIKE PARTICIPATION OF CUPW MEMBERS

Dimensions of Strike Participation

Most of the analysis in this section is concerned with the variations in strike participation among individual union members. I

---

[9] This analysis raises the question of whether Canada Post management cut back on inside postal workers' overtime in the summer of 1987 as part of a strategy to incite a major confrontation with CUPW. Without access to inside information from a management source, it is impossible to unequivocally answer this question. However, I suspect the answer is yes.

address this question: what factors caused some people to be more supportive of, and involved in, the strike than others? But before proceeding in this direction, it is important to consider a dimension of strike participation on which there was absolutely no variation in the entire Hamilton local.

Unlike in previous strikes, not a single CUPW member broke ranks and attempted to continue working during the 1987 strike.[10] In fact, four of the five workers whose union memberships had been suspended because of scab activity in previous strikes applied to the union for reinstatement either just before or after the 1987 strike. The absence of scabs from their own ranks was viewed with considerable pride throughout the local. This high degree of consensus in the local was viewed as a group achievement. "Not only did we not have a single scab," explained one day shift worker, "but I didn't hear a single person say 'I can't really afford to be out here' like so many people did in previous strikes. People's attitude was 'I'm out here and that's it'. Even the people who didn't picket were 100% behind the union." Thus, unlike in previous CUPW strikes where some non-participants were actually strike opponents, in this struggle even non-participants seemed to acknowledge the validity of the union's actions.

Reformed scabs were accorded considerable respect by other union members. One of these individuals, who had scabbed during the 1981

---

[10] Even if a Hamilton CUPW member had tried to continue working, it is questionable whether he or she would have been successful. A CUPW activist in Kitchener told me that management there had refused to let a CUPW member continue working -- when she wouldn't go on strike, they locked her out.

strike, was one of the most conscientious picketers I met. He obviously was making a special point of demonstrating to coworkers that he now supported the union. This was a serious (and highly successful) effort on his part to repair the social relations which were damaged when he scabbed during the 1981 strike. I was interested to discover that no overt cynicism was expressed towards his effort by any of the veterans of the 1981 strike in Hamilton. Instead, union veterans had two positive, complementary responses. First, as already noted, the individual's action was taken as a measure of group achievement. And second, the individual was given credit for his action. "It takes a big person to right a wrong," was the way one coworker commended the reformed scab. Significantly, this same coworker had refused to speak to him in the years subsequent to the 1981 strike.

In studying different dimensions of individual participation in the strike, it is important to note that some are much more important to the union's life than others. When union members scab, considerable intragroup conflict results. This is demonstrated by the treatment of the closest thing to a scab that the Hamilton local had in 1987: a member whose husband, demonstrating an unbelievable lack of understanding of his wife's workplace situation, worked as a strikebreaker.[11] During the strike a number of her coworkers commented on the situation to me, expressing their anger. When the union returned

---

[11] The CUPW member also demonstrated extreme naivete about the consequences of her husband's action as she "shared the secret" with a few of her closest workmates at the beginning of the strike. Needless to say, the secret was not a secret for very long. The woman's later attempts to dissociate herself from her husband's strikebreaking role were belied by her initial treatment of his action.

to work, many avoided speaking to her. Some even refused to exchange greetings. One laid out the ground rules for future social interactions in these stark terms: "Look lady, don't talk to me, you're dead." The scab-by-marriage was emotionally devastated by the treatment. To try and make amends she passed up all overtime in November, 1987, even though her past practice had earned her a reputation as an "overtime queen". This was meant to make amends for the fact that, unlike everyone else's, her family did not suffer financially during the strike.

This incident demonstrates that the presence of scabs in a local can seriously divide the membership and become a focus for many workers' frustration and anger. By way of contrast, if a union member chooses to sit at home rather than picket, other union members will at most be somewhat irritated with the lack of action.

Thus, of all the dimensions of strike participation analyzed in this section, the absence of scabs is probably the most important to the Hamilton local's capacity to mount concerted resistance to Canada Post. The membership saw themselves as being highly united in this struggle. This fuelled their determination and enthusiasm for the strike. I pursue an analysis of strikers' group consciousness in the next chapter.

The remainder of this section deals with three other dimensions of CUPW members' strike participation. Two types of strike support are considered: extent of strike involvement and attitudinal support. Strikers' anger towards the strikebreakers is the third dimension of participation.

Extent of Strike Involvement is a behavioural measure of the actions of CUPW members during the strike. Three steps were undertaken in developing this measure. First, I classified individuals as best I could based upon my own observations during the strike. Second, I independently discussed the strike involvement of each of the 45 individuals in my sample with two members of the Hamilton CUPW executive, and revised my initial classification based upon these conversations.[12] Third, where questions about the strike involvement of an individual still remained, I broached the issue with the same two executive members in a group setting. By thus pooling observations, individuals were classified into one of four categories based upon the amount of time they put into picket duty or helping in the union offices. Twenty percent were never or occasionally involved in union activity. Another 18% were sometimes involved, with 29% and 33% being regularly and dutifully involved respectively. Those CUPW members whose involvement was dutiful tended to do extra duty during the strike without being asked.

The second dimension of strike support is attitudinal support for the strike. It was measured during the second round of interviews with CUPW members. I asked, "How would you characterize your support for the strike --lukewarm, moderate, strong or very strong?" Half of the respondents replied "strong". Another 30% were very strong

---

[12] The two executive members who assisted me at this point were the local's Secretary-Treasurer Elaine McMurray and Chief Steward Yvon Seveny. They were best qualified for this job since each was on the picket line or in the strike headquarters at least as long as any other member of the Hamilton CUPW local.

supporters, with only 20% being lukewarm or moderate supporters. Clearly, the attitudinal support for the strike among the membership was overwhelming. This has two implications for aspects of workers' strike activity which I wasn't able to systematically measure. First, it means that workers did not tend to oppose the strike while taking part in picketing. For instance, I heard very few negative comments about the strike or local union either on the picket line or in interviews. Second, it means that workers tended to be somewhat willing to help out and do extra when asked. The high level of attitudinal support for the strike is thus not without practical implication: it points to important but hard-to-measure aspects of CUPW members' strike participation.

The third dimension of strike participation is anger towards the strikebreakers. I asked CUPW members, "How angry at the scabs were you during the strike? Were you furious, quite angry, somewhat angry, not very angry or not at all angry?" Thirty-four percent were furious while another 20% were quite angry. At the other end of the scale, 23% reported being not at all angry or not very angry. The remaining 23% were somewhat angry. I have chosen to analyze this dimension of strike participation largely because it is of quite a different character from the two types of strike support already introduced. Scab buses crashing the CUPW picket line represented the high point of immediate confrontation throughout the strike. Since Canada Post had never employed strikebreakers in any of the previous labour disputes with CUPW, such physical battles were a new experience for union veterans and newcomers alike. From my conversations with union members, it seems that individual participation in these intergroup confrontations was

often governed by a firsthand reaction rather than any pre-formulated conception of appropriate action. For instance, in thinking back on her response to the scabs crossing the line, one striker commented, "For me to yell obscenities and push cops is totally out of character. I felt an emotion I've never felt before."

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, I was unable to compile a measure of strikers' behaviour during picket line confrontations. Furthermore, anger towards the scabs should not be regarded as a direct substitute for such a behavioural indicator. Some strikers told me that they were so angry and upset at the scabs that they had to leave the picket line at times of confrontation. Other strikers, who were very rowdy on the picket line, reported that they actually weren't very angry at the scabs — instead, they were venting their anger towards management. However, I do believe there is a clear behavioural implication of a feeling of anger towards scabs: those with high levels of anger are likely to have been much more preoccupied with the scab issue throughout the strike than are those with low levels of anger. Therefore, measuring the extent of strikers' anger towards the scabs gives us insight into an important overall dimension of union members' social action during the strike.

Table 8.4 reports the associations between these three dimensions of CUPW members' strike participation. Attitudinal Strike Support was positively correlated with the other two dimensions of participation. The association was quite sizeable with Extent of Strike Involvement ($r=.38$), and somewhat smaller with Anger Towards Scabs ($r=.26$). Extent of Strike Involvement was also positively correlated

with Anger Towards Scabs, but the size of the association was quite modest (r=.18).

Potential Determinants of Strike Participation

My study was designed to assess the extent to which CUPW members' political attitudes influenced their strike participation. To adequately meet this objective, I also need to gauge the influence of a wide variety of other factors on strike participation. There are two reasons for this: (1) a political attitude may influence a dimension of participation only when it occurs in association with another factor; and, (2) the importance of underlying attitudes for an overall explanation of strike participation can best be established by comparing the magnitude of influence of a selection of relevant factors, including political attitudes.

In broad terms, the potential influences on workers' strike participation can be divided in two ways: they may relate to aspects of an individual's background or immediate situation; and, they may be concerned with the workplace or with social life away from work. In defining and measuring relevant variables in each of these broad categories, I took into account findings from Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of this thesis; results of other studies on workers' strike participation; and the perspectives I developed through informal conversations with CUPW members. In this subsection I explain my rationale for choosing to look at certain factors. As well, the operationalization of variables is established, although for the exact wording of items the reader is referred to the interview schedules found in Appendices 6 and 7. A

summary of the distribution of the sample on each variable is presented in Table 8.5.

1. Political Attitudes and Identities

Three political attitudes are included in the analyses of this chapter. Economic Radicalism is a summary measure of workers' underlying economic perspectives, and Authoritarian Individualism is a summary measure of workers' underlying social perspectives. Given my focus on workers' strike participation, it was natural to also include a political participation measure in my investigations -- Non-Participation in Informal Politics.[13] In Chapter 4, Working Class Identification and Left/Right Feeling were shown to have important associations with workers' political attitudes. These political identities are also included in the analyses of this chapter.

The other two political identities included in Table 8.5 have not previously been introduced. Union Feeling is an index which averages a respondent's feelings towards the labour movement, union activists, the people who run the labour unions and the Canadian Auto Workers (items e1, e3, e9, e15 in Appendix 6). CUPW members are generally sympathetic towards unions -- not a single respondent had a score of less than 40 on the index, and the dispersion of scores around the mean of 69 was consequently quite low. There are two reasons for including Union Feeling in this analysis. First, it measures CUPW members' general feelings towards unions without invoking any strike issues. Second, by including it in multivariate analyses along with

---

[13] For details on these attitudes see Tables 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4 in Chapter 3.

Economic Radicalism, I will be able to determine whether the influence of the latter variable on strike participation is strictly due to the effect of pro-union sentiments.

A measure of Religious Feeling is also reported in Table 8.5. It represents the average of a respondent's feelings towards life after death, religious prayer, religious worship and God (items e6, e7, e12 and e17 in Appendix 6). There was considerable dissensus on this index amongst CUPW members, with 20% scoring 25 or less and 31% scoring 75 or higher. Altemeyer has shown that acceptance of Christian orthodoxy has a strong positive correlation with a measure of authoritarian social beliefs which he calls Right-Wing Authoritarianism (1981:239-240). In a study of a strike in a small industrial factory in a mid-western U.S. town, Snarr (1975) found that religiously involved employees were more likely to be strikebreakers than employees not involved in religion.[14] Both of these findings suggest that CUPW members high in religious feeling will be less supportive of, and involved in, the strike, presumably because of their conservative, pro-authority perspective.

2. Personal Economic Situation

It will be recalled from Chapter 3 that neither personal income nor family income were important determinants of Canadian workers' political attitudes. However, income level might have a contextual impact on CUPW members' participation in this dispute.

---

[14] In the strike studied by Snarr, the prestrike workforce was split by the strike: some of the original workforce continued to work while the majority walked the picket line. For this reason the results of Snarr's study are applicable to my study of the variation in Hamilton CUPW members' strike participation rather than my comparison of striking union members and especially recruited strikebreakers.

The findings of other strike studies have shown that an individual's personal economic situation sometimes influences her or his strike participation. For one thing, workers may be hard pressed to economically survive the interruption of income resulting from a strike. Thus, during a work stoppage by day shift workers at an automotive parts factory in England in the late 1970s, the part-time afternoon shift workers continued to work. They were mainly single mothers who could not afford to lose any pay (Cavendish, 1982:148-149). Similarly, in a survey study of the members of a nonprofessional public sector union local in Michigan, Martin (1986:219,223) found that individuals who expected to experience serious problems or hardships as a consequence of a potential upcoming strike tended to indicate that they would support a strike for a shorter length of time than individuals who did not expect to experience hardships.

As well, in strikes over monetary issues, it may be the case that workers whose family economics are in relatively good shape do not feel the need for strike action to increase their own wages as strongly as do other workers. This is one explanation for Snarr's finding that, although 33% of the workers with a working spouse were strikebreakers, only 9% of the workers without a working spouse were strikebreakers (1975:373). By measuring the family income (item k11 in Appendix 7) of CUPW members I am able to assess the impact of income on strike participation. Given that wages were not an issue in this strike, however, and given that the strikers only lost about one and a half week's pay during the dispute, I do not expect income to be an important determinant of strike participation.

I also measured two other factors relating to CUPW members' personal economic situation: material dissatisfaction (item k10 in Appendix 7) and egoistic relative deserved deprivation (item k8 subtracted from item k9). The second variable is a measure of an individual's financial deprivation relative to what she or he "should have right now".[15] About half of the CUPW members expressed some level of relative economic deprivation on this measure. Now, since this strike did not offer the promise of substantially improving CUPW members' wages, strike participation could not possibly result in an outcome which would moderate the relative economic deprivation felt by an individual. Furthermore, in Chapter 4 I discovered that egoistic relative deprivation (defined broadly to include material dissatisfaction) is associated with a narrow range of political attitudes. These two factors lead me to believe that Relative Deserved Deprivation and Material Dissatisfaction will have inconsequential impacts on strike participation.

3. General Outlook on Job

The major conclusion of Snarr's case study of the strikers and nonstrikers in a small industrial factory was that strikers were more dependent upon their jobs (1975:374). He arrived at this conclusion by assuming that workers with certain social characteristics were more dependent upon their jobs than workers with other social characteristics. Specifically, high job skill, being married and being male were viewed as proxies for job dependence (1975:372). To better

---

[15] This variable was first considered in Chapter 4 of the thesis where it had the label Relative Deserved Deprivation.

assess the effects of job dependence on workers' participation in a strike, however, this concept could be measured directly. This is the approach I took in this study.

Job dependence was operationalized using two items. First, CUPW members were asked whether they expected to stay at the Post Office until they decided to retire (item 11 in Appendix 7). Sixty-four percent reported that such an eventuality was very likely or probable. Second, I assessed respondents' expectations of being able to find a job outside the Post Office that paid a comparable or higher wage (item k12). Sixty-four percent believed that they definitely or probably could not find such employment. Interestingly, the correlation between these two items is only .11, indicating that they measure different aspects of job dependence.

Another important side to workers' general job outlook is job dissatisfaction. Items measuring workers' perceptions of freedom on the job (n6), the interest-level of the work (n7), and the extent of worker input into decisions made by supervisors (n8) were combined into an index (alpha = .58). Fifty-nine percent of the sample was high in job dissatisfaction. In this research I want to identify whether the dissatisfied are more or less likely to be participants in the strike. I am unaware of any evidence linking job dissatisfaction to workers' strike participation.

4. Response to Strike Issues

There was uniformly solid support among CUPW members for the major bargaining issues championed by their national leadership. I asked respondents to rate the importance of various contract demands on

a 0 to 10 scale. The results for six of the major demands (items r1, r2, r3, r4, r5, r7 in Appendix 7) were totalled. The mean on this index was 53, and not a single member expressed opposition to the demands. In situations where a union membership holds widely different views on the importance of strike issues, I would expect such a variable to be an important determinant of strike participation -- those who disagree with the bargaining priorities would tend to participate less. However, due to the limited variability of my sample in judging the importance of strike issues, this variable may not be a particularly important determinant of participation in this strike.[16]

The contract concessions demanded by Canada Post in the months leading up to the strike, and the millions of dollars committed by the corporation and federal government to the strikebreaking operation, could not help but make a major impression on CUPW members. In these circumstances an individual may anticipate one or more of three forms of deprivation: (1) personal deprivation; (2) deprivation of coworkers; (3) group (union) deprivation. Early in the strike one CUPW member suggested to me that strike support was strongest from two groups of members: relatively new employees were behind the strike because they feared losing their jobs; and veteran workers were fighting to defend their union and the gains it had made in many previous struggles. I wanted to test the theory underlying this suggestion and, at the same

---

[16] If my survey included the small group of CUPW members who did not participate in the strike, this explanatory variable would likely be a more important determinant.

time, consider one of the complexities in the link between deprivation and social action (see Della Fave, 1974; Walker and Pettigrew, 1984).

CUPW members were asked how likely it was "that you, personally, will be adversely affected" if Canada Post goes ahead with its privatization plans (item m5). Forty-seven percent believed they would probably not or definitely not be negatively affected while 41% believed it was likely they would be personally hurt. This is my measure of personal deprivation. To assess each respondent's belief that coworker deprivation was likely, I asked CUPW members to estimate how many postal workers in Hamilton would be adversely affected if the privatization plans go ahead (item m6). A clear majority (68%) believed quite a few or a large number would be negatively affected. The correlation between personal deprivation and coworker deprivation is .48. Finally, two items were used to assess the sense of group deprivation. On the first, people were asked whether they thought the federal government and Canada Post management hoped to smash CUPW (item m4). Eight-six percent replied affirmatively, and most of those who disagreed offered a more sophisticated analysis of Canada Post's strategy for limiting CUPW's power. Consequently, since there was close to unanimity in thinking among union members that their union was under attack, this item can not be used in assessing variability in strike participation.

I turned to a second item to measure which members put a priority on union deprivation. Respondents were read a list of four issues -- own job security, job security of fellow workers, chance the government might smash your union, and privatization -- and asked to indicate which one most concerned them (item m7). Thirty-two percent

put a priority on union defence. This variable is positively associated with coworker deprivation (r=.28) but unrelated to personal deprivation.

5. Local Union Involvement/Attitudes

One of the important features of the 1987 strike by members of the Hamilton local of CUPW was that it was totally organized at the local level. The local union executive, all full-time postal workers, coordinated Hamilton strike activities. At no time during the strike did a full-time union official or employee even appear on the scene (except when Jean-Claude Parrot made a short visit to the picket line on October 15 at the invitation of the local executive). This is quite unlike the situation in some unions where business agents take charge during a strike. It also means that CUPW members' involvement in and attitudes towards the local union are particularly relevant to their participation in this strike.

Five different variables assess workers' union involvement and attitudes. The first was introduced in the last chapter -- whether an individual is or has been a steward or executive member. The next examines people's relationship to the local leadership. I asked whether they were good friends with any members of the executive or stewards (item o5 in Appendix 7). Sixty-one percent reported being a good friend of a local union leader.

I also asked a specific question concerning support for the local union (item i7). The sample was split between strong and middle-of-the-road union supporters, with only 7% identifying themselves as weak supporters. It must be remembered, however, that this attitude was measured at the time of the strike and thus reflects people's attitude

towards the local union in this context, and that my sample excluded those few individuals who were totally uninterested in the union's struggle. A number of CUPW members mentioned to me that their support for the local union had strengthened in the months preceding the strike as they came to understand the intentions of Canada Post. Consequently, this attitude conceptually overlaps with one of the dimensions of strike participation -- strike support attitude (support for the strike and support for the union in the strike go hand in hand). Because of this overlap (r=.54), multivariate analyses of the determination of workers' strike support attitude will not include the measure of general support for the local union.

Another variable considers the personal side of local union involvement -- it is a summated index formed from workers' reports on the picket line participation, and the extent of the support for the local union, from their two best friends amongst the CUPW membership (see items o1, o2, o3, o4 in Appendix 7). While the majority of friends were said to have picketed every day, more were identified as lukewarm or middle-of-the-road union supporters than strong supporters. Finally, I also measured the number of years each individual had been a CUPW member. Twenty-two percent had been hired by the Post Office since the 1981 strike, 47% were hired between 1975 and 1980, and the remaining 31% started at the Post Office between 1960 and 1974.

6. Union Ties Outside Work

In Chapter 5 (Table 5.5) I report that Hamilton workers holding the most pro-union of union schemata are more likely to have grown up in a union household and to have regular interaction with union members

than workers holding other union schemata. Furthermore, Martin (1987:223) found that expected strike support from significant others was an important determinant of workers' support for a strike to defend the union. To assess the impact of union ties outside work on the strike participation of CUPW members I measured three variables. First, I asked each respondent whether her/his family and friends had supported the strike (item p3). The majority indicated that they had received support, although most of them also mentioned an instance where they had received some flak. I anticipate that support from family and friends will be positively associated with strike participation.

Second, I asked whether people grew up in a pro-union household (item p1). Third, I asked whether any family members or good friends have ever served as union officials or executive members (item p2). Four-fifths of the sample did not grow up in a union family while there was a fairly even split between those who had personal ties to a union leader away from work and those who did not. In both cases I anticipated that pro-union socialization away from work would be positively associated with strike participation.

7. Social Background

The influence of five social background variables on strike participation will also be considered. One of the important features of the CUPW membership in Hamilton is that the majority are women (58% in January, 1988). Furthermore, women are prominent among the leaders in the local -- a situation somewhat exceptional in CUPW since, when Jean-Claude Parrot was asked about women in leadership roles in CUPW, he

pointed to the fact that in the early 1980s all but one of the Hamilton local's executive were women (Parrot, 1983:59).

Now, the conventional view of women workers is that they are easier to exploit than men. There are two bases for this generalization. First, evidence of women passively consenting to their subordination in the workplace has been accumulated in a number of case studies (e.g., Snarr, 1975:373; Simpson and Mutran, 1981:335). Second, this conventional view aligns with ideological notions of male superiority (Brown, 1976:35). While it is true that in some circumstances women workers have been shown to accept subordination, in other circumstances they have been shown to be very independent thinking and willing to fight for their rights in the workplace. For instance, Ruth Cavendish (1982:68) describes a young woman worker in an automotive parts factory who was every bit as anti-authoritarian or "bloody minded" as some of the male fertilizer plant workers studied by Nichols and Armstrong (1976:60). As well, Huw Beynon describes a confrontation over wage grading at Ford in Liverpool where women machine operators distinguished themselves by their solidarity while men assembly line workers were hesitant to act (1984:176). Recognizing that this turn of events goes against conventional stereotypes of men and women, male assembly line workers commented, "The women are the only men in this plant" (1984:176). These examples demonstrate that the stereotype of women workers as easier to exploit than men does not fit all cases, and certainly cannot be blindly applied to the situation inside the Hamilton Post Office.

During the course of the strike, two sharp differences in the participation of men and women stood out. First, even though women dominated the Hamilton local's executive in the early 1980s, only one of the six members of the union executive at the time of the strike was a woman. Given that the majority of union stewards in the local were women, and that 10 of the 18 individuals in my sample of Hamilton CUPW leaders were women, this struck me as odd. My talks with women CUPW activists indicated that domestic responsibilities inhibited many of them from volunteering to serve on the executive. The Hamilton local's executive normally meets one evening a week and, of course, had to meet much more often at the time of the strike. Furthermore, because of the adversarial relations between Canada Post management and inside postal workers, executive members constantly had to live with the stress of taking care of union responsibilities while working at a fulltime job.[17] Given the onerous obligations of a union executive, many women in the CUPW local simply ruled out the possibility that they could serve as an executive, work in the Post Office and keep up domestic commitments. I was especially interested to find that the weight of domestic labour affected the union participation of both married and single women. Two single women who were very active in the union told me how, at different times, they had dropped out of the union executive because of the need to care for an ailing parent.

---

[17] One Thursday in March, 1988 I met union president Bill Dalgleish just after he had finished his work shift at a postal station in Hamilton. He told me that he had received 17 separate union business telephone calls over the course of the day!

Second, women were much more vocal and energetic during confrontations on the picket line. Thus, I expected that gender would be an important determinant of Anger Towards Scabs. Accounting for this difference in strike participation will be one of the problems tackled in my analysis of data.

I also consider the effect on strike participation of family responsibilities, age, education and whether a CUPW member is married to a manager or supervisor. I include the first two variables in this study since they have figured in previous research. In his case study, Snarr found that the workers at the factory who were single were much more likely to cross their own picket line and strikebreak (1975:373). He suggests this is because they have less stake in their jobs; that is, since they did not see themselves as being economically tied to that particular job, they were not as concerned about the pay level and conditions of work. In order to test the validity of this notion I split the sample of CUPW members between those who are single with no dependents (23%) and others (77%).

A second family responsibility variable was also constructed: it is a dummy indicator of the separated and divorced individuals in the sample (another 23%). When examining the determinants of Anger Towards Scabs I consider the idea that sole support women (single, separated, divorced) are the angriest group of strikers because they have fewer economic options than sole support men or married strikers of either gender.

Older employees in the union local studied by Martin (1986:223) tended to be less willing to strike for a 24% wage increase than younger

employees. In fact, age was the single most important determinant of this dependent variable in a multivariate analysis. Martin's finding is not that relevant to the 1987 CUPW strike because it deals with a hypothetical situation where workers are aggressively taking the offensive in a dispute. Hamilton CUPW members, in contrast, were desperately trying to maintain the status quo on employment in wicket service jobs and contractual protections of job security. Since wicket service jobs in the Post Office are held by workers with more job seniority, older employees had a keen interest in the outcome of the dispute. It should also be recalled that in the analyses reported in Chapter 3 of the thesis, age was not an important determinant of Canadian workers' economic attitudes. In light of these factors, I do not expect that age will be a major determinant of strike participation.

I include the other two background variables both because of their importance in the analyses found in Chapter 3, and because of what I learned during my first round of interviews and informal conversations during the strike. As shown in Chapter 3, workers with non-working class spouses tend to be less sympathetic towards strikes (see Table 3.12) and less favourable towards unions (see Table 3.14) than other workers. In addition, during the strike I noted that Hamilton CUPW leaders were very aware of which union members had mixed class loyalties, and did not expect much strike participation from those who had family or personal connections to Canada Post management. In fact, when a number of these individuals made regular appearances on the picket line during the strike, union leaders were genuinely surprised. Unfortunately, my sample did not include any CUPW members with close

personal ties to Canada Post management. As an alternative measure of mixed class loyalties, I determined whether respondents had a spouse who was a manager or supervisor at another workplace (constructed from items k1 to k6, Appendix 7).

Strikers with some post secondary education were most likely to indicate some special interest in my research. In my conversations with these people I was struck by the extent to which they tended to "stand above" the conflict and acknowledge the strengths and shortcomings of both union and management. In fact, education was strongly negatively correlated with the variable measuring the personal importance of strike issues (r=-.48). It will also be recalled that education is a very important determinant of Canadian workers' political attitudes, with higher education workers tending to be less sympathetic towards strikes, more conservative in economic views, and less authoritarian on social issues than other workers (see Tables 3.11 to 3.13 in Chapter 3). Thus, I suspected that those CUPW members with higher levels of formal education would tend to show less support for the strike and less anger towards the scabs than CUPW members with lower levels of formal education.

Overview of the Correlates of Strike Participation

Three measures of association between each dimension of strike participation and the independent variables are reported in Table 8.6. In the multiple regression analyses which appear in this chapter, I utilize the Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients from this table. Because the Cramer's V and Gamma associations also appear in Table 8.6, the reader is able to confirm that utilizing correlation

coefficients, while it violates statistical assumptions, is not substantively misleading.[18]

A survey of Table 8.6 reveals that local union involvement / attitudes and political attitudes/identities are the two most important general categories of correlates of strike participation. In addition, one of the deprivation indicators in the View of Strike Issues category -- Coworkers Hurt/Privatization -- had an impact on all three participation dimensions. Although independent variables in the other categories are sometimes modestly associated with specific dimensions of participation, they did not have as important a general influence. This is obviously only a rudimentary sketch of the factors influencing CUPW members' strike participation. It sets the stage for a detailed consideration of the determinants of each dimension of strike participation. In the next three subsections, results of multivariate data analyses will be presented. I will attempt to integrate these

---

[18] I supply Cramer's V and Gamma associations in recognition of the fact that I am violating statistical assumptions each time r is calculated. Pearson's product-moment correlation is strictly appropriate only for variables measured at the equi-interval level. However, the dimensions of strike participation are measured on ordinal scales ranging from three to five categories. Furthermore, while a few independent variables are measured on equi-interval scales, most are measured either at the nominal level (e.g., Present or Past Leader) or ordinal level. Thus, depending upon how the independent variable is measured, either Cramer's V (appropriate for nominal level variables) or Gamma (appropriate for ordinal level measures) may be the statistically appropriate measures of association. Cramer's V is based on chi-square and thus measures the extent to which two variables deviate from complete independence without regard to the direction of deviation. Because of this it is of restricted utility. Gamma is based on a pair-by-pair analysis of all cases in a table and is directional. Where I calculated Cramer's V or Gamma for independent variables measured on a scale containing more than four categories (e.g., union feeling or age), I recoded the independent variable into three or four categories.

quantitative results with insights garnered from my field observations during the strike and talks with CUPW members.

Determinants of the Extent of Strike Involvement

A number of independent variables were correlated with the extent of CUPW members' strike involvement. Most of them are indicators of local union involvement/attitudes or background political attitudes/identities.

By far the largest correlates of strike involvement were the indicator Present or Past Union Leader and the attitudinal measure of support for the local union (see Table 8.6, third column of numbers). In Chapter 7, I identified a number of attitudinal differences between CUPW leaders and rank-and-file members. This raises the possibility that political attitudes and identities are associated with Extent of Strike Involvement only in so far as leaders and the rank-and-file differ on these attitudes and identities. Put in other words, Left attitudes may be associated with increased involvement in the strike only when they are coterminous with a leadership role identification.

To test this hypothesis I examined the correlations of Extent of Strike Involvement with political attitudes and identities while controlling for union leadership. The results are recorded in the first column of Table 8.7. The correlations with Economic Radicalism and Union Feeling disappeared. In interpreting this finding I do not mean to suggest that the zero order relationships between Economic Radicalism or Union Feeling and Extent of Strike Involvement are spurious. To argue for a spurious relationship would be illogical, since differences in political perspective are an integral component of the different role

conceptions of union leaders and rank-and-file members. Therefore, this partial correlation analysis can only be interpreted as signifying that Economic Radicalism and Union Feeling do not influence Extent of Strike Involvement beyond the level of influence they have on regular participation in the union. The data in Table 8.7 also show that the correlations of Extent of Strike Involvement with Authoritarian Individualism and Working Class Identification fell sharply when union leadership is controlled, but are still of substantive importance. Interestingly, although the zero order correlation with Left/Right Feeling is indistinguishable from zero, when union leadership is controlled it jumps to -.35.

This last finding is unexpected and deserves special attention. It indicates the existence of two distinct categories of "Leftists" (as measured on the Left/Right Feeling index) in the CUPW membership. Altogether, 42% of the sample was categorized as "high" on the Left/Right Feeling index. These Leftists were almost evenly split between union leaders and rank-and-file. Of the 10 union leader Leftists, 70% were regular or dutiful strike participants, and not a single person was never or occasionally on the picket line. But of the nine rank-and-file Leftists, 67% were occasional or sometimes strike participants. In fact, although Leftists only made up one-third of the rank-and-file, they represented over half of the rank-and-file members who were never or occasionally involved in the strike. Therefore, while union leader Leftists tended to be extensive strike participants, rank-and-file Leftists tended to be much less involved in the strike than the non-Leftist rank-and-file.

What accounts for the rank-and-file Leftists' relative lack of strike involvement? In the case of two individuals, health difficulties restricted both their participation in the union and participation in the strike. There were four other rank-and-file Leftists who had limited involvement in the strike. Each of them was a union cynic, questioning the effectiveness of the local union and dwelling upon the negative aspects of fellow workers' participation in the strike. One individual had been extensively involved in the 1981 strike and seems to have been jaded by the weak participation of her fellow workers at that time. A second individual scorned the weakness of CUPW and the Canadian labour movement from a far Left perspective and lamented the fact that Canadian unions were not as militant, united and socialist as those found in some other countries. Two other individuals were 1960s-generation Left libertarians who articulately criticized the approaches of both employer and union.

It is not coincidental that these four Leftist cynics numbered among the eight CUPW members who took it upon themselves to contact me before the strike began. Each of them was alienated from the intergroup conflict of the strike and welcomed the chance to tell their story to someone who, like themselves, was an observer. The fact is, while many of their fellow rank-and-filers were firmly drawn into the union's orbit in the strike period, the Leftist cynics never got too enthused about the union. They took on the role of sideline critics of both management and union.

I undertook a multiple regression analysis in order to establish the relative importance of the different determinants of Extent of

Strike Involvement. Two regression runs are reported in Table 8.8. In the first, independent variables with a substantively important association were entered in the model.[19] I took into account the partial correlation results reported in Table 8.7 at this point, and only included political attitudes and identities which showed substantive associations independent of union leadership. Variables with standardized regression coefficients (Beta) of less than .12 in absolute value were trimmed and a second model was run. In undertaking multiple regression analyses with only 44 cases, it is necessary to pay close attention to the adjusted coefficient of determination (adjusted R-squared). This is because, due to the limited variability in a small sample, the unadjusted R-squared rapidly increases as the number of variables in a model increases, regardless of the size of associations. The parsimony of the second model in Table 8.8 is designed to maximize the adjusted R-squared -- it focuses on a few main determinants of the Extent of Strike Involvement.

The second model in Table 8.8 accounts for 39% of the variation in the extent of CUPW members' strike involvement. Union leadership is far and away the most important determinant, although the effects of Left/Right Feeling and Authoritarian Individualism are also important.

---

[19] Only two of the local union involvement/attitude variables were entered in the initial analysis. This set of variables is highly intercorrelated. I was thus concerned about the problem of multicollinearity in the regression analysis. But more importantly, I did not want to partial a relationship out of itself by including variables with considerable conceptual overlap in the analysis. For these reasons, General Support for Local Union was not included. The correlation between Present or Past Leader and Friend of Executive or Steward is .28.

Working class identification and support from family/friends had lesser impacts.

The importance of union leadership as a determinant of Extent of Strike Involvement is not at all surprising. It reflects the different role conceptions held by strikers. In part these role conceptions involve differences in political perspectives. As well, they involve different senses of responsibility for the activities of the Hamilton CUPW local.[20] The findings reported in Table 8.8 indicate that although among themselves leaders had somewhat different conceptions of their role obligations, and, to an even greater extent, among themselves rank-and-file CUPW members had different conceptions of the obligations of their role,[21] variation between the two role conceptions was considerable. Hence, two-thirds of leaders were dutiful in strike involvement, compared to only 11% of the rank-and-file. And one-third of the rank-and-file were never or occasional picketers, compared to none of the leaders.

Two examples will illustrate the importance of role obligations for the extent of CUPW members' strike involvement. One of the union leaders I interviewed described herself as being a moderate strike supporter. She felt that, given the pace of technological change in

_____

[20] It is possible to argue that Present or Past Leader and Extent of Strike Involvement are indicators of the same construct — union activism. While there is some merit to this model, I believe it is useful to examine the measures as indicators of two causally related constructs.

[21] The distribution of the rank-and-file on extent of strike involvement was bi-modal. Forty-one percent were regular participants and 33% were never or occasional participants.

society, the union's job security demands were unrealistic and that some of the benefit demands were also unrealistic. Yet, she put in double shifts on the picket line because she felt a duty as a steward to try and motivate others. She was classified as a "dutiful" strike participant. The second example concerns a rank-and-file member who described himself as being "not a big supporter of strikes" in general and only a moderate supporter of this strike. At the same time he was on the picket line day after day because, just as he worked a regular shift when not on strike, he felt an obligation to work a regular picket shift while on strike. He was classified as a "regular" strike participant. What these examples reveal is how group identification (as either a union leader or a union rank-and-filer) and a conception of the responsibilities of a group member can be more important determinants of the Extent of Strike Involvement than the host of factors listed in Table 8.6 concerned with individual support for, or commitment to, the strike. In both examples, individuals who were equally lukewarm in attitudinal support for the strike committed themselves to a level of strike involvement which aligned with their respective group identities. As a consequence of the influence of group identities in shaping strikers' sense of responsibility for the strike, the Present or Past Leader variable is a much more important determinant of Extent of Strike Involvement than of Strike Support Attitude (cf. Tables 8.8 and 8.9).

In this chapter I set out to assess the influence of underlying political attitudes and identities on strike participation. It is therefore particularly important to note that three of the five major determinants of Extent of Strike Involvement are from this category of

independent variable, even after Economic Radicalism and Union Feeling were excluded from multivariate analyses because their effects are entirely captured by the union leadership variable. As discussed above, the negative effect of Left/Right Feeling is due to the limited strike participation of the Leftist union cynics among the rank-and-file. The positive impact of Authoritarian Individualism (reverse coded) is both surprising and significant. It is surprising because this second-order index, unlike the second-order index Economic Radicalism, does not include any items which directly relate to the issues at stake in the strike (see Table 3.1 in Chapter 3). It is significant because this is clearly an underlying political orientation influencing strike participation -- there is an elective affinity between a non-authoritarian, anti-individualist perspective and more extensive strike involvement. The positive effect of class identification is less surprising. Amongst the CUPW rank-and-file, 70% of the working class identifiers were regular or dutiful in strike involvement, compared to only 41% of the middle or upper class identifiers.

Determinants of Strike Support Attitude

Each of the five indicators of local union involvement and attitudes listed in Table 8.6 had a positive correlation of greater than .3 with Strike Support Attitude. Four of the seven political attitudes and identities also had associations of this magnitude, and three social background variables (Family Situation, Education and Spouse Not Working Class) had correlations larger than .25 in magnitude. The number of relatively large correlations in these three categories of independent variables is arresting, and distinguishes the pattern of determination

of Strike Support Attitude from the pattern of determination for Extent of Strike Involvement, for which there were far fewer relatively large correlations.

Once again I employed the partial correlation technique to assess whether the associations of Strike Support Attitude with background political attitudes and identities were due to differences in attitudes between the union leaders and rank-and-file. As reported in Table 8.7, attitudinal strike support was moderately correlated with Economic Radicalism, Union Feeling, Working Class Identification and Religious Feeling, independent of union leadership. These four political attitudes and identities thus influence this dimension of strike participation across the whole membership. I included each of them in an initial multivariate analysis.

Most of the correlations between the five indicators of local union involvement and attitudes are quite large. Thus, due to the problem of multicollinearity, each of these variables cannot be included in a multivariate analysis. In addition, because of the conceptual overlap between General Support for Local Union and Strike Support Attitude noted above, I excluded the former variable from the analysis. With these considerations in mind I chose three variables from this group to be included in a multivariate analysis -- Present or Past Leader, Best Friends' Union Support and Years as a CUPW Member. Although each is associated with Strike Support Attitude, they are not strongly associated with each other.

Four other variables had a correlation with attitudinal strike support which was greater than .2 in absolute value. These are also

included in the multivariate analyses presented in Table 8.9. Anticipating coworker deprivation due to Canada Post's business plan was positively associated with strike support (r=.28). In addition, there was a tendency for those union members who were single, had more education, or had a non-working class spouse, to indicate less strike support. In each case, strike support was less among those sections of the membership whom I presume to be less dependent upon their jobs. It is interesting that both Spouse Non-Working Class and Education were likewise found to be determinants of workers' sympathies towards strikes in a national study (see Table 3.12, Chapter 3.)

The major determinants of Strike Support Attitude are listed in the trimmed analysis column in Table 8.9. The six variables explain 43% of the variation in attitudinal strike support. Two of the six determinants are political attitudes and identities. Two points are interesting to note concerning this finding. First, Economic Radicalism influences attitudinal strike support even when the effect of Union Feeling is held constant. And second, these two variables affect attitudinal strike support even when union leadership is held constant. Such was not the case in the analysis of the determinants of Extent of Strike Involvement.

Union leadership appears for the second time as a major determinant of a dimension of strike participation. However, whereas it was the most important single determinant of the Extent of Strike Involvement, it is simply one important determinant among many in this analysis. Economic Radicalism, family responsibilities and mixed class loyalties were the other major determinants.

The degree of attitudinal support for the strike provides an indication of CUPW members' potential for being mobilized by specific requests for action. We can think of it as representing latent strike participation. At different points in the dispute this latent potential was actually tapped. For instance, on at least two separate occasions Hamilton union leaders made phone calls to members, requesting that they put in extra time on the picket line. Some rank-and-file members could be counted on to enthusiastically respond to such requests and show up as requested. Others would listen to the appeal for help but not take action. Again, my suggestion is that union members higher in attitudinal strike support were higher in latent strike participation. While the union leaders among them would tend to do extra work on the strike without prompting, due to their distinctive conception of role obligations, the rank-and-file members high in attitudinal strike support would chip in extra when organized to do so.

Determinants of Anger Towards Scabs

In this subsection I turn my attention to a conceptually distinct dimension of strike participation -- anger felt towards the scabs. A number of the variables listed in Table 8.6 are associated with Anger Towards Scabs. The first thing to mention, however, is a non-relationship. Union leadership, which was strongly associated with the other two dimensions of strike participation, is not related with anger felt towards the scabs. This indicates that the pattern of determination for this dependent variable will be quite distinctive.

Five of seven political attitudes and identities are associated with Anger Towards Scabs, although only the zero order correlations with

Left/Right Feeling (-.40) and Authoritarian Individualism (-.23) stand out. Anger was felt most strongly by those with positive feelings for the Right and authoritarian individualist perspectives. Left-wing CUPW members tended to blame the system (or at least Canada Post management and the Conservative government) for the strikebreaking operation while Right-wing CUPW members tended to blame the strikebreakers themselves. This is a classical sort of division between Left and Right -- system blame versus individual responsibility.

