

Group Consciousness in the 1983 Center for Political Studies
National Election Studies Pilot Study

David O. Sears, Tom Jessor, Martin Gahart -- University of California, L.A.

Our theoretical analysis contrasts two general points of view. The simpler is a symbolic politics viewpoint that treats groups as symbols like any other political symbol. The crucial independent variable is the individual's affective response to the group-symbol; e.g., strong negative response to "Israelis" or "feminists," or strong positive feeling about "liberals" or "Viet Cong" or "Wolverines." No structural relationship of individual to group is consequential; members and non-members may respond in exactly the same manner. Numerous arcane variants of simple affective responses to such symbols are possible, such as feelings of pride or anger, or of deprivation, or identification, or potency or helplessness, but all reflect, primarily, an underlying evaluative dimension.

The alternative is a group consciousness approach, which makes up in richness and the potential for draining NES resources what it lacks in parsimony. This approach begins with the structural relationship of individual to group, then elaborates it with a series of potentially interacting subjective links to the group and perceptions of its situation, on the way to a more complex model of group influence.

Our analysis, then, contrasts these two basic models as predictors of a series of policy attitudes. The particular group investigated by the Pilot Study is, of course, women. Before proceeding further, let us present briefly the specific theoretical approach and an overview of the relevant operations used in the Pilot Study.

Symbolic politics. The basic underlying idea here is that a simple evaluative dimension underlies all responses to symbols relevant to the women's issue(s). Perhaps the most straightforward operationalization of this dimension is the feeling thermometer. For reasons to be explained, we employ two measures here: the first and most simple-minded, a difference score between feelings about women and feelings about men; the second, a sum of feelings about feminists and women's liberation.

Group consciousness. This theory has two categories of elements:

(1) Structural-cognitive. This includes several dimensions along which the individual is structurally (in fact, or merely cognitively) related to the group in question. Our operations here include three such dimensions:

- a) Membership: is the individual a woman? a working woman?
- b) Political closeness: does the individual feel politically close to women in general, or working women? (or, to men?).

c) Interdependence: do the outcomes that affect the group as a whole also affect you? Do the group's activities (e.g., the actions of interest group representatives) affect the individual?

(2) Attributions. These structural links between group and individual may only be politically consequential when the individual makes some other attributional links between concerning the effects of group action. These might include two in particular:

a) Ingroup takes credit, system is blamed: attribution theory suggests that persistent action depends upon the individual making the "correct" attribution (psychologically correct, even if factually inaccurate); namely, that success is due to hard work and other controllable internal factors, and that failure is due to external blockages that must be overcome. "System blame" is the usual measure here.

b) Group organizations are efficacious: the group's outcomes are dependent in part upon the actions of interest group organizations; e.g., working women's outcomes depend in part upon the actions of women's groups.

(3) Fraternal deprivation. An additional motivational factor is deprivation. If the individual believes that the group is deprived, according to some standard of equity, fairness, expectation, or whatever, that is likely to motivate political action given the existence of the other preconditions cited above. In our case, this is indexed by the question of whether or not working women get what they deserve, and if not, whether or not the individual feels resentful about that shortfall. In the present study, of course, egoistic deprivation was omitted because it was assumed (on the basis of probably insufficient evidence) not to be politically consequential. However, in a full model of group consciousness, that too would be a factor, and it would fall into this category.

As will be seen, this relatively straightforward conceptual organization became modified as a consequence of the way the data came out. Basically, we changed to a dichotomous rather than a trichotomous way of thinking about group consciousness, in which the two attributions were divided between the more structural-cognitive side and the more evaluation-motivational side. Hence we treated the efficacy of women's organizations as another indicator of interdependence, yielding four structural measures, and system blame as another evaluative measure, yielding two of those (it and fraternal deprivation).