The other major determinants are found in the social background grouping. Women were much more likely to feel anger towards the scabs (r=.37),[22] as were CUPW members with less education (r=-.25). Sole support workers (single, separated and divorced combined) also tended to feel anger (r=.19).

Four other associations are worthy of notice. Strikers who anticipated personal or coworker deprivation as a result of Canada Post's business plan were more likely to be angry.[23] In addition, both of the variables directly measuring job dependence were positively associated with Anger Towards Scabs.

In the multivariate analyses reported in Table 8.10 I have added a variable representing an interaction between gender and marital status. My expectation was that the sign of the regression coefficient for the interaction term will be positive: because they have no other income to fall back on if they lose their jobs, and because they would

---

[22] This finding is analyzed in some depth later in this chapter.

[23] Only the latter is included in the multivariate analysis.

have a hard time finding a comparable paying job, I anticipate that sole support women will be especially angry.

The results of the multivariate analysis are somewhat surprising. In the trimmed analysis reported in Table 8.10, 37% of the variance in strikers' anger towards the scabs was explained. The major determinants were gender and marital status, even after the effects of other variables were controlled. Furthermore, counter to my expectations, the sign of the regression coefficient for the gender/marital status interaction term was negative. This indicates that sole support women were not the exceptionally angry group amongst the strikers. In fact, the major division in the membership was between married men who weren't very angry and everybody else who was.[24] I attempt to explain this finding in the next subsection. The major question I address is: What caused married women to be so much angrier at the scabs than married men?

The other important determinants of Anger Towards Scabs were three political attitudes and identities. Strikers with positive feelings for the Left tended to feel relatively less anger for the scabs than other strikers. Consistent with the Left-wing's emphasis on system problems rather than individual problems, they blamed Canada Post management and the federal government for the strikebreaking operation and directed the brunt of their anger in that direction. One Left-

---

[24] The mean score of married women on Anger Towards Scabs is 3.2 (N=12). This is marginally higher than the mean scores of sole support women (2.9; N=13) and sole support men (2.9; N=7). In contrast, the mean score of married men (1.8; N=12) is substantially lower.

leaning union leader explained his perspective in these colourful terms:

> I'm not as angry at the scabs as I am at management.
> Some of our members don't understand this -- how
> involved management was. But for me it's like the
> situation when somebody hires a contract killer to
> murder your family. You'd be angry at the killer sure,
> but you'd save most of your anger for the guy who hired
> the killer.

It is interesting that both union leader Leftists and Leftist cynics tended to feel a minimal amount of anger towards the scabs. Despite their sharply different views of CUPW and the strike struggle, they have this important common ground between them. It confirms a finding made in Chapter 4 of the thesis -- feelings for the Left and Right are more closely related to assumptions about human nature and social issues than to economic policy issues. Thus, both union leader Leftists and Leftist cynics see themselves as being on the Left even though they characterize the struggle in the Post Office in sharply different ways.

Economic Radicalism and Working Class Identification are the other important determinants of anger towards the scabs. With the effect of Left/Right Feeling held constant, economic radicals tended to feel more anger, as did working class identifiers. This is more concrete evidence for a conclusion reached in Chapter 4: class identification and feelings for Left and Right are distinct social psychological phenomena with independent implications for the shape of workers' political consciousness.

Understanding the Anger of the Strikers

Women were prominent among the strikers pounding on the windows of the buses carrying strikebreakers as they crashed the picket line, and among those dishing out verbal abuse to the scabs as they scurried in and out of the Post Office. There is an obvious reason for this observation. Because women made up 58% of the Hamilton CUPW members, and because married men strikers were distinctly less angry than either married women strikers or sole support strikers of either gender, the number of angry women strikers outnumbered the number of angry men strikers by a ratio of about 4 to 1.

The crescendo of angry women's voices on the picket line was interpreted within a sexist framework by both the police and local Canada Post management. Of the dozens of police officers who did duty on the Hamilton CUPW picket line during the strike, not a single one was a woman. The vast majority of the Canada Post officials involved in the strikebreaking operation were also men. In contrast, with 58% of the Hamilton membership being women and no gender difference in the extent of strike involvement, the majority of CUPW picketers were women. Thus, class and gender divisions reinforced each other in picket line confrontations. Anti-CUPW actions and comments by the police and management often had a sexist subtext.

Two comments made by different police officers provide an indication of their sexist approach to women strikers. The first was made by Sergeant Bayne Henderson, who coordinated the Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police's actions on the picket line. A large part of his job was to maintain or repair relations with the strikers by chit chatting

and being a "good old fellow". Following one picket line confrontation where women strikers had been prominent among those heckling the scabs, Henderson offered a group of strikers some lighthearted commentary designed to rebuild police-striker relations. "With all these women yelling," he said, "it makes me feel like I'm right at home." With this comment Henderson invoked the image of the bitchy wife who gives her husband no peace. It dismisses the actions of the women strikers in two ways. First, it implies that this is 'woman behaviour' wrenched out of its 'appropriate context', the home; the women's approach to confronting the scabs is portrayed as being inappropriate in this public arena. Second, it implies that just as the nagged husband does not pay much heed to the bitchy wife, Henderson and the police aren't paying much heed to the sharp words of the women CUPW members.

The second comment was anything but lighthearted. It was made by a frontline cop during a heated conversation with a woman striker. The police had just finished attacking the picket line. The woman striker was loudly giving this particular cop hell for grabbing her by the breast during the confrontation. The cop, no doubt following orders, was not replying to her accusations. But he let his guard down at one point. When the striker said something like, "Listen, I'm not interested in being treated like that", he sneered in reply, "Oh yeah? Then what are you out here for?" The frontline cop was invoking another sexist stereotype in interpreting the anger of women CUPW members: the women were activists on the picket line because they weren't getting enough sexual gratification. My suspicion is that the breast grabbing by a few of the male police officers was rationalized by this sexist

interpretation. The women were seen to be behaving as they were because they weren't "getting it" at home. Consequently, some of the police took it upon themselves to give the women what they "really wanted" on the picket line.

Canada Post hired special security personnel to video tape strikers during picket line confrontations. From comments made to strikers after they returned to work, it seems as if a number of local supervisors had viewed the tapes. Immediately after the strike's conclusion, the anger of the women strikers was made light of by male supervisors. One woman was asked whether she was embarrassed by her actions on the picket line. She told them that she was not embarrassed. (However, she admitted to me that she was surprised and puzzled at how humiliated she had felt at the use of scabs by her employer, and how emotional her response on the picket line had been.) Another woman faced a constant stream of jocular references to how "wild" she had been on the picket line. For instance, when one supervisor was dealing with her, another passed by and commented, "For God sakes, don't make her mad." She was also told by a supervisor, "I would never get in your way when you are angry. You were livid on the picket line." These comments did embarrass this striker because she did not have the impression that her picket line behaviour was that extraordinary. Throughout the first week on the job after the strike her constant thought was, "Will I ever live this down?"

Canada Post supervisors in Hamilton thus seemed to have a good time when viewing the videotapes. Their comments to women workers after the strike were not vicious and were made in the context of attempts to

rebuild management-worker relations. At the same time, these comments trivialized women's activist presence on the picket line. The sexist stereotype they invoked was of the overemotional woman who temporarily loses her mind. The attitude of supervisors was the condescension of the patriarch.

I did not systematically investigate whether male CUPW members shared the sexist stereotypes expressed by the police or management. However, I can report that I did not hear a single sexist remark about women's actions on the picket line from the male strikers. Instead, when either men or women CUPW members expressed criticisms of the picket line behaviour of their coworkers, they either related the criticism to the personality of a particular individual or left the criticism in very general terms. My impression is that even those strikers who were not particularly angry at the scabs had a sympathetic understanding of why some of their coworkers -- both women and men -- felt so angry.

By invoking different sexist stereotypes, the police and Canada Post management justified dismissing or even sexually abusing the angry women on the picket line. But these sexist approaches neither take the anger of the strikers seriously nor help us to understand why women CUPW members were overrepresented among the angry. I address each of these issues in the remainder of the subsection.

1. The Sources of Strikers' Anger

What insight I have into the sources of strikers' anger towards the scabs is largely due to the thoughts shared with me by a number of CUPW members. The first thing I learned from my conversations is that there is no single source for the anger felt towards the scabs --

different psychological and social psychological processes were in operation which led to strikers' feelings of anger. My intention here is to identify and discuss the five processes which I believe were most important in producing CUPW members' feelings of anger towards the scabs.

In some cases, strikers' anger was due to a deep feeling of outrage at the self-centredness of the scabs. "It made me angry that those people never stopped to consider that it could happen to them too," explained one CUPW member. This was the same message that another union member yelled in the faces of scabs early one morning on the picket line when the police numbers were low and she was able to get right up beside the loading dock steps behind the Main Post Office. "What really bothered me," she later said, "is that they hadn't stopped to consider that it could be them. It makes me wonder what would happen if there was real chaos in this country and people had to pull together just to survive."

Disdain for the morals of scabs was also evident in the way one striker approached the actions of her son-in-law, a frontline supervisor. Such supervisors are members of the Association of Postal Officials of Canada (APOC). In the third week of September, 1987, Canada Post sent a letter to APOC members regarding their employment during the strike. They were told that, should supervisory duties not be available during a CUPW strike, "you may be offered the opportunity to perform non-supervisory duties." The APOC members were also informed that "should you choose, which is your option, not to perform non-supervisory duties ... you will be placed on off-duty status until work

that you normally perform becomes available." The letter ended with a message for all APOC members with career advancement plans: "It is suggested that, between now and any potential strike date, you consider the options best suited to your position within Canada Post Corporation" (emphasis added). Frontline supervisors thus were formally free to choose between being a scab or being laid off during the CUPW strike. However, Canada Post clearly expected them to scab if they wanted to be considered for a promotion.

When faced with this decision, the striker's son-in-law chose to scab. She was outraged at his action. A couple of other APOC members in Hamilton had refused to do non-supervisory work and been laid off, but her own son-in-law, when given the same choice, had put his career interests first. The CUPW member's moral condemnation of this action was so great that, for the first time in years, she did not have Christmas dinner with her grandchild, daughter and son-in-law in 1987.

The feeling of powerlessness which CUPW members felt regarding the course of the strike was the second source of anger. Aside from a few minor victories, strikers were unable to stop scabs and mail from crossing their picket line. To this immediate sense of powerlessness was added the realization that no matter what they did, the federal government intended to order them back-to-work. In this no-win situation, strikers' frustrations mounted. I had a clear sense of the strikers' changing mood while on the picket line. During the first few days of picketing, CUPW members did not become agitated when a passing motorist would give them a hard time. A typical response to "Get back to work, you lazy bums" was "Thank you very much for your advice, sir,

and have a nice day." By the end of the strike, however, the picketers weren't tolerating any heckling. When any motorist yelled at them the standard irritated reply, usually echoed by a number of those present, was, "Fuck off, you asshole." This transformation in consciousness occurred over a remarkably short period of time -- the strike itself lasted 17 days and Hamilton CUPW members picketed on only about half of those days. The strikers were certainly not jaded by the course of events; rather, they were acutely frustrated by their own powerlessness.

As strikers' general level of frustration rose, it became more likely that they'd vent their frustration against any immediately irritating circumstance. The scabs crossing the picket line at regular intervals represented such irritants. Thus, this source of anger is a general frustration with the strikers' powerlessness; such frustration is transferred to strikers' dealings with the scabs on the line. I was interested to learn that a number of the rowdiest picketers attributed their anger to this source. In fact, much to my surprise, they usually reported feeling only a moderate level of anger toward the scabs -- their actions on the picket line were more a product of their high level of general frustration.

The third source of anger is rooted in intergroup interaction. Some of the scabs responded to the strikers' intimidation tactics with taunts, by damaging CUPW members' property inside the Post Office, or by indicating intent to physically injure the strikers. Especially when experienced personally, these incidents provoked anger among the strikers. One striker was particularly angered by the anti-CUPW graffiti left on the washroom walls by the scabs during the rotating

strike day on October 1 and subsequent lock out. Another striker told me that he didn't feel much anger towards the scabs until suppertime on the last day of the strike. "I got a bit angry when the kids on the bus held their pay cheques up to the windows as they went by. They were rubbing salt into the wound -- they didn't have to do that." A third union member reported that she wasn't angry "until a few things got me going." The first was when she saw two scabs carrying hammers into the Post Office underneath their coats. The second was when she learned that scabs had damaged the microwave and refrigerator owned by CUPW members and made a point of plugging all the toilets before they left. The most serious incident of this type occurred in the early morning hours on October 15 when only a skeleton crew of picketers were on the line. One or more scabs apparently climbed out on the roof of the Post Office from a 2nd floor window and threw some roofing material at the picketers, narrowly missing a woman's head. Whenever scabs showed signs of contempt for the strikers, anger was then provoked in return.

The need for an emotional scapegoat in the strike was the fourth source of anger. During the strike it sparked a bloodthirsty mentality towards the scabs among some of the strikers. After the strike it spawned a paranoic worry that scabs were continuing to work in the Post Office. I should emphasize that many strikers did not scapegoat the scabs. However, a scapegoat mentality was definitely evident amongst some of the membership.

One CUPW leader was quite troubled when I talked to her less than a week after the strike's conclusion. Her concern was that she and a few coworkers had behaved like "vigilantes" towards the scabs "who

were victims rather than perpetrators". "What hits me more than anything else about the strike," she said, "is that our own group was so bloodthirsty.... It makes me wonder how far it could have gone. Even though we hadn't planned on it, we could have hurt somebody."

The members of this group of strikers were like many others -- they yelled and screamed, banged picket signs and threw eggs on the picket line. What set them apart is that they were preoccupied with the issue of scabs. Their approach was to run a low intensity intimidation campaign. For instance, on some days they followed the scab buses. On at least one occasion an egg was thrown into a car which picked up a scab dropped from the bus. Early in the morning of October 13, after chasing the scab buses from downtown Hamilton, they cruised into the parking lot at Centre Mall where most of the strikebreakers were dropped. Some scabs took exception to their intimidation and returned the favour; the strikers were physically threatened and chased by car all the way back to the downtown. Two days later the strikers went "undercover" and mingled with the scabs at Limeridge Mall before buses arrived to take them to the Post Office. An hour later three of the "undercover" strikers got on the scab buses to deliver the union's message before the buses crossed the picket line. They took delight in the fact that some of the strikebreakers recognized them. The strikers' point was: it's easy for us to learn who you are.

All in all, the incidents just reported do not amount to much. These CUPW members certainly did not appear to be out to seriously hurt the strikebreakers. In fact, I got the sense that hunting scabs was partly motivated by anger and partly a sport to them. They had

identified a scapegoat in the conflict and were both emotionally and physically caught up in the heat of the chase. Theirs was a bloodthirstiness which didn't intend to spill any blood. They only wanted to make the scapegoats worry and sweat a little bit.

A scapegoat mentality was also evident in an incident which occurred immediately after the strike was ended. A CUPW member believed that a couple of casual employees looked like scabs and told other workers about her concern. One worker told me that when she learned about this accusation, "I was so upset that I couldn't even work." Another union member noted that a "panic type situation" ensued. Before very long, workers had jumped to the conclusion that there were 20 scabs working as casuals. (Strikers later concluded that only two of the casuals had actually been scabs.) CUPW members were puzzled by their feelings and actions in this incident. One speculated that it was an example of "mass hysteria". In analyzing this incident it is important to note that the union members were not emotionally agitated about having to work in the same building as Canada Post supervisors who had performed inside postal workers' jobs during the strike. This indicates that it was the scabs who assumed the emotional role of scapegoats for many CUPW members during the course of the conflict.

The fifth source of anger is based upon union members' pride in the work they do. It deeply hurt many workers that Canada Post hired untrained individuals to do their jobs. It hurt even more that their employer kept issuing news releases throughout the strike to the effect that the scabs were getting the job done. Most CUPW members in Hamilton seem genuinely proud of the effort, skill and commitment they

bring to their job. Thus, the mere presence of scabs was an insult to an important dimension of their self-concept.

The response of some strikers to being locked out on October 2 helped me understand this source of anger. The day shift showed up to work for 7 a.m. but was refused entry. Meanwhile, scabs continued to work. One striker told me that she broke down when faced with this unexpected situation. Here was the employer choosing to have the scabs do the work that CUPW members could do best. A number of other workers also took this turn of events as a personal insult.

The anger towards the scabs associated with workers' job pride is fairly benign. I interpret it as a secondary emotion, the primary being the personal hurt felt by union members. Getting upset rather than lashing out was the typical response of strikers feeling this way.

2. Understanding the Anger of Women Strikers

It will be recalled that married men strikers were distinctly less angry at the scabs than other CUPW members. Indeed, while only 17% of the married men strikers reported being quite angry or furious with the scabs, 75% of married women strikers, 62% of sole support women strikers and 71% of sole support men strikers reported being quite angry or furious. Furthermore, in the multivariate analysis recorded in Table 8.10, the effects of gender and marital status on Anger Toward Scabs held up when a variety of other explanatory variables were held constant. Consequently, the puzzle of this finding is unresolved.

Neither gender stereotypes nor research findings on gender differences in anger can shed much light on the puzzle. Women are usually stereotyped as being more emotional than men. However, as noted

by Frost and Averill (1982:281), there is a contradictory stereotype of women being less prone to anger than men. Therefore, depending upon the stereotype of choice, the findings of this study either partially confirm or partially disconfirm expectations. In either case, our understanding of why married women strikers were so much angrier than married men strikers is not advanced. Furthermore, the general thrust of research on anger is that "men and women become angry about equally often" (Frost and Averill, 1982:315). This generalization offers us no insight into the pattern of results of concern here.

Indeed, there is a logical problem in trying to interpret the results of this study utilizing gender stereotypes or research on gender differences. I did not identify an across-the-board gender difference in anger among CUPW members, since sole support men exhibited approximately the same high level of anger towards the scabs as married women and sole support women. Therefore, the relationship between gender and anger towards the scabs in this study cannot be reduced to universal differences between men and women in biology, psychology or gender roles.

Before addressing the gap in anger between married men and women strikers, it will be useful to describe key features of the work environment experienced by Hamilton postal workers. I offer this description to demonstrate that there were no significant work-based factors in place which would inhibit the expression of anger by women or men CUPW members.

In examining on-the-job social relations, the first fact of importance is the strength of the union. A good collective agreement,

strong local leadership and a tradition of standing up for workers' rights has created a situation in which union members have the opportunity to think and act in opposition to management. Second, unlike the situation in most industrial plants with a workforce split between men and women, there is no significant gender division of labour amongst CUPW members in the Hamilton Post Office. There are two main job classifications of CUPW members. PO4 encompasses wicket clerks and processing workers. PO2 includes mail handlers. Up until recently mail handlers have always been men. For three reasons, however, this does not represent an important division between men and women workers. First, there are relatively few mail handlers. Second, PO2 and PO4 employees receive the same wage. And third, in terms of skill and status, the male-dominated mail handler jobs are below that of all of the jobs within the PO4 classification.[25] In combination, the strong union presence and absence of a significant gender division of labour have contributed to the development of a working class subculture in which women are both non-obsequious and the equals of their male coworkers. (Note that this equality refers to workers' own subculture, not the policies of Canada Post towards women workers.) As a consequence, the subculture of Hamilton CUPW members does not tend to inhibit women from expressing their anger, just as it does not inhibit men.

---

[25] Beyond the CUPW bargaining unit, however, there is a definite gender division of labour. There are few women in frontline supervisor jobs, and hardly any women in management jobs above frontline supervisor.

The character of women's participation in this working class subculture became evident to me in three ways. First, one woman CUPW member impressed upon me how different the workfloor atmosphere in the Hamilton Post Office was in comparison to all the places she had worked over the years. This was the first place she'd ever been employed where women workers weren't scared to say what they thought. She found the absence of gender intimidation to be liberating. Second, women were prominent among the leaders in the Hamilton local, especially at the steward level. And third, women held their own in any informal banter among CUPW members. This was particularly evident when the subject turned to sex. One union leader told me he found that the sexual jokes and comments of some women workers were consistently more risque than anything his male coworkers came up with. For better or worse, workers tended to talk about strike issues with me rather than banter and joke about sex. However, the comments I overheard during the strike certainly indicated that women CUPW members had a high level of sexual confidence in their dealings with men. Overall, my observations of women CUPW members in Hamilton are consistent with what Anna Pollert found to be true of young, unmarried women workers at a unionized tobacco factory in Bristol, England in the early 1970s: "Work-place confidence and sexual confidence, in the sense of a more independent and active 'femininity', develop hand in hand" (1981:149).

Thus, in their everyday relations with Canada Post management and male coworkers, women CUPW members in Hamilton have an independence of mind and action. This situation helps us understand why women strikers would not be inhibited from expressing anger on the picket

line, but it does not help us understand the gap in anger between the married men and women strikers. I offer two explanations for this gender gap. The first centres on gender differences in labour market experience. The second is focussed on differences in what tends to provoke anger in men and women.

I begin with the first explanation. It is important to note that married men and women strikers were sharply different in job dependence. While 73% of the married men believed that they would likely or maybe be able to find a comparable paying job if they left the Post Office, only 8% of married women held this view. It is worth analyzing this data in some detail in order to determine whether job dependence is tied to the gender gap in anger. The multivariate analysis in Table 8.10 suggests not -- in the initial regression run the effects of gender and marital status were very important even with job dependence controlled.[26] In my view this finding is a consequence of the restricted within-gender variability of the Could Not Find a Comparable Job and Anger Towards Scabs variables. For instance, only 2 of the 11 married men strikers were angry towards the scabs and only 3 of the 11 believed they could not find a comparable job. It just so happened that neither of the angry married men strikers were among the three who doubted that they could find a comparable job. How, therefore, are we to interpret this negative association between job dependence and scab anger in the sample of married men strikers? With

---

[26] Amongst married CUPW members (N=24), the correlation between gender and scab anger is .56. With Could Not Find a Comparable Job controlled, the partial correlation is .51.

so little variation on either variable in the sample, I do not think we can give the finding any substantive weight. In such a circumstance, a correlation coefficient simply reflects random variation.

As an alternative, we need to assess the significance of the near constants in this study: (1) a large majority of married women strikers were angry at the scabs and an overwhelming majority believed themselves to be dependent upon their jobs at the Post Office; and (2) only a small percentage of married men strikers were angry at the scabs and a similarly small percentage believed themselves to be dependent upon their jobs at the Post Office. My interpretation is that the relatively high level of anger towards scabs felt by married women strikers in comparison to married men strikers is partially due to the different labour market experiences of the two groups. The married women had struggled much harder than the married men to get ahead in the working world. As a result, the married women had much more invested in this particular job.

In discussing her anger towards the scabs, a woman striker told me how hard she has had to fight over the past 15 years to get ahead. She raised a young child on her own for a number of years and worked in many low paying jobs. Even getting a job in the Post Office took time and effort. Her feeling during the strike was that Canada Post's strikebreaking operation threatened everything she had worked so hard for over those years. This fuelled her moral outrage at the actions of the scabs and motivated her to be very involved in the strike. Other women strikers used a similar logic in outlining their feelings of anger for the scabs. They had invested considerably more time and energy in

the past to get to their present station in the Post Office, and realized that there were not very many comparable jobs available to them in our society. It seemed grossly unfair that what women CUPW members had struggled so hard to achieve, Canada Post was seemingly handing over to the scabs on a silver platter.

I also want to suggest a second explanation for the gender gap in anger felt towards the scabs. I do not want to emphasize this explanation because the data supporting it is sketchy. However, it strikes me as being plausible and worth considering.

Some experimental research has found that women tend to be most angered by condescending treatment while men tend to be most angered by physical or verbal aggression (Frost and Averill, 1982:303). (Presumably this gender difference reflects differences in gender socialization related to the dominance of men in society.) Now, during the strike Hamilton CUPW members had to endure both physical aggression on the picket line and being treated with condescension by management and scabs. The physical aggression occupied but a short span of every day, and not every CUPW member took part in these flurries of conflict. Condescending treatment, however, was an ever-present feature of the strike for the union members. Indeed, the mere fact that Canada Post was running a strikebreaking operation was interpreted in this light by the strikers -- it amounted to management saying "We do not need CUPW members in order to run the Post Office." When a postal machine mechanic or sympathetic supervisor would report to the strikers that scabs thought the strikers' jobs were easy, anger towards the scabs was also provoked. Very soon in the strike, many strikers developed a

clearly defined us versus them consciousness, in which they regarded management and scabs as possessing unjustified superior airs.

We are in a position to explain the different levels of anger towards scabs in the CUPW membership. Single men were relatively angry because they tended to be active participants in the picket line skirmishes and were angered by this physical aggression.[27] Single and married women were relatively angry because they tended to be angered by the condescending treatment accorded the strikers. However, married men were not angry because (1) they did not tend to be involved in picket line skirmishes; and (2) they were not particularly angered by the condescending airs of management and scabs.

In summary, I have outlined two explanations for the greater anger observed among married women strikers than married men strikers: (1) married women's history of struggle in the labour market and greater job dependence; and (2) married women's tendency to respond to condescending treatment with greater anger than married men. It is likely that both explanations are partially valid, although it must be admitted that the second explanation is largely speculative.

Summary: The Influence of Political Attitudes on Strike Participation

My general finding is that there is considerable elective affinity between particular dimensions of political consciousness and particular strike actions. In multivariate analyses, background political attitudes/identities represented three of the five important

---

[27] The scab buses always crossed the picket line during the periods when afternoon shift and night shift workers were on duty. Workers on these shifts tended to be younger than day shift workers and were less likely to be married.

determinants of Extent of Strike Involvement, two of the six important determinants of Attitudinal Strike Support, and three of the six important determinants of Anger Towards Scabs. Between 36% and 43% of the variation in these three participation dimensions was explained in trimmed multiple regression analyses; much less would have been explained if political attitudes and identities had not been considered. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the Present or Past Leader variable, which was an important determinant of both Extent of Strike Involvement and Attitudinal Strike Support, is actually a proxy for important cleavages in political consciousness in the Hamilton CUPW membership. Thus, the importance of political attitudes and identities in influencing strike participation is actually understated by these quantitative results.

Left/Right Feeling, Working Class Identification and Economic Radicalism each had an important effect on two of the participation dimensions while Authoritarian Individualism and Union Feeling influenced one dimension of participation each. This result demonstrates the importance of considering the multidimensional character of workers' political consciousness. The negative effect of Left/Right Feeling on Extent of Strike Involvement deserves special mention in relation to this point. This finding was unexpected and led me to identify a group of Leftist cynics in the CUPW membership who had limited involvement in the strike. Such an insight would have been missed if only those attitudes I most expected to influence strike participation had been measured.

It is not my intention to exaggerate the influence of political attitudes and identities on strike participation. Obviously, other variables are also important determinants of one or more of the dimensions of strike participation. It must be remembered, however, that past research had suggested numerous contextual factors as the most likely influence on strike participation. Seen in this perspective, the overall importance of underlying political attitudes and identities in the analyses in this chapter is remarkable.

Table 8.1   Summary of Group Mean Comparisons
Involving Strikebreakers

Hypotheses

Political Attitudes	Strikebreakers To Right of CUPW Rank&File	Strikebreakers To Right of National Non-Union Workers
1) Strike Sympathies	Yes*	Yes*
2) General Union Sentiment	Yes*	No
3) Big Business Power	Yes*	No
4) Capitalist Economic Organization	Yes	Yes
5) Authoritarian Traditionalism	Yes	No
6) Welfare Bum	Yes	No
7) Left Self-Identification	Yes	No
Summary	3 Yes* 4 Yes 0 No	1 Yes* 1 Yes 5 No

* Difference between two groups is greater than 0.5 standard deviations

Table 8.2   Summary of Average Individual Consistency
Comparisons Involving Strikebreakers

Hypotheses

Political Attitudes	Strikebreakers More Consistent Than CUPW Rank&File	Strikebreakers More Consistent Than National Non-Union Workers
1) Strike Sympathies	No	No
2) General Union Sentiment	No	Yes
3) Big Business Power	No	Yes
4) Capitalist Economic Organization	No	No
5) Authoritarian Traditionalism	No	No
6) Welfare Bum	No	No
Summary	0 Yes 6 No	2 Yes 4 No

Table 8.3   Social and Economic Background Comparison:
Strikebreakers (1987 CUPW Strike) vs National Non-Union Workers (1984)

Background Variables	Strikebreakers	National Non-Union Workers
1. Age -- % less than 30 years	62	42
2. Education -- % with no post secondary	64	66
3. Marital Status -- % not presently married	76	43
4. Economic		
a) Personal Income -- % less than $10,000	68 (1986)	51 (1983)
b) Family Income -- % less than $15,000	68 (1986)	21 (1983)
c) Dissatisfaction -- % dissatisfied	55	30
d) This Year vs Last -- % believe worse	41	21
e) Unemployment -- % unemployed past year	77	30
5. Union Experience		
-- % with union member in family	46	33

Table 8.4   Associations Between Dimensions of CUPW Members' Strike Participation[a]

	(1)	(2)	(3)	Means	Standard Devns	Scale Range
(1) Attitudinal Strike Support		.47	.33	2.09	.71	1-3
(2) Extent of Strike Involvement	.38		.19	1.76	1.13	0-3
(3) Anger Towards Scabs	.26	.18		2.66	1.18	1-4

[a] Gamma coefficients are above the diagonal, Pearson product-moment correlations below

Table 8.5   Univariate Statistics, Independent Variables,
Analysis of CUPW Members' Strike Participation

A. Political Attitudes

1) Economic Radicalism   Alpha=.63 High/Low=58%/0%.   M=27.34 SD=4.15
2) Authoritarian Individualism (reverse coded) Alpha=.74 High/Low=29%/13%   M=24.47 SD=5.59
3) Non-Participation in Informal Politics   Alpha=.70 High/Low=9%/67%   M=10.2 SD=2.84

B. Political Identities

1) Union Feeling   Alpha=.78 High/Low=40%/0%   M=69.27 SD=13.73
2) Working Class Identification   Working Class/Middle Class=55%/45%   M=3.59   SD=1.37
3) Left/Right Feeling   Alpha=.45 Left/Neutral/Right=42%/36%/22%   M=107.67 SD=32.83
4) Religious Feeling   Alpha=.92 High/Low=31%/20%   M=58.21 SD=30.10

C. Personal Economic Situation

1) Family Income   Above $50,000/Below $36,000=34%/36%   M=44,000 SD=13,400
2) Relative Deserved Deprivation   Deserve More/Deserve The Same=54%/46%   M=.98 SD=1.09
3) Material Dissatisfaction   Dissatisfied/Satisfied=30%/70%   M=2.09   SD=.71

D. General Outlook on Job

1) Expect to Stay at Post Office   Stay/Not Sure/Leave=64%/20%/16%   M=2.86 SD=1.11
2) Could Not Find Comparable Job   Definitely Not/Could Find=30%/35%   M=1.95 SD=.82
3) Job Dissatisfaction   Alpha=.58 High/Low=59%/16%   M=9.07 SD=2.37

E. Response to Strike Issues

1) Personally Hurt/Privatization   Definitely Hurt/Not Hurt=25%/48%   M=2.57 SD=1.09
2) Coworkers Hurt/Privatization   Many Hurt/Few Hurt=35%/30%   M=2.05   SD=.82
3) Union Under Attack   Priority on Group Defence=31%   M=.31   SD=.47
4) Personal Importance of Issues   Very High/High/Moderate=30%/46%/23%   M=53.12 SD=5.62

F. Local Union Involvement/Attitudes

1) Present or Past Leader   Leaders=40%   M=.40   SD=.50
2) Friend of Executive Member   Friends=61%   M=.61 SD=.49
3) General Support for Local Union   Strong/Middle/Weak=49%/44%/7%   M=2.42 SD=.62
4) Best Friends' Union Support   Strong/Moderate/Lower=28%/51%/21%   M=9.58 SD=1.76
5) Years as CUPW Member   Short/Medium/Long=22%/47%/31%   M=10.78 SD=6.02

G. Union Ties Outside Work

1) Family/Friends Support Strike   Supportive/Middle/Not=30%/57%/14%   M=2.82   SD=1.02
2) Family Background Pro-Union   Pro-Union Family=20%   M=.20   SD=.41
3) Family/Friends Union Leaders   Close Relative/Other/Nobody=23%/34%/43%   M=.80 SD=.80

H. Background

1) Woman   Woman=58%   M=.58   SD=.50
2) Family Responsibilities   Single, No Dependents=22.7%   M=.23 SD=.42
3) Age   30 or less/31 to 40/Over 40=23%/52%/25%   M=37.52 SD=9.18
4) Spouse Not Working Class   Spouse Not Working Class=9%   M=.09   SD=.29
5) Education   Univ Deg/Some Post Sec/Finish High/Less=14%/20%/46%/20% M=2.27   SD=.95

Table 8.6 Correlates of CUPW Members' Strike Participation

Independent Variables	Extent of Strike Invlv			Strike Support Attitude			Anger Towards Scabs		
	V	G	r	V	G	r	V	G	r
A. Political Attitudes									
1) Economic Radicalism	.24	.26	.19	.39	.71	.50	.18	.21	.16
2) Authoritarian Individualism	.31	.14	.27	.25	-.07	.02	.33	-.23	-.23
3) Non-Participation in Politics	.20	.00	-.06	.18	-.18	-.13	.25	.15	.05
B. Political Identities									
1) Union Feeling	.22	.26	.20	.32	.52	.39	.22	.17	.14
2) Working Class Identification	.39	.49	.38	.32	.54	.40	.25	.13	.17
3) Left/Right Feeling	.25	-.12	-.06	.19	.32	.24	.30	-.27	-.40
4) Religious Feeling	.15	-.12	-.07	.23	-.34	-.31	.19	.08	.09
C. Personal Economic Situation									
1) Family Income	.17	-.10	-.07	.22	.02	-.01	.15	-.07	-.06
2) Relative Economic Deprivation	.24	.06	.00	.11	-.03	-.03	.28	-.09	-.08
3) Material Dissatisfaction	.27	-.06	-.06	.13	-.22	-.16	.29	-.23	-.18
D. General Outlook on Job									
1) Expect to Stay at Post Office	.21	.15	.11	.21	.13	.10	.32	.21	.23
2) Could Not Find a Comparable Job	.23	-.22	-.17	.20	.14	.09	.20	.23	.19
3) Job Dissatisfaction	.20	-.11	-.06	.21	-.02	.01	.29	-.10	-.08
E. View of Strike Issues									
1) Personally Hurt/Privatization	.38	.25	.25	.19	.00	-.01	.28	.24	.19
2) Coworkers Hurt/Privatization	.28	.16	.17	.22	.37	.28	.35	.24	.21
3) Union Under Attack	.12	xx	-.02	.12	xx	.05	.16	xx	.12
4) Personal Importance of Issues	.26	.02	.02	.13	.04	.15	.15	.03	.08
F. Local Union Involvement/Attitudes									
1) Present or Past Leader	.66	xx	.50	.58	xx	.49	.13	xx	-.11
2) Friend of Executive or Steward	.32	xx	.28	.44	xx	.44	.26	xx	.17
3) General Support for Local Union	.40	.69	.54	.43	.77	.54	.23	.15	.14
4) Best Friends' Union Support	.23	.03	.01	.37	.66	.31	.22	.01	.00
5) Years as CUPW Member	.31	.03	.00	.19	.35	.33	.26	.12	.04
G. Union Ties Outside Work									
1) Family/Friends Support Strike	.30	.27	.21	.25	.22	.15	.24	.13	.14
2) Family Background Pro-Union	.25	xx	-.16	.16	xx	-.15	.27	xx	-.14
3) Family/Friends Union Leaders	.31	-.01	.00	.32	-.13	-.09	.31	.14	.10
H. Social Background									
1) Woman	.28	xx	.01	.15	xx	.05	.38	xx	.37
2) Family -- Single, No Dependents	.05	xx	-.05	.30	xx	-.30	.35	xx	.11
3) Age	.48	-.01	-.12	.15	.20	.14	.22	.12	.13
4) Spouse Not Working Class	.08	xx	-.07	.44	xx	-.27	.24	xx	-.18
5) Education	.28	-.23	-.14	.33	-.44	-.31	.31	-.30	-.25

KEY: V -- Cramer's V (based on Chi-Square)
G -- Gamma (not recorded when the independent variable is a dummy variable)
r -- Pearson's product-moment correlation

Table 8.7   Correlations Between Political Attitudes/Political Identities
and Strike Participation, Controlling for Union Leadership

Independent Variables	Extent of Strike Invlv		Strike Support Attitude		Anger Towards Scabs	
	Partial r	r	Partial r	r	Partial r	r
A. Political Attitudes						
1) Economic Radicalism	-.03	.19	.37	.50	.24	.16
2) Authoritarian Individualism	.17	.27	-.11	.02	-.21	-.23
3) Non-Participation in Politics	.01	-.06	-.08	-.13	.03	.05
B. Political Identities						
1) Union Feeling	.00	.20	.25	.39	.20	.14
2) Working Class Identification	.20	.38	.23	.40	.25	.17
3) Left/Right Feeling	-.35	-.06	.04	.24	-.40	-.40
4) Religious Feeling	.10	-.07	-.20	-.31	.06	.09

Table 8.8   Determinants of the Extent of Strike Involvement

Independent Variables	Initial Analysis		Trimmed Analysis	
	b(SE b)	Beta	b(SE b)	Beta
A. Political Attitudes				
Authoritarian Individualism	.06(.03)	.30	.06(.03)	.31
B. Political Identities				
Working Class Identification	.13(.13)	.15	.13(.12)	.16
Left/Right Feeling	-.02(.01)	-.46	-.02(.01)	-.48
E. View of Strike Issues				
Personally Hurt/Privatization	.02(.17)	.02		
F. Local Union Involvement/Attitudes				
Present or Past Leader	1.2(.42)	.53	1.3(.36)	.55
Friend of Executive or Steward	.09(.37)	.04		
G. Union Ties Outside Work				
Family/Friends Support Strike	.14(.16)	.13	.15(.15)	.13
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.48(.35)		.47(.39)	

Table 8.9   Determinants of Strike Support Attitude

Independent Variables	Initial Analysis b(SE b)	Beta	Trimmed Analysis b(SE b)	Beta
A. Political Attitudes				
Economic Radicalism	.03(.03)	.17	.04(.03)	.24
B. Political Identities				
Union Feeling	.01(.01)	.16	.01(.01)	.16
Religious Feeling	.00(.00)	-.12		
Working Class Identification	.05(.09)	.09		
E. View of Strike Issues				
Coworkers Hurt/Privatization	.08(.13)	.09		
F. Local Union Involvement/Attitudes				
Present or Past Leader	.25(.26)	.17	.39(.21)	.27
Best Friends' Union Support	.07(.06)	.17	.07(.06)	.17
Years as CUPW Member	.00(.02)	.01		
H. Social Background				
Single, No Dependents	-.39(.25)	-.24	-.45(.23)	-.27
Spouse Not Working Class	-.61(.38)	-.25	-.74(.33)	-.30
Education	-.09(.13)	-.11		
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.56(.36)		.53(.43)	

Table 8.10   Determinants of Anger Towards Scabs

Independent Variables	Initial Analysis b(SE b)	Beta	Trimmed Analysis b(SE b)	Beta
A. Political Attitudes				
Economic Radicalism	.12(.07)	.41	.09(.04)	.32
Authoritarian Individualism	-.04(.05)	-.17		
B. Political Identities				
Union Feeling	.00(.02)	.03		
Working Class Identification	.19(.16)	.22	.20(.12)	.23
Left/Right Feeling	-.01(.01)	-.34	-.01(.01)	-.38
D. General Outlook on Job				
Expect to Stay at Post Office	-.06(.21)	-.06		
Could Not Find a Comparable Job	-.06(.32)	-.04		
E. View of Strike Issues				
Coworkers Hurt/Privatization	.16(.26)	.11		
H. Social Background				
Woman	1.4(.61)	.59	1.3(.44)	.55
Not Married	1.5(.71)	.64	1.3(.52)	.55
Interaction (Woman, Not Married)	-1.7(.91)	-.65	-1.5(.68)	-.57
Education	.15(.27)	.12		
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.51(.21)		.47(.37)	

CHAPTER 9: THREE MONTHS DOWN THE ROAD -- HOW THE STRIKE INFLUENCED THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF DIFFERENT GROUPS OF CUPW MEMBERS

This is the third chapter in a row where I undertake a detailed examination of the relationship between workers' political consciousness and action.

In Chapter 7, I outlined how Hamilton CUPW members' ongoing participation in workplace and strike struggles has resulted in a distribution of political consciousness which is on the Left in comparison with other unionized Canadian workers. But political consciousness and social action are united in a dialectical process. Thus, if from one perspective we can see consciousness as an outcome of workers' struggles, from another perspective we can see it as a basis for action. With this in mind, in Chapter 8 I considered how variations in CUPW members' background political attitudes and identities influenced their participation in the 1987 strike. The differences in logic between the two previous chapters, however, are not confined to which side of the consciousness/action relationship is given causal priority. In addition there are differences in unit of analysis and time frame. Chapter 7 focussed on group variations in political consciousness which are assumed to be the result of extended periods of working class action. Chapter 8 looked at how an individual's underlying political attitudes and identities influence participation during a 17-day strike.

My intention in this chapter is to go some way towards bridging the gap between the logic of study found in the two previous chapters. The individual is the sole unit of analysis, but the time frame is extended to a point approximately three months after CUPW members were ordered back to work. Most importantly, I study the dynamic character of relations between action and consciousness: short-term changes in an individual's attitudes are modelled as being determined by both an individual's initial political consciousness and social action during the strike.