Measures

Gender group consciousness was measured in six different ways in the pilot study. Four sets of items were aimed at describing the structural relationship between the individual and the group -- these included measures of 1) felt interdependence with men and working women (v3113-v3116); 2) the perceived impact of the women's movement on men and working women (v3117-v3118), and 3) on the respondent (v3119); and 4) felt political closeness to men and working women (v3111-v3112). Two other sets of items assessed the respondent's evaluations of the job situation of working women -- these included 5) questions about fraternal deprivation in employment (v3176-v3178), and 6) items eliciting opinions about system blame -- that is, whether sex differences in employment are due to personal failings or systemic factors (v3167, v3168). The manner in which the six scales were constructed will be outlined in detail below.

Two sets of items were used to measure the symbolic politics approach to groups. A set of thermometer items tapped respondents' global evaluations of "feminists" and "the womens liberation movement" (v2186, v2199), while another set tapped feelings toward "working women," and "men" and "women" in general (v2193, v2195, v2197). The above were the independent variables used in the analyses.

Structural items

A scale measuring felt interdependence with men and working women was constructed from variables 3113-3116. Both men and women were asked whether it would make any difference in how well they and their family would do if

4

working women in general" were to do better, and whether that difference would be for the better, or for the worse (v3113-v3114). A parallel question was asked about "men in general" doing better. The three categories (for the better; no difference; for the worse) were collapsed into two (do better vs. no difference or do worse), since few respondents said that they would do worse if either men or working women did better. A typology was then created by crossing the two items separately for male and female respondents. The resulting variable includes four categories within each sex: 1) those respondents who feel that they will do better when members of their own gender group do better, and will not be affected by the outcomes of the opposite gender group; 2) those respondents who felt they will do better if either men or working women do better; 3) those who feel unaffected by the outcomes of either men or working women; and 4) those who felt they would do better only if members of the opposite sex did better.

The distribution of responses for women and men can be seen in Table 1. A nearly equal, and sizable proportion of women (23%) and men (20%) expressed a "group" orientation -- that is, they felt affected only by the outcomes of their own gender group. Larger percentages of women and men expressed no specific group orientation -- that is, they either felt affected by the progress of both sexes, or felt unaffected by the outcomes of others. In general, more men than women felt independent of group outcomes -- 49% of the men, as opposed to 32% of the women were affected by neither men nor working women. Finally, some respondents expressed an orientation towards the opposite gender: 17% of the women and 4% of the men fell into this category. These respondents were not investigated in later analyses.

Table 1

Structural measures of group consciousness among women and men

Scale	Women	Men
Interdependence (v3113-v3116)		
Affected by same gender only	20%	23%
Affected by both working women and men	32	27
Affected by neither working women nor men	32	46
Affected by other gender only	17	4
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	101	100
Political closeness (v3111, v3112)		
Close to same gender only	19%	10%
Close to both working women and men	58	57
Close to neither working women nor men	18	22
Close to other gender only	6	10
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	101	99
Interdependence with women's organizations (v3117, v3118)		
Women's organizations have helped women, and hurt or not affected men	42%	49%
Women's organizations have helped both women and men	28	19
Women's organizations have not affected women or men	15	18
Women's organizations have hurt women	15	1
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100	101
Personal impact of women's organizations (v3119)		
Women's organizations have hurt or not affected women (personally)	79%	93%
Women's organizations have helped respondent	20	7
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	99	100

A parallel typology was created for the political closeness items (v3111, v3112). Each item was collapsed into two categories -- those who felt somewhat or very close versus those who felt distant from or did not consider working women or men when thinking about politics. The resulting typology contains categories similar to those in the interdependence typology.

The distribution of responses, also in Table 1, show that most of the men and women felt particularly close to both gender groups (58% for women, 57% for men). But a sizeable percentage of women (19%) expressed a specific "group" orientation towards women when thinking about politics, while few women (6%) were politically close to men only. In contrast, an equal number of men felt close to men only (10%) as felt close to women only (10%).

The relationship between the interdependence and closeness measures can be seen in Table ²~~1~~. Among women the two measures are significantly related: $X^2(4)=10.6$, $p < .05$. A sizeable minority of women (10%) are both interdependent with and close to women only. It may be useful to retain both of these measures to help uncover an underlying group orientation among women. On the other hand, few men (4%) are both interdependent with and close to men only. This is because so few men feel close to men only -- of these men who are interdependent with other men only, the majority feel close to both women and men. This may be due to the presence of a stronger underlying group orientation for women, or it may be that the two measures are picking up different phenomena among men than among women.

A third typology was constructed from v3117 and v3118 to assess perceptions of the impact of the women's organizations on the standing of men

Table 42

Sex differences on structural measures of group consciousness

Interdependence	<u>Political Closeness</u>			Totals
	Close to working women only	Close to both working women and men	Close to neither working women nor men	
Women				
Interdependent with working women only	10	10	3	23
Interdependent with both working women and men	7	27	5	39
Interdependent with neither working women nor men	6	23	9	38
Totals	<u>23</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>100%</u>
Men				
	<u>Close to men only</u>	<u>Close to both working women and men</u>	<u>Close to neither working women nor men</u>	<u>Totals</u>
Interdependent with men only	4	12	8	24
Interdependent with both working women and men	2	22	4	28
Interdependent with neither working women nor men	5	29	13	47
Totals	<u>11</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>99%</u>

(v3118) and women (v3117) in society (that is, the interdependence of men and women with women's organizations). Crossing these two variables produced a typology of respondents in four categories: 1) those who felt that women's organizations have for the most part helped women, and have either hurt or not affected men; 2) those who felt that women's organizations have helped both women and men; 3) those who felt that women's organizations have not much affected either women and men; 3) those who felt that women's organizations have for the most part hurt women. Finally, a single item (v3119) assessed whether respondents felt that the effects of women's organizations had helped, hurt, or not affected their own welfare. Few respondents felt that women's organizations had hurt them, personally, so these respondents were combined with those not affected to form an item with two response categories.

For the most part, both men and women felt that women's organizations had positively contributed to the progress of women in general, as can be seen in Table 1. Only 30% of the women and 33% of the men felt that women's organizations had hurt or had no impact on women's standing. More women than men (28% to 19%) however, saw women's organizations as helping men and women equally. Men, on the other hand, were more likely (49% to 42%) to view women's organizations as selectively helping women, leaving men largely unaffected. And in the personal impact item, men (93%) claimed they had not been personally affected by these organizations, while a sizeable minority of women (20%) said that they had been helped. Among these women who were helped, the majority (59%) were disposed to see women's organizations in an especially positive light -- as helping both men and women.

The interdependence and closeness typologies were, for the most part, unrelated to the two organizational questions. None of the chi-square tests on the combinations of interdependence, closeness, and interdependence of men and women with women's organizations were significant for either sex. Interdependence and closeness were related to the personal impact question (v3119) for women, but not for men: for interdependence, $X^2(2)=6.2$, $p < .05$; for closeness, $X^2(2)=8.01$, $p < .05$. Among women, political closeness was more strongly related to personal impact, in that women who felt close to women only were more likely to feel helped by women's organizations (35%) than women who felt close to both men and women (24%) or women who felt close to neither men nor women (4%). The relationship between interdependence and personal impact was slightly different. Here, women who were affected by women only and women who were affected by both men and women were equally likely to have been helped by women's organizations (30% and 33%, respectively); in contrast, only 13% of the women unaffected by men or women claimed to have been similarly helped.

In general, there appears to be a stronger relationship among the structural group items for women than for men. Furthermore, there seem to be two types of items in this set of four which are distinct from one another among women: the interdependence/closeness items, and the items referring to women's organizations (v3117-v3119). We will discuss the construction of the evaluative measures in the next section, before examining the relationship between these measures and the structural measures.