STUDY BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Summary of Previous Research Findings

Very few studies have attempted to assess systematically the effects of a strike on the attitudes of workers. As a consequence, research findings usually amount to general characterizations of the orientation of a workforce in the period after a strike (Kelly and Nicholson, 1980:876). As guidance for this study, such character-izations are of limited utility. This is mainly the case because attitudinal variations between individual workers are ignored. At the same time, even a cursory review of a number of these characterizations makes clear a very important point: the way in which a strike affects workers' attitudes depends very much on the type of strike it is. Workers' attitudes coming out of the strike will be influenced by their views on the legitimacy of the strike action; by the posture the employer takes towards the strike; by the actions workers engage in to maintain the strike and the relationships developed out of those

actions; by the circumstances leading to the strike's ending; and by the material results of the strike action.[1] I will illustrate this general point by briefly discussing three different studies of strikes by employees of the Ford Motor Company.

The first study examines the strike by Ford workers in Britain in February and March, 1969. The strike was in opposition to a contract demand by Ford that supplemental pay during lay offs and an enlarged holiday bonus would only be paid in plants where workers did not wildcat strike, engage in work slowdowns, or ban overtime (Beynon, 1984:253). Support for the strike in Liverpool was almost complete (Beynon, 1984:248). National union leaders eventually reached an agreement to end the strike which lessened the financial impact of, but did not eliminate, the plant-wide penalty clauses demanded by Ford. The Liverpool workers weren't happy with the agreement, but they went back to work in a proud and defiant mood. In the words of a union activist, "We were going back united into that plant.... We knew that we had given them a real fight" (quoted in Beynon, 1984:286). On the shopfloor after the strike the workers were militant, "indulging in any and every 'unconstitutional' practice to ensure that the plant was disqualified each week" from receiving a good behaviour bonus (Beynon, 1984:286). The way this strike developed and ended thus caused a great many workers' to be more anti-management than before the strike.

---

[1] In organizing my thinking on this question, the integrated model of strike causation and processes suggested by Kelly and Nicholson (1980:871) was a useful reference.

The second study is concerned with the strike by members of the United Auto Workers (UAW) against Ford in North America in September, 1976 (Stagner and Eflal, 1982). Probability samples of workers in three Ford locals in the United States were surveyed before, during, just after, and seven months after the strike. Trends in the attitudes of Ford workers were compared to the trends in the attitudes of UAW members at Chrysler and GM plants who were surveyed at the same times although they did not strike. During the strike, the Ford workers expressed more attitudinal militancy towards their employer and indicated a greater willingness to participate in their union than non-striking UAW members (Stagner and Eflal, 1982:41-42). Less than a month after the strike's conclusion, however, the Ford workers could no longer be distinguished from non-striking autoworkers on either measure. Therefore, the circumstances of this strike seem to have had no major impact on workers' poststrike attitudes.

The third study is of a major wildcat strike at Ford's Oakville, Ontario car and truck assembly plants in the summer of 1977. It began when 150 workers in a section of the car plant, unhappy with the firing of two coworkers, refused to go back to work after a break (Wells, 1984:240). Before the end of their shift the company had rehired the fired workers (1984:246), but the strikers refused to return to work unless the company agreed that there would be no disciplinary action taken against the wildcatters. The company refused. On the next two days the original wildcatters paraded through first the car and then the truck plants, getting hundreds of workers to join their protest. They were enthralled by the sense of collective power unleashed by the

rebellion (1984:249) and rejected the appeals of the local union leadership to return to work (1984:250). The wildcat fizzled out on the fourth day, however, without any concessions from the company. Worried about being fired, many individuals drifted back to work. This isolated the original rebels and forced them to return as well. By the end of the shift the company had fired 15 and handed out long suspensions to others for their involvement in the wildcat. Activists were cowed by the company's punishing action and militancy was moderated and limited in scope following the strike (1984:253-261). The wildcat's unhappy ending "reinforced a sense of fatalism and individualism" amongst workers (Wells, 1984:xiii).

These three studies show that different types of strikes have sharply different effects on workers' attitudes in the poststrike period. To get some clues as to how CUPW members' attitudes will be affected by their 1987 strike, it is imperative to examine research on strikes which share some crucial similarities. For instance, there are important parallels between the strike at Ford in Liverpool in 1969 and the CUPW strike in Hamilton in 1987: in each case the employer provoked the strike by making contract demands which were aimed at weakening the power of the union; the two workforces were united in their strike efforts; and workers returned to work in each case dissatisfied with the practical outcome of their strike. Given these parallels, I expect to find some of the same poststrike militancy among Hamilton postal workers which existed at Ford in Liverpool in 1969.

I am fortunate that one of the few systematic studies of workers' attitudes following a strike deals with a set of circumstances

which also have important parallels to the 1987 CUPW strike. In 1951, about 125 workers at a clothing factory in a town in Wisconsin went on strike to secure a first contract. Twenty-nine of their coworkers continued to work throughout the four month-long dispute. Researchers interviewed over 50 of the workers involved in the strike shortly after its conclusion along with union and company officials and other members of the community. A less systematic follow-up round of conversations was conducted four years later. The research is reported in an absorbing but mistitled monograph, Diary of a Strike (Karsh, 1958). In addition to the employer's use of scabs, the Wisconsin clothing factory strike and 1987 CUPW strike in Hamilton are similar in two important ways: (1) the workforces had never before experienced picket line confrontations; and (2) the workforces were of a similar modest size, meaning that the dynamics of picket line confrontation were similar.[2]

It must be acknowledged that there are many differences between the two strikes. The major ones are: (1) over 35 years separate the strikes; (2) the strike by Hamilton CUPW members was part of a national public sector strike which had important national ramifications, while the strike in Wisconsin was against a relatively small local company and did not have an impact beyond the local area; (3) the Hamilton strike was part of the eighth national strike by Canada's inside postal workers

---

[2] About 125 workers were on strike at the Wisconsin clothing factory. The Hamilton CUPW membership numbered 350. However, the postal workers were spread between two main processing facilities and numerous postal stations. Furthermore, the processing operations were operated 24 hours a day during the week. This meant that picketers had to be split into shifts at the Main Post Office. These factors diffused the efforts of the Hamilton CUPW local, and they were never able to put any more than about 75 people on a picket line at one time.

who had been unionized for over 20 years, while the Wisconsin strike was a struggle for a first contract. However, despite these important differences in context, the battle to stop scabs from entering the workplace makes workers' picket line experiences very similar in the two strikes.

The analysis of the clothing factory workers' poststrike attitudes provides some clues as to what to expect in this study. First, immediately after the strike, as a result of their common struggle on the picket line, the majority of strikers felt very friendly and close to their fellow workers (Karsh, 1958:139). This ingroup intimacy was an important component of a new understanding of and commitment to unionism. As one worker put it: "I really don't think we had a union, not much of it anyway, before the strike. We became one with the strike, and we got stronger throughout" (1958:143). The workers' new commitment to their union was also grounded on a clear identification of outgroups: the scabs, the factory owner and his family, and factory supervisors were all defined as outgroups in the period right after the strike.

The extent to which the conflictive relations of the picket line were later carried over to the shopfloor was an important feature of the clothing factory strike. In 1955 a union activist noted that, as a consequence of the 1951 strike, "the girls fight back a lot more than they used to" in dealings with supervisors (1958:157). At the same time, considerable accommodation between conflicting groups took place. Right after the strike, local union leaders were less inclined to cling to their resentments against the scabs than other workers, and instead

emphasized the need to unite the workforce (1958:137). Four years later, the scabs were no longer a clearly defined outgroup; many, in fact, were among the most eager union members (1958:155). At that time, Bernard Karsh also found that some of the most militant strikers had quit their jobs. A local union leader believed this was because they were unable to adjust to the accommodations of the poststrike period: "They didn't want to forget the strike and stop fighting. So they quit" (1958:159).

In sum, Karsh's study points to the importance of considering both worker-to-worker and worker-to-management relations in the poststrike Hamilton Post Office. Specific attention should be focussed on the extent to which different workers carry over or set aside the conflictive intergroup relations of the strike. I can put this last point in the form of a question: for just how many CUPW members in Hamilton did "the struggle continue"?

Study Objectives

The first objective in this chapter is to describe the ways in which the strike affected the beliefs and feelings of CUPW members. The data reported here is uncommon in two ways. First, short-term change in a number of different attitudes is systematically described. Second, special attention is paid to the variation in attitude change amongst the union members.

The second objective of the chapter is to explain the variations in short-term attitude change. Strike participation, underlying political attitudes and identities, and some of the other background and

contextual variables introduced in the last chapter are considered as potential determinants of attitude change.

CHANGES IN CUPW MEMBERS' ATTITUDES

Included in the second interview with CUPW members were two sets of items which measured short-term attitude change. The first set asked an individual to subjectively evaluate the existence and extent of attitude change. The first question in this set was open-ended (item j1 in Appendix 7). A second question asked for an overall evaluation of the extent of attitude change but did not provide a referent for the evaluation (item j2). Seven other questions asked whether an individual's attitudes towards different groups involved in the strike (e.g., the union local, Canada Post management in Hamilton, the police) had become more positive, more negative, or remained the same (items j3 to j9, each measured on a 5 point scale). Groups were included in the list if they had been important participants in the strike and the subject of at least a certain amount of picket line conversation.

The second set of items measure attitude change in a different way. Since they refer to outcomes of the strike, these items measure attitudes which must be newly formed. I asked whether CUPW and its members had gained anything from the strike (item m8), and followed that up with an open-ended question on what had been gained (item m9). Another question asked whether a respondent held out much hope that Judge Cossette's arbitration settlement would be favourable to postal workers (item r10). Finally, each respondent was requested to use a 5 point discouraged/optimistic scale to rate their current level of

discouragement "about the situation postal workers find themselves in at present" (item r11) and then, in an open-ended question, s/he was asked to explain what, if anything, made her/him optimistic or discouraged at the present time (item r12).

The General Sense of Attitude Change

Thirty-two percent of the sample described the extent of their change in attitudes due to the strike as major, 30% reported moderate changes, 20% minor changes and 18% not much change at all. Thus, there is considerable variation on this item in the sample. In the next section I will identify the bases for this variation.

Answers on the open-ended question on attitude change were grouped into four categories.[3] Twenty-three percent indicated that their attitudes hadn't changed. Nine percent reported a personal change. These included making a renewed commitment to pursuing an education, feeling greater personal confidence and feeling exhausted. A residual category representing 36% of the sample mentioned changes in a wide variety of political attitudes. For instance, 7% had lost respect for the police and an equal percentage said they learned about the hard side of management. The final category, amounting to 32% of the sample, mentioned a distinct change in their on-the-job attitude. The basis of the change was a loss of respect for and tolerance of Canada Post management because of their approach to negotiations and the strike. Most of the individuals in this category mentioned that since the strike, they had stopped putting themselves out on the job. "I'm not

---

[3] Only the answer first mentioned by each participant is analyzed here.

doing anything extra on the job," reported one person. "I'm doing what it takes to stay out of trouble, but I'm not doing anything to make the Post Office look good." Using identical concepts, another worker noted: "I go in, do my time, then get out. I never do any extra." A wicket clerk remarked that the events of the strike had "stripped my pride away from the job. I still help my customers, but my loyalty to the corporation is zero." Feeling the same way, a fourth worker said she is "trying very hard to be apathetic at work. I am doing my job and trying not to let things bother me anymore." There was but one sort of variation on this refrain: two of the individuals who also had a new bitterness towards Canada Post reported feeling angrier at events in the workplace.

A few of the workers who indicated a changed on-the-job attitude also mentioned that they had previously contemplated working in a supervisory capacity for Canada Post. However, they all rejected this possibility now. One of them informed me that "people who have been involved in supervisory competitions in the past don't want anything to do with them now."

In the course of interviewing I was impressed by the forcefulness and conviction of the answers on attitude change provided by those reporting a changed on-the-job attitude. Indeed, all in this category of union member said there had been moderate or major changes in their attitudes. In comparison, only 63% of those reporting a change in political attitudes and only 50% of those reporting a personal change said that there had been moderate or major changes in their attitudes. As recorded in Table 9.1, the correlation between Extent of Attitude

Change and the dummy variable indicating an On-the-Job Attitude Change is a sizeable .47.

Changes in Attitudes Towards Groups Involved in the Strike

I begin this lengthy subsection by providing a quantitative overview of changes in attitudes towards groups involved in the strike. I then present a detailed account of attitude change towards specific groups by analyzing comments made by CUPW members.

In Table 9.2 I have conceptually divided seven groups involved in the strike into two categories: anti-worker and pro-worker. In the first category are: local CUPW management, the police, and the federal Progressive Conservative government. In the second category are: the local union, fellow workers, the labour movement, and Jean-Claude Parrot and the National CUPW. My general expectation was that CUPW members would tend to feel more positive towards pro-worker groups and more negative towards anti-worker groups as a consequence of their experiences in the strike. Based upon the criticisms passed on to me by a few union leaders,[4] I also expected some individuals to report being more negative towards the National CUPW, although I had no idea of how widespread this point of view would be.[5]

Three main patterns of frequency distribution are evident in Table 9.2. First, for each of the three groups in the anti-worker category, a majority of respondents indicated being more negative in

---

[4] I outline and discuss these criticisms of the National CUPW later in this chapter and in Chapter 10.

[5] Attitude change in a positive direction was scored high in the case of pro-worker groups and attitude change in a negative direction was scored high in the case of anti-worker groups.

attitude, about a third indicated no change, and not a single person reported being more positive in attitude. Second, for "Fellow Workers", a greater number of respondents were more positive in attitude than unchanged, with only a token percentage being more negative in attitude. Third, for the other three groups in the pro-worker category, a majority of respondents were unchanged in attitude. Two subpatterns are contained within the third main pattern of frequency distribution. In regard to the "Local Union" and the "Labour Movement", only a token percentage of respondents were more negative in attitude, while 30% in each case were more positive. This pattern is reversed for "J.C. Parrot/National CUPW": only a token percentage were more positive in attitude while 23% were more negative.

I also factor analyzed the intercorrelations between these seven items, since I suspected that they indicated either two or three underlying dimensions of attitude change. My objective was to construct summated index indicators of underlying dimensions where possible, so as to streamline later data analyses. I hypothesized that attitude change towards Jean-Claude Parrot and the National CUPW would be uncorrelated with the other items. I then hypothesized that either: (1) the six remaining items indicated a single dimension of attitude change (so that feeling more positive about a group in the pro-worker category went along with feeling more negative about a group in the anti-worker category, and vice versa); or (2) the three items in the anti-worker category indicated one dimension of attitude change and the three remaining items in the pro-worker category indicated another.

Three factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1 were extracted using the principal axis method; together they explained 46% of the variance in the seven items. The factor pattern matrix, rotated using the oblimin method contained in SPSSX, is reported in Table 9.3. Based upon the results of this factor analysis I decided to construct two summated indexes. The first, titled Union Attitude Change index, was formed by adding the scores on Local Union, Fellow Workers and Labour Movement (alpha reliability = .66) The second, titled Authority Attitude Change index, was formed by adding the scores on Local Management and Police (alpha reliability = .54). The item measuring attitude change towards the federal PC government had moderate positive loadings on both the first and second factors; it is thus considered separately in further analyses. Also analyzed separately is the item measuring attitude change towards J.C. Parrot and the National CUPW, which loaded positively on the third factor. Note, however, that the Local Union item loaded negatively on this factor. This indicates a tendency for those reporting a positive attitude change towards the local union to report a negative attitude change towards the national union (Pearson correlation between these two variables = -.24). This reflects the fact that a number of Hamilton CUPW leaders came out of the strike with more positive feelings for the local union and more negative feelings for the national union.

The first and second factors recorded in Table 9.3 have a small negative correlation (r=-.09). As well, the Union Attitude Change index is negatively correlated with the Authority Attitude Change index (r= -.24; see Table 9.1). This means that those more negative in attitude

towards authority tend <u>not</u> to be those more positive in attitude towards unions. I discuss this finding later in the chapter.

1. Changes in Attitude Towards Local Management

In the year preceding the strike, the attitudes of many CUPW members in Hamilton soured towards local management. There were two types of disenchantment: the disenchantment of the union defender, and the disenchantment of the conciliator. Union defenders were frustrated with the increasing abuses of the collective agreement by local management and by the decline in respect for the power of the local union shown by management. Conciliators lamented the breaking down of relations of mutual respect between local management and the workforce, and the phasing out of local arrangements which had made the Hamilton Post Office a relatively pleasant place in which to work. Many CUPW members, including union leaders, mixed these two types of disenchantment when discussing their criticisms of local management. I sensed, however, that conciliator disenchantment fueled a large proportion of the strongest and most bitter appraisals. Many CUPW workers believed that the Hamilton Post Office had been an oasis in the desert of bad workplaces which made up Canada Post. Now this oasis was drying up, and they placed the blame for this marked change in the labour-management environment solely at the feet of management.

One point of clarification needs to be made before proceeding. I analyze workers' frustrations with local management in the prestrike period here because I believe that negative attitudes towards local management formed during the strike were often an extension of prior disenchantment.

Criticisms of local management's actions in the prestrike period centred on two main issues. The first is the most important: the recently appointed managers of mail processing and wicket services at the Main Post Office were not widely respected. Both men were seen as keen on implementing directives from above without regard for the concerns of workers or any informal local agreements previously in effect in the Hamilton Post Office. Hamilton workers lost in two ways as a result of their approach to managing: (1) some objectionable formal methods of work organization and scheduling were introduced in this period which, although common in other cities, had previously been withheld from Hamilton; and (2) management grew less tolerant of the longstanding pattern whereby workers would take it easy when the mail volume was light as long as they worked hard when the mail volume was heavy.

Some examples will illustrate the kind of changes on the workfloor in the Hamilton Post Office in the prestrike year. First, for regular-sized letters, sorting cases organized by postal code replaced old cases organized according to geographical area. This new system shifted hand sorting of mail from a task with some interest to an almost mindless task: no longer were the prodigious memories of many postal clerks an integral part of the hand sorting labour process. Second, an hourly rest break for coders working at the Group Desk Suite was cut back. For over a decade CUPW members in Hamilton who were coding had been given a 10 minute break every hour where they were free to leave the "mech room" and do what they wanted. In 1986, however, this traditional practice was eliminated by the new manager of mail

processing. Instead, coders were relieved for five minutes every hour but were required to do an alternative job in the "mech room" during that time. Third, a new shift schedule for afternoon shift workers was introduced. It meant that these workers would get two days off in a row only every third week, whereas previously they had had every Saturday and Sunday off.

Considerable dissatisfaction with the policies of the wicket services manager was also much in evidence in the prestrike period. The gist of the criticism was that he meddled and interfered where past managers had given wicket clerks a much freer hand. As a result, two long-term wicket clerks transferred back to processing jobs to get away from him. As well, I was told that most of the wicket clerks at the Main Post Office applied for two retirement vacancies which opened up on October 5, 1987 at the Postal Station in Westdale.

According to a number of workers, the state of top-level management in the Hamilton Post Office went from good to abysmal in the year preceding the strike. As late as the autumn of 1986, conciliatory workers were willing to wear management-sponsored buttons that said, in reference to the Hamilton Post Office, "WE'RE NOT THE BIGGEST BUT WE'RE THE BEST." One of those workers told me a few days before the strike, "Now the place has gone to hell. Management doesn't give a damn about workers or about the mail." A sizeable proportion of the workers who were conciliatory with the previous management in Hamilton, therefore, had dramatically turned against this new management in the immediate prestrike period. Much like the traditionalist rebels in the wildcat strike studied by Alvin Gouldner in 1950 (1954:62-63), these individuals

were frustrated by the passing of relations of trust and respect and the phasing out of relatively comfortable local arrangements.

Over and over again in the fall of 1987 I heard criticisms of the top Canada Post managers in Hamilton. Often I asked union members why they thought things had gone so far downhill. Many focussed their criticisms at the individual level or talked about the malaise of incompetence which pervades the Canada Post management hierarchy. In actuality, however, I believe there were two factors at work, the first somewhat hidden from view, the second on display for every inside postal worker to observe.

First, Hamilton managers were implementing a corporate strategy designed to run down wicket services as a prelude to privatization, work around important sections of the collective agreement with CUPW, and become obstructionist in dealings with the union. Many of their actions were, no doubt, shots called from above. Thus, the respect, trust and local arrangements so liked by conciliators among CUPW members were destroyed in the context of a concerted corporate campaign to weaken the union.

Second, in comparison to people who had preceded them, the mail processing and wicket services managers were genuinely incompetent, mismanaging both resources and people. Had they been sensitive to worker/management traditions in the Hamilton Post Office, they would have strived to maintain enough of that tradition to appease conciliators among the CUPW membership. Such an approach would have somewhat weakened union oppositional efforts and, more importantly, would have kept the conciliator workers happy and productive. That the

mail processing manager was a failure in his job was proven just after the strike. Canada Post demoted him all the way down to a job supervising the handful of mechanics in the Hamilton Post Office.

Even though there were two major factors underlying changes in management practices in Hamilton in the prestrike period, individual managers' shortcomings were the more obvious problem and thus more salient for many workers. The disrespect CUPW members had developed for the mail processing and wicket services managers at the Main Post Office in 1986-87 meant that every action of these individuals was critically scrutinized during the strike. Given their central roles in the dispute and their own proven incompetence, it is not surprising that workers found the managers' actions wanting. Two examples illustrate this point. The first came to my attention during an interview. In answering the open-ended question on attitude change because of the strike, one worker bitterly said that she hadn't been able to forget the mail processing manager laughing when a CUPW member was kicked in the back during a picket line scuffle. This was her enduring image of the strike.

The second example concerns the October 2 meeting between Hamilton Canada Post managers and a group of day shift workers who were demanding to know why they weren't being allowed to return to work. Neither the wicket services manager nor mail processing manager would provide workers with a straightforward answer to their insistent query on the morning of October 2. They took two different approaches, however. The wicket services manager played a game. He handed the wicket clerks among the group of workers a three sentence document which

claimed that they were still on strike. The basis for his claim was that the Hamilton local's executive had yet to officially inform his facility, i.e. wicket services at the Main Post Office, that the strike was over. Of course, he knew the one-day rotating strike in Hamilton had been over for 10 hours and that the union executive had communicated, in writing, the intention of the membership to return to work to the top Canada Post official present at the Main Post Office the previous evening. It just so happened that this top official, the mail processing manager, was standing beside him at that very moment. But his stalling game was to stick with this ad hoc rule on how to end a rotating strike: the strike was still on in wickets because this facility hadn't been officially notified otherwise. And once officially notified of CUPW members' intent to return to work in wicket services, he wrote, "Canada Post will fix the time and date" for their return. The workers were somewhat irritated by this runaround but happy to get the wicket services manager's position in writing. They insisted that he or someone else sign and date the document; he refused. Meanwhile, the mail processing manager could hardly claim that the strike was still on given the letter from the local union he had been hand delivered the previous evening. He simply told workers that they would be "duly informed" when they were to return to work. The mail processing manager also refused to put anything he said in writing.

In observing this encounter between local management and determined workers, I was struck by the absence of candour and straightforwardness in the comments of the local managers. Any workers in the group who still held a conciliatory perspective would have been

bitterly disappointed with the encounter: no respect for workers' concerns was evident in the cuteness and formalism which respectively characterized the replies of the wicket services and mail processing managers.

The second focus of workers' criticisms of local management in 1986-87 centred on the abusive conduct of a couple of front line supervisors who had recently arrived in Hamilton. The supervisory style of the most odious of these individuals can be illustrated by the disciplinary record of one CUPW member. In one year under this individual's supervision, the CUPW member reported being disciplined on 16 separate occasions. In 10 previous years of service he had only been disciplined once. There are countless other stories which evidence the destructive approach taken by this particular supervisor in relations with union members: he was infamous even among workers who had had no personal contact with him. His presence in the Hamilton Post Office, whether intentional or happenstance,[6] definitely turned a surprisingly wide section of the CUPW membership against local Canada Post management, and, by extension, the corporation as a whole. In October, 1987 the same union member who had been disciplined 16 times told me that up until early 1987 he had fully intended to continue working in

---

[6] I was told that this individual had been employed as a supervisor by both Irwin Toy and Hallmark Greeting Cards at the time of high profile Toronto strikes over the past decade. More recently, he had been employed at the Gateway mail processing plant in Toronto where, the story goes, workers drove him out of the plant. Some Hamilton CUPW leaders insinuated that this individual was a professional agitator, employed by corporations which wanted to provoke a workforce in order to guarantee strike action. I do not have any evidence which would either confirm or deny this contention.

the Post Office until he retired. But his own problems with the odious supervisor led him to infer that "that type of confrontational supervisor is the type of supervisor of the future in Canada Post". In response to this conclusion he initiated plans to go into another line of work. For a number of other workers, hassles with the confrontational supervisors were also a bitter backdrop to the strike.

Therefore, due to two main factors, many CUPW members had become more negative in attitude towards local management in the year preceding the strike. My argument is that, in many cases, frustration about the policies of the new local managers or bitterness about the confrontational style of a couple of abusive supervisors spilled over into union members' evaluations of local management's actions during the strike.

During the strike I also noted two types of incidents which inevitably sparked negative comments from workers towards local management.

First, a few supervisors performing non-supervisory jobs during the strike did so with an enthusiasm which was apparently quite uncharacteristic. When workers saw evidence of this on the loading docks, they became angry, as they had with scabs who taunted them. Second, supervisors who were renegades from the union cause and did non-supervisory work during the strike bore the brunt of a special animosity from CUPW members. One such frontline supervisor had been a Sergeant-at-Arms on the Hamilton local's executive before switching over to management. Another supervisor in this category had also been a CUPW member at one time. While a postal clerk he had been fired, and workers

had engaged in a wildcat strike to get his job back. There was a lingering sense of betrayal among many CUPW members about his decision to join management -- it came to the fore whenever he was observed doing their work during the strike. The third renegade supervisor was a regular driver of shuttle trucks through the picket line at all hours of the day and night. He was held in contempt because he was the son of the president of the Hamilton local of the Letter Carriers.

2. Changes in Attitude Towards the Police

The Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police, unlike the local Canada Post management, are not involved in the normal course of postal operations. Consequently, there is no prestrike history of postal worker/police relations to report: any changes in workers' attitudes towards the police are a function of intergroup conflict on the picket line in conjunction with individual expectations concerning police behaviour.

A minority of union members reported that their attitudes towards the police were unchanged. Many in this unchanged category indicated that their initial negative impressions of the police had been confirmed. "I always knew what the police were like," commented one worker. But others with initial favourable impressions of the police were also among the unchanged. In their view the police had a job to do in the strike just like workers or management. Thus, the police could not be faulted for playing the anti-union role they did in the strike -- it was all part of what was expected of them. Within the confines of this role, the police's actions were judged as acceptable. "All in all

the police acted pretty responsibly," was the assessment of one male worker with this perspective.

Two types of comments were made by workers whose attitudes towards the police became more negative. Many focussed on the rough treatment meted out on the picket line, especially to women. In their eyes, it was unconscionable that some of the cops seemed to be enjoying the dirty job they were doing. For some other strikers, the actions of the police in the strike prompted a more fundamental change in viewpoint: their highly favourable attitude towards the police had been shattered. Said one union member after reporting that her attitude towards the police was considerably more negative, "I'm really surprised by that since I've always respected the police for the job they do." Another commented, "I'd never had any direct dealing with the police before, but I always thought they were good guys. But in this strike they were led by a goon." A third CUPW member noted that she'd always been very law abiding. "I believe the police should have been protecting us on the picket line, and the police spokesman said that this was their job. In fact, a number of cops were really rough, especially on women. Because of the discrepancy between what the police said they were going to do and what they did, I've lost my trust in people in authority."

3. Changes in Attitude Towards the Federal PC Government

When I asked one worker whether his attitude towards the federal Progressive Conservative government was more positive, more negative or about the same as a result of the strike, he chuckled and responded with a play on words: "Put me down as positive. I'm still pretty positive

that they're rotten bastards." The idea of a postal worker feeling more positive towards the federal PC government in the sense I intended clearly struck him as slightly absurd. His coworkers shared this view.

In his conciliation report of September 1987, Claude Foisy noted that CUPW "regards Canada Post as a government agency, and the arguments put forward to substantiate its positions are directed more often than not to the Government of Canada rather than to an independent corporation which espouses the view that it has been given responsibility for running the operation like a private business" (p.3). Like their national negotiators, the Hamilton membership viewed the federal PC government as the prime force guiding Canada Post's business objectives and strike strategy. The workers widely believed that they were political targets in this conflict and that their resistance had an important political dimension. On the picket line and in interviews, a number of people were almost as eager to talk about the implications of the just-negotiated U.S-Canada Free Trade Deal as their own strike. Their experience with the federal PC government had been an impetus for them to look more critically at other aspects of the Tory political agenda. Indeed, Lenin's description of the effects of a strike on workers' political consciousness (see Chapter 7) are a good guide to the experiences of many Hamilton CUPW members.

Amongst those union members who grew more negative in attitude towards the federal PC government, two types stood out: (1) individuals who had been uninterested in politics before; and (2) former Tories. The first type was more common and was represented by younger people. The events of 1987, culminating in the strike, represented a political

awakening. A number told me that they had started to follow politics more. They were also uniformly critical of the federal PC government's policies. One of them said: "I'm more concerned now about the direction the country is going in. It seems that Big Business and Mulroney would prefer to see most of us working parttime in the future -- maybe holding down two 4-hour-a-day jobs with no benefits or breaks. It makes me wonder where the country is going to be by the turn of the century."

The strike even shook up the political allegiances of an older worker hired since the 1981 strike who described herself as "a Conservative from way back". As an illustration of how a change in material circumstances and access to political information can change long-held political party sympathies, her story is fascinating.

> My family were all Conservatives, but I'll never vote
> for them again. I heard every word of the back-to-work
> debate on TV. It was depressing how cut and dried it
> was. The government -- Harvie Andre and the other
> Conservatives -- put us down time and again. What they
> were saying was absolute nonsense -- just window
> dressing for what they wanted to do anyway. But I
> respected what the NDP and Liberals were saying.

4. Changes in Attitudes Towards Fellow Workers

An obvious result of the strike was a new found sense of togetherness among many workers which was built on the picket line. However, given the cohesion between workers that Karsh (1958) had found shortly after a strike which also involved picket line confrontations, and given the group cohesion I observed on the CUPW picket line, I was somewhat surprised that only half of the sample reported feeling more positive towards fellow workers. The split between union members on this item is an important one. I investigate its bases later in this

chapter. At this point I will report the opinions of both those who felt more positive and those who felt more negative towards fellow workers.

I could not help but notice that union leaders were prominent among those reporting more positive feelings towards fellow workers. On a number of separate occasions, union executive officers and stewards told me that they had never been so proud of the Hamilton membership. It seems as if those active in the union had relatively low expectations concerning how many members would be willing to put their bodies on the line. They were thus pleasantly surprised when many members who were normally middle-of-the-road and even weak union supporters were solid picketers.

A number of the rank-and-file also reported feeling more positive towards fellow workers. "With the people we were with on the picket line, it's more like a family," is the way one described her feelings in January, 1988. A second talked about feeling a kinship with fellow workers who were now "like brothers and sisters". There were two foundations for the development of workers' sense of group belongingness. First, they were impressed with the courage and commitment of their coworkers on the picket line. Second, they had the opportunity to talk to and get to know many coworkers during the course of the strike.

It is important to realize that much of what happened on the picket line at the Hamilton Post Office was only important at a symbolic

level.[7] The picket line was a symbol of the group unity of CUPW members in Hamilton. In the long run it was not important how many buses or trucks they turned away during the strike; it was only important that they fought the good fight as a group and were not intimidated by either Canada Post or the police. One worker noted that the strike showed him a new side to the people he works with. "People stood up for what they believed in.... We came together, not as a union but as a group of people." A veteran union leader recognized the importance of the coming together of people for CUPW when he commented, "It's like the rebirth of the union." For a veteran rank-and-filer the strike reinforced this group conception: "We stick together — that's the thing which sets CUPW people apart."

The struggle and camaraderie of the picket line brought many workers closer together. It seemed to instantaneously break down barriers to communication. The new spirit of friendship between workers was still evident three months after the strike's conclusion. New employees mentioned how much better they had been able to get to know coworkers on the picket line than while immersed in the daily routine of working. A Post Office veteran with 25 years of seniority reported that the strike gave him a chance to meet and get friendly with workers on other shifts. Old grudges among union leaders dating back to some internecine union election campaigns in the early 1980s were largely set aside. Suspicions veterans had about the union commitment of younger

---

[7] But there was one important non-symbolic effect: media representation and public perceptions of the strike were influenced by what happened on the Hamilton picket line.

workers were laid to rest. And for the first time in years, CUPW and LCUC members who worked in the same areas of the Post Office were friendly with each other (based on the fact that both groups went through difficult struggles in 1987). "We're not fighting amongst ourselves anymore," explained a CUPW member who described how LCUC members would regularly wave or stop and chat with her. "At the time of the 1981 strike, the drivers and carriers would just laugh at us. But now we know who the enemy is."

One CUPW member reported developing a sense of togetherness with her coworkers which was out of step with her past practice. Her feeling of kinship for them was quite a surprise to her. "I'm not usually like that, " she explained. "I pick and choose my friends and am basically pretty intolerant of stupidity. But the strike has changed me a lot. It's made me more tolerant of fellow workers. I thought some of the people were dummies before, but now I'm more understanding; I can see their side on things." This sense of togetherness between workers changed the quality of their working relations: "On our shift we're all a pretty tight knit group -- we rely on each other to get jobs done and we're more interested in each other." A worker on another shift also reported a new standard of worker cooperation after the strike: "We're still working together as a unit even though management has been doing its best to divide us."

There was a minor counter trend to the wave of goodwill amongst the membership, however. One worker whose attitude towards fellow workers had become more negative focussed her criticism on union members whose strike participation amounted to "sitting down with a hot

chocolate and watching the 11 o'clock news." Three other workers who had similarly developed negative attitudes were perturbed by another issue -- the extent to which some active strikers had quickly made peace with management in the fall of 1987. "I saw people on the picket line who were throwing eggs, yelling and spitting," explained one of the critics. "But inside the Post Office now their attitude is 'let's roll over and play dead'. They make excuses for the way management behaved during the strike." A second of the critics explained that these coworkers were behaving just like a child abused by her parents who, when separated from her mother and father, cries out "Mommy, Daddy". In his estimation, they had quickly forgotten management's role in the strike because they were either angling for overtime or preferred job assignments.

5. Changes in Attitudes Towards the Local and National Unions

The performance of the local union, like the performance of the national union, was generally viewed as satisfactory and was not an issue of concern for the majority of Hamilton CUPW members during the 1987 strike. In part, this accounts for the high proportion of unchanged attitudes in relation to these two groups. As well, I noted that many CUPW members were judicious and gracious in their evaluation of the local union: they might mention a criticism of the way the strike was run locally but still report that their attitude towards the local union was unchanged. The Hamilton membership seemed to be very sensitive to the fact that local union leaders were all volunteers putting in long hours on an often thankless job. Thus, their criticisms were tempered with a sense of gratitude.

There was no organized group of critics in the Hamilton local at the time of the 1987 strike. Therefore, the criticisms I present here were mentioned in passing and were not the basis for any organized factional struggle in the local.

A few members were critical of the way that picketing was organized during the strike. First, the absence of a picket captain to guide strikers through some confrontations was noted as a weakness. Second, a number of people believed the decision to sit down on the picket line on the evening of October 14 was a tactical mistake which led to unnecessary injuries. Third, some strikers were irritated by the changing picketing policies initiated by different members of the local executive. This third criticism relates to a minor split in the executive which developed during the strike. On Friday October 9, the majority of executive members decided to cancel picketing for the upcoming Sunday and Monday of the Thanksgiving weekend. They wanted to give the membership a break. The decision also reflected their view that picketing wasn't that important to the final outcome of the strike since the passage of the back-to-work legislation, introduced in Parliament the previous day, was inevitable. Then on Saturday afternoon, October 10, the two members of the executive on strike duty cancelled the afternoon shift's picket duty when the numbers who showed up were small: they were worried about having too few members on the line to handle the obnoxious Saturday night drunks in downtown Hamilton. After the Hamilton picket lines went down, Canada Post shifted mail and scab management personnel from throughout southwestern Ontario into Hamilton for weekend sorting. Seeing this, one member of the executive

took it upon himself to get picketing going again. Beginning on Saturday evening and carrying through to Tuesday morning, October 13, he and some assistants tried to organize greater membership participation in picketing. Members were phoned at home and asked to get involved.

A couple of members told me that they strongly supported the efforts to organize weekend picketing. Overall, though, the spontaneous appeals did not elicit widespread membership support. One night shift worker reported getting a call on Sunday evening, October 11 just as he was settling in to an evening of relaxation. He had been told on Friday night that picketing was cancelled for the weekend, but now he was being asked to do picket duty that night. He went down to the line, but was the only person from his shift to show up. After a few hours he left. "That was it. I didn't go back for the rest of the strike." The disorganized way that weekend picketing was organized catalyzed the sense of futility he had about the strike: "We were just wasting our energy out there. No matter what we did we were going to be squashed. It was a situation where if we used rocket launchers they'd just wipe us out with nuclear weapons. I came to the conclusion that the more I did in the strike the worse off I'd be afterwards." This is clearly a case where a worker's acquiescent consent to the power of the government and management was solidified by ineffective union organization. I return to this theme in a section titled "Passive Consent and Divided Workers" in Chapter 10.

One additional criticism of the local union's performance during the strike was voiced to me. A member who had been very active during the strike was discouraged with the way that Hamilton strike activities

ended. For one thing, he felt that picketing should have continued right up until the back-to-work legislation took effect rather than ending in the early evening of October 16. As well, he believed that a rally/demonstration should have been organized at strike's end similar to one held in Vancouver which had received national media attention. This would have lifted everyone's spirits and been a good way to build postal workers' unity before returning to work.

CUPW members also passed on two criticisms of the local union's performance in the poststrike weeks. First, a number of individuals complained about not getting enough communication about what was happening in mediation and what the national union was doing. Second, a few workers were critical of the workfloor behaviour of union leaders. One steward was described by more than one person as "the crazy one" for how agitated she got right after the strike's conclusion when it was discovered that some casual employees had been scabs. Another steward was judged to have been "not totally professional" and "dishonest" in reference to some of the ways that he responded to management's techniques of harassment. In the view of one worker (a steward herself), the few militant union leaders who were always trying to get management and the union going after the strike were at odds with the majority of union members who were pessimistic and had the attitude of not bothering with anything. This second group of criticisms reveals that workers had different views on the proper balance between struggle and accommodation on the workfloor. They were also split on whether the spirit of the "Here, have an egg in the face" conflict techniques of the picket line should imbue poststrike struggle tactics.

Alongside the criticisms of the local union was some important praise. A considerable amount of this praise came from union leaders who tended to have a broad conception of the local union: for them, the membership is the important component of the local. With this perspective, leaders tended to feel more positive towards the local just as they felt more positive towards fellow workers. At the same time, a number of rank-and-filers also reported feeling more positive towards the local union. In my interviews, what stood out were those cases where new employees had come to a new appreciation of the union as a consequence of the strike. One such person explained how her thinking had changed: "Before the strike a lot of us new employees didn't understand why the union was so militant. We couldn't understand why the union seemed to be doing so much nitpicking. But in this strike we gained knowledge about how management operates. The union has got to fight management right down the line, otherwise management will get the upper hand and walk all over you."

There was a fascinating split in the Hamilton membership's attitudes towards the National CUPW. On the one hand, the vast majority of rank-and-file members reported being unchanged in attitude towards Jean-Claude Parrot and the National CUPW. When I asked for further comments from such people on the national union leadership, I would invariably be told that the strategy of rotating strikes was sound and that the national leadership had done a very adequate job. In fact, virtually the only criticism of the National CUPW I heard from rank-and-filers in Hamilton was that there wasn't much information on the mediation/arbitration process or the National Program of Action after

the strike. (And, as one of the individuals who made this criticism herself noted, this was partially a fault of the Hamilton local, since information received from the National CUPW was not making it to the membership.) Of the 26 rank-and-file members who answered the question on attitude change towards the National CUPW, only two indicated being more negative in attitude; of the others, four were more positive in attitude and the rest unchanged. On the other hand, not a single union leader reported being more positive in attitude towards the National CUPW and a substantial number (44%) were more negative. Union leaders and rank-and-file thus tended to view the performance of the National CUPW in entirely different lights.

What caused so many Hamilton union leaders to feel more negative towards the National CUPW? As the strike progressed I heard a few specific criticisms. The one voiced by the greatest number of people concerned the strategy of rotating strikes: they favoured a general strike since rotating strikes required that members work without the protection of a collective agreement.[8] But, as I learned in the months after the strike, the opposition of Hamilton leaders to specific

---

[8] In a September 29, 1987 letter, the General Manager of Labour Relations for Canada Post, Harold Dunstan, informed CUPW that the collective agreement would no longer apply effective 12:01 a.m., September 30. The company unilaterally imposed a set of terms and conditions of employment based upon sections of the collective agreement it found acceptable supplemented by the minimal protections for workers outlined in the Canada Labour Code. Of great concern to workers was that the grievance procedure outlined in Article 9 of the collective agreement was scrapped. Thus, it appeared that when they worked after September 29, workers were at risk since they had little remedy if disciplined. Canada Post's suggestion for resolving problems did not set their minds at ease: "Individual complaints may be brought to the attention of an employee's supervisor for informal resolution."

policies of the National was actually grounded in fairly fundamental differences in union philosophy. I discuss the internal struggle in CUPW in some depth in the next chapter. Here I simply provide a quick overview.

Hamilton leaders believed that the leadership of the National Union had lost touch with the membership. Jean-Claude Parrot and other national leaders were condemned (1) for not doing what could be done to defend the members' interests at this time; and (2) for instead following a political plan of action which most members did not support and found irrelevant to their own concerns. Because Hamilton leaders were convinced that they had a good sense of where their own membership was at, they were confident of the soundness of their criticisms.

Now, my own research has shown a healthy respect for the local union leadership amongst the Hamilton membership: this tends to confirm the union leaders' self-conception concerning the sound state of their relations with the membership. However, not everything the Hamilton leadership said and did was a direct reflection of membership opinion. Indeed, in criticizing the policies and practices of the National CUPW leadership in the strike period, Hamilton union leaders were at odds with their own rank-and-file, who were not complaining. At face value the opposing views of the Hamilton leadership and rank-and-file on this subject seem to stand the popular image of CUPW on its head: one might argue that the rank-and-file were content with the militant leadership at the national level while the leadership in the Hamilton local were actually a reactionary minority who were out-of-touch with the views of the majority! Yet, such a conclusion is superficial and misleading, and

shows no understanding of the dynamics of leadership within a large union. In the next chapter I will offer further analysis of this complicated matter. Specifically, I will address the paradoxical finding that Hamilton CUPW leaders' criticisms of the national leadership were issued in the name of the membership and to some extent represented rank-and-file members' perspectives, even though the Hamilton rank-and-file did not themselves voice the same criticisms.

6. Changes in Attitude Towards the Labour Movement

Some Firestone workers, members of the United Rubber Workers, joined the picket line one evening during the strike.[9] Much to the surprise of a CUPW member who expected support, one of them proceeded to "give us hell". He noted that postal workers, many of whom are women, had a higher hourly wage than Firestone workers, most of whom were men. "Isn't $13.25 enough for you?" he asked.

For this postal worker, the incident typified the indifference and occasional animosity shown towards CUPW by blue collar, male unionists during the strike. In her view, the resentment of blue collar men is largely because of the preponderance of women among postal workers: these men believe that CUPW members are paid too much simply because so many women are being paid more than them.

No other CUPW members I spoke to had quite so harrying an experience with a picket line "supporter". Quite a few mentioned, however, that they were disappointed with the limited support from other union members on the picket line. Some of these individuals cited this

---

[9] The Firestone plant in Hamilton closed in January, 1988, throwing more than 1000 union members out of work.

as a reason for having a more negative attitude towards the labour movement. "I didn't see any support on the picket line," remarked one such worker. "You hear them bellowing, but where's the action?" A number of other CUPW members mentioned their disappointment after saying that their attitude towards the labour movement was unchanged. "Maybe there was a lack of communication" was one explanation put forward by an individual who didn't want to be too harsh on other union members.

A couple of workers discussed the lack of support for the strike in the context of a general assessment of the problems confronting the Canadian labour movement. "The labour movement is too scattered," said one. "It doesn't work together enough. We care if it's us in trouble, but we don't stick together when others are in trouble." The analysis of a second worker was complementary: "I wish unions would get off their asses. They are too laid back. I'm like other union members. We don't do enough. We're too easy going, too spoiled and selfish."

Although the thrust of criticism of the labour movement is not insignificant (13% of the sample), it must also be kept in mind that 30% of the sample felt more positive towards labour. One of these individuals remarked that the strike experience helped him appreciate other workers' struggles: "I watched the TV pictures of the Gainers strike without really comprehending what was happening. Now I can better understand what the Gainers workers were going through." A second CUPW member with more positive feelings for the labour movement noted that, because of this strike, "I now realize how much newspapers and top management lie about the situation workers find themselves in." Therefore, those whose attitudes towards labour had become more positive

emphasized how their own strike had opened their eyes and made them more sympathetic to the overall struggle of the labour movement in Canadian society. Those with more negative attitudes focussed on the lack of support from local unions for their strike.

Attitudes Towards the Outcome of the Strike

When asked whether there had been any gains from the strike, 36% of the sample replied "No". Those who replied "Yes" can be divided between two main groups. The majority, making up 50% of the total sample, believed that the union had been internally strengthened through the struggle. Nine percent said that the public had new insight into the issues in the Post Office as a consequence of the strike. Considering the main reason cited by those who believed CUPW made gains in the strike, it is not surprising that the dummy variable indicating Strike Gains shows a moderate positive correlation with the Union Attitude Change index (r=.26; see Table 9.1). At the same time, it is uncorrelated with any of the other measures of attitude change already discussed.

Most CUPW members had a realistic assessment of the most likely outcome of the binding arbitration process imposed by Bill C-86. The Progressive Conservative cabinet chose a judge, Laurent Cossette, to arbitrate the dispute. Cossette's sympathies are shown by the fact that he was one of the grievance arbitrator nominees of the employer for the Quebec Region (Daryl Tingley, speech, February 21/88). Thus, fully 66% of the sample reported "no hope" that Cossette's arbitration decision would be favourable to postal workers. Many of the 18% who expressed "some hope" had a "there's always hope" rationale for their choice.

Only 9% expressed much hope and a further 7% did not know. Clearly there were no false expectations among CUPW members that a victory would be handed to them on a silver arbitration platter.

In early 1988 CUPW members had much cause for discouragement. Local management was frequently ignoring the collective agreement, but because the grievance system was backed-up there was no prospect of making the employer pay for its violations in the foreseeable future. "If the grievance system doesn't work, what do you have?" remarked one worker who was discouraged by her inability to get any results from grievances. Local management was also harassing the workforce, as outlined in Chapter 6 above. A worker with some disciplinary measures on her file said she felt intimidated into not taking sick days when she was sick because of the hassle management would put her through. She felt this to be a violation of her basic human rights. Another worker described how angry she got when, in a disciplinary interview over a petty case of insubordination, she was asked, "Do you have a drug or alcohol problem?" She retorted, "No, do you?"

Workers were also discouraged because there seemed to be nothing they could do to change the course of events. "Canada Post and the Conservatives appear to be proceeding regardless of what anyone says," remarked one CUPW member. "They're in cahoots to undermine us, to take away all the rights we've fought for and won over the years," said another. Most agreed. A third worker noted that the whole struggle had a "preconceived" quality to it.

The way that labour laws restricted CUPW's field of action was also cited as a source of discouragement. The CUPW contract had expired

in August, 1986 but the process of getting a new one had dragged on for more than a year before CUPW was even in a legal strike position. "I wish when our contract expired we could just walk out and go on strike like Chrysler or Ford," noted one union member. "We've been without a contract for a long time -- it's a pain in the neck working without a contract."

Only 9% of the sample indicated that they did not feel discouraged about the current situation of postal workers. Of the remainder, fully 50% reported being discouraged without any tempering of optimism, while 41% were discouraged but hopeful. As recorded in Table 9.1, the measure of discouragement was associated with a number of other indicators of attitude change. Discouragement had large positive correlations with Extent of Attitude Change, On-the Job Attitude Change and Authority Attitude Change, and had a negative correlation with Strike Gains.

The reasons for CUPW members' discouragement can be classified into four broad categories. A majority (53%) felt they were fighting a lost cause. Twenty-five percent mentioned shopfloor losses. Nine percent cited the time delays associated with getting a new contract and a single member reported finding her coworkers' indifference to be discouraging.

Among the 50% of the sample who found anything hopeful in the current situation, it is interesting that only 7% mentioned the strengthening of the union as a reason for optimism. Nine percent were optimistic about the Progressive Conservatives being defeated in the next election and the remainder held out a glimmer of hope in the

arbitration process or put forward one of two optimistic refrains: "there is always hope"; or "things can't get any worse so they must be going to get better."

UNDERSTANDING THE BASES FOR ATTITUDE CHANGE

Research Questions

Which is the more important for attitude change — what CUPW members did during the strike, or the perspectives and expectations they brought to the strike? This is the preliminary question considered in this section. If the first alternative is correct, then the measures of strike participation introduced in the previous chapter will prove to be the crucial determinants of the various dimensions of attitude change. But if the second possibility is correct, then background and contextual variables will turn out to be the crucial determinants of attitude change.

The logic of the quantitative investigations in this section parallels that of the previous chapter. I use multivariate analyses to assess the importance of different factors on strikers' attitude change. Many of the explanatory variables introduced in the last chapter are also featured here. In addition, measures of strike participation are considered.

Overview of the Correlates of Attitude Change

The correlations between strike participation and attitude change are generally quite minor (see Table 9.4). However, there are some important exceptions to this generalization. First, each of the indicators of strike support -- Extent of Strike Involvement and Strike

Support Attitude -- has a moderate positive correlation with Union Attitude Change. Second, the same participation dimensions are positively correlated with Strike Gains, although the magnitude of the correlations is not as great. Third, Extent of Strike Involvement is negatively associated with On-the-Job Attitude Change, National CUPW Attitude Change[10] and Discouragement. Fourth, Anger Towards Scabs has a moderate positive association with On-the-Job Attitude Change, Authority Attitude Change and PC Government Attitude Change. It can thus be seen that the two strike support dimensions on the one hand, and Anger Towards Scabs on the other hand, are associated with distinct sets of attitude change variables.

The correlations between measures of attitude change and 21 background or contextual variables are presented in Table 9.5. While a number of moderately sized correlations are present in this table along with a single large correlation (.61; gender with Authority Attitude Change), what stands out are the numerous trivial associations. The typical pattern in the table is for a background or contextual variable to be associated with one or two attitude change dimensions but not others.

However, Authoritarian Individualism and Left/Right Feeling are associated with four attitude change dimensions each, three of them common. CUPW members with more Right-wing or authoritarian individualist perspectives tended to experience more attitude change, to report an on-the-job attitude change, and to have become more negative towards the

---

[10] It is worthy of notice that this correlation disappears when union leadership is controlled.

Progressive Conservative government. Authoritarian individualists also tended to have become more negative towards authority, and those with more positive feelings for the Right-wing were less likely to see strike gains.

The similarity in correlation patterns for Authoritarian Individualism and Left/Right Feeling is consistent with a major finding of Chapter 4. In an analysis of national survey data I found that affect for Left and Right is more strongly related to social and value-related attitudes than to economic policy attitudes (see Table 4.3, Chapter 4). My conclusion was that the ideological processes which generate affect for Left and Right have a distinctive impact on workers' political consciousness and action. The results recorded in Table 9.5 lend support to this conclusion.

I can now offer a general interpretation of the results involving Authoritarian Individualism and Left/Right Feeling. CUPW members who respected authority and had conservative leanings before the strike were more likely to grow negative on the related attitude change dimensions, presumably because their original assumptions were contradicted. It is important to note that this section of the membership felt their attitude change to be more extensive than any other section of the membership.

In contrast, it seems that CUPW members already favourably inclined towards the union and its struggle were more likely to experience a positive change in union attitudes. Thus, the major correlates of Union Attitude Change include Union Feeling, Working Class Identification, Coworkers Hurt/Privatization, Union Under Attack and

Friend of Executive or Steward. In this case the strike built upon a solid base of group identification, effecting attitude change by confirming assumptions.

For two of the attitude change dimensions there were few important determinants. Only union leadership and emphasizing that the union was under attack had substantive correlations with National CUPW Attitude Change. As outlined above, close to half the leaders in the sample reported a more negative attitude towards the National CUPW while only 8% of the rank-and-file did the same. Furthermore, there was little other variation in the sample. It is thus not surprising that few factors are associated with this dimension of attitude change. For PC Government Attitude Change only the variables already mentioned -- Authoritarian Individualism and Left/Right Feeling -- had correlations higher than .2 in magnitude. If we remember that most of the sample developed more negative attitudes towards the federal Tories, then a general interpretation of this finding can be made: strikers tended to develop more negative attitudes except when they went into the strike with a well defined opposition to the PC Government.

To better understand the bases of attitude change I now turn to multivariate data analyses involving four of the attitude change dimensions. Such analyses would be of little interest in the cases of PC Government Attitude Change and National CUPW Attitude Change, since few variables are associated with either of these attitude change dimensions. In addition, On-the-Job Attitude Change and Strike Gains are excluded from being a dependent variable in multiple regression runs

because they are dummy variables.[11] Consequently, multivariate analyses are carried out for Extent of Attitude Change, Union Attitude Change, Authority Attitude Change, and Discouragement.

Results of Multiple Regression Analyses

1. Determinants of Extent of Attitude Change

I was able to explain only 22% of the variance in Extent of Attitude Change in the trimmed analysis reported in Table 9.6. When the effects of other variables were held constant, Single and Authoritarian Individualism were the major determinants: single people with no dependents tended to experience less attitude change while those with authoritarian individualist perspectives tended to experience more. It seems plausible that the attitudes of single people changed less in the conflict because they didn't feel that as much was at stake for them as CUPW members with families did. The influence of Authoritarian Individualism on Extent of Attitude Change is consistent with the argument made above: union members' tended to have a stronger sense of attitude change when their background assumptions were undermined. In addition, age, union leadership and education had negative effects on the Extent of Attitude Change (the more experience or knowledge going into the strike, the less the change in attitudes due to the strike), while regarding the strike issues as important had a positive effect.

---

[11] A logistic regression or logit analysis could have been carried out for each of these variables. I decided not to do so for two reasons: (1) the substantive benefits would be outweighed by the complexity introduced into the data analysis; and (2) the small sample size precludes the introduction of many independent variables into any single analysis.

2. Determinants of Authority Attitude Change

Some of the same predictors are included in the analyses where Authority Attitude Change is the dependent variable (see Table 9.7). Some 53% of the variation in this attitude change dimension is explained in the trimmed analysis. By far and away the major determinant is gender: women were much more likely to have become more negative in attitude towards authority. The violent and sexually abusive actions of the police towards women strikers are one source of this shift in attitudes. As well, the same factors which caused women to feel more anger towards the scabs (see Chapter 8) would influence their attitudes towards local Canada Post management and the police. Finally, it must be remembered that women in Canadian society generally do not find themselves in as many public situations of physical confrontation in the course of a lifetime as men (e.g., schoolyard brawls, football games, fights in bars). The newness of the circumstances encountered in the strike may also contribute to some of the gender gap in Authority Attitude Change.

The only background political attitude or identity included in the trimmed analysis is Alienation from Government: those more alienated from the federal government tended to become more negative in attitude towards authority as a result of the strike. This seems to be a case of a background cynical perspective being generalized in the course of strike experience.

Personal Importance of Issues and Education were also important determinants of Authority Attitude Change, as they were of Extent of Attitude Change. As expected, those who rated the main strike issues as

being more important tended to become more negative in attitude towards authority. However, contrary to the direction of the bivariate relationship (see Table 9.5), the sign of the beta coefficient for education is also positive. Those higher in education tend to be less alienated from government ($r=-.30$) and to regard the strike issues as less important ($r=-.48$). When the effects of these two variables are held constant along with the effect of gender (correlation with education $= -.28$), the direction of the influence of education is reversed from what would be expected.

3. Determinants of Union Attitude Change

Many different background and contextual factors are determinants of Union Attitude Change. The six variables included in the trimmed analysis reported in Table 9.8 explain 36% of the variance. Significantly, the most important single determinant is a measure of strike participation -- Extent of Strike Involvement. Even when various background and contextual factors are taken into account, the greater the strike involvement the more likely that a CUPW member will have experienced a positive attitude shift on this index.

As noted above, those who already had a positive union identification were more likely to develop more positive union attitudes. Thus Union Feeling, having a sense of coworker deprivation and being a friend of a union leader each had an independent, positive effect on Union Attitude Change. Gender and Job Dissatisfaction were the other variables included in the analysis: women and the dissatisfied were less likely to have developed more positive attitudes towards union groups. The dissatisfied's job alienation appears to negatively

influence views of coworkers and unions. However, I do not have a clear idea of the aspects of women workers' gender experiences which result in this negative effect.

4. Determinants of Workers' Discouragement

Four variables explain 42% of the variance in the CUPW members' Discouragement (see Table 9.9). Union leaders were less likely to be discouraged than the rank-and-file: this was the most important single determinant, just as it was an important determinant of Extent of Strike Involvement (see Chapter 8). At the same time, two contextual factors and a background attitude also had effects on Discouragement. Placing more importance on the strike issues and emphasizing that CUPW was under attack each resulted in higher levels of discouragement. When the effects of the other three variables were held constant, Economic Radicalism also had a strong positive effect on discouragement. Thus, it appears that the CUPW members most discouraged by the strike's outcome were economically radical rank-and-file members who emphasized the strike's overall significance but who lacked the long-term perspective of union leaders.

Conclusions

In the 1987 CUPW strike, workers' short-term attitude change was largely a function of the expectations and perspectives they brought to the struggle. Indeed, in only one of the four multivariate analyses which were undertaken was a strike participation dimension an important determinant of attitude change. It is important to note where strike participation had its influence: it was the major determinant of variation on the Union Attitude Change index -- that dimension of

attitude change which is most important from a union perspective. Even when the effects of a variety of other determinants were held constant, more extensive strike involvement tended to result in more positive attitudes towards union. This points to the importance of participation in collective union activity as a basis for the development of positive ingroup identification.

Our understanding of union members' attitude change would have been incomplete without an examination of background political attitudes and identities. Specifically, Economic Radicalism was a major determinant of strikers' discouragement; Authoritarian Individualism had a strong effect on Extent of Attitude Change; and Alienation from Government had a major influence on Authority Attitude Change.

At the same time, a few social background and contextual factors were also crucial determinants of different dimensions of attitude change. Specifically, both gender and union leadership had important effects in two of the analyses, and Personal Importance of Issues was a major determinant in three out of four multivariate analyses. This demonstrates that both background political perspectives and social background/contextual variables must be taken into consideration when assessing the determinants of short-term attitude change.

In this research I was able to distinguish two major attitude change processes. The first process involved union members who went into the strike with considerable respect for authority. Their background assumptions were shattered by the actions of the police and Canada Post management during the conflict. Considerable attitude change resulted. For some, especially workers who were formerly

conciliatory in their dealings with management, this meant an entirely new on-the-job attitude: they no longer made any special effort to assist local management.

The second attitude change process involved union members who went into the strike already sympathetic to the union and its struggle. The solid performance of the Hamilton local's membership during the conflict confirmed the validity of their background assumptions and strengthened their pro-union commitment. In this second process assumptions were confirmed instead of shattered.

These two major attitude change processes are quite distinct. Across the Hamilton CUPW membership, new-found disenchantment with management did not tend to translate into a sudden rapture with fellow workers and the union. Of course, this is a statement of general tendency which does not preclude exceptions. Some CUPW members did develop new-found union commitments while abandoning their respect for Canada Post management. I noted this dual process especially among some newer employees who were drawn into the union's orbit by their strike experiences. But the fact remains that over the whole membership, Union Attitude Change was negatively correlated with Authority Attitude Change. This shows that disillusionment with the employer, even in its strongest form, does not automatically result in a gain for the union cause.

Some union leaders in the Hamilton local of CUPW were well aware of the point I just made. During picket line confrontations when CUPW members pulled together and stood their ground, one frequently said to me, "Now what we've got to do is take this spirit back inside [the Post

Office] with us when the strike is over." He knew that picket line militancy one day did not necessarily result in a permanent allegiance to the union cause. With this in mind, right after the strike the union executive drew up a short list of rank-and-file members who had been strong participants in the strike. They then made an effort to get them more involved in the union -- to build a union commitment upon the militant anti-management sentiments they had demonstrated in the strike. Becoming stewards, taking education courses and attending regional union meetings were among the options made available to these rank-and-file members.

Overall, the strike appears to have had three main positive effects on poststrike membership participation in the Hamilton CUPW local. First, union leaders and long-time rank-and-file union supporters were brought closer together, and they usually renewed their union commitment. Second, some members, usually relatively new employees, developed a fresh sense of union identification. And third, a few rank-and-file members started to become active in the union after being encouraged to do so by the executive. For these three groups of CUPW members, "the struggle continued" in the months after the strike. But such was not the case for two other sections of the membership: the "let's forget the strike" conciliators and the alienated. The conciliators took the approach of putting the strike behind them -- they all adapted to the new demands of management and some made a conscious effort to strengthen their personal ties with supervisors. The alienated, as already discussed, didn't cooperate with management, but neither did they offer any concerted resistance. As far as they could,

the alienated withdrew psychic involvement in the job _and_ the union's collective struggle.

This split in the after-the-strike responses of CUPW members is important. Even in a situation where management, with the backing of important state institutions, figuratively bashed unionized workers over the head with a 2x4, an enduring allegiance to the union was not developed among substantial sections of the workforce. In the second section of Chapter 10, titled "Explaining the Different Forms of Consent to Management Domination", I assess the significance of this finding.

Table 9.1   Associations Between Indicators of Attitude Change[a]

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
(1) Extent of Attitude Change							
(2) On-the-Job Attitude Change	.47						
(3) Union Attitude Change Index(+)	.27	.00					
(4) Authority Attitude Change Index(-)	.34	.45	-.24				
(5) PC Government Attitude Change(-)	.21	.01	.23	.21			
(6) National CUPW Attitude Change(+)	.08	-.03	-.01	-.03	.07		
(7) Strike Gains	.04	-.09	.26	-.08	.02	.18	
(8) Discouragement	.25	.38	-.03	.47	.03	.16	-.20

[a] In the attitude change indexes, "+" means that positive responses are scored high, while "-" means that negative responses are scored high.

Table 9.2   Changes in Attitudes Towards Groups Involved in the Strike

Group	More Positive Considerably	More Positive Somewhat	About Same	More Negative Somewhat	More Negative Considerably
Local Management	0%	0%	30%	12%	58%
Police	0%	0%	30%	27%	43%
Federal PC Government	0%	0%	30%	14%	57%
Local Union	14%	16%	64%	7%	0%
Fellow Workers	27%	23%	41%	7%	2%
Labour Movement	16%	14%	56%	12%	2%
J.C. Parrot/National CUPW	5%	5%	68%	14%	9%

Table 9.3   Rotated Factor Matrix, Items Measuring Changes in Attitudes
Towards Groups[a]

Group	First Factor	Second Factor	Third Factor
Local Union	.91		-.44
Fellow Workers	.65		
Labour Movement	.44		
Federal PC Government	.35	.35	
Local Management		.80	
Police		.46	
J.C. Parrot/National CUPW			.67

[a] Only factor loadings greater than .3 in absolute value are reported.

Table 9.4   Correlations Between Dimensions of Attitude Change[a]
and Dimensions of Strike Participation

	Strike Participation		
Attitude Change	Extent Strike Involvemt	Strike Support Attitude	Anger Towards Scabs
(1) Extent of Attitude Change	-.10	.09	.13
(2) On-the-Job Attitude Change	-.23	.05	.28
(3) Union Attitude Change Index(+)	.42	.32	.09
(4) Authority Attitude Change Index(-)	-.04	.03	.30
(5) PC Government Attitude Change(-)	-.04	.00	.27
(6) National CUPW Attitude Change(+)	-.21	-.05	-.06
(7) Strike Gains	.20	.17	-.10
(8) Discouragement	-.26	-.03	.11

[a] See Table 9.1.

Table 9.5 Correlations Between Dimensions of Attitude Change[a] and a Selection
of Background and Contextual Variables[b]

Attitude Change Dimensions[c]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
A. Political Attitudes								
1) Economic Radicalism	-.08	-.12	.03	.07	-.04	-.03	-.09	.24
2) Authoritarian Individualism	-.41	-.37	-.07	-.28	-.22	-.06	-.06	.03
3) Non-Participation in Politics	.24	.33	-.03	.08	.08	-.10	.05	.03
4) Alienation from Government	.12	.08	-.08	.39	.11	.19	-.21	.20
B. Political Identities								
1) Union Feeling	.06	-.20	.34	-.12	.09	-.10	.09	.09
2) Working Class Identification	-.11	.01	.20	.06	.08	-.14	-.02	-.08
3) Left/Right Feeling	-.30	-.25	-.13	-.12	-.27	-.06	.21	-.15
4) Religious Feeling	.24	-.07	.07	-.06	.18	.03	-.07	.01
C. Personal Economic Situation								
1) Relative Economic Deprivation	-.02	-.21	-.02	.01	.08	-.03	-.24	.27
D. General Outlook on Job								
1) Job Dissatisfaction	-.16	-.12	-.32	.01	.13	.08	-.14	-.02
2) Could Not Find a Comparable Job	.12	.16	-.23	.32	-.15	.02	-.28	.18
E. View of Strike Issues								
1) Coworkers Hurt/Privatization	.12	-.04	.27	-.11	.02	.08	-.02	.01
2) Union Under Attack	.07	.06	.20	.12	.12	.32	-.09	.23
3) Personal Importance of Issues	.24	.10	-.05	.45	-.08	-.12	.08	.26
F. Local Union Involvement/Attitudes								
1) Present or Past Leader	-.15	-.17	.14	.06	-.15	-.43	.05	-.23
2) Friend of Executive or Steward	.16	.14	.44	-.06	.03	-.23	.08	.06
3) Years as CUPW Member	.07	-.20	-.01	-.08	-.11	.06	.00	-.16
H. Social Background								
1) Woman	.18	.20	-.21	.61	.16	-.08	-.09	.31
2) Family -- Single, No Dependents	-.22	-.14	-.07	-.08	-.04	-.01	-.27	-.07
3) Age	.17	-.08	-.02	.20	.10	.06	.13	-.05
4) Education	-.20	.06	-.07	-.17	-.14	.09	.12	.03

[a] See Table 9.1.
[b] Entries are Pearson product-moment correlations
[c] Key for Attitude Change Dimensions:

1 Extent of Attitude Change	5 PC Government Attitude Change
2 On-the-Job Attitude Change	6 National CUPW Attitude Change
3 Union Attitude Change	7 Strike Gains
4 Authority Attitude Change	8 Discouragement

Table 9.6   Determinants of the Extent of Attitude Change

	Initial Analysis		Trimmed Analysis	
Independent Variables	b(SE b)	Beta	b(SE b)	Beta
A. Political Attitudes				
Authoritarian Individualism	-.06(.05)	-.33	-.08(.04)	-.41
Non-Participation in Politics	.02(.09)	.04		
B. Political Identities				
Left/Right Feeling	-.01(.01)	-.16		
E. View of Strike Issues				
Personal Importance of Issues	.05(.04)	.23	.05(.04)	.24
F. Local Union Involvement/Attitudes				
Present or Past Leader	-.37(.44)	-.17	-.49(.39)	-.22
H. Social Background				
Woman	-.05(.40)	-.02		
Family -- Single, No Dependents	-1.1(.50)	-.43	-1.1(.45)	-.43
Age	-.02(.03)	-.17	-.03(.02)	-.24
Education	-.21(.22)	-.18	-.23(.21)	-.20
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.37(.15)		.35(.22)	

Table 9.7   Determinants of Authority Attitude Change
(Negative responses scored high)

	Initial Analysis		Trimmed Analysis	
Independent Variables	b(SE b)	Beta	b(SE b)	Beta
A. Political Attitudes				
Authoritarian Individualism	-.01(.04)	-.05		
Alienation from Government	.23(.09)	.33	.24(.08)	.34
D. General Outlook on Job				
Could Not Find a Comparable Job	.11(.28)	.06		
E. View of Strike Issues				
Personal Importance of Issues	.11(.04)	.42	.10(.03)	.38
H. Social Background				
Woman	1.4(.43)	.47	1.5(.35)	.51
Age	-.02(.02)	-.11		
Education	.46(.24)	.30	.40(.21)	.26
2nd Block, Participation Variables				
Anger Towards Scabs	.14(.17)	.12		
R-squared(adjusted R-squared)	.60(.49)		.58(.53)	

Table 9.8   Determinants of Union Attitude Change
(Positive responses scored high)

Independent Variables	Initial Analysis b(SE b)	Beta	Trimmed Analysis b(SE b)	Beta	Indirect Effect
B. Political Identities					
Working Class Identification	-.04(.25)	-.02			
Union Feeling	.02(.03)	.14	.02(.02)	.16	none
D. General Outlook on Job					
Job Dissatisfaction	-.23(.12)	-.25	-.23(.12)	-.25	none
Could Not Find a Comparable Job	-.28(.39)	-.10			
E. View of Strike Issues					
Coworkers Hurt/Privatization	.63(.37)	.24	.64(.34)	.24	none
F. Local Union Involvement/Attitudes					
Present or Past Leader	-.79(.76)	-.18	-.70(.69)	-.16	.19
Friend of Executive or Steward	.98(.70)	.22	1.1(.64)	.25	none
H. Social Background					
Woman	-.78(.61)	-.18	-.91(.55)	-.21	none
2nd Block, Participation Variables					
Extent of Strike Involvement	.61(.30)	.32	.66(.28)	.34	none
Strike Support Attitude	.31(.53)	.10			
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.48(.32)		.47(.36)		

Table 9.9   Determinants of Workers' Discouragement

Independent Variables	Initial Analysis b(SE b)	Beta	Trimmed Analysis b(SE b)	Beta
A. Political Attitudes				
Economic Radicalism	.12(.04)	.50	.13(.04)	.52
Alienation from Government	.00(.07)	.00		
C. Personal Economic Situation				
Relative Economic Deprivation	.02(.15)	.02		
E. View of Strike Issues				
Union Under Attack	.59(.31)	.27	.66(.29)	.30
Personal Importance of Issues	.08(.03)	.46	.10(.03)	.54
F. Local Union Involvement/Attitudes				
Present or Past Leader	-1.2(.39)	-.57	-1.3(.32)	-.63
H. Social Background				
Woman	.37(.30)	.18		
2nd Block, Participation Variables				
Extent of Strike Involvement	-.06(.14)	-.07		
R-squared (adjusted R-squared)	.51(.37)		.48(.42)	

CHAPTER 10: THOUGHTS ON THREE PUZZLING QUESTIONS

In this chapter I discuss three questions which were introduced in Chapter 6. First, why did CUPW members in Hamilton receive so little picket line support during the 1987 strike? Second, given the provocative actions of management inside the Hamilton Post Office in 1987 and 1988, why did so many CUPW members not become on-the-job militants? Third, what were the impediments and consequent strategic predicaments which confronted the national leadership of CUPW as it attempted to launch an ambitious political action campaign in the poststrike period? My answers to these questions are aimed at developing better understandings of the character of bourgeois hegemony and the possibilities of constructing an alternative hegemony in contemporary Canada.

PASSIVE CONSENT AND DIVIDED WORKERS

The 1987 CUPW strike was a high profile confrontation involving the use of strikebreakers. It is not unreasonable to have expected unionized workers in Hamilton to join the picket line en masse in order to help postal workers turn back the scab buses. This sort of working class solidarity is commonplace in Canada whenever a major employer is so brazen as to hire strikebreakers. For instance, workers at Gainers Meats in Edmonton in 1986 received considerable picket line support from other workers. And at Dare Cookies in Kitchener in the early 1970s, whole shifts of workers from other factories used to show up at the Dare

workers' picket line to help battle police and a professional strikebreaking operation.

What accounts for the paucity of picket line solidarity during this dispute? I see two complementary factors at work. First, the inaction of union members across Hamilton, just like the inaction of bystanders who watched picket line skirmishes, was partially rooted in the realization that what happened on the picket line in Hamilton would not have a long-term impact on the course of the strike. The failure of Hamilton workers to join the CUPW picket line represents acquiescence to government and management power in this dispute. Second, the Hamilton working class is politically and organizationally divided, and these divisions kept most workers away from the CUPW picket line. Many workers would hesitate to spontaneously lend assistance to inside postal workers because of their political disapproval of the militancy of CUPW. This problem is compounded by the fact that the union movement in Hamilton seems incapable of quickly organizing an across-union campaign of solidarity.

It is important to note that lack of picket line support does not mean that postal workers entirely lacked sympathy in this dispute. An indication of sympathy for the strikers became apparent when, for a few days, the owner of a downtown restaurant was believed to have moonlighted as a scab during the rotating strike on October 1. While working as a scab, a former employee of the restaurant had widely

proclaimed himself to be the restaurant's owner.[1]   This information was
passed on to strikers.   By word of mouth an informal boycott of the
restaurant was organized.   As a direct consequence of the boycott,
during the week of October 4 the restaurant lost $4500 in business
(Hamilton Spectator, October 17:B2).   The owner noted, "I could have
been out of business in three months and never known the reason why if I
hadn't started asking around." Clearly, a not inconsiderable degree of
sympathy was tapped in this boycott.

What does this sympathy represent? I interpret it as a sign of
Hamilton workers' deeply felt disapproval of strikebreakers.   This
disapproval is rooted in the history of working class struggle in the
city, with the historic battles between strikers and scabs during the
1946 Stelco strike being an integral component of working class lore.
Therefore, it would be naive to interpret the boycott as indicating
wholehearted endorsement of the legitimacy of CUPW's struggle.   If
support for the strikers had been so unconditional, then many more
bodies would have materialized on the picket line.

The truth of the matter is that Canadian workers do not feel as
sympathetic towards the struggles of postal workers as they do towards
the struggles of many other workers. This is shown by the data reported
in Table 10.1. In my household survey in the summer of 1987, Hamilton

---

[1] At face value this appears to be an ingenious way to get back
at a former boss but, at least for the press, the restaurant owner put
the action in a better light:

> I don't think this man meant anything malicious. I
> think he was boasting about owning a restaurant to
> improve his social life maybe.   But he didn't think
> about the repercussions of that kind of talk during a
> strike (Hamilton Spectator, Oct. 17/87:B2).

workers felt considerably more positive towards the labour movement than towards CUPW, and considerably more positive towards union leaders than towards Jean-Claude Parrot. This trend was observed for union leaders, union rank-and-file and non-union workers. In contrast, there was virtually no gap in the feelings of either Hamilton CUPW leaders or rank-and-file towards union leaders and Jean-Claude Parrot. In this regard, note the large difference in feeling thermometer scores in the "Jean-Claude Parrot" column in Table 10.1. CUPW leaders have a score of 72 compared to only 48 for union leaders in the household survey. And the CUPW rank-and-file have a score of 65 compared to only 40 for the union rank-and-file in the household survey. To put the matter politely, there is not an overflowing reservoir of good feeling for CUPW and its national leader among most Hamilton workers.

Indeed, there is even a fall-off in feeling thermometer scores among workers who hold a strongly pro-union perspective. In Chapter 5 of the thesis I used Q methodology to isolate a group of Hamilton workers who organize their attitudes towards unions using a schema which views union political action as legitimate. Workers holding this schema (N=31) have feeling thermometer scores of 79 for the labour movement but only 60 for CUPW, and 71 for union leaders but only 53 for Jean-Claude Parrot. This indicates that there would be some hesitancy about supporting CUPW even amongst those workers who generally support a politically active union.

In addition to being politically divided, workers are organizationally divided. For the most part, there are no organizational mechanisms in place to mobilize workers for across-

workplace actions. The Hamilton CUPW local certainly asked local union leaders for picket line assistance. An executive member of the Hamilton CUPW local, Elaine McMurray, happened to be the secretary of the Hamilton and District Labour Council at the time, so communication between the two groups was very good. She kept Hamilton labour leaders abreast of strike developments, and the strike received special attention at the October 15, 1987 meeting of the Labour Council. CUPW's requests for help yielded a smattering of assistance, usually from labour leaders themselves, but no groups of 10 or 25 or 50 supporters ever appeared on the line. It would seem that local labour leaders had no networks in place for pulling out rank-and-file picket line support. Quite simply, there was no organizational form which could quickly mobilize across-union support for the CUPW strikers. This is a sign that, beyond the boundaries of the workplace, the working class in Hamilton is largely unmobilized. To counteract this problem, the Hamilton CUPW local would have had to mount an active educational/outreach campaign during the strike -- an unrealistic proposal given the short duration of the strike and the fact that the Hamilton local did not have any paid staff to help make preparations for the strike.

The lack of picket line support for the CUPW strikers can thus be attributed to the conjunction of two factors: workers' acquiescence to government/management power in the dispute, and the political and organizational divisions in the working class. It is important to note that these two factors combined interactively, not additively. Capitalist power is much more likely to appear as ubiquitous in

situations where the working class has neither the will nor the means to undertake concerted oppositional actions. Working class divisions thus make it more likely that workers will passively consent to capitalist domination.

EXPLAINING THE DIFFERENT FORMS OF CONSENT TO MANAGEMENT DOMINATION

As discussed in the previous chapter, CUPW members were sharply divided in how they responded to Canada Post management in the weeks after the strike. Some were conciliatory. Many were passive due to a pervasive feeling of alienation. Others felt closer to the union and fellow workers than before the strike; for them the struggle continued. Further examination of these three forms of response can yield insight into the character of postal workers' consent to management control in the workplace.

There were no management ideologues amongst the postal workers I interviewed. Not a single person told me how much they liked the way that management ran the Hamilton Post Office and dealt with the workforce. At the same time, a few of the conciliatory workers expressed a perspective which legitimated management power. "They're just doing their job" I was told. These conciliators did more than adapt to the existing relations of power in the Hamilton Post Office. They consciously defended the structure of power and the legitimacy of the role of superordinates in the exercise of power even if they found fault with specific instances of the exercise of authority. Their consent to management domination was active.

Most conciliatory workers, however, did not indicate a normative rationale for cooperating with management. Instead they actively adapted to the poststrike situation to further their own immediate interests. As already noted, those in management's good books tended to get preferred job assignments and could count on all the overtime they wanted. The conformity of these conciliators is grounded in material self-interest. Their passive consent is conditional on receiving preferential treatment. We can see the actions of this type of conciliatory as being a form of what Mann has called pragmatic role acceptance (1970:435).

The action of alienated workers represents a second form of pragmatic role acceptance. Their passivity at work is a very limited form of rebellion against management power. But while alienated workers performed only the minimum of their role requirements, they did nothing to challenge the power relations connecting different roles. While they were unhappy with the situation at work, they did not think anything could be done to change that situation. This amounts to a passive, equivocal consent to the existing structure of power in the Hamilton Post Office.

What accounts for the consent of many CUPW members to management domination in the workplace? Why weren't they radicalized by the strike? In the case of those few people who offered a conscious legitimation of management power, the initial answer to these questions is straightforward: their poststrike normative acceptance of the structure of power is consistent with their prestrike views. One alienated postal worker was particularly irked by the actions of this

group of coworkers. At the same time, he suggested a generational explanation for their outlook and actions. Like many frontline supervisors in the Post Office, these CUPW members were generally younger than 30 years old, he noted. They had come of age in the 1970s, and like most of their generation had learned to accept rather than question authority. Unfortunately, because there are too few CUPW members of this type in my sample, I am unable to offer a systematic appraisal of this explanation. I can report, though, that it is consistent with my data. I can add that the '70s generation individuals who expressed normative acceptance of the structure of power in the Post Office were among those with postsecondary education.

The workers who made peace with management in order to obtain preferential treatment were also reverting to a prestrike mode of conduct. Any political education they received during the strike had no long-term impact on their workplace actions: the material benefits which came from being in management's good books shaped their conduct in the poststrike Hamilton Post Office, just as it had shaped their conduct before the strike. This suggests that a management will almost always be able to purchase the consent of some workers no matter how polarized the situation on a shopfloor.[2]

Amongst Hamilton CUPW members who were not on-the-job militants, alienation was the most common response. Above all else, postal workers' powerlessness in late 1987 encouraged this form of consent to

---

[2] One exception to this generalization occurs when a group of workers takes it upon themselves to enforce worker solidarity using physical punishment. This type of working class policing was not part of the CUPW culture in Hamilton.

management power. This powerlessness was evident in the legal repression of the strike and in the increasing levels of management harassment on the workfloor. Even many union activists who were doing their best to fight for workers' rights had a strong sense that workers were fighting a losing battle. Therefore, the existing imbalance of power relations in the Post Office discouraged workers and made alienated acceptance of minimal role requirements seem like the only feasible course of action.

An alienated shopfloor response was also caused by factors which promote individualism among CUPW members. Many workers who were disgusted with the actions of management did not believe that their options were limited to getting involved in the union's struggle. Some consciously fell back into the role of privatized worker,[3] attempting to "tune out" what happened at work and adopt a strictly instrumental approach to Post Office employment. This posture of self-centredness is sustained by the family intimacy and consumerism which dominate home life, and is feasible because postal workers' wages are sufficient to sustain a gratifying personal life.[4] Interestingly, for a number of postal workers this appeared to be but a new expression of a deeply ingrained individualism. Prominent among those who took up a strict instrumentalist approach were union members who (1) had previously

---

[3] This is a privatism mixed with alienation. See Figure 1.1 in Chapter 1.

[4] This is one of the unintended consequences of the collective struggle of the working class. When a group of workers succeeds in securing adequate wage rates, it creates the means for some workers to limit collective participation at work in favour of the compensating comforts of personal life.

considered the idea of becoming a supervisor, (2) were making plans to change jobs, (3) were planning to start their own business, or (4) were enhancing their own employment opportunities through postsecondary education. Therefore, in many cases the self-centred individualism of alienated CUPW members is not solely a product of the privatized character of their non-work lives. A number of other factors may have provided them with real and/or illusory hopes of making an individual getaway from the Post Office.

My discussion in this section has so far dealt with the forms of postal workers' consent to management domination. It must not be forgotten, however, that many CUPW members reject the existing power relations in the Post Office. Fully two-thirds of Hamilton CUPW leaders strongly agreed with the statement, "If given the chance, non-management employees at Canada Post could run things effectively without bosses." Across the entire membership, 62% either strongly or somewhat agreed with this statement. Thus, although many would not use this term to describe themselves, a majority of the sample are practical socialists in their views on worker control at the point of production.[5]

It is only because of economic necessity that many of these practical socialists go along with management's decrees to the extent

---

[5] One veteran union leader had an historical view of workers' control in the Post Office. In his eyes, workers will always be the ones who are truly in charge of moving the mail. As a consequence of successful union struggles in the first 10 years of CUPW's existence, in the mid-1970s management tacitly recognized workers' control on the shopfloor. Although this is no longer the case, he optimistically believes that a new round of struggle, beginning with the 1987 strike, would swing the pendulum back the other way: in coming years, workers' real power on the shopfloor would again be acknowledged by management.

they do. Quite simply, a certain degree of role acceptance must characterize their action in the Post Office if they are to hold onto their jobs. At the same time, their consent to management power in some circumstances is tempered in other circumstances by attempts to shift the balance of power on the shopfloor. Thus, in small and large skirmishes, these CUPW members contest the shape of management domination and strive to defend and extend workers' rights.