Evaluative measures

Two scales were constructed to measure fraternal deprivation and system blame. The fraternal deprivation scale combined responses to questions about 1) whether working women in general get more or less than they deserve (v3176) and 2) whether the respondent was bitter or resentful about this situation (v3177-v3178). Few respondents (19%) felt that working women get more than they deserved, so the deserving item was collapsed into a three-point scale, running from (1) women get as much, more, or much more than they deserve, to (2) women get slightly less than they deserve, to (3) women get much less than they deserve. The resentment items (v3177-v3178) were combined and collapsed into a three-point scale, running from (1) don't feel bitter, not certain, to (2) feel a little resentful, to (3) feel somewhat or very resentful. Respondents who felt that women "get as much as they deserve" in v3176 were not asked questions about resentment, so they were coded (1) in the three-point resentment scale. Those few respondents who felt that women get more than they deserve were asked whether they resented this situation; for ease of interpretation they too were coded (1) on the three-point resentment scale. The deserving and resentment scale were then added together, forming a fraternal deprivation scale running from 2 to 6, with those respondents feeling that women get less than they deserved and resenting the situation representing the high point of the scale. The distribution of responses on the scale, as well as the scale means are shown separately by sex in Table ~~4~~³. These respondents who felt high levels of deprivation (4-6) had to express at least a moderate level of both deservingness and resentment, or a high level of either one of these feelings. Forty percent of the women felt a high level of

Table 3

Sex differences on evaluative measures of group consciousness

Scale	Marginal frequencies		Means		t
	Women	Men	Women	Men	
Fraternal deprivation (v3176 & v3177-78)	--	--	3.46	3.14	-2.26*
Low (2)	29%	31%			
Medium (3)	31	41			
High (4-6)	40	27			
	<hr/>	<hr/>			
	100	99			
System blame (v3167, v3168)	--	--	5.66	5.47	-.88
Low (2-4)	26%	26%			
Medium (5, 6)	39	44			
High (7, 8)	34	30			
	<hr/>	<hr/>			
	99	100			

*p < .05

fraternal deprivation compared to 27% of the men. The difference between the scale means for men and women was significant, $t = -2.26, p < .05$.

The system blame measure was created from items 3167 and 3168. Item 3167 was a 5-point Likert scale assessing the respondent's agreement with the statement "many women who don't do well in life have good training, but the opportunities always go to men." Item 3168 was of the same format, assessing agreement with the statement "sex discrimination keeps women from the top jobs." Both items were collapsed into 4-point scales running from 1) disagree strongly to 4) agree strongly. The correlation between the two items was $r = .49$; since the items were so highly related they were added together to form a scale running from 2 to 8. Respondents who scored high on the scale felt that discrimination prevented women's job advance -- that is, the system was blamed rather than the individual. As can be seen in Table 2, men and women scored nearly equally on the measure, the difference between scale means was not significant.

The two evaluative measures were highly related among both women and men. Among women the correlation was $r = .46, p < .001$, among men the correlation was $r = .40, p < .001$. The measures were inconsistently related with the structural measures. Separate one-way analyses of variance were conducted for each structural x evaluative combination for men and women separately; the results can be seen in Table 4. For women, only the personal impact variable was systematically related to both evaluative measures, with women who had been helped by women's organizations feeling more fraternal deprivation and blaming the system for blocking women's job opportunities, than women who had not been

Table 4

Scale means on the evaluative measures within the structural measures

Structural Measures	Women		Men	
	System Blame	Fraternal Deprivation	System Blame	Fraternal Deprivation
<u>Evaluative Measures</u>				
<u>Interdependence</u>				
Own gender only	6.5	4.2	3.0	5.2
Both genders	5.9	3.7	3.3	5.6
Neither gender	5.5	3.2	3.1	5.5
ANOVA result	ns	p < .05	ns	ns
<u>Closeness</u>				
Own gender only	6.0	4.0	4.3	2.4
Both genders	5.9	3.4	5.8	3.4
Neither gender	5.1	3.5	5.5	3.1
ANOVA result	ns	ns	p < .01	p < .05
<u>Interdependence with Women's Organizations</u>				
Organizations helped women only	6.0	3.6	5.7	3.2
Organizations helped both men and women	5.6	3.9	6.2	3.4
Organizations not affect men or women	5.8	3.0	5.1	3.0
Organizations hurt women	5.2	3.0	4.7	2.9
ANOVA result	ns	p < .05	p < .05	ns
<u>Personal Impact</u>				
Hurt, not affected by women's organizations	5.4	3.2	5.4	3.2
Helped by women's organizations	6.5	4.3	6.0	3.1
ANOVA result	p < .01	p < .01	ns	ns

10

affected. Fraternal deprivation proved to have a stronger relationship to the structural measures than did system blame, suggesting that questions about women's deservingness and resentment in the job arena may reflect some group connectedness, rather than some simple evaluation of group progress.