We can thus describe management hegemony in the poststrike Hamilton Post Office as being very uneven and generally weak. It very definitely approximates the _minimal hegemony_ ideal type outlined in Chapter 1 of the thesis. Only a smattering of workers consciously legitimated management power. The consent of most conciliatory CUPW members along with alienated workers was grounded in pragmatic role acceptance. The coercive power of management was key to generating this role acceptance. Finally, many workers contested management power. It is very significant that CUPW members had a definite alternative in mind in opposing management power -- they believed that workers could run the Hamilton Post Office better than management.

STRATEGIC PREDICAMENTS FACED BY CUPW'S NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Shortly after the end of the 1987 strike, the National Executive Board of CUPW (NEB) decided to initiate a National Program of Action. As I noted in the introduction to this case study (see Chapter 6), the national union leadership originally emphasized that the Program of Action was a campaign to build public awareness of, and support for, CUPW's vision of a worker- and service-oriented postal system. This led

me to characterize the Program of Action as an attempt to build a limited alternative hegemony in Canadian society in relation to the issue of postal service.

By February, 1988, however, the NEB was downplaying the hegemony-building side of the National Program of Action and presenting it as a political fightback campaign for postal workers. This shift in emphasis can be seen in a quote from the speech on the National Program of Action made by the union's 1st vice-president, Daryl Tingley, to CUPW's Special National Convention on the afternoon of February 21, 1988.

> In the short-term our objectives are: to stop the five year business plan of the corporation; to minimize the impact of mediation-arbitration on our present collective agreement; to do our utmost to eliminate the adverse effects of the National Sortation Strategy; and to promote the expansion and improvement of services to the public. In the long-term we want to have adopted at all levels of government anti-scab legislation; we want to defeat the federal government's policies on free trade and privatization and deregulation; we want to win back our right to free collective bargaining and the right to strike; and in the next federal election we want to defeat the Mulroney Conservative government.[6]

With these words, Tingley has cast the National Program of Action in a practical mould, not a consciousness raising mould. Indeed, it is quite significant that at no point in Tingley's speech, or in the Background Information prepared for the Special National Convention (Canadian Union of Postal Workers, 1988), is there explicit mention of the notion of

---

[6] This quote is from a tape recording of the proceedings of the Special National Convention on the afternoon of February 21. Unless otherwise noted, other quotes presented in this section were also transcribed from the same tape. In the case of individuals who addressed the convention in French, I recorded important sections of the English translation of their remarks.

building "public consciousness and support for CUPW's vision of a postal system that is service-oriented and not a target for private enterprise" (see CUPW Bulletin 86-89/192, October 26, 1987).

It is my view that this change in the public face of the National Program of Action is due to two main developments. First, it became apparent to the union that Canada Post's new centralized sortation strategy would have a massive impact on the membership: a minimum of 3450 operational positions would be declared surplus (CUPW Bulletin, 86-89/221, Jan. 14/88), many through the closure of smaller Post Offices (CUPW Bulletin, 86-89/224, Feb. 4/88). Second, union locals in Quebec and southwestern Ontario severely criticized the NEB for not doing enough to defend the membership's immediate interests. Thus, just as the NEB wanted to move ahead with its plans to build an alternative hegemony in relation to postal service, it was forced to refocus its attention on a bread-and-butter issue (anticipated job loss due to major changes in the organization of sortation) and internal union politics. This appears to have caused the practical redefinition of the National Program of Action.

Was it happenstance that pressures from a bread-and-butter issue and internal union struggles forced an adjustment in the direction of the National Program of Action between October, 1987 and February, 1988? I think not. In my view the shift in the public face of the National Program of Action is a result of some intractable problems which bedeviled CUPW's national leadership as it sought to organize an alternative hegemonic movement in the area of postal policy in Canada. My objective in this section of the chapter is to identify and discuss

these problems. I do so by means of an analysis of the various criticisms of the NEB which were made by Hamilton CUPW leaders and CUPW leaders from Quebec.

Criticisms of the National Leadership by Hamilton CUPW Leaders

> -- "We're more union than they pretend to be."
> -- "Parrot's very good with the Left. The point is, he prefers the Left to postal workers."
> -- comments by two Hamilton CUPW leaders

At a few points during the 1987 strike I got an indication that relations between the national CUPW leadership and the Hamilton local leadership were somewhat adversarial. For instance, members of the Hamilton executive reported that they had given serious consideration to engaging in a general strike starting September 30, 1987 rather than following the rotating strike strategy of the national leadership. In addition, I also learned that some members of the Hamilton executive weren't shy about angrily expressing points of disagreement to members of the National Executive Board (NEB). In response to an October 13 memo sent out by the National Chief Steward, John Fehr, concerning union representation for Canada Post employees covered by the GS bargaining unit,[7] a Hamilton executive sent this reply by Fax machine to Ottawa:

> Dear NEB:
> With the situation as it presently exists with our members laying all over the sidewalk & being

---

[7] This is a group of former PSAC members who were certified as CUPW members during CUPW's 1987 sign-up campaign. The memo reported that the GS bargaining unit members would receive second stage grievance representation by the national union. This incensed Hamilton union leaders since the national leadership had for some time refused to carry out second stage grievance representation for CUPW members, preferring to let grievances pile up, waiting for arbitration hearings. For more information on this issue, see the text of the petition cited later in this subsection.

> arrested on an hourly basis by the police -- that
> bulletin under the signature of Mr. Fehr clearly
> demonstrates that the priorities that have existed in
> our union over the past few years are continuing.
> FUCK YOU FEHR

However, although during the strike I learned that Hamilton union leaders were critical of the national leadership, my understanding of their criticisms was very incomplete. It was only in the four months after the strike's conclusion, culminating in CUPW's Special National Convention in February, 1988, that I came to understand their objections to the policies and actions of the national leadership. During this period the Hamilton local executive put considerable energy into trying to reform the national union. After the November 26 call for a Special National Convention, most of this energy was directed to organizing opposition to the national leadership amongst locals in southwestern Ontario. The specific activities of the Hamilton executive included: (1) sending a letter to the National Executive Board shortly after the strike's conclusion which asked that the National Director of the Ontario Region, Joe Alviano, be removed from office because of his alleged misappropriation of union funds; (2) continuing to be the moving force behind regular "networking" meetings of CUPW leaders in postal facilities controlled by Canada Post's Huron Region (meetings of this "Tomahawk" network were held in late October, 1987 and early February, 1988); (3) organizing a meeting of union presidents from southwestern Ontario on January 13, 1988 in order to work out a joint strategy for

the Special Ontario Regional Conference[8]; (4) putting forward a motion at the Special Ontario Regional Conference calling for the resignation of National Director Joe Alviano[9]; and (5) maintaining contact with the leadership of the Montreal local of CUPW. By talking with Hamilton CUPW leaders at regular intervals throughout this period, my understanding of their perspectives on internal union matters gradually developed.

The specific criticisms of Hamilton CUPW leaders fall into four categories. I will first list the categories of criticisms and then proceed to provide examples for each. First, the national leadership was seen as being arrogant and out-of-touch with the union membership. Second, some national leaders were viewed as incompetents who mismanaged union affairs. Third, some of the key policies of the national leadership were judged to be misdirected. Fourth, the national leadership was accused of engaging in dirty politics to maintain its control of the union. Based upon the full range of these criticisms, those Hamilton leaders who were most involved in union politics had concluded that the general orientation of the national leadership was incorrect.

Hamilton union leaders were frustrated by the way that the national CUPW leadership consistently ignored their requests and criticisms. For instance, a number of months before the 1987 strike,

---

[8] In the period before the Special National Convention, the four CUPW regions -- Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario and Western -- each had a Special Regional Conference, the main purpose of which was to select delegates to the Special National Convention.

[9] The chair of the convention, Jean-Claude Parrot, ruled the motion out of order. A Hamilton delegate challenged the decision of the chair. About 60% of the delegates supported Parrot's decision.

different CUPW locals, including Hamilton, had circulated the following petition amongst the membership:

> We the undersigned members of the Canadian Union of Postal Workers wish to inform the National Executive Board that the second level grievance replies being received by the membership are both divisive and demoralizing to the Union and the membership.
>
> The decision of the National Executive to cease holding second level grievance hearings plays into the hands of the employer by adding to the alienation of the membership and may also jeopardize any grievances that do reach arbitration.
>
> While we recognize that dealing with management at any level is frustrating at best, it must be done.
>
> We therefore demand that the National Union begin conducting second level grievance hearings at the National Level immediately.

I saw hundreds of names of CUPW members on copies of the petition held by the Hamilton local. Hamilton local leaders were irked by the fact that the national leadership never bothered to respond to the petition.

The National Executive Board also failed to reply to the Hamilton local's request in late 1987 that the National Director of the Ontario Region be removed from office. Once again, their perception was that a serious criticism was being arrogantly ignored. The Hamilton local could not even seem to get basic information from the NEB. For instance, no response was made to their request for a list of all employees working out of the national office in Ottawa.

The national leadership was also criticized for mismanaging union affairs. Two national officers were repeatedly singled out by Hamilton leaders. The first was the National Director of the Ontario Region. In addition to accusing him of misappropriating union funds, Hamilton leaders viewed his day-to-day leadership of the Region as incompetent. The second was the National Secretary-Treasurer. Hamilton

executive members were incredulous at the bookkeeping work she sent to the local, given that it was so riddled with errors. In both cases, CUPW leaders in Hamilton believed that the incompetence of these individuals was excused by the NEB because they were political "yes people" for Jean-Claude Parrot and the group around him.

Some of the key policies of the national leadership were also criticized. At the top of the list was the decision of the National Executive Board to abandon second stage grievance hearings and automatically refer all grievances to arbitration. In November, 1986 an arbitrator indicated that CUPW's position jeopardized all its grievances because it would allow the employer to make the technical argument in an arbitration hearing that the official steps for processing a grievance were not being followed. Furthermore, the employer began using the NEB's position in its communication with the CUPW membership. Second stage grievance replies "were divisive and demoralizing" because the grieving member was told (1) that the grievance was rejected because the national leadership refused to argue it and (2) that, should the grievance be referred to arbitration, the employer would object because no second stage hearing had been held. In the eyes of Hamilton CUPW leaders, the NEB's position played into management's hands by contributing to a major back-up of the grievance system. They were especially irritated that the national leadership did not change its position once it became apparent that Canada Post was using the NEB's refusal to attend second stage hearings to sow discord in CUPW.

Before the preparatory period for the Special National Convention, other reservations about the national union's strategies

were also expressed, but not with the same frequency and conviction as the criticisms of the national's handling of grievances. These reservations overlapped with the concerns expressed by the Montreal local in leaflets sent to CUPW locals across the country in 1986 and 1987. Prominent among them were opposition to the rotating strike strategy and opposition to the use of over $3 million from the union's Strike Fund to purchase an office building in Ottawa. After the National Executive Board's announcement of the agenda for the Special National Convention, Hamilton local leaders developed two additional major disagreements with national policies: they disagreed with taking $2 million from the Strike Fund to pay for the National Program of Action; and, they objected to proposed changes in the union's constitution which would limit the power of the Montreal local in the Quebec region and make Montreal union members susceptible to a disciplinary procedure controlled by the NEB.

Hamilton CUPW leaders were particularly incensed by the way that the national leadership seemed to be playing dirty politics, both in its dealings with them and on other union issues. This dirty politicking was judged to directly hinder the struggle to defend the rights of the Hamilton membership. For instance, leaders believed that grievances from Hamilton were being neglected at the national level because of the Hamilton local's opposition to the national leadership. This happened in two ways. First, the national leadership ignored requests by the Hamilton local for permission to engage in expedited arbitrations at the local level. However, permission was granted to locals which supported the National Executive Board. Second, Hamilton grievances were very

infrequently picked to go to arbitration by the National Chief Steward (who had the discretionary power to decide the order in which grievances were processed). The perception of the Hamilton leaders was that arbitration cases from the Atlantic and Western Regions of CUPW received priority since this was where the political support for the National Executive Board was strongest.

Hamilton union leaders were also angered by the way that the National Chief Steward, John Fehr, went about limiting the authority of the Hamilton local. Unhappy with the slowness of the grievance system, the Hamilton local began taking health and safety cases directly to the Canada Labour Relations Board in 1987. They achieved a number of successes. They then received a letter from the Labour Board informing them that the national union had instructed the CLRB to process no more cases forwarded from Hamilton. The NEB's position on this issue, as explained by John Fehr to the Special National Convention on February 21, has some plausibility -- they were worried about the possibility that such cases would establish a negative precedent for all CUPW members, so decided that only cases authorized by a member of the NEB could be sent to the Labour Board. In other words, the union's central power was needed to protect the interests of all members. What is important in the incident, however, is that instead of communicating directly with the Hamilton local and facilitating their active defence of the membership while at the same time guarding against any negative precedents, Fehr chose to "pull rank" and communicate with the CLRB.

A similar sort of incident occurred in late 1987. As it had done in the past, the Hamilton executive chose to withdraw a few

grievances which they judged to be unwinnable, including some which had been filed by a member who had since become a supervisor. When he received information on the grievance withdrawals, Fehr wrote to Canada Post management in Hamilton informing them that the grievances were still active since the Hamilton local had no authority to withdraw grievances. His action had the effect of belittling the competency of the Hamilton executive in the eyes of the management it has to deal with on a daily basis. Again, Fehr chose to "pull rank" with the Hamilton local rather than communicating his reservations directly to the local's executive members.[10]

---

[10] The exchange on this issue on the convention floor on the afternoon of February 21, 1988 is illuminating and worth quoting at length. The Chief Steward of the Hamilton local, Yvon Seveny, first addressed the matter. He stated, in the course of a 5 minute speech:

> We had a scab in the local who became a supervisor. We decided to remove all her grievances from the grievance procedure and we sent a letter off to management to do that. What happened? We get a copy of a letter from management -- we get no communication from National Office -- addressed to them from John Fehr telling them to keep all these grievances in the grievance procedure, they're going to hear them, and to ignore the Hamilton local. Why? Because Brother Fehr wants to win the scab some money? That's a Program of Action?

John Fehr replied immediately, again in the course of a 5 minute speech:

> With respect to withdrawal of grievances that are put to arbitration, what Brother Seveny has just said is frankly grounds for a "failure to represent" complaint being filed against this union by the individual he has cited. I had no idea of who that person was. All that I know is that my analysis of the Canada Labour Code would tell anyone, particularly a person who works with grievance arbitration, that you may not drop a grievance simply because you do not like that individual. And whether or not your dislike for that person is because

Finally, CUPW leaders in Hamilton also believed that dirty politicking was a component of the National Program of Action. In their view, political patronage played a major role in the choice of individuals to fill the roles of regional coordinators for the Program of Action.

Given their many difficulties with and criticisms of the national CUPW leadership, it is not surprising that a few Hamilton leaders had arrived at the conclusion that the general orientation of the NEB was incorrect and detrimental to the membership of the union. Local union leaders used different phrases to describe their general appraisal of the national leadership; the quotes at the beginning of this subsection are two pithy examples of such appraisals. Their view was that the national leadership of CUPW was preoccupied with its own socialist visions of union grandeur and, as a consequence, was falling down in its duty to serve and defend the CUPW membership. Hamilton

---

you are politically biased against the individual, you don't happen to like the colour of their skin, or whether or not they scabbed is frankly no grounds for withdrawing that grievance.

And I should also tell people here that it wasn't just one person's grievance who was withdrawn. It was more than one. Brother Seveny didn't mention what particular sin these others had committed. I'm not sure. I didn't ask. What I did was, I wrote the employer and I said no local has the opportunity to withdraw a grievance from arbitration. If the local wishes to do that they may contact me and we'll do it (Emphasis added).

Thus, at the Special National Convention John Fehr defended his technical expertise in handling grievances. But, quite amazingly, he admitted that he did not even bother to ask the Hamilton local about the withdrawn grievances, and instead undercut their authority by communicating directly with Canada Post management in Hamilton. In this case, the charge of dirty politicking stands up to scrutiny.

leaders felt that the union membership had far too little impact on the direction of the national union, and suspected that the union staff employed in the Ottawa office had far too much. In sum, they believed that the national union office was politically out of step with the union membership in a way that was posing grave problems for CUPW.

The critical position of some Hamilton CUPW leaders returns us to a paradox which was first identified in Chapter 8. They criticized the NEB for being out of step with the rank-and-file, but in so doing were articulating a point of view which was not being expressed by rank-and-file Hamilton members. Were Hamilton CUPW leaders thus misrepresenting the viewpoint of the membership? Or were they simply attuned to the practical consciousness of the membership, formulating systematic criticisms based upon a thorough understanding of that practical consciousness?

To answer these questions it is first necessary to note the dynamics of leadership/membership relations in CUPW locals. The Montreal local of CUPW prides itself in encouraging membership participation in union affairs. Even so, the local averaged less than 150 members at regular monthly meetings held in the 1983-85 period (SPC Montreal, April, 1986:7). This demonstrates that, even in a local which is noted for encouraging membership participation, only a small percentage of CUPW members involve themselves in regular union affairs. In Hamilton, regular monthly, union meetings might attract 15 members. Thus, outside of the leadership circles in any local, few CUPW members are informed about, or even that interested in, internal union politics.

Given this situation, it would be unreasonable to expect rank-and-file Hamilton members to express systematic appraisals of the state of internal union politics. They might have views on specific issues, such as the NEB's policy of not participating in second stage grievance hearings, but would not have an overarching conceptual framework for analyzing union affairs. Therefore, it would be wrong to interpret my findings as indicating that Hamilton CUPW leaders misrepresented the views of the Hamilton membership. Indeed, to some extent I am sure that their concerns about the direction of the union are consistent with the practical union orientation of the rank-and-file.

However, amongst the CUPW rank-and-file in Hamilton I also observed a loyalty and even affection for the national union and Jean-Claude Parrot which was not shared by the most critical of the leaders in the local.[11] In this sense the campaign of opposition waged by the Hamilton CUPW leadership seems to me to have been slightly out of step with the views of the rank-and-file.

Criticisms of the National Program of Action at the Special Convention

On the afternoon of February 21, 1988, the 281 delegates to CUPW's Special National Convention considered a constitutional amendment authorizing $2 million from the union's Defence Fund to be spent on the National Program of Action. Debate on the resolution was limited to two and one-half hours, and at the debate's conclusion the resolution passed easily in a show of hands vote. (I estimate that 70% of the delegates

---

[11] This observation is consistent with a finding of Chapter 7: the Leftward shift in the political attitudes of the Hamilton CUPW rank-and-file in comparison to national samples of union members is organized around the adoption of an alternative set of social likes and dislikes.

supported the resolution.) Opposition to the resolution was restricted to the Quebec and Ontario Regions. I learned from Hamilton delegates to the convention that the Western and Atlantic Region delegates had block-voted on this resolution -- delegates from these regions were not supposed to change their minds in the course of convention debate.[12] The debate on funding the National Program of Action was thus largely a democratic ritual, legitimating a decision already made.[13] At the same time, I found the debate of great interest. The criticisms of the Program of Action expressed on the convention floor represent a concentrated overview of opposition within CUPW to this sort of political initiative. They are a second barometer of the problems faced by the national CUPW leadership, complementary to the criticisms expressed by Hamilton leaders in the preconvention period.

Before proceeding with an analysis of oppositional criticisms, I should note that certain types of CUPW delegates were much more likely to speak during the debate than others. Of the 14 speakers who spoke in favour of the Program of Action, six identified themselves or were known to me as full-time union officials. Of the 13 speakers who spoke against the Program of Action, nine were from the Quebec Region and four

[12] A major development in the convention occurred the next day when some delegates from the Western Region broke away from the block and voted against constitutional changes which limited the power of the Montreal local in the Quebec Region. This NEB resolution only passed by about 15 votes.

[13] It should be remembered that the National Program of Action had been underway for over 3 months at the time of the debate. Major sums of money had already been committed even though the union's deficit for the fiscal year July/87 to June/88 was projected to be over $1 million not including any expenses incurred in the Program of Action (Daryl Tingley speech, Special National Convention, February 21, 1988).

from the Ontario Region. Three of four Ontario speakers explicitly criticized the Program of Action for not being "revolutionary" (e.g., "The proposed Program of Action is inadequate because it appeals to everybody but the workers for a solution.... Generating profits for the bourgeoisie is the primary function of Canada Post. This fact has to be exposed to the people.... Only the workers can emancipate themselves.") The fourth speaker from Ontario did not express criticisms of this quality, but was recognized throughout the union as a supporter of a far Left organization. On both sides of the question, then, the voices of many 'ordinary' activists were not heard. In light of this fact, my analysis of oppositional comments has a restricted scope. The range of opinion does not enable me to compose a comprehensive list of the criticisms held by all sectors of convention delegates. However, I can determine whether convention criticisms expressed by delegates from the Quebec Region are consistent with the views of Hamilton leaders reported in the previous subsection.[14]

Quebec Region delegates mentioned five types of criticisms during the debate. First, a number of speakers suggested that the political orientation of the Program of Action was wrong. Second, the Program of Action was portrayed as an attempt by the NEB to compensate for past leadership failures. Third, the national leadership was accused of mismanaging the organization's finances. For instance, large 1986 donations to the strikers at Gainers Meats in Alberta and to

---

[14] I give the ultra-Left criticisms of the National Program of Action no further attention in this thesis. These perspectives did not command any more than a smattering of allegiance amongst convention delegates.

striking Newfoundland government employees were condemned by one speaker for being financially irresponsible when the union was in a budget deficit situation. Fourth, it was suggested that the regional coordinators for the Program of Action were patronage appointments. Fifth, the NEB's actions were judged as being unconstitutional.[15] The political orientation and misleadership criticisms were prominent, and are thus outlined in more depth here.

The political thrust of the National Program of Action was criticized both for being out of touch with what the membership wanted the union to be doing, and for being unrealistic. "The members are not willing to follow action plans that want to change the social and political order," argued a speaker from Quebec. The leader of the Montreal local, Marcel Perreault, put this point in the first person: "I'm not an NDP. I'm not a Liberal. I'm not a Conservative. I'm a unionist, and I want the Defence Fund to defend the union." Another Montreal speaker stated, "Members just want us to solve their problems, not defeat political parties." A humorous comment questioned how realistic the Program of Action is. "So we want to get the support of the public?" rhetorically asked a Quebec delegate. "Oh yeah? Listen, there are two national sports in Canada: hockey and beating up on the posties."

---

[15] Article 13 of the CUPW Constitution allows constitutional amendments "during a National Convention". In Article 3 of the Constitution the regular triennial convention of CUPW is called the "National Convention" while special conventions like the one held in February, 1988 are called a "Special Convention" or a "Special National Convention". There is thus some ambiguity in the CUPW Constitution as to whether a Special National Convention has the constitutional power to amend the constitution.

Numerous criticisms of the National Program of Action focussed on the strategic failures of the NEB. To a number of convention speakers from Quebec, the mere need for a Program of Action of this type signified that the national leadership had neglected the grassroots of the union. "We don't need $2 million in Montreal to get the membership to participate in their union," stated one delegate. "When we want plans of action we mobilize the membership." Another delegate argued that the National Program of Action created a parallel structure within the union. "It shows that locals aren't able to mobilize the members." The national leadership was thus condemned for taking an approach over the years which had failed to build up membership participation in CUPW.[16]

---

[16] Some comments by Hamilton union leaders on membership participation in CUPW are of relevance here. They believed that in many centres across the country the union was but an organizational shell, with membership involvement being virtually non-existent. The largest local in the country, Toronto, was the primary example of this malaise in CUPW. Hamilton CUPW leaders also believed that most of the locals in the Atlantic and Western Regions were very weak. In their view this allowed union officials to develop considerable power in those regions and accounted for the limited opposition to the NEB amongst convention delegates from those regions.

It is also interesting that CUPW's national leadership acknowledged the grassroots weakness in the union, although they offered no analysis of its causes. In his speech to the Special Convention on the afternoon of February 21, 1987, Daryl Tingley stated:

> We want to make sure that this Program is more effective than past programs where we've put together documentation, sent it to the locals, and said "Implement it". I know a lot of you have done that. It's not a criticism of anybody. A lot of you have done it but others haven't done it. We believe it is necessary to change our Program but also to put in place area coordinators who would work with the locals, to assist them to put in place structures which would make it a possibility to carry out the campaign and Program from one end of the country to the other.

The other two major criticisms of the national leadership's policies concerned specific issues. The NEB was criticized for not working hard enough to oppose every instance of technological change introduced by the employer. Their position on second stage grievances was also condemned by a convention speaker from Montreal.

Many of the concerns expressed by Hamilton CUPW leaders in the months preceding the convention were thus echoed on the floor of the Special National Convention by delegates from Quebec. In sum, criticism of the national CUPW leadership covered five major points: incorrect general orientation to union activity; arrogance; mismanagement; dirty political dealing; and, misleadership on key strategic issues like grievances and technological change.

Responses by the National Leadership and its Supporters

It is beyond the scope of my research to ascertain the validity of each of the criticisms of CUPW's national leadership. However, it seems necessary to at least indicate how the national leadership and its supporters publicly responded to the criticisms.

First, the national leadership acknowledged that its orientation to union activity was different from that of the critics. In his opening remarks to the Special National Convention, Jean-Claude Parrot argued that the critics were inappropriately trying to apply strategies from the 1970s to a much changed situation in the late 1980s.

> Times are changing, and the present time belongs to
> those who are prepared to build for the future. Anyone
> who wants to relive the battles of the 1970s should step
> aside because we must build a union of the future, not a
> union of the past.

Most of the supporters of the National Program of Action who addressed the convention emphasized that an ambitious campaign of political action was merely a sensible response to the situation facing inside postal workers. An Ontario delegate stated:

> All our traditional methods of fighting back have been sabotaged. Our right to collective bargaining has been taken way. Our right to strike has been taken away. And the employer has sabotaged our grievance procedure to the extent that we could no longer police our collective agreement. We don't have any choice right now. We have to adopt this Program of Action.... The only response to a political attack is through a political campaign.

A speech from the convention floor by an Atlantic Regional officer covered the same ground.

> A Program of Action is needed in this union to defeat the political action of the Tories. (And although some don't like to admit it, what's happening to this union is direct political action by the Tories.) The only way we're going to defeat that is to recognize that we not only have to implement a Program of Action to deal with our internal struggles and to prevent changes that are going to take place under binding arbitration, but we also have to take a political role. And yes, there is a change in orientation. Yes, there has been a shift. But I'm telling you it's for the good of this union. Because we have no choice, brothers and sisters. To sit back and do nothing is to watch this union self-destruct.

In contrast, there were no direct responses to the criticisms of mismanagement, arrogance and dirty political dealing.[17] However, in the cases of the latter two criticisms, a line of response can be constructed from various sources. It appears that the national

---

[17] An exception to this generalization is found in John Fehr's reply to convention criticisms made by Yvon Seveny, the Hamilton local's Chief Steward. Their exchange is reported in footnote 10 of this chapter.

leadership believed that any highhandedness or dirty political dealing on its part was (1) insignificant in comparison to the dirty politicking by its opponents, and (2) was a justified response to its opponents' actions. Four pieces of evidence will be presented to support this interpretation.

First, during the February 21, 1988 morning session at the Special National Convention, Jean-Claude Parrot mentioned how much more tolerant of dissenting opinion the national leadership was in comparison to the leadership of the Montreal local. Second, in the Background Information papers presented to the Special National Convention, the NEB noted that in the Quebec Region (1) "No regional officers, union representatives, trustees, alternate trustees, disciplinary committee members and alternates come from any other local but Montreal"; (2) Quebec Regional officers were not implementing national programs; and (3) Quebec Regional officers were publicly criticizing the national leadership and were using regional education seminars "to foster division within the Union". The latter two actions were interpreted as being unconstitutional and of grievous harm to the union.[18] I suspect that the national leadership believed that some dirty politicking was justified to counteract what it viewed as the concerted dirty politicking perpetrated by the leadership of the Montreal local.

---

[18] CUPW, like most unions, has a clause in its constitution which, if literally applied, would penalize almost all types of dissent outside of formal union channels. Among other things, Article 8.01 regards as an offence (1) conduct which is "detrimental to the welfare or interests of the Union or its members"; and (2) not complying with the policies of the union.

The third piece of evidence is found in a letter written by the NEB on March 19, 1987 to Clement Morel. In the letter the NEB explains why it decided to dismiss Morel as a member of the Negotiating Committee. It contains a remarkable story of underhanded political dealing which the NEB believed (1) was the responsibility of the Montreal local of CUPW, and (2) was important enough to receive prominent mention in a letter of only some 1000 words.

> We can assure you, Brother, that the fact that another negotiator and the National President each received a funeral wreath, that national and regional officers across the country, negotiators and some local officers have received a rubber frog in their mail and that technical staff hired by the Union received the same will not intimidate us. Furthermore, despite the fact that the National President's daughter, who is eight months pregnant and has nothing to do with our disagreements, also received a rubber frog in her mail, that his wife has received anonymous telephone calls at home, death threats, a dead fish in the mail and a wreath was sent to her, you can be assured that it will not make the National President resign and will not prevent him from continuing the struggle he has conducted over the past twenty-five years for postal workers in every region.

Fourth, Jean-Claude Parrot and the NEB also argued that the dissent of the Montreal local was based upon the power cravings of Marcel Perreault rather than on any sense of union principle. In an August 11, 1987 leaflet handed out to the membership of the Montreal local, Parrot offered this explanation for why the executive of the Montreal local recommended voting "No" to a national strike and "No" to constitutional changes recommended by the NEB which defined the place of former Union of Postal Communications Employees members in CUPW:

> I know him [Marcel Perreault] well enough to know that he hasn't been able to accept losing his influence throughout the rest of the country.... He also hasn't

been able to accept, since the last National Congress,
the fact that he's lost his influence on the rest of
Quebec. It's obvious that he's now afraid of losing
whatever power he holds at the local level and that he
fears the influx of new members into our union because
of the proposed merger with UPCE.

Finally, the national leadership and its supporters responded to

the criticism of misleadership on key strategic issues not by directly

answering the criticisms, but by turning the criticism around. During

the debate on the National Program of Action at the Special National

Convention, a number of speakers accused the critics of failing to offer

any alternative to the National Program of Action.[19] Two separate

speeches from the convention floor convey this point of view.

> Delegate after delegate after delegate has been
> getting up to the microphones and saying, "This is
> unacceptable", "This is terrible". But the biggest
> problem I see is that while a lot of people are saying
> how terrible these things are, and how inadequate this
> proposal is — I've seen a lot of documents from courts
> being reprinted and handed out; I've seen a lot of legal
> opinions from lawyers being reprinted and handed out;
> I've seen all kinds of glossy documents floating over
> the convention floor; but I see not one document that
> says, "Here's what we're saying you should do. And
> here's where the money should come from". [Extended
> applause, whistling, cheers]

---

[19] This criticism is only partially correct. The opponents to
the National Program of Action did not offer any alternative special
program. However, they did have an alternative in mind, as explained by
the Chief Steward of the Hamilton local, Yvon Seveny, at the Special
National Convention.

> Now, one brother asked what an alternative is to a
> Program of Action. And the alternative is already in
> place. The alternative is the local structure, the
> regional structure and the national structure. If the
> union was doing the job on the shopfloor that it should
> be doing in defence of our contract and the membership,
> we wouldn't need a Program of Action, we would be
> winning these issues.

> If you're opposed to a resolution, the responsible
> way to actually show your opposition is to come onto the
> floor with an alternative, with a solution on paper.
> Obviously the resources are there for people to do
> this.... So I don't know why, if you're opposed to it,
> you didn't come up with an alternative.

Comments along this line seemed to have the largest impact on delegates during the two and one-half hours of convention discussion. These comments were effective because the opponents of the National Program of Action, in addition to not offering a special alternative program, employed convention floor tactics which were negative and obstructionist,[20] and were bound to irritate delegates who were either firm supporters of the national leadership, critical supporters of the national leadership, or fence sitters.

A Final Note on the Special National Convention

Over the past few pages I hope I have conveyed the impression that the Special National Convention of CUPW was a highly polarized meeting. In this atmosphere delegates from both sides did not necessarily listen to the arguments, but instead responded according to which side was speaking. The critics of the National Program of Action were actually a motley assortment: Montreal local delegates and delegates from sympathetic Quebec locals who were regarded as being under the iron fist of Marcel Perreault; supporters of a far Left organization (Canadian Party of Labour) from the Toronto local; and

---

[20] For instance, the first morning of the Special National Convention was taken up by procedural wrangling. Opponents to the NEB asked that there be a recorded vote on every procedural motion. This request itself entails a vote. Furthermore, when a NEB procedural decision was passed, opponents (usually 50 to 75 delegates) lined up at the microphones and each formally recorded her/his dissent to the decision.

delegates from Southwestern Ontario who were viewed (by the national leadership) as being on the Right-wing of the union. If they were inclined to do so, supporters of the national leadership could easily find a reason to dismiss this seemingly unholy alliance. For instance, on the convention floor there was evidence of anti-French bigotry by some supporters of the national leadership from the Western Region. And supporters of the national leadership who were aligned with Trotskyist groups tended to dismiss the views of any person who was both aligned with a rival far Left group and critical of the national leadership of CUPW. Thus, the convention was not a debating club with each side conscientiously answering the arguments of the other side. Prejudice, sectarianism and passion sometimes seemed to rule the day.

The Strategic Predicaments Facing the National CUPW Leadership

In attempting to orient CUPW towards the far-reaching political objectives of the Program of Action, the national leadership met significant opposition from within the union. What was the nature of the problems confronting the NEB, and what strategic predicaments resulted from these problems?

The first problem involves the objectives of a labour union. Certainly union members disagree on the extent to which unions should be involved in political action. Few would disagree, however, that the primary functions of the union are to defend the membership and to provide the support services that the membership expects. If a union leadership falls down in fulfilling these primary functions, then it risks alienating both union rank-and-file and key leaders at the local level. Such a circumstance existed in many CUPW locals during the

period around the 1987 strike. By neglecting or ignoring the defence and service objectives of CUPW in favour of political objectives, the national leadership created the conditions for strong opposition to its political program. This suggests that a political program cannot secure wide membership support in a union when it is seen as detracting from the union fulfilling its basic responsibilities to the membership.

The second problem ties into the first; it involves the restricted resources available to labour unions in Canadian society. In comparison to any large employer, unions have very limited monetary and professional resources. This means that a union's resources can easily be stretched too thin if a great many projects have been put on the agenda, and important work may be neglected in the rush to cover other tasks. Consequently, union leaders constantly face a dilemma: while a great many tasks cry out to be undertaken, undertaking too many of them will undermine a union's overall effectiveness. This appears to be the situation in which CUPW found itself in 1987. At the same time as the national leadership was making presentations to Conciliation Commissioner Foisy, preparing for a strike, handling a flood of grievances from across the country and assessing the impact of Canada Post's five year plan on postal workers, it was organizing postal cleaners, raiding PSAC for new members and engaged in political outreach. On top of all that, it was having to defend itself in court in the civil cases launched by the Montreal local, and to present arguments to the Canada Labour Relations Board on the future shape of the bargaining units in the Post Office. It seems likely that part of the reason the national CUPW leadership neglected the defence of the

membership and union services throughout this period is that it simply had too many major projects on the go.

The third problem concerns the nature of leadership within a union. A socialist union leadership such as that which existed in CUPW during this period must tread a fine political line. In striving to guide a union towards the Left, it cannot push too hard and fast or volunteer leaders at the grassroots of the union will be alienated by the union's direction. It also must put considerable time and energy into basic membership education and organization in order to nurture grassroots activism. From a socialist perspective, then, a union has two pulses: the political direction of the union (largely determined by the orientation of the leadership); and the extent of grassroots involvement in the union. If the first pulse is strong but the second is weak, the socialist political perspective of the union is really an empty shell.

To some extent this is the situation the CUPW national leadership confronted in 1987. They had two responses. First, a handful of paid political organizers (regional coordinators of the National Program of Action) were substituted for absent grassroots activism. Second, aggressive steps were taken to minimize the power and authority of union locals who opposed the NEB. In the short run this is a feasible strategy for getting their political message out and for maintaining political control in CUPW. It did not change the fact, however, that CUPW was organizationally weak in many parts of the country, including the union's largest local, Toronto. It also did not change the fact that a significant minority of CUPW's grassroots leaders

were politically opposed to the national leadership's orientation towards unionism. Instead of committing their energies to the Program of Action, they were building a movement of internal political opposition.

The attempt by CUPW's national leadership to fashion an alternative hegemony in relation to the issue of postal service thus had an ironic twist. As the NEB of CUPW strived to establish its moral and political leadership outside the union, its leadership was increasingly being rejected within the union. To keep the union on the course it favoured, the national leadership was forced to take steps to enhance its centralist control over union affairs. This further destroyed its legitimacy in the eyes of many grassroots CUPW leaders.

My conclusion is that CUPW's capacity to be the focal point of an alternative hegemony was severely impeded by problems related to the functions, resources and leadership dynamics of labour unions in contemporary Canada. The experience of CUPW in 1987-88 does not rule out the possibility that a contemporary Canadian union could successfully initiate a hegemonic project. However, it does suggest that such a project could only be accomplished by a large union which has a strong track record on bread and butter issues, and which has nurtured grassroots activism over an extended period of time.

Table 10.1 Feeling Thermometer Averages for Different Groups of Hamilton Workers

| Groups of Hamilton Workers | Dependent Variables | | | | |
	Labour Movement	CUPW	Union Leaders	Jean-Claude Parrot	N
1. Household Survey[a]					
Union Leaders	69	53	67	48	26
Union Rank-and-File	61	41	51	40	54
Non-Union Workers	54	40	45	34	108
2. Strike Survey[b]					
CUPW Leaders	77	xx	73	72	18
CUPW Rank-and-File	69	xx	64	65	27

xx This item was not included in the survey of strikers.
[a] For details of this survey see Chapter 5.
[b] For details of this survey see Chapter 6.

CHAPTER 11: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter I undertake two tasks. First, I summarize the major findings from each of the three parts of the thesis. Second, I outline what I see as the theoretical, methodological and political conclusions of this research project.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

On the Trends and Divisions in Workers' Political Attitudes

1. There were no dramatic changes in Canadian political culture in the 1970 to mid-1980s period. At the same time, two trends in the political attitudes of workers and other classes were identified. First, there was increasing opposition to Big Government. Second, there was a liberal shift in views on personal life choices (e.g., premarital sex, Black/White marriage). In addition, there is evidence of temporary Rightward shifts in workers' views on immigration and public sector strikes in response to the economic hardship experienced in the early 1980s; these shifts in views had disappeared by the mid-1980s.

2. Class differences across the spectrum of political issues are more complicated than traditional sociological rule of thumb generalizations would lead us to believe. While Canadian workers are generally to the Left on economic issues, they are not generally more intolerant on social issues than owners/managers or even, in some cases, professionals. Indeed, on items concerned with personal life choices,

the distribution of workers' attitudes resembles the relatively liberal attitudes of professionals rather than the relatively conservative attitudes of owners/managers. On items concerned with family relations and social discipline, however, workers tend to be quite conservative in comparison to professionals.

3. New conservative organizations like the National Citizens' Coalition (NCC) claim to represent the views of ordinary Canadians. For the most part this claim is without support. However, in regard to popular disenchantment with the size of government, union involvement in politics and school discipline, this propaganda claim has a substantial degree of truth attached to it. It is significant that the National Citizens' Coalition has greatly expanded its activities in the 1980s on the back of a court case which challenges the right of a union to use dues collected from a non-member for anything other than contract administration services (the Merv Lavigne case). Furthermore, the other major recent activity of the NCC has been a campaign in favour of privatization. This demonstrates that the NCC has a keen sense of the elements of its platform which are most palatable to Canadians.

4. Four categories of social experience variables were found to have an influence on a wide range of workers' political attitudes. These categories are: class networks, job characteristics, society-wide trends and region. My findings lend support to each of the three basic propositions of the social experiences perspective on working class attitude variation. To some extent, variations in workers' political attitudes are due to (1) differences in occupational perspectives (e.g., blue collar/white collar divisions), (2) the effect of competing group

identities (e.g., generational differences and differences between Quebecois and English Canadian political cultures), and (3) variation in the extent of participation in working class subcultures (e.g., the impact of education, class background and the class of spouse).

5. Class network and job characteristic variables were important determinants of economic and government-related attitudes, but not social attitudes. My finding that blue collar workers tend to be quite distinct from white collar workers on economic and government-related issues runs counter to the idea that there has been a recent convergence of working class experience across this traditional occupational divide, and contradicts a major conclusion in a recent Canadian study (Johnston, 1987).

6. Of all the social experience variables I considered, education had the greatest overall impact on political attitudes. Canadian workers higher in education are less alienated from the system of government, higher in political interest, more liberal on social issues and less likely to support working class struggle.

7. Active consent to capitalist domination in Canadian society (as measured by the Capitalist Economic Organization index) is strongest among workers who do not live in Quebec, who have more formal education, who come from a non-working class background, and who work in a white collar job.

8. The adjusted coefficient of determination was .25 or higher in only 4 of the 16 multiple regression analyses reported in Chapter 3. In these analyses, correlation coefficients were corrected for random measurement error, and the effects of a wide variety of social

experience variables were assessed. This indicates that the social experiences perspective generally provides us with only a very partial understanding of working class attitude variation.

9. Workers' views on economic equality in Canadian society tend to be influenced by egoistic relative deprivation independent of a sense of class identification. This demonstrates that, in some cases, intrapersonal comparisons have an independent influence on workers' political views.

10. Where egoistic relative deprivation is a determinant of a political attitude, egoistic relative deprivation and class identification have a negative interaction effect. That is, these two social psychological processes do not tend to build upon each other in the development of workers' political attitudes.

11. Few workers organize their attitudes syllogistically. However, a much larger percentage of anti-capitalist workers are consistently Left-wing in perspective (11.7%) than pro-capitalist workers are consistently Right-wing in perspective (4.7%).

12. Affect for Left and Right is modestly associated with the second-order attitudes Economic Individualism and Moral/Defence Liberalism, but only very weakly associated with the second-order attitudes Economic Justice and Alienation From Government. In contrast, feelings of intrapersonal deprivation are associated with the latter two attitudes. This suggests an alternation of social psychological processes. When the results of Chapters 3 and 4 are juxtaposed, it is possible to identify an important dichotomy in the determination of workers' political attitudes. First, basic working class experiences --

command relations in blue collar jobs, the consciousness of class engendered in working class homes, and the development of a sense of egoistic relative deprivation -- lead to more egalitarian economic thinking and a disillusionment with the system of government. These perspectives do not tend to be associated with any tendency in affect for Left and Right. Second, the ideological processes which generate affect for Left and Right also influence workers' views on social issues and fundamental economic values. In contrast, basic working class experiences have little impact on these types of political attitudes.

13. The results of this study lend some support to Sniderman and Tetlock's likability heuristic hypothesis. Specifically, workers' fundamental economic values and moral/defence views are more likely to be to the Left when (1) they identify with the Left; and (2) they have more positive feelings for the Left than the Right.

14. In most cases, working class identification and positive feelings for the Left have similar influences on workers' political attitudes. Yet, in the case of Moral/Defence Liberalism, the influences run counter to each other. This indicates that class identification and affect for Left and Right are distinct social psychological phenomena with independent implications for workers' political consciousness.

On How Workers' Organize Their Views on Unions

1. There are six characteristic ways in which workers organize their views on labour unions. I labelled these six general union schemata as follows: (1) Politically active defence organizations, (2) Economic defence organizations, (3) Necessary evil, (4) Legitimate but

too prone to conflict, (5) Interfere with individual rights, and (6) Generally disruptive in society.

2. The six union schemata differ quite markedly in affective tag. This lends support to Susan Fiske's proposition that a distinctive affective tag is attached to the category label of a schema. This affective tag is "a 'precomputed' summary of the perceiver's reaction to the schema's attributes as a whole" (1986:46). Furthermore, a great deal of the variation on the item "If I had to choose, I probably would not be a member of a labour union" is explained by the six variables made up of union schemata factor loadings. This suggests that the schemata are meaningful abstractions.

3. The schemata can themselves be organized along two dimensions. The first is the affective tag attached to each schema. Two union schemata are very positive in affect, two are negative and two are neutral to mildly positive. The second dimension concerns the social bases of each schema. Only one of the union schemata with a neutral or positive affective tag ("Politically active defence organizations") was influenced by experiences with unions. This caused me to identify it as an oppositional schema, and contrast it to the other schemata, which represent different variants of the dominant ideology on labour unions in Canadian society.

4. The development of an oppositional perspective on unions is promoted by intensive rather than casual experiences with unions -- the major determinants of the schema "Politically active defence organizations" were growing up in a union family, being a union leader, and having regular interaction with union members away from work.

On Workers' Political Consciousness and Strike Action

1. In comparison to national samples of union members, the entire spectrum of political consciousness among Hamilton CUPW members is further Left. Union leaders in the Hamilton CUPW local were to the Left of national union leaders on both practical policy issues and items indicating ideological orientation. The rank-and-file in the Hamilton CUPW local were to the Left of national union rank-and-file on practical policy issues but not on items indicating political orientation. Furthermore, the attitudes of Hamilton CUPW leaders tended to be more consistent than national union leaders, while the attitudes of Hamilton CUPW rank-and-file were no more consistent than the attitudes of national union rank-and-file. I thus conclude that the Hamilton CUPW membership exhibited two levels of socialist political consciousness at the time of the 1987 strike. First, all of the leaders and a number of the rank-and-file possessed a practical socialist consciousness (although there was considerable variation in the extent of its development). This signifies that there is an important continuity in political attitude between CUPW leaders and rank-and-file. Indeed, my empirical findings demonstrate that on practical policy issues the gap in attitudes between CUPW leaders and rank-and-file in Hamilton is not nearly as important as the gap between CUPW members in one group and other Canadian union members in a second group. Second, there was a much higher proportion of conscious socialists among the CUPW leaders than among the rank-and-file. This is an important discontinuity in the Hamilton CUPW local.

2. The majority of CUPW members in Hamilton hold critical views of (1) the dominant conception of the merit of occupations in Canadian society, and/or (2) the notion that pay should be based on merit. CUPW members have developed these critical views in the course of responding to the widely held view that postal workers are overpaid. I argue that the ideological struggle faced by CUPW members in routine social interaction has likely influenced a variety of the dimensions of their political consciousness, including their views towards the poor in Canadian society. Hamilton CUPW members are markedly more sympathetic towards the poor than union members in Canada as a whole.

3. Strikebreaker recruits in Hamilton can be divided between two groups: marginalized workers facing economic hardship and anti-union mercenaries. Needy economic recruits predominated, and as a consequence the strikebreakers were not that different in political consciousness from national samples of non-union workers.

4. For the majority of strikebreakers, participation in the strike was motivated strictly by the high wages offered by Canada Post Corporation. Interestingly, a cash calculation also influenced the strike participation of a number of union members. For instance, some Hamilton mail service couriers (members of the Letter Carriers Union) worked overtime during the strike and thus passively assisted management's strikebreaking operation. And one of the issues which most outraged Hamilton CUPW members in the prestrike period was management's decision to arbitrarily limit the amount of overtime they could work before calling in casual employees. These incidents indicate that cash, either offered or withheld, has a powerful effect on many workers'

actions. Furthermore, it suggests that the compliance of Canadian workers is often grounded on a purchased, passive consent.

5. Through the use of multiple regression analyses I discovered that there was considerable elective affinity between Hamilton CUPW members' background political attitudes/identities and different dimensions of strike participation. This indicates that, in addition to variations in social background and contextual experience, variations in political consciousness must be considered when analyzing the determinants of union members' involvement in a strike.

6. I was able to explain a moderate amount of the variation in CUPW members' strike participation. The adjusted coefficients of determination for each of the three dependent variables were: Extent of Strike Involvement (.39), Strike Support Attitude (.43), and Anger Towards Scabs (.37).

7. Strikers' anger towards scabs was not a one-dimensional phenomenon. Those strikers who were angry may have had a deep feeling of outrage at the self-centredness of the scabs; felt powerless about the general course of the strike and lashed out at the scabs as an accessible target; been responding to the dynamics of intergroup interaction with the scabs; needed an emotional scapegoat in the conflict; or, been offended by the sight of untrained individuals taking over their jobs.

8. A major unexpected finding of my study is that married men strikers were much less angry at the scabs than married women strikers. I offer two explanations for this finding. First, the vast majority of married women CUPW members are more dependent upon their Post Office

jobs than married men CUPW members. This stems from the fact that mail processing and handling jobs in the Post Office are much better paying and more secure than the vast majority of jobs available to women in Canadian society. The different levels of anger towards the scabs thus seem to reflect the different labour market experiences of men and women in Canadian society. Second, experimental research suggests that women are more likely to respond to condescending treatment with greater anger. Since the entire strikebreaking operation was an affront to the dignity of CUPW members, this gender difference in response to condescension may account for some of married women's greater anger.

9. Independent of a wide range of other factors, strike involvement was the most important determinant of change in Hamilton CUPW members' attitudes towards unions. Greater picket line involvement during the strike resulted in more favourable attitudes towards unions after the strike. However, for other attitude dimensions, workers' short-term attitude change was a function of the expectations and perspectives they brought to, or developed during the course of, the struggle rather than their strike involvement.

10. In multiple regression analyses, social background and contextual factors proved to be much more important determinants of workers' short-term attitude change than background political attitudes/identities. I was able to explain anywhere from a moderate to major amount of the variation in CUPW members' short-term attitude change. The most important explanatory variables for each dimension of short-term attitude change were (adjusted coefficients of determination in brackets): Extent of Attitude Change -- gender and the political

attitude Authoritarian Individualism (.22); Authority Attitude Change --
gender, Personal Importance of Strike Issues, and the political attitude
Alienation From Government (.53); Union Attitude Change -- Extent of
Strike Involvement, Coworkers Hurt/Privatization, Job Dissatisfaction
and Friend of Executive or Steward (.36); and Workers' Discouragement --
Present or Past Leader, Personal Importance of Issues and the political
attitude Economic Radicalism (.42).

11. Two major attitude change processes affected Hamilton CUPW
members in the immediate poststrike period. First, many of the union
members who entered the strike with considerable respect for authority
had their background assumptions shattered in the labour conflict. This
engendered a sharp decline in respect for management and the police, and
meant that their poststrike on-the-job attitude was quite different from
their prestrike on-the-job attitude. Second, most of the union members
who entered the strike sympathetic to the union and its struggle were
enthused by the performance of the Hamilton local's membership. This
confirmed their background assumptions and strengthened their pro-union
commitment. Interestingly, while a few CUPW members experienced both of
these attitude change processes, over the entire membership the
processes did not tend to be found in tandem. This demonstrates that
disillusionment with the employer, even in its strongest form, does not
automatically result in a gain for the union cause.

12. The absence of picket line support for CUPW members during
the strike was due to two complementary factors: (1) Hamilton workers'
acquiescence to government and management power in the dispute; and (2)
political and organizational divisions in the working class. I argue

that these divisions make capitalist power seem to be beyond challenge, and thus strengthen the likelihood that workers will passively consent to capitalist domination.

13. In the weeks after the strike's conclusion, Hamilton CUPW members followed one of three courses of action. Some were conciliatory with management. Others were alienated and, as far as possible, withdrew psychic involvement in the job. Still others carried the solidarity of the picket line onto the workfloor in the Post Office. The actions of most of the conciliators were grounded on calculations of material self-interest. In contrast, the passive consent of alienated workers was grounded on a feeling that nothing could be done to change the unsatisfactory state of affairs inside the Post Office. This position reflected postal workers' objective powerlessness at that point in time. In addition, this response was made possible by the decent income earned by CUPW members and the solace of reasonably comfortable lives away from work. It was also encouraged by a number of factors which caused some of these workers to plan, or at least dream about, an individual getaway from the Post Office.

14. My analysis of the political struggle within CUPW in the months following the strike leads me to three general conclusions. First, a union leadership must meet its defence and service commitments before embarking on an ambitious political action campaign, or else it creates the conditions for strong internal union opposition. Second, given the restricted resources available to even a large union, it is quite easy for a union to take on too many major projects and, as a result, spread itself too thin. Third, the political health of a union

has two features. The first is its political direction — a dimension largely determined by the orientation of the leadership. The second is the extent of grassroots involvement in the union. When a socialist union leadership directs a union which lacks grassroots activism, the socialist direction of the union is largely an empty shell.

15. The National Program of Action initiated by CUPW's national leadership in the weeks after the 1987 strike was, in part, an attempt to extend the union's political and moral leadership outside the union. I see it as an effort to build a limited alternative hegemony in Canadian society in relation to the issue of postal service. My research shows that the National Program of Action was accompanied by an ironic twist — as CUPW's national leadership strove to extend its influence outside the union, its leadership was increasingly being rejected within the union. This turn of events suggests that a union's ability to act as the focal point of a hegemonic political project is tightly constrained by restrictions related to the functions, resources and leadership dynamics of labour unions in contemporary Canada.

CONCLUSIONS

Theoretical Conclusions

1. Appraising the Character of Working Class Consent to Capitalist Domination in Canada in the 1980s

A substantial minority of Canadian workers consciously support capitalist principles of economic organization. Thirty-five percent of the working class respondents in the 1982 Class Structure survey were at the pro-capitalist end of the Capitalist Economic Organization index

(see Table 3.9, Chapter 3). Furthermore, in 1987 some 30% of Hamilton CUPW members were likewise at the pro-capitalist end of this index, with CUPW leaders as likely to be consciously pro-capitalist as the rank-and-file (see Table A9.4, Appendix 9).

In Chapter 4 of the thesis I demonstrated that few of the workers who consciously support capitalist economic principles are consistently Right-wing in political perspective. Indeed, a number of them are actually practical socialists (all the Hamilton CUPW leaders who support capitalist principles of economic organization fall into this category). Thus, most of the workers who profess support for capitalism tend to qualify or even contradict that support when considering practical policy issues. This, of course, is not an original insight -- it simply confirms the oft-repeated observation that many workers in capitalist countries possess a dual consciousness.

Another aspect of dual consciousness was identified in Chapter 5. A number of Hamilton workers organized their attitudes towards unions using the "Economic defence organizations" schema. These workers are quite positive in affect towards unions but do not look upon political involvement by unions with great favour. Their active consent to capitalist domination comes in a negative form -- they do not support the political efforts of one of the main movements with anti-capitalist potential.

In my research on the 1987 CUPW strike I identified a few workers who actively consented to government and employer power in the dispute. Some of these workers were anti-union mercenaries who applied for jobs as scabs. Others were CUPW members who empathized with

management and quite easily fell into a conciliatory role after the strike. One characteristic shared by many individuals in both of these groups was a relatively high level of education. This is an interesting finding, given the results of the multiple regression analysis with Capitalist Economic Organization as the dependent variable (see Table 3.12, Chapter 3). In that analysis, workers with higher levels of education tended to be more supportive of capitalist economic principles. In the next subsection I discuss the importance of educational differentiation for our understanding of contemporary class structure.

Although few of the workers involved in the 1987 CUPW strike actively consented to government and management power, many passively consented. Some -- including the majority of scab recruits, a minority of striking CUPW members and some mail service couriers -- consented by gearing their actions to their own economic self-interest. Their consent was purchased. Other workers were discouraged by the overwhelming power and resources in the hands of the authorities, and simply fell into line. Their consent was based on the belief that nothing could be done to change the situation, and was often accompanied by a dream or plan to get into a new line of work.

In considering the breadth of evidence I have accumulated on working class consent to capitalist domination in Canadian society, I am left with the general impression that bourgeois hegemony is elastic and highly resilient. Indeed, none of the ideal types suggested by Joseph Femia (see Chapter 1) seems to capture the main features of this hegemony. The hegemony of the capitalist class in Canada is at once

minimal and integral -- different variants of passive consent at one level of social experience coexist with active consent at another level, and the two forms of consent sustain each other.

Most Canadian workers seem to be able to live with bourgeois domination as long as there is some form of personal compensation. That personal compensation, whether it be a pleasant non-work life centred on the family or the possibility of a future opportunity to get into a less alienating line of work, itself generates a certain degree of active consent to bourgeois domination. Quite simply, the line of least resistance for most dissatisfied workers is to treat their job in narrow instrumental terms, and perhaps to study or to work at a second job in order to enhance personal economic security. They choose the line of least resistance rather than fighting the system. Furthermore, the mere presence of opportunities to do something else, even if they are not taken up, is sufficient to mute dissatisfaction and build a certain amount of active consent to capitalist power. Many workers hold the conviction that their lives could be better with some effort on their part, and the system is given credit for providing such opportunities for change and possible advancement.

Thus, while the Progressive Conservative government and Canada Post Corp. smashed the collective struggle of inside postal workers in 1987, the persistent windows of individual opportunity were seen as a redeeming virtue of the system. CUPW was defeated, but many workers did not see this as a crushing defeat for themselves as individuals. They passively consented to government and management power in the labour conflict while they actively consented to a system which offered them

certain choices and opportunities as individuals. In this sense bourgeois hegemony can be seen as minimal and integral at the same time.

2. The Significance of Educational Divisions in the Working Class

There are substantial differences in the educational levels of Canadian workers. Furthermore, with the increase in the participation rate of the 18 to 24 year old cohort in postsecondary education throughout the 1980s, differences in educational levels are growing. This is a highly significant trend because education is the social experience with the greatest overall impact on variation in workers' political attitudes. Increasing differences in the educational levels of Canadian workers promise to exacerbate the political divisions in the working class.

In fact, the evidence accumulated in this thesis indicates that the political attitudes of workers with higher levels of education tend to resemble the political attitudes of professionals. First, my analysis of Gallup poll results (see Chapter 2) indicated that professionals are distinctly more liberal than workers in their conceptions of family relations and views on social discipline. On political attitude indexes which relate to the same domain of content (Welfare Bum and Authoritarian Traditionalism; see Table 3.12 in Chapter 3), education is an important determinant of the variation within the working class -- workers with higher levels of education are more liberal than other workers. Second, my analysis of poll results showed that professionals are to the Right of workers in their conception of the economic role of government. On political attitude indexes which relate to the same domain of content (Economic Radicalism and Economic

Justice; see Tables 3.11 and 3.13 in Chapter 3), education is an important determinant of the variation within the working class -- workers with higher levels of education are relatively conservative in their views when compared to other workers. Third, I noted no major difference between the responses of workers and professionals on poll questions concerned with personal life choices. It is thus of considerable interest that education had very little impact on the variation of Moral/Defence Liberalism in the working class (see Table 3.13 in Chapter 3).

A variable which is this important in determining both between-class and within-class variations in political attitudes poses a special interpretive problem. Steven Brint has noted that higher education is the key variable in all theories of the rise of a knowledge class or new middle class (1984:60). My study did not use education as a criterion when defining the Canadian class structure. However, empirical analyses of national survey data showed that education is the most important social source of variation in Canadian workers' political attitudes. This finding has definite theoretical implications. It suggests that either (1) some rethinking of class boundaries needs to take place, or (2) a theoretical schema needs to be developed which integrates the realities of class divisions and educational differentiation. I favour the latter approach, since the debates over class boundaries of the past decade have not yielded any great theoretical or empirical insights.

The main contribution of my thesis towards this theoretical task is the finding that Hamilton CUPW members with higher levels of education felt that they had a variety of long-term economic

opportunities. This generated a considerable degree of consent to the capitalist system, even amongst workers who were thoroughly disgusted by the actions of the government and employer during the 1987 CUPW strike. Therefore, my suggestion is that one of the ways by which education affects workers' political consciousness is through the mobility opportunities it offers. Workers with higher levels of education do not think they are stuck in a job for life; this optimism is rooted in the greater labour market demand for their services. In contrast, workers with lower levels of education see themselves as being much more dependent upon a particular job, especially if it is reasonably well paid. Therefore, in part education may influence workers' political consciousness by shaping workers' views of the openness of the class structure and their own mobility opportunities.

Methodological Conclusions

I presented and analyzed quantitative data in many different ways in this thesis. In Chapter 2 I studied opinion poll time series. In Chapter 3 I carried out parallel analyses on data from two different national surveys in order to provide a check on the validity of findings. In Chapter 5 I made an original application of Q methodology in investigating how workers organize their views on unions. In Chapter 7 I again compared survey results. This was possible because most of the political attitude indicators included in my interviews of Hamilton CUPW members were drawn from either the 1982 Class Structure survey or the 1984 National Election survey. In Chapter 9 the quantitative data I analyzed came from a two-wave panel study. Finally, in Chapters 7 through 9 I interpreted and discussed quantitative results by drawing

upon (1) answers to open-ended interview questions, (2) data from my participant observation during the 1987 CUPW strike, and (3) evidence from my study of strike documents.

This summary of my use of quantitative data in the thesis should make clear two points. First, in this project I have emphasized quantitative rather than qualitative research. This reflects my own realist-positivist epistemological perspective and my strengths as a researcher. Second, I am aware of the limitations of quantitative data from cross-sectional surveys. Thus, wherever possible I have looked at data from one survey in relation to some other data. My assumption is that this comparative approach provides a more suitable empirical basis for interpretation.

Undoubtedly the methodological approach taken in this thesis has been thoughtful, systematic and even, at some points, innovative. However, in reviewing the methodology only one question counts: has this methodology enabled me to develop a sound understanding of Canadian workers' political consciousness and the degree of working class consent to capitalist domination? My answer is a qualified yes.

By analyzing quantitative data I have successfully identified general patterns, and have tested notions such as Sniderman and Tetlock's likability heuristic and Fiske's view of the relationship between affect and cognition at the schema level of individual consciousness. Furthermore, by linking quantitative data with qualitative data in Part Three of the thesis, I have developed a deeper picture of some of the patterns which emerged from quantitative analyses.

At the same time, my view is that this project would have benefitted from considerably more qualitative research. In Part Two it would have been useful if in-depth interviews with selected respondents had been carried out in addition to the Q sort survey. Indeed, if such in-depth interviews had preceded the survey and formed the basis for the development of some original hypotheses, the Q study could have taken on a theory testing function. In Part Three it would have been useful if a number of lengthy, unstructured interviews had been undertaken with postal workers in order to develop a finely tuned picture of the complexities and ambiguities of union members' political consciousness during the course of the strike. It would have also been very interesting if a few scab recruits had been studied in a similar way. As it stands, the data in Part Three are somewhat unbalanced -- many of the issues suggested by quantitative analyses are only briefly discussed because in-depth qualitative data is unavailable.

My research experience has given me a firsthand understanding of the difficulties involved in carrying out a multi-method study during an action-filled event such as the 1987 CUPW strike. Such a project could best be accomplished by a team of researchers.

One further methodological conclusion can be derived from my research. The results of this study confirm that quantitative indexes are meaningful measures of political consciousness. For example, in the multivariate analyses reported in Chapter 8, background political attitudes were important determinants of different dimensions of Hamilton CUPW members' strike participation. At the same time, each of these indicators provides only a partial picture of political

consciousness and must be interpreted cautiously. Thus, the Hamilton CUPW members who were consciously Left in political orientation actually fell into two quite different groups -- those who were solidly pro-union and those who were quite cynical about their union's struggle. In order to identify this pattern I had to go beyond the distribution of responses on the Left/Right Feeling index. Furthermore, in Chapter 5 I discovered that workers who are very positive in feeling towards labour unions do not necessarily hold the same schematic view of unions. In order to identify this pattern I needed to go beyond the distribution of responses on McShane's General Union Attitude index (see Table 5.4, Chapter 5). These examples demonstrate the need for cautious interpretation of the results from quantitative indexes. Investigators must curb the tendency to read too much into isolated pieces of hard data.

Political Conclusions

It may well be that bourgeois hegemony in contemporary Canada is so elastic and resilient that opposition movements are doomed to cycles of activism, co-optation and decline. If this scenario is correct, then the development of a full-fledged alternative hegemony will never take place. The best that socialist and other progressive critics of capitalism can hope for is a gradual Leftward shift in the character of bourgeois hegemony in response to the political pressures of opposition movements. The best of all possible worlds is capitalism with an ever more humane face.

Yet, is there any harm in testing the limits of the resilience of bourgeois hegemony by attempting to build an alternative hegemony? I

suppose a case could be made against striving to build a strong anti-capitalist movement on the grounds that this will encourage a reactionary counter-movement and possibly result in a capitalism with a less humane face. In other words, gradual progress will be endangered by political polarization, and so the Left should not do anything to encourage political polarization. The problem with this argument is that pro-capitalist forces are already awakened and are struggling to turn bourgeois hegemony towards the Right. It seems highly likely that they will continue their political and educational activities regardless of any strategy adopted by progressive forces. A dynamic of political polarization is thus already in place in Canada. Consequently, the Left does not have to worry about unintentionally creating a Right-wing monster -- the monster is already alive and roaming the streets.

The main recommendation for a political strategy aimed at developing an alternative hegemony in Canada is that it promises some success even if it fails. That is, even if a sustainable alternative hegemony does not emerge, at least the state and the capitalist class will be forced to respond to the significant political pressures created by the attempt to develop an alternative hegemony.

In considering whether or not to commit themselves to the onerous task of building an alternative hegemony, socialists must also ask whether there is any other sensible strategic choice. Let us consider the alternatives. Ultra-left politics is at best ignored by Canadian workers and at worst it hardens some workers' negative feelings towards socialism. There is absolutely no mass support in Canada for any form of a political pressure campaign using violent means. The New

Democratic Party is a fairly Right-wing social democratic organization without any serious commitment to anti-capitalist struggle. And popular organizations (women's, environment, peace, etc.), because they tend to be issue- rather than program-oriented, do not offer the possibility of anything more than piecemeal reforms. Faced with these options, most Canadian socialists give token or guarded assistance to the NDP, support a popular movement or two, and largely sit on the political sidelines. My view is that the only productive option to this state of semi-passivity is active engagement in a campaign of hegemonic struggle.

The Canadian working class gets many of its ideas about contemporary affairs from the national media. In order to contest dominant values and interpretations of social life it is absolutely imperative to develop an alternative national news outlet. The work of the capitalist media needs to be countered and challenged on its own terrain of social time since public attention has long since shifted to other concerns by the time that monthly alternative magazines run their often-stale commentaries.

This project would require a very large investment of funds and the development of a sophisticated news organization. My analysis of CUPW's National Program of Action (see Chapter 10) demonstrated that a labour union leadership faces many problems when it attempts to initiate an ambitious and far-reaching political campaign. Specifically, there are competing defence and service tasks which continually demand attention, even a relatively large union has only modest resources at its disposal, and a union must always be sensitive to and be trying to build grassroots activism at the local level. I think it is fair to say

that any union, or any popular organization for that matter, would not be in a position to initiate a national popular news service. In my view such a project could only get off the ground if a wide variety of popular organizations each contributed some start-up costs, and an entirely independent organization evolved to run the project. This would allow organizations like unions to make a judicious contribution to the project without forcing them to turn their attention away from the tasks which are their raison d'etre.

An important level of working cooperation between major progressive groups in Canada has recently been achieved. In December, 1987, the Working Committee for Social Solidarity released a document which was highly critical of the capitalist system. The document argued, "In the final analysis, a society and economy that is based primarily on market priorities is enormously wasteful in terms of both human and material resources" and called for "a popular movement to transform the dominant socio-economic policies of this country" (Globe & Mail, Dec. 10/87:A1). Among the groups endorsing this document were the United Church, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women, and three labour centrals including the Canadian Labour Congress. It seems reasonable to argue that such groups would have the collective resources to cover the start-up costs of a project such as a national popular newspaper. Such a newspaper could get off the ground if a wide coalition of groups each committed some resources to the project.

Furthermore, the technology exists to produce the main content of a national newspaper at one location and then send it to regional centres where regional content can be added and printing take place.

For such a paper to succeed it would have to contain high quality journalism (so that people see the paper as a valuable source of news and views). In other words, it would have to be a real newspaper, not a newsletter for the converted. In addition, thousands of activists across the country would have to be mobilized to buy and distribute the paper (as a supplement to regular channels of commercial distribution).

This is obviously a very ambitious proposal. However, it strikes me as being absolutely essential if bourgeois hegemony in Canada is to be seriously contested at the intellectual/moral level.

A national popular newspaper could provide the impetus for numerous small scale educational projects such as alternative community newspapers. It would also likely become a common focus for the activists in a community. Ideally it would encourage greater cooperation between labour leaders and dialogue between different popular organizations.

Furthermore, I suspect that a national popular newspaper could also be the impetus for a political contestation of bourgeois hegemony in different localities. As alternative perspectives on major issues are promoted throughout the country, working people will become more receptive to political organizing around these alternative perspectives. This will be especially true in solidly working class sections of major cities. Any political successes will come by politically mobilizing a great number of people and then mounting effective grassroots campaigns in local elections.

The political contestation of bourgeois hegemony at provincial and national levels will be, of course, a problem of much greater

difficulty. Given the rules governing parliamentary elections, it will probably be necessary to form a new national political party to undertake this task. However, until the point in time when such a party would have a reasonable opportunity of electing representatives in key ridings across the country, it would be counterproductive to commit time and resources to its development. Indeed, it seems most likely that such a party would emerge from, or be sparked by, a split in the NDP. Such a split would only occur when an alternative hegemony had become visible in Canadian society, and Left-leaning NDPers were convinced that leaving their party would not mean a stroll into the political wilderness.

Many workers consent to capitalist domination in Canadian society because they do not see how things could be any different. If this pessimistic acquiescence is to be overcome, it is necessary to develop and promote an alternative vision and build an alternative political movement. Such a political project may be a pipe dream — perhaps the only opportunities for fundamental change in advanced capitalist societies will occur if the economic system collapses or some humans survive a nuclear holocaust. But just maybe, through the efforts of tens of thousands of people, an alternative hegemony can be built which fundamentally challenges the tenets of capitalist class power in contemporary Canada. For those who are convinced that, in view of the wealth and technological development of our society, working people's lives could be qualitatively better than they presently are, the struggle to build an alternative hegemony is worth the try.

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abercrombie, Nicholas, Stephen Hill and Bryan S. Turner, 1980. The Dominant Ideology Thesis. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Acorn, Milton, 1972. More Poems For People. Toronto: NC Press.

Adamson, Walter L. 1980. Hegemony and Revolution: A Study of Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Alt, John, 1976. "Beyond Class: The Decline of Industrial Labor and Leisure." Telos, 28:55-80.

Altemeyer, Bob, 1981. Right-Wing Authoritarianism. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Anderson, Perry, 1976-77. "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci." New Left Review, 100:5-78.

Archibald, W. Peter, 1978. Social Psychology As Political Economy. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Bandura, Albert, 1986. Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Banting, Keith, 1987. "The Welfare State and Inequality in the 1980s." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 24(3):309-338.

Barrett, Stanley R. 1987. Is God a Racist? The Right Wing in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Barton, Allen H. and R. Wayne Parsons, 1977. "Measuring Belief System Structure." Public Opinion Quarterly, 41(2):159-180.

Beynon, Huw, 1984. Working For Ford, second edition. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Billig, Michael, 1976. Social Psychology and Intergroup Relations. New York: Academic Press.

Blackburn, R.M. and Michael Mann, 1975. "Ideology in the Non-Skilled Working Class." Chapter 8 in Working-Class Images of Society, edited by Martin Bulmer. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bocock, Robert, 1986. Hegemony. London: Tavistock.

500

Boggs, Carl, 1976. Gramsci's Marxism. London: Pluto Press.

Bollen, Ken, 1985. "Structural Equations With Latent Variables. Chapter Seven: Confirmatory Factor Analysis." Unpublished Manuscript, Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina.

Borgida, Eugene and Bruce Campbell, 1982. "Belief Relevance and Attitude-Behavior Consistency: The Moderating Role of Personal Experience." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42(2):239-247.

Brannon, R. et al. 1973. "Attitude and Action: A Field Experiment Joined to a General Population Survey." American Sociological Review, 38:625-636.

Brimelow, Peter, 1986. The Patriot Game. Toronto: Key Porter.

Brint, Steven, 1984. "'New-Class' and Cumulative Trend Explanations of the Liberal Political Attitudes of Professionals." American Journal of Sociology, 90(1):30-71.

Brint, Steven, 1985. "The Political Attitudes of Professionals." Annual Review of Sociology, 11:389-414.

Brown, Richard, 1976. "Women as Employees: Some Comments on Research in Industrial Sociology." Pp. 21-46 in Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage, edited by Diana Leonard Barker and Sheila Allen. London: Longman.

Brown, Steven R. 1980. Political Subjectivity: Applications of Q Methodology in Political Science. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Buci-Glucksmann, Christine, 1982. "Hegemony and Consent." Pp. 116-126 in Approaches to Gramsci, edited by Anne Showstack Sassoon. London: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative.

Canadian Union of Postal Workers, 1987. CUPW Conciliation Brief, Parts I to IV. Ottawa: Canadian Union of Postal Workers.

Canadian Union of Postal Workers, 1988. CUPW, Special Convention 1988, Background Information, Urgent Questions (A) to (E). Ottawa: Canadian Union of Postal Workers.

Carmines, Edward G. and James A. Stimson, 1982. "Racial Issues and the Structure of Mass Belief Systems." Journal of Politics, 44:2-20.

Carr, E.H. 1961. What is History? New York: Vintage Books.

Cavendish, Ruth, 1982. Women on the Line. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Comrey, Andrew L. and John A. Newmeyer, 1965. "Measurement of Radicalism-Conservatism." Journal of Social Psychology, 67:357-369.

Conover, Pamela Johnston and Stanley Feldman, 1981. "The Origins and Meaning of Liberal/Conservative Self-Identifications." American Journal of Political Science, 25(4):617-645.

Conover, Pamela Johnston and Stanley Feldman, 1984. "How People Organize the Political World: A Schematic Model." American Journal of Political Science, 28(1):95-126.

Converse, Philip E. 1964. "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In Ideology and Discontent, edited by David E. Apter. New York: The Free Press.

Craft, James A, and Suhail Abboushi, 1983. "The Union Image: Concept, Programs, and Analysis." Journal of Labor Research, IV:293-314.

Davidson, Joe and John Deverell, 1978. Joe Davidson. Toronto: James Lorimer & Co.

Dawson, Paul A. 1979. "The Formation and Structure of Political Belief Systems." Political Behavior, 1(2):99-122.

Della Fave, L. Richard, 1974. "On the Structure of Egalitarianism." Social Problems, 22(2):199-213.

Edelman, Murray, 1965. The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Eichler, Margrit, 1988. Nonsexist Research Methods: A Practical Guide. Boston: Allen & Unwin.

Elliott, Brian and David McCrone, 1985. "Class, Culture and Morality: A Sociological Analysis of the New Conservatism." Unpublished paper, University of Edinburgh, Department of Sociology.

Fazio, Russell H. and Mark P. Zanna, 1981. "Direct Experience and Attitude-Behavior Consistency." Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 14:161-202.

Femia, Joseph V. 1981. Gramsci's Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness, and the Revolutionary Process. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fillmore, Nick, 1986. "The Right Stuff: An Inside Look at the National Citizens' Coalition." This Magazine, 20(2/June-July):4-11,19.

Fiorito, Jack, 1987. "Political Instrumentality Perceptions and Desires for Union Representation." Journal of Labor Research, VIII(3):271-289.

Fiske, Susan T. 1984. "Schema-triggered Affect: Applications to Social Perception." Pp. 55-78 in Affect and Cognition, edited by Margaret Syndor Clark and Susan T. Fiske. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fiske, Susan T. 1986. "Schema-Based Versus Piecemeal Politics: A Patchwork Quilt, But not a Blanket, of Evidence." Pp. 41-53 in Political Cognition, edited by Richard R. Lau and David O. Sears. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Foisy, Claude H. 1987. "Conciliation Report on the dispute opposing Canada Post Corporation and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers in relation to the renewal of their collective agreement ended September 30, 1986."

Form, William, 1985. Divided We Stand: Working-Class Stratification in America. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Fox, John, 1984. Linear Statistical Models & Related Methods. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Frost, W. Douglas and James R. Averill, 1982. "Differences Between Men and Women in the Everyday Experience of Anger." Chapter 13 in Anger and Aggression: An Essay on Emotion, by James R. Averill. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Furnham, Adrian, 1984. "The Protestant Work Ethic, Voting Behaviour and Attitudes to the Trade Unions." Political Studies, XXXII:420-436.

Gaskell, George and Patten Smith, 1984. "Relative Deprivation in Black and White Youth: An Empirical Investigation." British Journal of Social Psychology, 23:121-131.

Getman, Julius G. et al., 1976. Union Representation Elections: Law and Reality. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Giddens, Anthony, 1979. Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ginsberg, Benjamin, 1986. The Captive Public. New York: Basic Books.

Goldthorpe, J.H. et al., 1968. The Affluent Worker: Political Attitudes and Behaviour. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goldthorpe, J.H. et al., 1969. The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gouldner, Alvin W. 1954. Wildcat Strike. Yellow Springs, Ohio: The Antioch Press.

Graham, Ron, 1986. One-Eyed Kings: Promise & Illusion in Canadian Politics. Toronto: Collins.

Gramsci, Antonio, 1971. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. New York: International Publishers.

Gramsci, Antonio, 1977. Selections from Political Writings, 1910-1920. New York: International Publishers.

Gramsci, Antonio, 1978. Selections from Political Writings, 1921-1926. New York: International Publishers.

Hall, Stuart, 1980. "Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems." Pp. 15-47 in Culture, Media, Language. London: Hutchinson.

Hall, Stuart, 1983. "The Great Moving Right Show." Pp. 19-39 in The Politics of Thatcherism, edited by Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hall, Stuart, 1985. "Authoritarian Populism: A Reply to Jessop et al." New Left Review, 151(May/June):115-124.

Halle, David, 1984. America's Working Man: Work, Home, and Politics among Blue-Collar Property Owners. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Hobsbawm, E.J. 1971. "Class Consciousness in History." Pp. 5-21 in Aspects of History and Class Consciousness, edited by Istvan Meszaros. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Huber, Joan and William H. Form, 1973. Income and Ideology: An Analysis of the American Political Formula. New York: The Free Press.

Huxley, Christopher, David Kettler and James Struthers, 1986. "Is Canada's Experience 'Especially Instructive'?" Pp. 113-132 in Unions in Transition: Entering the Second Century, edited by Seymour Martin Lipset. San Francisco: ICS Press.

Isaac, Larry, Elizabeth Mutran and Sheldon Stryker, 1980. "Political Protest Orientations Among Black and White Adults." American Sociological Review, 45(April):191-213.

Jessop, Bob, 1982. The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods. New York and London: New York University Press.

Johnston, William A. and Michael D. Ornstein, 1982. "Class, Work and Politics." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 19(2):196-213.

Johnston, William A. and Michael D. Ornstein, 1985. "Social Class and Political Ideology in Canada." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 22(3):369-393.

Johnston, William A. 1981. Social Class, Social Life and Political Attitudes in Canada. Toronto: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, York University.

Johnston, William A. 1987. "Social Divisions and Ideological Fragmentation." Canadian Journal of Sociology, 12(4):315-329.

Judd, Charles M. and Michael A. Milburn, 1980. "The Structure of Attitude Systems in the General Public: Comparisons of a Structural Equation Model." American Sociological Review, 45(August):627-643.

Judge, Ken, et al. 1983. "Public Opinion and the Privatization of Welfare: Some Theoretical Implications." Journal of Social Policy, 12(4):469-490.

Karsh, Bernard, 1958. Diary of a Strike. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Kelly, John E. and Nigel Nicholson, 1980. "The Causation of Strikes: A Review of Theoretical Approaches and the Potential Contribution of Social Psychology." Human Relations, 33(12):853-883.

Kerlinger, Fred N. 1964. Foundations of Behavioral Research: Educational and Psychological Inquiry. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kerlinger, Fred N. 1984. Liberalism and Conservatism: The Nature and Structure of Social Attitudes. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kerr, Willard A. 1952. "Untangling the Liberalism-Conservatism Continuum". Journal of Social Psychology, 35:111-125.

Kim, Jae-On and Charles W. Mueller, 1978a. Introduction to Factor Analysis. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, series no. 07-013. Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications.

Kim, Jae-On and Charles W. Mueller, 1978b. Factor Analysis: Statistical Methods and Practical Issues. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, series no. 07-014. Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications.

King, Anthony, 1985. Contribution to "Following the Leaders: How Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher Have Changed Public Opinion." Public Opinion, June/July:17-19,58.

Kluegel, James R. and Eliot R. Smith, 1981. "Beliefs About Stratification." Annual Review of Sociology, 7:29-56.

Knoke, David, 1979. "Stratification and the Dimensions of American Political Orientations." American Journal of Political Science, 23(4):772-791.

Kochan, Thomas, 1979. "How American Workers View Labor Unions." Monthly Labor Review, 102(4):23-31.

Kohn, Melvin L. and Carmi Schooler, 1983. Work and Personality: An Inquiry into the Impact of Social Stratification. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing.

Kopinak, Kathryn, 1987. "Gender Differences in Political Ideology in Canada." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 24(1):23-38.

Krahn, Harvey and Graham S. Lowe, 1984a. "Community Influences on Attitudes Towards Unions." Relations Industrielles, 39(1):93-112.

Krahn, Harvey and Graham S. Lowe, 1984b. "Public Attitudes Towards Unions: Some Canadian Evidence." Journal of Labor Research, V(2):149-164.

Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe, 1985. Hegemony & Socialist Strategy. London: Verso.

Lambert, Ronald D., James E. Curtis, Steven D. Brown and Barry J. Kay, 1986. "In Search of Left/Right Beliefs in the Canadian Electorate." Canadian Journal of Political Science, XIX(3):541-563.

Lambert, Ronald D., Steven D. Brown, James E. Curtis, Barry J. Kay and John M. Wilson, 1986. The Canadian National Election Study Codebook. Waterloo, Ontario: University of Waterloo.

Lane, Robert E. 1962. Political Ideology: Why the American Common Man Believes What He Does. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Langford, Tom, 1986. "Workers' Subordinate Values: A Canadian Case Study." Canadian Journal of Sociology, 11(3):269-291.

Lau, Richard R. and David O. Sears, 1986. "Social Cognition and Political Cognition: The Past, the Present, and the Future." Pp. 347-366 in Political Cognition, edited by Richard R. Lau and David O. Sears. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lenin, V.I. 1960 (1899). "On Strikes." Pp. 310-319 in V.I. Lenin Collected Works, Volume 4. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Lenin, V.I. 1973 (1902). What Is To Be Done? Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.

Lipset, Seymour Martin and William Schneider, 1983. The Confidence Gap: Business, Labor and Government in the Public Mind. New York: The Free Press.

Lipset, Seymour Martin, 1981. Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics, expanded and updated edition. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lockwood, David, 1975 (1966). "Sources of Variation in Working-Class Images of Society." Chapter 2 in Working-Class Images of Society, edited by Martin Bulmer. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Lukes, Steven, 1974. Power: A Radical View. London: Macmillan.