Among men, the significant relationship between political closeness and the evaluative measures stands out. Men who feel close to both women and men feel the most strongly that women are fraternally deprived and face discrimination while men who feel politically close to men only, feel the opposite. Thus the closeness, system blame, and fraternal deprivation measures may be tapping one common factor for men, reflecting positive and negative evaluations of women's progress.

Symbolic measures

The two symbolic measures were created from the thermometer items in the 1983 pilot study. A factor analysis of the gender-related thermometers revealed two factors, with the thermometers for men (v2193), women (v2197), and working women (v2195) falling on one factor and the thermometers for feminists (v2186) and women's liberation (v2199) falling on the second. The "men" thermometer was doubled and the "women" and "working women" thermometers were subtracted from it to form a "gender" thermometer, with favorability towards men the high point of the scale. The "feminism" thermometer was created by adding the feminist and women's liberation thermometers, with favorability towards feminists as the high point of the scale. Women and men did not differ significantly on the "gender" and

"feminism" thermometers and the thermometers showed no significant relationship with either the evaluative or structural measures.

Dependent Measures

Nine dependent measures were created for the analyses. Three measures encompassed the "gender gap issues" -- (1) positivity toward Ronald Reagan, (2) spending for defense, and (3) attitudes about government spending for social services. Four other measures involved attitudes toward women. They tapped opinions about (1) government intervention in favor of women, (2) traditional beliefs about women's roles, (3) beliefs about discrimination, and (4) opinions about whether women should solve their problems through individual or collective action. Finally, two measures tapped (1) women's awareness of government policy toward women and (2) political participation. The reliabilities for the measures and the scale means for men and women can be seen in Table 5.

Gender Gap

Reagan scale. The 5-item Reagan scale combined three types of measures: (1) an evaluation of Reagan's job performance (v2102), (2) the 1983 Reagan feeling thermometer, and (3) the respondents' vote intentions if the 1984 Presidential vote were held today, and Reagan were to be pitted against either Mondale (v3101), Glenn (v3102), or Kennedy (v3103). These items were standardized and summed to form a scale, with positivity toward Reagan as the high point of the scale.

Defense spending. This 3-item scale was formed from three groups of items.

Table 5

Sex differences on policy issue scales and issue public

	Item to total Correlation	Scale Statistics	Scale Means		t
			Women	Men	
Gender Gap					
Reagan Approval (N=261)	--	$\alpha = .89^a$	-.62	.87	2.89*
Job performance (v2102)	.79				
Thermometer (v2182)	.78				
Vote: Reagan vs. Mondale (v3101)	.74				
Vote: Reagan vs. Glenn (v3102)	.75				
Vote: Reagan vs. Kennedy (v3103)	.64				
Increase Defense Spending (N=306)	--	$\alpha = .78^a$	-.12	.17	1.03
Don't cut defense (v330-v332)	.59				
Federal spending on military (v317)	.62				
Increase defense spending (v407)	.64				
Opposition to government social spending (N=244)	--	$\alpha = .81^a$	-.72	1.03	3.13*
Specific program spending (v311, v315, v319, v320, v321, v322, v323, v324)	.63				
Government improve living standard (v3181)	.70				
Government create jobs (v3182)	.65				
Government reduce income gap (v3184)	.53				
Guaranteed jobs (v425)	.50				
Government services (v443)	.44				
Behavioral Measures					
Awareness of Women's Issues (N=261)	--	$r = .15^b$	1.86	2.00	1.49
Know fate of ERA (v3208)	--				
Aware of party stands on women's issues (v437, v438)	--				
Participation (N=313)		$\alpha = .49^a$.80	.58	-2.08*
Contacted US representative (v2204)	.30				
Signed petition (v2205)	.32				
Worked with others (v2206)	.32				
Attended school board meeting (v2207)	.19				

Table 5 (continued)