Lukes, Steven, 1979. "Power and Authority." Chapter 16 in A History of Sociological Analysis, edited by Tom Bottomore and Robert Nisbet. London: Heinemann.

Maddox, William S. and Stuart A. Lilie, 1984. Beyond Liberal and Conservative: Reassessing the Political Spectrum. Washington: Cato Institute.

Mann, Michael, 1970. "The Social Cohesion of Liberal Democracy." American Sociological Review, 35(3):423-439.

Mann, Michael, 1973. Consciousness and Action Among the Western Working Class. London: Macmillan.

Marshall, Gordon, 1983. "Some Remarks on the Study of Working-Class Consciousness." Politics & Society, 12(3):263-301.

Martin, James E. 1986. "Predictors of Individual Propensity to Strike." Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 39(2):214-227.

Marx, Karl, 1954 (1867). Capital, Volume I. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels, 1972 (1848). Manifesto of the Communist Party. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.

Matthews, Ralph and J. Campbell Davis, 1985. "The Comparative Influence of Region, Status, Class and Ethnicity on Canadian Attitudes and Values." In Regionalism in Canada, edited by Robert J. Brym. Toronto: Irwin Publishers.

McDonald, Joseph A. and Donald A. Clelland, 1984. "Textile Workers and Union Sentiment." Social Forces, 63(2):502-521.

McKenzie, Robert and Allan Silver, 1968. Angels in Marble: Working Class Conservatives in Urban England. London: Heinemann.

McShane, Steven L. 1985. "Sources of Attitudinal Union Militancy." Relations Industrielles, 40(2):284-301.

McShane, Steven L. 1986. "General Union Attitude: A Construct Validation." Journal of Labor Research, VII(4):403-417.

Menzies, Ken, 1982. Sociological Theory In Use. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Miliband, Ralph, 1969. The State in Capitalist Society. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Mills, C. Wright, 1963. The Marxists. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Myles, John, 1988. "Decline or Impasse? The Current State of the Welfare State." Studies in Political Economy, 26(Summer):73-107.

Navarro, Vicente, 1986. "The 1980 and 1984 US Elections and the New Deal." In the Socialist Register, 1985/86, edited by Ralph Miliband, et al. London: The Merlin Press.

Nichols, Theo and Peter Armstrong, 1976. Workers Divided. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins.

Norusis, Marija J. 1985. SPSSX: Advanced Statistics Guide. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ogmundson, Rick, 1975. "On the Measurement of Party Class Positions: The Case of Canadian Federal Political Parties." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 12(4:Part2):565-576.

Ollman, Bertell, 1987. "How to Study Class Consciousness, And Why We Should." The Insurgent Sociologist, 14(1):57-96.

Ornstein, Michael D. et al. 1980. "Region, Class and Political Culture in Canada." Canadian Journal of Political Science, XIII(2):227-271.

Panitch, Leo, 1986. "The Impasse of Social Democratic Politics." In the Socialist Register, 1985/86, edited by Ralph Miliband, et al. London: The Merlin Press.

Parkin, Frank, 1967. "Working-Class Conservatives: A Theory of Political Deviance." British Journal of Sociology, 18:278-290.

Parkin, Frank, 1971. Class Inequality and Political Order: Social Stratification in Capitalist and Communist Societies. London: MacGibbon & Kee.

Parkin, Frank, 1979. Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique. New York: Columbia University Press.

Parrot, Jean-Claude, 1983. "Jean-Claude Parrot: An Interview." Studies in Political Economy, 11(Summer): 49-70.

Peterson, Steven A. 1984. "Privatism and Politics: A Research Note." Western Political Quarterly, 37(3):483-489.

Pollert, Anna, 1981. Girls, Wives, Factory Lives. London: Macmillan Press.

Portes, Alejandro and Adreain Ross, 1974. "A Model for the Prediction of Leftist Radicalism." Journal of Political and Military Sociology, 2(Spring):33-56.

Poulantzas, Nicos, 1973. Political Power and Social Classes. London: Verso.

Pratt, Geraldine, 1987. "Class, Home, and Politics." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 24(1):39-57.

Qualter, Terence H. 1985. Opinion Control in the Democracies. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press.

Repo, Satu, 1982. The Problem of Working Class Consciousness in Marxist Cultural Theory. Toronto: Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto (Department of Educational Theory, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education).

Reynolds, Steven Huntley, 1981. The Struggle Continues: An Analysis of Conflict in the Canadian Post Office. Department of Sociology, McMaster University: Unpublished M.A. Thesis.

Rinehart, James W. 1987. The Tyranny of Work: Alienation and the Labour Process, second edition. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Robinson, John P. et al. 1969. Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Rokeach, Milton, 1968. Beliefs, Attitudes and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ross, George and Jane Jenson, 1986. "Post-War Class Struggle and the Crisis of Left Politics." In the Socialist Register, 1985/86, edited by Ralph Miliband, et al. London: The Merlin Press.

Rossi, Peter H. et al. (eds.) 1983. Handbook of Survey Research. New York: Academic Press.

Rude, George, 1980. Ideology and Popular Protest. New York: Pantheon Books.

Rummel, R.J. 1970. <u>Applied Factor Analysis</u>. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.

Runciman, W.G. 1966. <u>Relative Deprivation and Social Justice</u>. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Schlozman, Kay Lehman and Sidney Verba, 1979. <u>Injury to Insult: Unemployment, Class and Political Response.</u> Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Seliktar, Ofira, 1986. "Identifying a Society's Belief Systems." Chapter Eleven in <u>Political Psychology</u>, edited by Margaret G. Hermann. San Francisco & London: Jossey-Bass.

Sennett, Richard and Jonathan Cobb, 1973 (1972). <u>The Hidden Injuries of Class.</u> New York: Vintage Books.

Showstack Sassoon, Anne, 1982. "A Gramsci Dictionary." Pp. 12-17 in <u>Approaches to Gramsci</u>, edited by Anne Showstack Sassoon. London: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative.

Simpson, Ida Harper and Elizabeth Mutran, 1981. "Women's Social Consciousness: Sex or Worker Identity." <u>Research in the Sociology of Work</u>, 1:335-350.

Snarr, D. Neil, 1975. "Strikers and Nonstrikers: A Social Comparison." <u>Industrial Relations</u>, 14(3):371-374.

Snedecor, George W. and William G. Cochran, 1980. <u>Statistical Methods</u>, seventh edition. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press.

Sniderman, Paul M. and Philip E. Tetlock, 1986. "Interrelationship of Political Ideology and Public Opinion." Chapter Three in <u>Political Psychology</u>, edited by Margaret G. Hermann. San Francisco & London: Jossey-Bass.

Stagner, Ross and Boaz Eflal, 1982. "Internal Union Dynamics During a Strike: A Quasi-Experimental Study." <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 67(1):37-44.

Stewart-Patterson, David, 1987. <u>Post Mortem: Why Canada's Mail Won't Move</u>. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada.

Sullivan, John L. et al. 1981. "The Sources of Political Tolerance: A Multivariate Analysis." <u>American Political Science Review</u>, 75(1):92-106.

Tajfel, Henri, 1982. "Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations." <u>Annual Review of Psychology</u>, 33:1-39.

Tanner, Julian and Rhonda Cockerill, 1986. "In Search of Working-Class Ideology: A Test of Two Perspectives." The Sociological Quarterly, 27(3): 389-402.

Tawney, R.H. 1964 (1931). Equality, fourth revised edition. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Taylor, Ian, 1984. Theorising the Crisis in Canada: Legitimation Crisis, Hegemonic Crisis or Otherwise? Ottawa: Working Paper 84-1, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University.

Turkel, Gerald, 1980. "Privatism and Orientations Toward Political Action." Urban Life, 9(2):217-235.

Walker, I. and Thomas F. Pettigrew, 1984. "Relative Deprivation Theory: An Overview and Conceptual Critique." British Journal of Social Psychology, 23:301-310.

Weber, Max, 1968. Economy and Society, Volume Two, edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wells, Don, 1984. Holding the Line: Autoworkers' Resistance and the Limits of Class Struggle. Toronto: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Westergaard, J.H. 1975. "Radical Class Consciousness: A Comment." Chapter 15 in Working-Class Images of Society, edited by Martin Bulmer. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Williams, Raymond, 1983. Keywords, revised edition. London: Fontana Paperbacks.

Wright, Erik Olin, 1978. Class, Crisis and the State. London: New Left Books.

Wright, Erik Olin, 1985. Classes. London: New Left Books.

Zajonc, R.B. 1980. "Feeling and Thinking: Preferences Need No Inferences." American Psychologist, 35(2):151-175.

Zeller, Richard A. and Edward G. Carmines, 1980. Measurement in the Social Sciences: The Link Between Theory and Data. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

	Survey	
Variable	1982 Class Structure	1984 National Election
Working Class Background	1 = Family Class Location (F.Class) is Autonomous Worker or Worker M=.46, SD=.50, N=1104	1 = occupation of principal wage-earner in family when 16 was clerical, skilled labour or unskilled labour M=.63, SD=.48, N=1391
Spouse Non-Working Class	0 = Spouse's Class (S.Class2) is not applicable, autonomous worker or worker M=.14, SD=.35, N=1142	0 = no spouse, spouse is worker, spouse is housewife M=.17, SD=.37, N=1395
Mental Skill Index	10-item index, see text M=29.8, SD=8.2, N=972	Not Measured
Manual Skill Index	2-item index, see text M=7.6, SD=2.3, N=982	Not Measured
Blue Collar	1 = occupation coded upper blue collar or lower blue collar on Occ2 (Wright's 5 category occupation) M=.54, SD=.50, N=1142	Not Measured
Skilled Manual	Not Measured	1 = manual worker with special training M=.23, SD=.42, N=1451
Nonskilled Manual	Not Measured	1 = manual worker with no special training M=.37, SD=.48, N=1451
Job Input	Not Measured	Subjective evaluation, Var538, reverse code, 3 = No Say M=2.0, SD=.72, N=1478
Years Current Job (Lg10)	calculated from Q100yr (year began present job) with low = .5 M=.51, SD=.57, N=768	Not Measured
Personal Income (Lg10)	original code 0(none) to 12(over $100M) M=.61, SD=.26, N=1134	original 10 category $750 to $75M M=4.0, SD=.46, N=1349

APPENDIX 1   OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS (continued)

Variable	Survey	
	1982 Class Structure	1984 National Election
Company Size (at location)	(Lg10) Coded from Q36 and Q39c M=1.6, SD=.84, N=737	6 category recode from Var534 M=4.1, SD=1.7, N=1353
Profit Sector	1 = employed by private profit-making business M=.70, SD=.46, N=1142	Not Measured
Union Member	1 = currently union member M=.35, SD=.48, N=1142	1 = currently union member M=.30, SD=.46, N=1472
Ever on Strike	1 = 1 or more times on strike M=.24, SD=.43, N=1142	Not Measured
Unemployed	1 = presently unemployed and available for work (from questionnaire type) M=.31, SD=.46, N=1142	1 = unemployed in past year M=.27, SD=.44, N=1478
Homeowner	1 = homeowner M=.57, SD=.50, N=1142	(Outright Homeowner) 1 = outright homeowner M=.32, SD=.47, N=1400 (Mortgaged Homeowner) 1 = mortgaged homeowner M=.35, SD=.48, N=1400
Family Income (Lg10)	original code 0(none) to 12(over $100M) M=.81, SD=.16, N=1136	original 11 category $750 to $125M M=4.4, SD=.32, N=1401
Age	constructed from birth year, Q165 M=37.9, SD=13.8, N=1140	from self report of exact age or interviewer estimate M=38.6, SD=16.3, N=1478
Urban Childhood	1 = lived mostly in city or town when growing up M=.61, SD=.49, N=1142	1 = lived mostly in city or suburb growing up M=.48, SD=.50, N=1478
Parents' Education	Not Measured	2-item index, see text M=5.1, SD=2.7, N=1184
Education	1 = some elementary or less to 8 = university degree M=4.4, SD=1.9, N=1142	1 = some elementary or less to 7 = finish university M=4.0, SD=1.5, N=1478
Gender	1 = Female M=.57, SD=.50, N=1142	1 = Female M=.44, SD=.50, N=1478

APPENDIX 1 OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS (continued)

	Survey	
Variable	1982 Class Structure	1984 National Election
Atlantic	1 = Atlantic Resident M=.10, SD=.29, N=1142	1 = Atlantic Resident M=.10, SD=.30, N=1478
Quebec	1 = Quebec Resident M=.27, SD=.44, N=1142	1 = Quebec Resident M=.26, SD=.44, N=1478
Prairies	1 = Prairie Province Resident M=.15, SD=.36, N=1142	1 = Prairie Province Resident M=.14, SD=.34, N=1478
B.C.	1 = British Columbia Resident M=.12, SD=.32, N=1142	1 = British Columbia Resident M=.12, SD=.32, N=1478
Roman Catholic	1 = practicing Roman Catholic (Q168c=2) M=.32, SD=.47, N=1142	1 = Roman Catholic Affiliation (Var371=1) M=.52, SD=.50, N=1466
No Religion	Not Measured	1 = no religious affiliation M=.1, SD=.3, N=1466

APPENDIX 2   OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF MEASURES OF EGOISTIC RELATIVE DEPRIVATION

Referent
Category   Variable Name and Operationalization
----

1. Expected Future   1) General Relative Future Deprivation (GRFD)
   Economic   10 minus "The financial situation you expect to have 5 years from
   Situation   now" (Var360) measured on a 0 (worst) to 10 (best) scale.   M=3.0
                      2) Relative Future Deserved Deprivation (RFDD)
                         "The financial situation you should have right now, all things
                         considered" (Var361) minus Var360. M=-.3
                      3) Relative Future Satisfaction Deprivation (RFSD)
                         "Still thinking about the material side of things, and looking
                         ahead over the next three or four years, do you think that you
                         will be better off, worse off, or will things stay the same?"
                         (Var027) M=1.8
                      4) Relative Future Deprivation Index (RFDI)
                         -- formed by adding the Z scores for RFDD and RFSD. Alpha = .47

2. Past Economic   1) Relative Past Inflation Deprivation (RPID)
   Situation   "Over the past five years, has your personal income kept ahead of
                         increases in the cost of living, stayed the same, or fallen behind
                         some or a lot?" (Var444) Mean on 1 to 4 scale = 2.5
                      2) Relative Past Satisfaction Deprivation (RPSD)
                         "Compared to your material standard of living one year ago, would
                         you say that you are better off, about the same, or worse off
                         today?" (Var026) M=2.0
                      3) Relative Past Deprivation Index (RPDI)
                         -- formed by adding the Z scores for RPID and RPSD. Alpha = .38

3. Deserved Economic 1) Relative Deserved Deprivation (RDD)
   Situation   Var361 minus "Your present financial situation" (Var359) M=1.4

4. Best Economic   1) General Relative Deprivation (GRD)
   Situation   10 minus Var359. M=4.6
                      2) Relative Satisfaction Deprivation (RSD)
                         "Let's think about the material side of your life.... Would you
                         say that you are very satisfied, fairly satisfied, a little
                         dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the material side of your
                         life right now?" (Var021) M=2.2

5. Expected Future   1) Relative Future Job Deprivation (RFJD)
   Job Deprivation   "How concerned are you that you might be laid-off -- very
                         concerned, quite concerned, a little concerned, or not at all
                         concerned?" (Var564) M=2.0

APPENDIX 3   UNION ITEMS INCLUDED IN Q SORT

1. UNIONS AS A LINE OF DEFENCE FOR WORKERS

1) The selfishness of employers can be fought only by a strong union.
2) Working people don't need labour unions since they are almost always treated fairly by bosses.
3) Labour unions are instrumental in improving the standard of living of working people.
4) Working people are financially better off without labour unions.
5) Labour unions are very necessary to protect working people from unfair treatment and exploitation.
6) Unions protect lazy workers, but good workers don't need their help at all.
7) Unions keep managers and supervisors in line.
8) Workers don't get much of value for their union dues.

2. UNIONS AS POWERFUL ORGANIZATIONS IN SOCIETY

1) The influence exercised by labour unions continues to be a very positive force in this country.
2) Labour unions have become too powerful for the good of the country.
3) Labour unions should have much more of a say in deciding government policies.
4) Government policies and laws are too much in favour of labour unions.
5) Unions force companies to better manage their use of labour.
6) Unions interfere with the efficient use of labour.
7) One of the economic myths in our society is that union demands are a primary cause of unemployment and inflation.
8) Unions impose too many restrictions on employers.

3. HOW UNIONS ARE DIRECTED

1) Union leaders are probably less self-interested than any other elite group in Canadian society.
2) Union leaders do what is best for themselves rather than what is best for their members.
3) People active in unions bring to light some important problems which most companies would like swept under the carpet.
4) Most of the people active in labour unions are just chronic complainers.
5) Unions are more responsive to suggestions from members than other comparable groups in our society.
6) Most unions are run in a dictatorial fashion without much input from members.
7) On most issues a majority of union members would stand behind their leaders.
8) Many union leaders are corrupt.

4. UNIONS AS COLLECTIVIST ORGANIZATIONS

1) How unions spend dues money is a group decision, and individual members should abide by the decisions of the majority.
2) Union members should have the right to withhold dues which are earmarked to be spent on political causes they don't support.
3) Union members are justified in intimidating and scaring scab labour in order to protect their jobs.
4) The police and courts should ensure that any individual has the right to cross a picket line without fear of hindrance or harassment.
5) The pace of work is usually much more sensible and safe in a unionized company than in a non-union firm.
6) A union environment encourages workers to be complacent and lazy.
7) If the majority of workers in a plant vote to have a union, the others should be required to join.
8) Workers are better off without unions because they have more freedom and independence in their working lives.

5. UNIONS AS CONFLICT GROUPS

1) Picket line violence is almost always caused by provocative actions taken by management or the police.
2) The 'schoolyard bully' character of unions is illustrated by the goon tactics often seen on picket lines.
3) Most labour conflicts result from fundamental differences in interests between employers and workers.
4) Most labour conflicts are initiated by radical agitators.
5) If a labour law is bad, unions are quite right to ignore it.
6) When unions disobey the law they should be put into trusteeship by the government.
7) Labour unions need the strike weapon if they are to advance the cause of working people.
8) Most strikes result from unreasonable demands by unions.

6. UNIONS IN POLITICS

1) Unions should be affiliated with pro-Labour political parties.
2) Unions spend too much time and money on political action.
3) Unions have made an important political contribution to the fight for women's equality and the rights of minorities.
4) Unions have often neglected their bargaining functions while becoming preoccupied with broader political issues like discrimination.
5) Labour unions are the main vehicle for working class opinion.
6) Labour unions are the vehicle of socialist union leaders bent on destroying this country.
7) Union newspapers give a more reliable version of the facts than papers like <u>The Spectator</u> or <u>The Toronto Star</u>.
8) Union newspapers are just labour propaganda.

APPENDIX 4   INTERVIEW SCHEDULE, Q SORT STUDY

INTERVIEW FORM

HAMILTON SURVEY, SUMMER 1987, WORKERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS UNIONS

INTERVIEWER NO. ___ (1)   INTERVIEW DAY ___ (2,3) RESPONDENT NO. ___ (4,5)
FORM   B (6-2)

[As I mentioned, I'd like to begin with a few background questions.]

Q1. Could you please tell me the year in which you were born. _____ (7,8)

Q2. What is your employment status? [Read the following list, if necessary.]
     Are you   (9-1) Currently employed full time (30 or more hours per week).
               (9-2) Currently employed part time.
               (9-3) On temporary layoff.
               (9-4) Unemployed and looking for work.
               (9-5) Retired.
               (9-6) Unable to work due to injury or disability.
               (9-7) A full time homemaker.
               (9-8) A student ----------> Go to Q8
               (9-0) Other _____ (specify)

Q3. What kind of work do you do (or did you do in your last job)? What are (were)
your main duties or activities? [Get detailed information.]

_____
_____
_____ (10,11-   )

Q4. Would you describe your work as being manual or non-manual?
         Manual (12-1)   Non-manual (12-2)   Equal mix (12-3)

Q5. Are (were) you self-employed or do (did) you work for someone else?
         Work for someone else (13-1)
         Self-employed (13-2) -------> Go to Short Instruction, next page

Q6. Do (did) you supervise any other workers as part of your job?
         Yes (14-1)   No (14-2) ----------> Go to Q8

Q7. How much responsibility do (did) you have in their hiring, firing, pay or
promotions?
     No Responsibility (15-1)   Minor Responsibility (15-2)   D.K. (15-8)
     A Great Deal of Responsibility (15-3) -------> Go to Short Instruction, next page

Q8.   I'd also like to know about the occupations of any other adults in this
household. Can you tell me what each does for a living? [For each separate person,
ask the following.] Is he(she) self-employed or does he(she) work for someone else?
Does he(she) supervise other workers as part of his(her) job?   How much say does
he(she) have in other workers hiring, firing, pay or promotions? [Note: include a
deceased spouse in this question if it seems appropriate.]

Number of other adults in home _____ (16)

Person No.	Relation	Occupational Details	Self-Employ		Supervise Others		Say in Hiring Firing, etc.	
			Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
(17)	(18-)	(19,20-)	(21-1)	(21-2)	(22-1)	(22-2)	(23-1)	(23-2)
			Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
(24)	(25-)	(26,27-)	(28-1)	(28-2)	(29-1)	(29-2)	(30-1)	(30-2)
			Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
(31)	(32-)	(33,34-)	(35-1)	(35-2)	(36-1)	(36-2)	(37-1)	(37-2)
			Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
(38)	(39-)	(40,41-)	(42-1)	(42-2)	(43-1)	(43-2)	(44-1)	(44-2)

* * * * *

Short Instructions

[For the self-employed, for supervisors with a great deal of responsibility for hiring and firing, or for individuals where the major source of family income (estimate at 75% or more) comes from non-working class activity.]

As it turns out I will only need to take about 5 more minutes of your time with a few questions about labour unions. ------> Do Q9 to Q20, skip the sort.

* * * * *

Long Instructions

[For workers from working class families.]

The rest of the interview will be concerned with your views on labour unions. At the start I'll be asking you several questions, but for most of the time you will be reading one sentence statements about unions and deciding whether you agree or disagree with them. Let me show you what I mean. [Show the respondent the sorting tree and a sample card if s/he hasn't already asked about it.] I should tell you that the rest of the interview will probably take about 20 minutes, but that you can take as long as you want to sort the statements about unions. As well, you can withdraw from the interview at any time if you wish.

* * * * *

For the first few questions about unions we will be using this drawing of a thermometer [Hand Card No. 8]. It is called a feeling thermometer because it helps in measuring feelings toward various groups of people. Here is how it works. Scores between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favourable and warm toward an individual or a group of people -- the higher the score, the warmer and more favourable your feelings. Scores between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel too favourable and are cool toward a group of people -- the lower the score, the cooler and less favourable your feelings. If you don't have any feelings at all toward an individual or a group of people, just say so and we'll go on to the next one.

Q12. To begin, can you tell me your feeling towards the leader of the inside postal workers' union, Jean Claude Parrot.
_____ (54-56)   No feeling.   D.K.   Mixed.

Q11. How about your feeling towards the inside postal workers union, CUPW.
_____ (51-53)   No feeling.   D.K.   Mixed.

Q10. Next, your general feeling about the people who run the labour unions.
_____ (48-50)   No feeling.   D.K.   Mixed.

Q9. Finally, your feeling towards the labour movement in Canada.
_____ (45-47)   No feeling.   D.K.   Mixed.

The next set of questions also focus on labour unions. Please refer to this card when answering the questions. [Hand Card No. 7.]   Indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

Q20. Unions are an embarrassment to our society.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree
(64-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7)

Q19. Employees are considerably better off when they belong to a labour union.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree
(63-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1)

Q18. People would be just as well off if there were no unions in this country.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree
(62-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7)

Q17. I am proud of the labour movement in this country.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree
(61-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1)

Q16. I am glad that labour unions exist.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree
(60-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1)

Q15. If I had to choose, I probably would not be a member of a labour union.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree
(59-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7)

Q14. Unions are a positive force in this country.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree
(58-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1)

Q13. Most people are better off without labour unions.

| strongly agree (57-1 | moderately agree -2 | mildly agree -3 | uncertain -4 | mildly disagree -5 | moderately disagree -6 | strongly disagree -7) |

* * * * *

Q21. I would also like to know if you are presently a member of a union.
Yes (65-1) ------> Go to Q23   No (65-2)

Q22. Have you ever been a member of a union?
Yes (66-1)   No (66-2) ------> Go to Q27   Presently a member (66-3)

Q23. For approximately how many years in your working life have you been a union member? _____ (67-68)

Q24. Have you ever been on strike?
.Yes (69-1)   No (69-0) --------> Go to Q26

Q25. Have you ever walked a picket line during a strike?
Yes (70-1)   No (70-0)

Q26. Have you ever served as a union steward or union official or in any other official capacity in a union?
Yes (71-1)   No (71-0)

Q27. Would you say that you grew up in a union family or not?
Union family (72-1)   Not union family (72-2)   Uncertain/ D.K. (72-3)

Q28. At the present time are any of your close friends, or any of the members of your immediate family (children, brothers, sisters, etc.) members of labour unions?
Yes ------> [List who they are] 1st mention _____ (73-)
No --------> Go to Q30   2nd mention _____ (74-)
                          3rd mention _____ (75-)

Q29. Have any of these individuals served as union stewards or union executive members? [List which ones] _____ (76-)

Q30. As well, we would like to know the highest level of education you have completed.
(77-1) None or some elementary
(77-2) Finish elementary
(77-3) Some technical, vocational or academic high
(77-4) Finish technical, vocational or academic high
(77-5) Some community college or special course.
(77-6) Finish community college or special course.
(77-7) Some university (77-8) Finish university

Q31. And, as a final question, were you born and raised in Hamilton? [If not] Where were you born and raised?
Born _____   Raised _____ (78,79-)

Code Repeat _____ (1,5)   Census Tract _____ (6,9)
Respsex   Male (10-0)   Female (10-1)
Length   Short version (11-1)   Long version (11-2)

SORTING OF STATEMENTS ABOUT UNIONS

1. [Put the sorting tree in front of the respondent. For this a table or coffee table is most useful but the floor in front of a seated respondent will also suffice.]

2. There are 48 boxes in the sorting tree. What we want you to do is fill each of the boxes with one of these cards. [Show the stack of file cards.] You should put statements you disagree with in one of the left columns of the tree, statements you are neutral towards in the centre and statements you agree with in one of the right columns of the tree.

3. Before you begin I should tell you that there is no right or wrong way to sort the cards since each statement is a matter of opinion. We are simply interested in your views of unions.

4. And one more point before you begin. The quickest way to do this is to fill up the left and right columns of the tree first. Just put any statements you are uncertain about in the middle column -- you can come back to them for final placement after you've read all 48 cards.

5. [At sometime during the sorting exercise.] I should tell you that you are free to move cards around at any time -- you're free to change your mind.

6. [When the respondent is finished.] Do you want to make any final changes before I record your answers?

[Coding Use Only]

00 ____	15 ____	29 ____	47 ____	65 ____	79 ____
03 ____	16 ____	33 ____	48 ____	66 ____	81 ____
05 ____	17 ____	35 ____	49 ____	68 ____	82 ____
07 ____	20 ____	36 ____	51 ____	69 ____	83 ____
08 ____	21 ____	39 ____	54 ____	70 ____	88 ____
09 ____	23 ____	40 ____	56 ____	72 ____	91 ____
11 ____	24 ____	41 ____	60 ____	74 ____	96 ____
14 ____	26 ____	46 ____	64 ____	76 ____	98 ____

APPENDIX 5   LEAFLET SENT TO HAMILTON CUPW MEMBERS

Tom Langford's study of the 1987 strike

Background: I am a McMaster student working on a Ph.D. thesis. My research is concerned with the attitudes and viewpoints of working people in Canada.

Proposal: I would like to see whether the social and political views of a cross-section of CUPW members in Hamilton are changed as a result of their participation in the 1987 strike.

I NEED SOME VOLUNTEERS

Who Do I Want To Talk To? I would like to conduct one-on-one interviews with about 40 different CUPW members. Anyone in the bargaining unit can participate. My objective is to talk to approximately an equal number of men and women and to talk to equal numbers of strong union supporters and middle-of-the-road or even weak union supporters.

What's Involved? I would like to interview each individual at three points in time: First, before the union is in a legal strike position, or in the first few days of a strike; Second, during the strike; and Third, after the strike is completed. Interviews can be conducted over the telephone or in person. The first interview will take about half an hour. My questions concern your social and political views. I don't probe into your personal life.

Guarantee of Confidentiality Information and views gathered in this research are strictly confidential. In my research reports I will neither identify anyone by name nor provide any biographical information which would identify a person.

Participation is Voluntary from Start to Finish You can tell me to hit the road at any time during the research if I rub you the wrong way.

IF YOU ARE INTERESTED

Either give me a call, preferably between 9 and 11 in the morning or 9 and 11 in the evening (leave a message with my wife if I'm not home).

                Tom Langford 547-6760

Or fill out the form at the bottom of this page and mail it (before the strike!!) or drop it off at my house.

                    (tear here)

Yes, I'm interested in being interviewed as part of your study.

Name: _____ Phone Number: _____
                    (Please Print)
Send to: Tom Langford, 135 Rosslyn Ave North. Or phone me at 547-6760.

APPENDIX 6   INTERVIEW SCHEDULE, FIRST INTERVIEW WITH
HAMILTON CUPW MEMBERS

DATE _____ QUESTIONNAIRE ON BACKGROUND ATTITUDES, Autumn, 1987   RESP # ___
(1-3)

a   1.   I would like to begin by asking you about government spending on the Canadian Forces.
Do you think the government should be spending ... (CARD # 1)
a great deal more / somewhat more / the same / somewhat less / a great deal less / qual /dk
4-1   -2   -3   -4   -5   -7 -8

a   2.   (The next few questions are in an agree/disagree format. I'll read a statement. Please
indicate whether you agree or disagree with it. (CARD # 2)]
For the most part, welfare is simply a way of giving away money to people who
don't want to work.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
5-1   -2   -3   -4   -7 -8

a   3.   It is possible for a modern society to run effectively without the profit motive.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
6-4   -3   -2   -1   -7 -8

a   4.   In any industrial society it will always be necessary to have a division between those
experts who make decisions and people who carry out those decisions.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
7-1   -2   -3   -4   -7 -8

a   5.   If given the chance, non-management employees at Canada Post could run things
effectively without bosses.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
8-4   -3   -2   -1   -7 -8

a   6.   The energy crisis will not be fully solved until the government controls the major
energy companies.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
9-4   -3   -2   -1   -7 -8

a   7.   In order to reduce crime, the courts should give criminals stiffer punishments.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
10-1   -2   -3   -4   -7 -8

a   8.   One of the main reasons for poverty is that some people are not intelligent enough to
compete in this modern world.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
11-1   -2   -3   -4   -7 -8

a   9.   During a strike, management should be prohibited by law from hiring workers to take the
place of strikers.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
12-4   -3   -2   -1   -7 -8

a   10. The next question also refers to a strike situation. Imagine that workers in some firm
are out on strike over working conditions and wages. Which of the following outcomes
would you like to see occur? (CARD # 3)
the workers win / the workers win / the workers win / the workers go back to / qual/dk
their most impt / some of their / only a few of / work without winning /
demands   / demands and make / their demands and / any of their   /
                / some concessions / make major concessions / demands   /
13-4   -3   -2   -1   -7 -8

h   1.   I'm also interested in how you would describe your political and social views
Would you describe them as being small "c" conservative, middle of the road, or small
"l" liberal? Would that be ... (CARD # 12)

Ultra conservative	Moderately conservative	Slightly conservative	Middle of the Road	Slightly liberal	Moderately liberal	Ultra liberal	DK	REF
(14-1)	(-2)	(-3)	(-4)	(-5)	(-6)	(-7)	(-8)	(-9)

OTHER _____ (14-0)

2

a   11. [The next group of questions once again are in an agree/disagree format.   For   each of
          the following statements please indicate whether you agree or disagree]. (CARD # 2)
          Big corporations have far too much power in Canadian society.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          15-4   -3   -2   -1   -7   -8
a   12. Corporations benefit owners at the expense of workers and consumers.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          16-4   -3   -2   -1   -7   -8
a   13. One of the main reasons for poverty is that in every society some people have to be on
          the bottom and some on the top.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          17-1   -2   -3   -4   -7   -8
a   14. One of the main reasons for poverty is that many poor people simply do not want to
          work.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          18-1   -2   -3   -4   -7   -8
a   15. Striking workers are generally justified in physically preventing strikebreakers from
          entering the place of work.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          19-4   -3   -2   -1   -7   -8
a   16. It is better for the family if the husband is the principal breadwinner outside the
          home and the wife has primary responsibility for the home and children.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          20-1   -2   -3   -4   -7   -8
a   17. If parents disciplined their children more firmly, there would be less crime.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          21-1   -2   -3   -4   -7   -8
a   18. One of the main reasons for poverty is that the economy is based on private ownership
          and profits.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          22-4   -3   -2   -1   -7   -8

b   1.   [For the next four questions I will again be asking you whether you agree or
          disagree with certain statements. These statements concern your attitudes towards the
          Federal Government.]
          People like me don't have any say about what the government in Ottawa does.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          23-4   -3   -2   -1   -7   -8
b   2.   I don't think the Federal Government cares much about what people like me think.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          24-4   -3   -2   -1   -7   -8
b   3. Sometimes, Federal politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me
          can't really understand what's going on.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          25-4   -3   -2   -1   -7   -8
b   4.   Generally, those elected to Parliament soon lose touch with the people.
          strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree / qual / dk
          26-4   -3   -2   -1   -7   -8

3

c   1.   I'm going to shift my focus for the next few questions. I have found that people sometimes don't pay too much attention to elections. How about yourself? Thinking about the last provincial election where the Peterson government won a huge majority, were you ... (CARD # 4)

very interested / fairly interested/ slightly interested / not interested at all / dk
27-1   -2   -3   -4   -8

c   2.   Do you pay much attention to politics generally -- that is, from day to day, when there isn't a big election campaign going on? Would you say that you follow politics ... (CARD # 5)

very closely / fairly closely / not much at all / dk
28-1   -2   -3   -8

c   3.   I am also interested in how often you read about politics in the newspapers and magazines. Would that be ... (CARD # 6)

often / sometimes / seldom / never / dk
29-1   -2   -3   -4   -8

c   4.   How often do you watch programs about politics on TV?

often / sometimes / seldom / never / dk
30-1   -2   -3   -4   -8

c   5.   How often do you discuss politics with other people?

often / sometimes / seldom / never / dk
31-1   -2   -3   -4   -8

d   1.   [The next set of questions all concern labour unions. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.] (CARD # 7)

If I had to choose, I probably would not be a member of a labour union.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree	dk
32-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7	-8

d   2.   I am proud of the labour movement in this country.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree	dk
33-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	-8

d   3.   Employees are considerably better off when they belong to a labor union.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree	dk
34-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	-8

d   4.   Unions are an embarrassment to our society.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree	dk
35-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7	-8

4

e 1. [In the next few questions I am going to try to record your feelings toward various groups of people, individuals and social customs. For these questions, could you please imagine that you have a picture of a thermometer in front of you. The highest score on the thermometer is 100 degrees, and the lowest score is 0 degrees. If I mention a group of people you feel neutral or 50/50 towards, then you would give me a score of 50 degrees. If I mention a group of people you feel quite warm or favourable towards, then you would give me a score above 50 to a maximum of 100 degrees. And if you feel cool or unfavourable towards the group I mention then you can give me a score less than 50 -- the lower the score, the cooler and less favourable your feelings. If you don't have any feelings at all toward a group of people, just say so and we'll go on to the next one. Do you think you understand what we're going to do? (CARD # 8)

I'll begin with your feeling towards ...
The labour movement in Canada. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (36-38)
Please give me a score somewhere between 0 degrees and 100 degrees.
Next, how about your feeling towards ...

e 2. Small "c" conservatives. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (39-41)
e 3. Labour union activists. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (42-44)
e 4. Whites. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (45-47)
e 5. Immigrants from England. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (48-50)
e 6. The idea of life after death. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (51-53)
e 7. Religious prayer. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (54-56)
e 8. The leader of CUPW, Jean-Claude Parrot. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (57-59)
e 9. The people who run the labour unions. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (60-62)
e 10. Small "l" liberals. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (63-65)
e 11. Immigrants from the Carribean. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (66-68)
e 12. Religious worship. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (69-71)
e 13. Non-whites. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (72-74)
e 14. Left-wingers. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (4-6)
e 15. The Canadian Autoworkers Union. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (7-9)
e 16. Immigrants from India and Pakistan. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (10-12)
e 17. God. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (13-15)
e 18. Right-wingers. _____ No feeling. DK. Mixed. (16-18)

f 1. In the next question I would like you to consider your own political opinions. Would you describe yourself as being right, centre or left in your point of view? Would that be ... (CARD # 9)
far / strongly / leaning / centre / leaning / strongly / far REFUSED (-9)
left   left   left   right   right   right   DK (-8)
(19-7)   (-6)   (-5)   (-4)   (-3)   (-2)   (-1)

f 2. Where would you put the political opinions of the president of the inside postal workers' union, Jean Claude Parrot -- right, centre or left? Would that be ...
far / strongly / leaning / centre / leaning / strongly / far REFUSED (-9)
left   left   left   right   right   right   DK (-8)
(20-7)   (-6)   (-5)   (-4)   (-3)   (-2)   (-1)

f 3. Where would you put the political opinions of the prime minister of Canada, Brian Mulroney -- right, centre or left? Would that be ...
far / strongly / leaning / centre / leaning / strongly / far REFUSED (-9)
left   left   left   right   right   right   DK (-8)
(21-7)   (-6)   (-5)   (-4)   (-3)   (-2)   (-1)

5

g 1.   One hears a lot about different social classes. Do you ever think of yourself as belonging to a social class? YES (22-1)   NO (-2)   DK (-8) REFUSED (-9)

g 2.   (IF YES TO G1.) Which of the following classes would you say you were in ... (C # 10)

Upper Class	Upper middle Class	Middle Class	Working Class	Lower Class	DK	REFUSED	NA	OTHER _____
(23-1)	(-2)	(-3)	(-4)	(-5)	(-8)	(-9)	(-0)	(-6)

g 3.   (IF NO OR D.K. TO G1.) Well, if you had to make a choice, which of these social classes would you say you were in ... (CARD # 10)

Upper Class	Upper middle Class	Middle Class	Working Class	Lower Class	DK	REFUSED	NA	OTHER _____
(24-1)	(-2)	(-3)	(-4)	(-5)	(-8)	(-9)	(-0)	(-6)

g 4.   (IF CLASS IS CHOSEN IN G2. OR G3.) Some people feel close to other people in their own class, but others don't feel this way as much. How about you? Would you say you feel very close to other (CHOSEN CLASS) people, would you say you feel fairly close to them, or would you say that you don't feel much closer to them than you do to people in other classes? (CARD # 11)

Feel Very Close	Feel Fairly Close	Don't Feel Close	DK	Refused	NA
(25-1)	(-2)	(-3)	(-8)	(-9)	(-0)

i 1   For the next three questions I again return to the agree/disagree format. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. (Card # 2)
Pornographic magazines and movies should be censored.

strongly agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	qual	dk
26-1	-2	-3	-4	-7	-8

i 2   The decision to have an abortion should be the responsibility of the pregnant woman.

strongly agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	qual	dk
27-4	-3	-2	-1	-7	-8

i 3   People who are homosexuals should be permitted to teach school.

strongly agree	somewhat agree	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	qual	dk
28-4	-3	-2	-1	-7	-8

PRELIMINARY BACKGROUND INFORMATION

SEX   Female (29-1) Male (29-2)

START WORK   When do you start work as an inside postal worker?

_____   year _____ (30-31)
(record here)   month _____ (32-33)

RESIDENCE   What city or town do you live in?

_____   Hamilton (34-1)
(record here)   Other   (-2)

CUPW SUPPORT   I am interested in the extent to which you generally support your union. Would you describe yourself as a ... (CARD # 13)

Strong union supporter	Middle of the road supporter	Weak union supporter	Opponent of the union
(35-4)	(35-3)	(35-2)	(35-1)

6

UNION CLOSENESS   Some people feel close to other people in their own union, but others don't
feel this way as much. How about you? Would you say you feel very close to
other CUPW members, would you say you feel fairly close to them, or would you
say that you don't feel any closer to them than any other people with whom
you are acquainted (CARD # 11)

Feel Very Close   Feel Fairly Close   Don't Feel Close   OK   Refused   NA
(36-1)   (-2)   (-3)   (-8) (-9)   (-0)

FIRST INTERVIEW DATE   Month _____ (37-38)
                       Day _____ (39-40)
                       Year _____ (41-42)

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

PHONE: _____

RESP #: _____

Comments

APPENDIX 7   INTERVIEW SCHEDULE, SECOND INTERVIEW WITH
                HAMILTON CUPW MEMBERS

SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE, C.U.P.W. MEMBERS   Respondent Number _____ (1-3)
                        Second Interview Date: Month _____ (4-5)
                                               Day _____ (6-7)
                                               Year _____ (8-9)

        I'm going to be asking you two types of questions during this interview. The first type
relates to your perceptions of the strike and strike issues.   The second type concerns your own
background -- age, education, things like that.   If you don't feel like answering any of the
questions just say so and I'll move on to the next question.

j 1. I'd like to begin by asking whether you believe your attitudes or way of thinking have
changed in any way as a result of what happened during the strike and the way the strike was
ended?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____(OVER)
[CODING First mention _____ (10-11) Second mention _____ (12-13) Third mention _____ (14-15)]

j 2. In an overall sense, would you describe the extent of your change in attitudes as being not
much change at all, minor changes, moderate changes or major changes?
        not much   minor   moderate   major   don't
        change at all changes   changes   changes know
        16-1   -2   -3   -4   -8

        I've got a few more specific questions relating to changes in your attitudes.

j 3. First, as a result of the strike would you say that your attitudes towards the local union
are more positive, more negative, or about the same? Would that be ...
        considerably   somewhat   about   somewhat   considerably don't know
        more positive   more positive the same   more negative more negative
        17-5   -4   -3   -2   -1   -8

j 4. How about your attitudes towards the police.   Are they more positive, more negative, or
about the same? Would that be ...
        considerably   somewhat   about   somewhat   considerably don't know
        more positive   more positive the same   more negative more negative
        18-1   -2   -3   -4   -5   -8

j 5. And how about your attitudes towards Canada Post management in Hamilton. Are they more
positive, more negative, or about the same? Would that be ...
        considerably   somewhat   about   somewhat   considerably don't know
        more positive   more positive the same   more negative more negative
        19-1   -2   -3   -4   -5   -8

j 6. Next, as a result the strike would you say that your attitudes towards the Federal
Progressive Conservative government have changed. Are they more positive, more negative or about
the same? Would that be ...
        considerably   somewhat   about   somewhat   considerably don't know
        more positive   more positive the same   more negative more negative
        20-1   -2   -3   -4   -5   -8

j 7. As well, I'm interested in whether your attitudes towards the labour movement have changed. Are your attitudes more positive, more negative, or about the same. Would that be ...

considerably more positive	somewhat more positive	about the same	somewhat more negative	considerably more negative	don't know
21-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	-8

j 8. And how about your attitudes towards your fellow workers. Are they more positive, more negative, or about the same? Would that be ...

considerably more positive	somewhat more positive	about the same	somewhat more negative	considerably more negative	don't know
22-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	-8

j 9. Finally, I'd like to know whether your attitudes towards Jean-Claude Parrot and the national leadership of the C.U.P.W. are more positive, more negative or about the same? Would that be ...

considerably more positive	somewhat more positive	about the same	somewhat more negative	considerably more negative	don't know
23-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	-8

I'm going to ask a few background questions now.

k 1. To begin with, I'm interested in your marital status. Are you married, widowed, separated, divorced, or are you single?

married	widowed	separated	divorced	single	refused
24-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-9

[IF SINGLE, GO TO QUESTION K 7.]

* * * * * * * *

k 2. [FOR EVERYONE OTHER THAN SINGLE RESPONDENTS] I have a few questions about the work your spouse does. What is (was) the occupation of your spouse (former spouse)?

_____

_____ [Coding _____ (25-26)

k 3. Is your spouse self-employed or does he/she work for someone else?
self-employed (27-1)   work for someone else (-2)   don't know (-8)

k 4. Would you describe your spouse's job as involving managerial responsibilities?
yes, managerial (28-1)   no, not managerial (-2)   don't know (-8)

k 5. Does (did) your spouse supervise the work of other employees as part of her/his job?
yes, supervise (29-1)   no supervision (-2)   don't know (-8)

k 6. [IF SUPERVISING] How much responsibility does (did) he/she have in the hiring and firing of other employees.
No responsibility (30-1) Some responsibility (-2) Major responsibility (-3)   d.k. (-8)

* * * * * * * *

k 7. Do you (and your spouse) have any children? How many children are you currently supporting? _____ (31)

The next group of questions focus on your standard of living.

k 8. On a scale of 0 to 10, with zero being the worst and 10 being the best, how would you rate your present financial situation? _____ (32-33)

k 9. And on the same zero to ten scale, what is the financial situation you should have right now, all things considered? _____ (34-35)

k 10. Thinking about your current material standard of living, would you say that you are very satisfied, fairly satisfied, a little dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the material side of your life right now?

very satisfied / fairly satisfied / little dissatisfied / very dissatisfied / don't know
(36-1)   (-2)   (-3)   (-4)   (-8)

k 11. I am also interested in getting a rough idea of your yearly family income. Could you please tell me which of the following four categories best describes your before taxes and before deductions family income. The first category is 20 to 34 thousand dollars. The second category is 35 to 49 thousand dollars. The third category is 50 to 64 thousand dollars. And the fourth category is 65 thousand dollars or higher.

	20-34M(37-1)	35-49M(-2)	50-64M(-3)	65+M(-4)
GUESS				
IF REFUSED	20-34M(37-5)	35-49M(-6)	50-64M(-7)	65+M(-8)

k 12. If you left your current job with Canada Post, do you think it is likely that you'd be able to find another job that paid a comparable or higher wage? Would that be ...

Quite likely   Maybe   Probably Not   Definitely Not   Don't Know
(38-1)   (-2)   (-3)   (-4)   (-8)

I'm also interested in your future job plans.

l 1.   To begin with, how likely do you think it is that you'll continue working for Canada Post until you decide to retire? Would that be ...

Very Likely   Probably   Maybe   Probably Not   Very Unlikely   Don't Know
(39-5)   (-4)   (-3)   (-2)   (-1)   (-8)

l 2. [IF MAYBE, PROBABLY NOT OR VERY UNLIKELY] What sort of a job do you think you'll go for after this one? _____

_____ [Code Occup _____ (40-41)   Code SES _____ (42-43)]

l 3. Do you think that you would find a supervisory job with Canada Post more interesting and to your liking than your current job?   YES (44-1)   MIXED (-2)   NO (-3)   D.K. (-8)

l 4. Do you foresee yourself as possibly working in a supervisory capacity with Canada Post at some point in the future?   YES (45-1)   MIXED (-2)   NO (-3)   D.K. (-8)

I want to return to the strike with my next set of questions.

m 1. How would you characterize your support for the strike?

Lukewarm   Moderate   Strong   Very Strong   D.K.
(46-1)   (-2)   (-3)   (-4)   (-8)

m 2. Why? What was your main reason for being a (   ) supporter of the strike?

_____

_____ [Code _____ (47-48)]

m 3. Altogether, people in Hamilton picketed on 7 separate days during the strike if we don't count the Thanksgiving weekend when picketing wasn't officially organized. If you can remember, on about how many of those days did you help out on the picket line or in the union office?

_____ (number) or Don't Know (49-8)

■ 4. Do you think that the federal government and Canada Post management hoped to smash your union in this confrontation?   YES, (50-4)   YES, (-3) MAYBE (-2) NO (-1) D.K. (-8)
                    Definitely   Qualified

■ 5. Do you think it is very likely that you, personally, will be adversely affected if Canada Post goes ahead with its plans to privatize services and secures the contractual right to lay off surplus employees? Would you say that you would be ...

Most definitely affected (51-5)	Quite likely affected (-4)	Maybe affected (-3)	Probably not affected (-2)	Definitely not affected (-1)	D.K. (-8)

■ 6. How about other postal workers in Hamilton.   Do you think that many of them will be adversely affected by Canada Post's plans to privatize services and lay off surplus employees. Would you say that ...

A large number will be affected (52-4)	Quite a few will be affected (-3)	A handful will be affected (-2)	Hardly anybody will be affected (-1)	D.K. (-8)

■ 7. During the strike, which of the following four issues were you more concerned about?

your own job security (53-1)	the job security of your fellow workers -2	the chance that the government might smash your union (-3)	the general political issue of privatization (-4)	NONE (-8)

        COMBINATION (Specify)   _____
_____
                                                        [Coding ___ (53)]

■ 8. Do you think C.U.P.W. and its members gained anything from the strike?
       YES (54-3)   NO (-1)   QUALIFIED (-2)   D.K. (-8)
■ 9. What would that be?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_   _____ [Code _____ (55-56)]

    I'm going to ask you some more background questions now.

n 1. To start off with, I'm interested in the highest level of education you completed before starting to work full time.... Have you taken any educational courses since you've been working full time?
_____ [Coding ____ (57)]

n 2. In what year were you born? _____ (58-59)

n 3. Are you a mail handler, do you work on wickets, or do you work in processing? [If in processing] Do you spend a good deal of your working time coding at the Group Desk Suite, do you hand sort mail, or do you have a specialized job like working on registered letters?
   Handler (60-1)   Wickets (-2)   Mechanized processing (-3) Hand sorting (-4) Specialized (-5)

n 4. Thinking about the wages and benefits inside postal workers receive for their labour, do you think that members of C.U.P.W. are underpaid, overpaid or paid about right for the work they do?   UNDERPAID (61-3)   ABOUT RIGHT (-2)   OVERPAID (-1)   D.K. (-8)

n 5. As you are well aware, many people in Canadian society don't have much sympathy for inside postal workers. One of the arguments I've heard such people make many times is that compared to workers in similar jobs, postal workers are overpaid. How do you respond to that kind of reasoning? _____

_____
_____
_____
_____ [Coding _____ (62-63)]

In the next three questions I want to look at what you think about your own job. Please tell me how true each of the following statements is of your own job.

n 6. There is a great deal of freedom to decide how to do my work.... Is this
    Very true   Somewhat true   Not Very true   Not at all true   Not Sure
    (64-1)   (-2)   (-3)   (-4)   (-8)

n 7. The work is interesting.... Is this
    Very true   Somewhat true   Not Very true   Not at all true   Not Sure
    (65-1)   (-2)   (-3)   (-4)   (-8)

n 8. I can influence important decisions made by my superior.
    Very true   Somewhat true   Not Very true   Not at all true   Not Sure
    (66-1)   (-2)   (-3)   (-4)   (-8)

I'm now going to ask you a few questions about what your closest friends or acquaintances at work did during the strike.

o 1. Thinking about the person who is your closest friend or acquaintance, did he or she picket regularly during the strike? Would that be ...
    Every Day (67-3)   Some Days (-2)   Never (-1)   D.K. (-8)
0 2. Would you say that this friend is ...
    A strong union supporter   A middle of the road supporter   A luke warm supporter
    (68-3)   (-2)   (-1)

0 3. Next, how about the person who is your second closest friend at work. Did he or she picket regularly during the strike? Would that be ...
    Every Day (69-3)   Some Days (-2)   Never (-1)   D.K. (-8)
o 4. Would you say that this friend is ...
    A strong union supporter   A middle of the road supporter   A luke warm supporter
    (70-3)   (-2)   (-1)

o 5. Are you good friends with any members of the union executive or any union stewards?
    YES (71-1)   NO (-2)

o 6. On the whole, to what extent do you respect the honesty and leadership abilities of the local union executive. Would you say you respect them ...
    A great deal   Somewhat   Not very much   Not at all   Don't know
    (72-4)   (-3)   (-2)   (-1)   (-8)

I'm also interested in whether you come from a family with union connections.

p 1. Would you say that you grew up in a pro-union family or not?
    Pro-union (73-3)   Middle (volunteered) (-2)   Not union family (-1)   D.K. (-8)

p 2. Have any of your good friends away from work, or any of the members of your immediate family (children, parents, brothers, sisters) ever served as union stewards or union executive members? _____

_____

    [Coding number (74-)   Coding closeness (75-   )]

p 3. Were the family members and friends you are closest to generally supportive of the C.U.P.W. strike? Yes (76-4)   Yes, with reservation (76-3) Qualified (-2) No (-1)

RESPONDENT # _____ (1-3) CARD # _2_ (4)

    My last set of questions all concern strike issues.

q 1. In your opinion, what is the main reason that CUPW and Canada Post couldn't negotiate a settlement between themselves? _____

_____ [Coding _____ (5-6)]

q 2. How angry at the scabs were you during the strike? Were you ...
    furious   quite angry   somewhat angry   not very angry   not at all angry
    (7-5)   (-4)   (-3)   (-2)   (-1)

q 3. How angry at the scabs are you now? Are you ...
    furious   quite angry   somewhat angry   not very angry   not at all angry
    (8-5)   (-4)   (-3)   (-2)   (-1)

     On a scale ranging from zero to 10, with 10 representing an issue of great importance to you, please indicate the importance of the following contract demands made by C.U.P.W.
r 1. Increasing the number of day shift jobs and decreasing night shift jobs. _____ (9-10)
r 2. Getting Canada Post to create more full time positions rather than
      using so many casuals and part timers.   _____ (11-12)
r 3. Stopping Canada Post's plans to privatize wicket services.   _____ (13-14)
r 4. Maintaining the job security provisions of the old contract.   _____ (15-16)
r 5. Increasing the number of New Directions Outlets in malls, and the
      contracting in of major sub-post offices.   _____ (17-18)
r 6. Allowing coders a 5 minute rest period per hour.   _____ (19-20)
r 7. Expanding the number of retail services offered at wickets.   _____ (21-22)
r 8. Preventing the reintroduction of individual work measurement. _____ (23-24)
r 9. Decreasing the number of days worked from 10 days every 2 weeks _____ (25-26)
      to 9 days every 2 weeks, with no loss of pay.

r 10. Do you hold out much hope that the report of the mediator-arbitrator, Cossette, will be any more favourable to postal workers than the conciliation report by Foisy?
        NO (27-3)   MAYBE (-2)   YES (-1)

r 11. How discouraged are you about the situation postal workers find themselves in at present? Would you describe yourself as being ...
Very discouraged/Somewhat discouraged/Discouraged, but hopeful/Quite optimistic/Very optimistic
    (28-5)   (-4)   (-3)   (-2)   (-1)
r 12. WHY? _____

_____

_____

    [Coding, Discouraged _____ (29-30) Coding, Optimistic _____ (31-32)]

APPENDIX 8   QUESTIONNAIRE, STRIKEBREAKER RECRUITS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR REPLACEMENT WORKERS

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>: My name is Tom Langford. I am a student at McMaster University in Hamilton doing research for a Ph.D. thesis. I am interested in learning more about the background and attitudes of individuals who apply for jobs as replacement workers with Canada Post.

<u>THE SURVEY</u>: I would appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to complete this survey and return it to me in the stamped return envelope. I do <u>not</u> require your name or address, only your point of view. When you fill out the survey, you will notice numbers in brackets associated with each answer. This is a computer code which you can ignore.

<u>BACKGROUND QUESTIONS</u>

1. In what year were you born? (Please write your answer on the line.) _____ (10,11)

2. What is your sex? (Please circle one of the answers.)
         Male (12-1)   Female (-2)

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Please print your answer) _____
_____ (13,14)

4. What is your marital status? (Please circle one answer)
         Single (15-1)
         Married, including common law (-2)
         Separated or divorced (-3)
         Widowed (-4)

5. Do you have any children? (Please circle)
         Yes (16-1)   No (-2)

6. (If you have children) How many children are you currently supporting? (Please write on the line.) _____ (17,18)

7. What is your present employment status? (Please circle)
         Working 30 or more hours a week (19-1)
         Working 15 to 29 hours a week (-2)
         Working 1 to 14 hours a week (-3)
         Full-time student and not working (-4)
         Full-time homemaker and not working (-5)
         Unemployed (-6)
         Other (Please record) _____ (-7)

2

8. What was your personal income, before taxes, in 1986?
(Please circle one answer)   Less than $5,000 (24-1)
                                $5,000 to $9,999 (-2)
                                $10,000 to $14,999 (-3)
                                $15,000 to $19,999 (-4)
                                $20,000 to $29,999 (-5)
                                $30,000 to $39,999 (-6)
                                $40,000 or more (-7)

9. [If you are presently living with a spouse or partner] What
was your spouse's or partner's personal income, before taxes, in
1986? (Please circle one answer)
        Less than $5,000 (21-1)
        $5,000 to $9,999 (-2)
        $10,000 to $14,999 (-3)
        $15,000 to $19,999 (-4)
        $20,000 to $29,999 (-5)
        $30,000 to $39,999 (-6)
        $40,000 or more (-7)

10. How satisfied are you with your material standard of living?
(Please circle one answer)
     Very   Fairly   A Little   Very
   Satisfied   Satisfied   Dissatisfied   Dissatisfied
    (22-1)   (-2)   (-3)   (-4)

11. Compared to your material standard of living one year ago,
would you say that you are ... (Please circle one answer)
          Better Off   About the Same   Worse Off
           (23-1)   (-2)   (-3)

12. Does any member of your family belong to a trade or labour
union? (Please circle)   Yes (24-1)   No (-2)

13. Do any of your close friends belong to a trade or labour
union? (Please circle)   Yes (25-1)   No (-2)

14. Have you ever belonged to a trade or labour union? (Please
circle)   Yes (26-1)   No (-2)

15. [If you have belonged to a labour union] For approximately
how many years were you a union member? (Please record answer on
the line) _____ (27,28)

16. I would like to know whether you have any feelings towards
the inside postal workers union, CUPW. Please circle the
category listed below which best describes your feelings towards
the postal workers union.
No   Strong   Moderate   Mild   Like   Moderate   Like
Feeling Dislike   Dislike   Dislike   Mildly   Like   Strongly
(29-0)   (-1)   (-2)   (-3)   (-4)   (-5)   (-6)

3

17. In this question I would like you to consider your own political opinions. Would you describe yourself as being right, centre or left in your point of view? Please circle the category below which best describes your own political point of view.

far left	strongly left	leaning left	centre	leaning right	strongly right	far right	don't know
(l8-7)	(-6)	(-5)	(-4)	(-3)	(-2)	(-1)	(-0)

18. Thinking back over the past year, for how much of this time have you been unemployed and wanting to work? (Please record your answer on this line.) _____ (31,32)

19. What city or town do you live in? (Please record your answer on this line.) _____ (33,34)

20. For how many years have you lived in the city or town where you presently reside? _____ (35,36)

21. Please list the cities and towns you have lived in during the 1980s. _____
_____ (37,38)

QUESTIONS CONCERNING CANADA POST

1. In your own words, could you please tell me why you decided to apply for a job as a replacement worker with Canada Post.
_____
_____
_____ (39-43)

2. Have you read or heard very much about the current set of negotiations between Canada Post Corporation and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers? (Please circle one answer)

Quite A Lot (44-1)	Some (-2)	A Little (-3)	Nothing (-4)

3. In your opinion, what are the two main issues in dispute between Canada Post and the inside postal workers union? (Please print your answers or circle "Don't Know").

DON'T KNOW (45)

First Issue: _____ (46,47)

Second Issue: _____ (48,49)

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON YOUR SOCIAL AND POLITICAL VIEWS

1. I would like to begin by asking you about government spending on the Canadian Forces. Do you think the government should be spending ... (Please circle one answer)

a great deal more	somewhat more	the same	somewhat less	a great deal less
(-1)	-2	-3	-4	-5

4

2.   [The next few questions are in an agree/disagree format. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each statement by circling one of the answers which appear underneath it.]

For the most part, welfare is simply a way of giving away money to people who don't want to work.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / disagree somewhat / strongly disagree
5-1   -2   -3   -4

3.   It is possible for a modern society to run effectively without the profit motive.
strongly disagree / somewhat disagree / agree somewhat / strongly agree
6-1   -2   -3   -4

4.   In any industrial society it will always be necessary to have a division between those experts who make decisions and people who carry out those decisions.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree
7-1   -2   -3   -4

5.   If given the chance, non-management employees at Canada Post could run things effectively without bosses.
strongly disagree / somewhat disagree / agree somewhat / strongly agree
8-1   -2   -3   -4

6.   The energy crisis will not be fully solved until the government controls the major energy companies.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree
9-4   -3   -2   -1

7.   In order to reduce crime, the courts should give criminals stiffer punishments.
strongly disagree / somewhat disagree / agree somewhat / strongly agree
10-4   -3   -2   -1

8.   One of the main reasons for poverty is that some people are not intelligent enough to compete in this modern world.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree
11-1   -2   -3   -4

9.   During a strike, management should be prohibited by law from hiring workers to take the place of strikers.
strongly disagree / somewhat disagree / agree somewhat / strongly agree
12-1   -2   -3   -4

10. The next question also refers to a strike situation. Imagine that workers in some firm are out on strike over working conditions and wages. Which of the following outcomes would you like to see occur?

the workers win their most important demands	the workers win some of their demands and make some concessions	the workers win only a few of their demands and make major concessions	the workers go back without winning any of their demands
13-4	-3	-2	-1

5

11. Big corporations have far too much power in Canadian society.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree
14-4   -3   -2   -1

12. Corporations benefit owners at the expense of workers and consumers.
strongly disagree / somewhat disagree / agree somewhat / strongly agree
15-1   -2   -3   -4

13. One of the main reasons for poverty is that in every society some people have to be on the bottom and some on the top.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree
16-1   -2   -3   -4

14. One of the main reasons for poverty is that many poor people simply do not want to work.
strongly disagree / somewhat disagree / agree somewhat / strongly agree
17-4   -3   -2   -1

15. Striking workers are generally justified in physically preventing strikebreakers from entering the place of work.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree
18-4   -3   -2   -1

16. It is better for the family if the husband is the principal breadwinner outside the home and the wife has primary responsibility for the home and children.
strongly disagree / somewhat disagree / agree somewhat / strongly agree
19-4   -3   -2   -1

17. If parents disciplined their children more firmly, there would be less crime.
strongly agree / somewhat agree / somewhat disagree / strongly disagree
20-1   -2   -3   -4

18. One of the main reasons for poverty is that the economy is based on private ownership and profits.
strongly disagree / somewhat disagree / agree somewhat / strongly agree
21-1   -2   -3   -4

19. [The next few questions concern labour unions. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements by circling one of the answers.]
If I had to choose, I probably would not be a member of a labour union.

strongly agree	moderately agree	mildly agree	uncertain	mildly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree
22-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-6	-7

6

20. I am proud of the labour movement in this country.
strongly moderately mildly   uncertain   agree   moderately strongly
disagree disagree   disagree   mildly   agree   agree
21-1   -2   -3   -4   -5   -6   -7

21. Unions are an embarrassment to our society.
strongly moderately mildly   uncertain   agree   moderately strongly
disagree disagree   disagree   mildly   agree   agree
24-7   -6   -5   -4   -3   -2   -1

22. Employees are considerably better off when they belong to a
labour union.
strongly moderately mildly uncertain mildly   moderately strongly
agree   agree   agree   disagree disagree   disagree
25-7   -6   -5   -4   -3   -2   -1

23.   The final question returns to the subject of income. Given
your skills and capabilities, how much income, before taxes, do
you think you deserve to make in a year. (Please circle one
answer)
          Less than $5,000 (26-1)
          $5,000 to $9,999 (-2)
          $10,000 to $14,999 (-3)
          $15,000 to $19,999 (-4)   .
          $20,000 to $29,999 (-5)
          $30,000 to $39,999 (-6)
          $40,000 or more (-7)

===
     This completes the survey. Thank you for taking the time to
help me with my research.   Please return the survey in the
stamped, addressed envelope. If you have further questions I can
be reached at my home telephone number: Tom Langford, (416) 547-
6760.

                  I M P O R T A N T   N O T E

     I would like to conduct a follow-up interview with you over
the telephone sometime during the next few weeks.   If you are
willing to talk with me for a few minutes, please record your
phone number below. Please note that the information you give me
is strictly confidential. At no time do I need to know your full
name or your address.   Furthermore, neither the Canada Post
Corporation nor the Canadian Union of Postal Workers will have
any access to my interview forms and notes.

PHONE NUMBER _____

FIRST NAME ONLY (so I know who to ask for -- you can provide a
nickname or alias if you wish) _____

BEST TIMES TO CALL _____

APPENDIX 9   DATA TABLES, CHAPTERS 7 AND 8

Table A9.1: Strike Sympathies of Six Groups of Canadian Workers

	CUPW LEADERS	CUPW RANK&FILE	SCABS	NATIONAL UNION LEADERS	NATIONAL UNION RANK&FILE	NATIONAL NON-UNION
Agreement with Index Items						
Q137c Outlaw strikebreakers	100%	89%	5%	82%	80%	62%
Q137f Physically stop scabs	72%	52%	14%	47%	38%	26%
Q142 Workers win impt demands	72%	41%	18%	22%	21%	11%
Strike Sympathies Index[a]						
Group mean	10.9	9.7	6.2	8.9	8.7	7.6
Upper 95% limit	na	na	na	9.3	8.9	7.7
Lower 95% limit	na	na	na	8.5	8.5	7.4
Adjustment, age/education controls	+.1	+.2	+.1	+.1	0	0
Number in group sample	18	27	20	77	344	669
Interindividual Structure						
Percentage high on index	94%	70%	10%	56%	57%	33%
Percentage low on index	0%	4%	70%	10%	12%	30%
Group standard deviation	1.32	1.77	1.68	1.84	1.85	1.93
Relative group dissensus[b]	17.6%	23.6%	22.4%	24.5%	24.7%	25.7%
Rank in group consensus	1	3	2	4	5	6
Intraindividual Structure						
Average standard deviation	.52	.80	1.05	.88	.90	.94
Average relative individual inconsistency[c]	20.7%	31.9%	41.9%	35.1%	36.0%	37.6%
Rank in individual consistency	1	2	6	3	4	5

[a] Index minimum=3, maximum=12, midpoint=7.5   [b] (Group standard deviation/index midpoint) x 100
[c] (Individual standard deviation/average item midpoint) x 100
na Not applicable for a nonprobability sample.

Table A9.2: General Union Sentiment, Six Groups of Hamilton Workers

	CUPW LEADERS	CUPW RANK&FILE	SCABS	HAMILTON UNION LEADERS	HAMILTON UNION RANK&FILE	HAMILTON NON-UNION
Agreement with Index Items						
M2 Choose not to be in union	0%	18%	32%	11%	32%	44%
M6 Proud of labour movement	89%	78%	45%	70%	65%	48%
M8 Employees better off with union	94%	85%	68%	93%	87%	65%
M5 Union are an embarrassment	0%	7%	32%	7%	19%	26%
General Union Sentiment Index[a]						
Group mean	26.1	23.3	18.4	24.2	21.3	17.8
Upper 95% limit	na	na	na	26.2	23.0	19.1
Lower 95% limit	na	na	na	22.2	19.7	16.5
Adjustment, age/education controls	-.3	+.1	-.4	+.5	+.2	-.1
Number in group sample	18	27	22	27	54	107
Interindividual Structure						
Percentage high on index	94%	78%	23%	85%	69%	45%
Percentage low on index	0%	0%	4%	7%	13%	21%
Group standard deviation	2.78	4.36	4.93	5.06	6.05	6.72
Relative group dissensus[b]	17.4%	27.2%	30.8%	31.6%	37.8%	42.0%
Rank in group consensus	1	2	3	4	5	6
Intraindividual Structure						
Average standard deviation	.48	1.05	1.04	.82	1.23	1.30
Average relative individual inconsistency[c]	11.9%	26.2%	25.9%	20.6%	30.8%	32.4%
Rank in individual consistency	1	4	3	2	5	6

[a] Index minimum=4, maximum=28, midpoint=16; items M2 and M5 are reverse coded.
[b] (Group standard deviation/index midpoint) x 100
[c] (Individual standard deviation/average item midpoint) x 100
na Not applicable for a nonprobability sample.

Table A9.3: Big Business Power Attitude, Six Groups of Canadian Workers

	CUPW LEADERS	CUPW RANK&FILE	SCABS	NATIONAL UNION LEADERS	NATIONAL UNION RANK&FILE	NATIONAL NON-UNION
Agreement with Index Items						
Q137g Big corps too powerful	100%	84%	90%	82%	85%	86%
Q137a Corporations hurt workers	100%	93%	67%	75%	79%	71%
Big Business Power Index[a]						
Group mean	7.5	6.9	6.2	6.5	6.3	6.2
Upper 95% limit	na	na	na	6.8	6.4	6.3
Lower 95% limit	na	na	na	6.1	6.2	6.1
Adjustment, age/education controls	0	+.1	+.1	0	0	0
Number in group sample	17	25	21	78	341	667
Interindividual Structure						
Percentage high on index	100%	88%	71%	70%	74%	72%
Percentage low on index	0%	0%	5%	11%	10%	11%
Group standard deviation	.80	1.09	1.17	1.58	1.34	1.38
Relative group dissensus[b]	16.0%	21.8%	23.4%	31.6%	26.8%	27.6%
Rank in group consensus	1	2	3	6	4	5
Intraindividual Structure						
Average standard deviation	.12	.45	.40	.40	.50	.51
Average relative individual inconsistency[c]	5.0%	18.1%	16.2%	15.9%	20.1%	20.3%
Rank in individual consistency	1	4	3	2	5	6

[a] Index minimum=2, maximum=8, midpoint=5   [b] (Group standard deviation/index midpoint) x 100
[c] (Individual standard deviation/average item midpoint) x 100
na Not applicable in a nonprobability sample.

Table A9.4: Capitalist Economic Organization Attitude, Six Groups of Canadian Workers

	CUPW LEADERS	CUPW RANK&FILE	SCABS	NATIONAL UNION LEADERS	NATIONAL UNION RANK&FILE	NATIONAL NON-UNION
Agreement with Index Items						
Q137d Profit motive unnecessary	39%	11%	20%	38%	37%	37%
Q139d Profit system causes poverty	67%	73%	43%	59%	61%	59%
Q139i Govt should control energy	35%	30%	32%	41%	42%	43%
Q137e Bosses unnecessary at work	83%	48%	33%	44%	43%	46%
Capitalist Economic Organization Index[a]						
Group mean	10.7	9.4	8.3	9.5	9.5	9.5
Upper 95% limit	na	na	na	10.2	9.8	9.7
Lower 95% limit	na	na	na	8.8	9.2	9.3
Adjustment, age/education controls	+.1	+.3	+.1	+.1	0	0
Number in group sample	17	23	18	77	330	621
Interindividual Structure						
Percentage high on index	41%	17%	6%	26%	21%	21%
Percentage low on index	29%	30%	56%	32%	33%	36%
Group standard deviation	3.18	2.35	2.35	2.98	2.58	2.50
Relative group dissensus[b]	31.8%	23.5%	23.5%	29.8%	25.8%	25.0%
Rank in group consensus	6	1	1	5	4	3
Intraindividual Structure						
Average standard deviation	1.01	.92	.78	.85	.87	.86
Average relative individual inconsistency[c]	40.2%	36.6%	31.2%	33.9%	34.7%	34.3%
Rank in individual consistency	6	5	1	2	4	3

[a] Index minimum=4, maximum=16, midpoint=10   [b] (Group standard deviation/index midpoint) x 100
[c] (Individual standard deviation/average item midpoint) x 100
na Not applicable for a nonprobability sample.

Table A9.5: Authoritarian Traditionalism, Six Groups of Canadian Workers

	CUPW LEADERS	CUPW RANK&FILE	SCABS	NATIONAL UNION LEADERS	NATIONAL UNION RANK&FILE	NATIONAL NON-UNION
Agreement with Index Items						
Q139h Discipline kids, less crime	63%	37%	72%	63%	67%	65%
Q139f Punish criminals, less crime	65%	70%	77%	77%	86%	83%
Q144d Husband as breadwinner	44%	33%	43%	57%	61%	62%
Q137b Society needs experts	50%	69%	76%	80%	76%	81%
Q140 Spend more on armed forces	44%	54%	55%	41%	44%	42%
Authoritarian Traditionalism Index[a]						
Group mean	12.1	12.2	11.1	11.1	10.9	10.7
Upper 95% limit	na	na	na	11.9	11.2	11.0
Lower 95% limit	na	na	na	10.2	10.6	10.5
Adjustment, age/education controls	+.1	-.2	-.5	+.2	+.1	0
Number in group sample	16	24	19	74	330	642
Interindividual Structure						
Percentage high on index	25%	12%	11%	12%	6%	6%
Percentage low on index	38%	25%	48%	48%	46%	48%
Group standard deviation	4.19	2.84	2.92	3.66	2.80	2.88
Relative group dissensus[b]	32.2%	21.8%	22.5%	28.2%	21.5%	22.2%
Rank in group consensus	6	2	4	5	1	3
Intraindividual Structure						
Average standard deviation	.93	1.05	1.10	.96	.91	.94
Average relative individual inconsistency[c]	35.9%	40.5%	42.2%	36.8%	34.9%	36.1%
Rank in individual consistency	2	5	6	4	1	3

[a] Index minimum=5, maximum=21, midpoint=13. Agree responses coded low.
[b] (Group standard deviation/index midpoint) x 100
[c] (Individual standard deviation/average item midpoint) x 100
na Not applicable for a nonprobability sample.

Table A9.6: Welfare Bum Attitude, Six Groups of Canadian Workers

	CUPW LEADERS	CUPW RANK&FILE	SCABS	NATIONAL UNION LEADERS	NATIONAL UNION RANK&FILE	NATIONAL NON-UNION
Agreement with Index Items						
Q139c Poor won't work	6%	26%	43%	50%	58%	57%
Q144i Those on welfare won't work	6%	19%	64%	39%	55%	52%
Q139a Poor not intelligent	18%	44%	36%	37%	42%	40%
Q139e Poverty natural in society	22%	63%	38%	58%	58%	63%
Welfare Bum Index[a]						
Group mean	13.9	11.4	10.8	10.4	9.9	9.9
Upper 95% limit	na	na	na	10.9	10.2	10.1
Lower 95% limit	na	na	na	9.8	9.6	9.7
Adjustment, age/education controls	-.1	-.2	-.2	0	0	0
Number in group sample	17	26	21	77	346	684
Interindividual Structure						
Percentage high on index	88%	46%	33%	31%	27%	26%
Percentage low on index	6%	19%	19%	17%	29%	28%
Group standard deviation	2.09	2.72	2.47	2.54	2.58	2.51
Relative group dissensus[b]	20.9%	27.2%	24.7%	25.4%	25.8%	25.1%
Rank in group consensus	1	6	2	4	5	3
Intraindividual Structure						
Average standard deviation	.68	.89	.98	.87	.81	.83
Average relative individual inconsistency[c]	27.4%	35.7%	39.0%	34.8%	32.5%	33.0%
Rank in individual consistency	1	5	6	4	2	3

[a] Index minimum=4, maximum=16, midpoint=10. Agree responses coded low.
[b] (Group standard deviation/index midpoint) x 100
[c] (Individual standard deviation/average item midpoint) x 100
na Not applicable for a nonprobability sample.

Table A9.7: Social Libertarianism, Five Groups of Canadian Workers

	CUPW LEADERS	CUPW RANK&FILE	NATIONAL UNION LEADERS	NATIONAL UNION RANK&FILE	NATIONAL NON-UNION
Agreement with Index Items					
V336 Homosexuals teach school	82%	92%	43%	51%	52%
V335 Abortion, woman's decision	88%	89%	84%	76%	76%
V334 Censor pornography	38%	64%	71%	73%	76%
Social Libertarianism Index[a]					
Group mean	9.4	8.7	7.6	7.3	7.2
Upper 95% limit	na	na	8.1	7.6	7.4
Lower 95% limit	na	na	7.2	7.0	7.1
Adjustment, age/education controls	0	-.2	+.1	-.1	0
Number in group sample	14	22	104	222	761
Interindividual Structure					
Percentage high on index	71%	64%	35%	34%	32%
Percentage low on index	21%	14%	34%	36%	39%
Group standard deviation	3.00	1.73	2.30	2.31	2.12
Relative group dissensus[b]	40.0%	23.1%	30.7%	30.8%	28.3%
Rank in group consensus	5	1	3	4	2
Intraindividual Structure					
Average standard deviation	.60	1.06	1.08	.96	1.05
Average relative individual inconsistency[c]	24.2%	42.6%	43.2%	38.4%	42.1%
Rank in individual consistency	1	4	5	2	3

[a] Index minimum=3, maximum=12, midpoint=7.5.
[b] (Group standard deviation/index midpoint) x 100
[c] (Individual standard deviation/average item midpoint) x 100
na Not applicable for a nonprobability sample.

Table A9.8: Non-Participation in Informal Politics, Five Groups of Canadian Workers

	CUPW LEADERS	CUPW RANK&FILE	NATIONAL UNION LEADERS	NATIONAL UNION RANK&FILE	NATIONAL NON-UNION
Responses on Index Items[a]					
V017 General political interest	11%	30%	39%	42%	45%
V039 Watch politics on TV	28%	37%	24%	31%	38%
V016 Interest in recent election	11%	26%	31%	32%	34%
V038 Read about politics	17%	15%	20%	28%	34%
V040 Discuss politics	17%	22%	26%	40%	43%
Non-Participation Index[b]					
Group mean	9.7	10.5	11.1	11.7	12.2
Upper 95% limit	na	na	11.7	12.2	12.4
Lower 95% limit	na	na	10.6	11.3	12.0
Adjustment, age/education controls	+.1	+.4	0	-.1	0
Number in group sample	18	27	134	292	1033
Interindividual Structure					
Percentage high on index	11%	7%	10%	17%	20%
Percentage low on index	72%	63%	47%	40%	36%
Group standard deviation	2.87	2.83	3.22	3.64	3.59
Relative group dissensus[b]	23.0%	22.6%	25.8%	29.1%	28.7%
Rank in group consensus	2	1	3	5	4
Intraindividual Structure					
Average standard deviation	.87	.81	.86	.78	.79
Average relative individual inconsistency[d]	33.4%	31.0%	33.1%	30.1%	30.5%
Rank in individual consistency	5	3	4	1	2

[a] Percentages low in interest and participation. [b] Index minimum=6, maximum=20, midpoint=12.5
[c] (Group standard deviation/index midpoint) x 100
[d] (Individual standard deviation/average item midpoint) x 100
na Not applicable for a nonprobability sample.

Table A9.9: Alienation from Government, Five Groups of Canadian Workers

	CUPW LEADERS	CUPW RANK&FILE	NATIONAL UNION LEADERS	NATIONAL UNION RANK&FILE	NATIONAL NON-UNION
Agreement with Index Items					
V030 Govt doesn't care	76%	78%	72%	66%	68%
V029 MPs lose touch	100%	88%	74%	82%	82%
V032 No say in govt	78%	63%	65%	66%	68%
Alienation from Government Index[a]					
Group mean	9.8	9.6	8.9	8.9	9.0
Upper 95% limit	na	na	9.3	9.2	9.1
Lower 95% limit	na	na	8.5	8.6	8.8
Adjustment, age/education controls	0	+.2	-.1	0	0
Number in group sample	17	24	116	258	860
Interindividual Structure					
Percentage high on index	76%	77%	65%	61%	62%
Percentage low on index	6%	17%	13%	13%	14%
Group standard deviation	1.79	2.28	2.16	2.09	2.13
Relative group dissensus[b]	23.9%	30.4%	28.8%	·27.9%	28.4%
Rank in group consensus	1	5	4	2	3
Intraindividual Structure					
Average standard deviation	.43	.56	.64	.59 ·	.55
Average relative individual inconsistency[c]	17.3%	22.2%	25.4%	23.7%	21.9%
Rank in individual consistency	1	3	5	4	2

[a] Index minimum=3, maximum=12, midpoint=7.5
[b] (Group standard deviation/index midpoint) x 100
[c] (Individual standard deviation/average item midpoint) x 100
na Not applicable for a nonprobability sample.

Table A9.10: Left/Right Orientation, Six Groups of Canadian Workers[a]

	CUPW LEADERS	CUPW RANK&FILE	SCABS	NATIONAL UNION LEADERS	NATIONAL UNION RANK&FILE	NATIONAL NON-UNION
Individual Items						
V507 Left self-identifiers	53%	33%	14%	16%	10%	10%
V284 Left-wing feeling above 50	33%	37%	na	18%	10%	9%
V285 Right-wing feeling above 50	6%	37%	na	22%	20%	23%
Left Self-Identification[b]						
Item mean	4.8	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.6
Upper 95% limit	na	na	na	4.1	3.9	3.7
Lower 95% limit	na	na	na	3.5	3.5	3.5
Adjustment, age/education controls	0	-.1	-.1	0	0	0
No opinion, refusals	6%	0%	50%	38%	49%	42%
Number in total group sample	18	27	22	134	292	1038
Interindividual Structure						
Percentage high on item (6,7)	28%	11%	4%	4%	3%	4%
Percentage low on item (1,2)	0%	4%	4%	10%	8%	11%
Group standard deviation	1.03	.96	1.04	1.31	1.22	1.39
Relative group dissensus[c]	25.8%	24.0%	26.0%	32.8%	30.5%	34.8%
Rank in group consensus	2	1	3	5	4	6
Left/Right Feeling Index[d]						
Group mean	124.6	96.4	--	91.3	92.1	82.3
Upper 95% limit	na	na	--	100.1	98.9	86.1
Lower 95% limit	na	na	--	82.5	85.2	78.4
Adjustment, age/education controls	+1.2	-1.3	--	+.8	-.6	+.1
Mixed, no feeling, don't knows	0%	0%	--	44%	59%	59%
Number in total group sample	18	27	--	134	292	1038
Interindividual Structure						
Percentage high on index (125-200)	39%	11%	--	9%	8%	5%
Percentage low on index (0-75)	0%	22%	--	18%	14%	17%
Group standard deviation	31.0	29.4	--	38.4	38.1	40.2
Relative group dissensus[c]	31.0%	29.4%	--	38.4%	38.1%	40.2%
Rank in group consensus	2	1	--	4	3	5
Intraindividual Structure						
Average standard deviation	13.5	11.3	--	15.9	15.9	17.1
Average relative individual inconsistency[e]	26.9%	22.6%	--	31.7	31.8%	34.1%
Rank in individual consistency	2	1	--	3	4	5

[a] All percentages in this table are based upon total sample size. "Mixed", "No Feeling", "No Response" and "Don't Know" answers are excluded when calculating means and standard deviations.
[b] Item minimum=1 (most right), maximum=7 (most left), midpoint=4. V507 has been reverse coded.
[c] (Group standard deviation/item or index midpoint) x 100
[d] Index minimum=0 (most right), maximum=200 (most left), midpoint=100. V285 reverse coded.
[e] (Individual standard deviation/average item midpoint) x 100
na Not applicable for a nonprobability sample.

551