	Item to total Correlation	Scale Statistics	Scale Means		t
			Women	Men	
Women's Issues					
Government Involvement (N=264)	--	$\alpha = .77^a$.12	-.09	-.56
Government set aside jobs (v3171)	.37				
Government improve women's position (v3185)	.74				
Government promote affirmative action (v3187)	.75				
Government ensure equal pay (v3189)	.53				
Non-traditional beliefs (N=243)	--	$\alpha = .58^a$.09	-.07	-.66
Equal role for women (v435)	.40				
Abortion a woman's choice (v463)	.33				
Strength of disappointment about ERA defeat (v454)	.17				
Men don't have more ambition (v3169)	.57				
Discrimination (N=270)	--	$r = .27^b$.09	-.11	-1.01
Women not favored for jobs or training (v3166)	--				
Working man better off than working woman (v3175)	--				
Collective Action	--	$r = .32^b$.11	-.12	-1.14
Women join together (v3170)	--				
Women should protest (v3173)	--				

a. Cronbach's alpha

b. Simple item correlation

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

One group (v330-332) asked the respondent to choose from a list of five ways in which the government should "cope with the current economic situation". Respondents could make three choices. Those who chose "cut defense spending" were the low point of the scale, those who did not mention cutting defense the high point. Two other items (v317,v407) measured more directly how respondents felt about the amount of money being spent on defense. The items were standardized and added, forming a scale with those respondents who wanted to increase defense spending at the high point of the scale.

Opposition to government social spending. This scale is described in the report on "values" (submitted by Sears, Huddy, and Gerbert-Schaeffer).

Women's Issues

Government involvement. This scale is also described in the values report.

Nontraditional beliefs. This 4-item scale combined items about women's equality (v435), the Equal Rights Amendment(v454), and abortion (v463), and a question about differences in drive and ambition between the sexes (v3169). The items were standardized and added, so that respondents who believed women should not stay at home, who were disappointed at the failure of the Equal Rights Amendment, who believed abortion was a woman's choice, and who felt that men did not succeed because of more drive and ambition scored high on the scale.

Belief in discrimination. Two items tapped beliefs about whether women faced job discrimination (v3166, v3175). Those who believed that women were not favored for jobs (v3166), and that men were better off in terms of job benefits, pay, and opportunities for advancement than equally-

15
trained women were scored high on this scale.

Women's collective action. This scale is also described in the "values" report.

Behavioral measures

Awareness of women's issues. This additive scale was composed of two items. Respondents who claimed to know whether the ERA passed or was rejected in their home state were coded (2), those who said they "didn't know" were coded (1). Respondents who knew that the Republican party was less in favor of women's rights (v438) than the Democratic party (v437) were coded (2), all others were coded (1). The two items were added together to form a scale running from 2 to 4 (recoded to 1-3), with those who were more aware at the high point of the scale.

Participation. This simple additive scale was composed from four items about political activity taken from the 1983 pilot study (v2204-v2207). Respondents were asked whether they had contacted their representative in Congress, signed a petition on a national matter, worked with others on a community problem, and attended any meeting in which public school policies were discussed. The resulting scale ran from 0 to 4, those who were not active as the low point and those who had engaged in all four activities as the high point.

STRUCTURAL VARIABLES

One initial question is whether or not enough people feel structurally connected to the groups in question (working women, men) to make it worthwhile to try to test a group consciousness model with NES-size national samples. The answer clearly is yes.

a) Membership. Of course more than half the sample is women. A substantial number of those are working women. (v. 762)

b) Closeness: Almost one-third of the sample said they felt "very close" politically to working women (however, only 19% said they felt equally close to men). About 20% of the sample felt politically close to women but not men. This would be the crucial analytic group, and it is large enough to use. The comparable group for men (close to men, not to women) is small, about 10% of the men. In general the group consciousness approach seems less useful for men than women, for this and other reasons. (v. 3111-2)

c) Interdependence: About half the sample of each sex said they thought they would do better if working women did better, and the same was true concerning the possibility that men might do better. Over 20% of each sex felt they would do better if their own sex in general did better, but not necessarily if the other sex did better. This conjunction of the two items is the crucial combination for group consciousness, and yields enough of each sex to be analytically useful. (v. 3113-6)

A second indicator concerns felt interdependence with the group's organizations; i.e., have the efforts of women's organizations helped the respondent personally. About one-quarter of the women felt affected one way or the other (mostly helped), but only about 10% of the men did, again emphasizing the asymmetry of the issue (v. 3119).

In short, in all these cases enough women felt structurally connected to other women to press ahead. Moreover, these dimensions are analytically separate enough among women to make separate analysis worthwhile. Our initial hunch that the three dimensions would merely succeed in isolating a small band of women who felt close to, interdependent with, and helped by women's organizations was not borne out.

STRUCTURE VS. EVALUATION

The theory of group consciousness suggested above proposed that its substrate is the structural relationship of person to group; various subjective or attitudinal variables would direct and motivate action on top of that, but would be secondary.

The data in the pilot study suggest a somewhat different view; in two ways. It suggests that structure and evaluation are somewhat different components of individuals' attitudes about groups, and that the latter has the more potent political effect.

First of all, we decided to look primarily at women, on the grounds that women appeared to be a positive reference group but men did not appear to me. Then we conducted a factor analysis of the above items on group consciousness. The results are shown in Table ⁶. It presents a fairly (though ultimately not perfectly) clear picture. The first factor has a strong component of evaluation -- people who are high on the first factor feel resentful about women's status, blame men or the system for the fact that women don't do as well as men, and feel they have been helped by women's organizations (and that they would do better if women would). These are all variables with a strong feeling or evaluative component. (the latter is treated here as structural, but has some evaluative themes).

The second factor tends more to describe the woman's structural relationship to her group. A person high on this factor would feel politically close to (rather than distant from) women, interdependent in outcomes, that women and women's organizations are interdependent. We ~~overdraw~~ the distinction slightly here, but not grossly.

An additional reason for feeling that the distinction is important is that our other structural variable -- group membership -- also correlates with the structural but not the evaluative variables. The gammas for the three evaluative measures are .46, .16, and .09 (the tau-betas are .17, .10, and .06). The first is significant but the other two are not. On the other hand, there are gross sex differences in ^{two of} the three structural variables, as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

An additional reason for making the distinction is that the evaluation measures successfully predict to our dependent variables, whereas the structural measures do not do so very successfully. That is next.

PREDICTING TO DEPENDENT VARIABLES

We began by conducting analyses of variance of all six independent variables by eight dependent variables: (1) issue public for the gender issues; (2) gender gap -- government spending, Reagan, defense spending; and (3) women's issues -- government aid to women, discrimination, traditional femininity, and collective action.

Among men.

None of the ³²relationships between the four structural variables and these eight dependent variables was statistically significant.

Most of the relationships with evaluative variables were also non-significant, but there were some exceptions, six in all (of 16). Fraternal deprivation was related to discrimination, as was system blame; this latter was related to collective action; and three others were significant, dealing with Reagan, defense, government spending. A weak series of relationships, but stronger than structure.

In the absence of any further and more powerful data to the contrary, then, we concluded that there was relatively little profit in this line of research on men, at least not from the structural side of group consciousness.

Among Women: Method.

Before presenting the results on women, let us indicate the scope of our analyses, some of which have been hinted at above. Basically we conducted five kinds of analyses:

(1) Factor analyses of the 6 measures of group consciousness, as already presented in Table 6 above.

(2) Analyses of variance of the effects of the six indicators of group consciousness upon eight dependent variables, as just alluded to.

(3) Factor analysis of all the measures of group consciousness, the dependent variables, and the thermometer measures relevant to the women's issue.

(4) Regressions upon the eight dependent variables described above, using as predictors (and entering in steps as follows): group consciousness; ideology and party identification; thermometers; demographics.

(5) All of the above look only at the main effects of group consciousness. Thus we conducted an exhaustive set of analyses seeking out interactions among them.

Among Women: Results.

We would argue that among women, most of the political impact of the women's issue seems to be carried by the strong symbolic meaning attached to feminism. There seems to be very little payoff in the structural measures of group consciousness. Here is the evidence:

Structure and evaluation seem to be independent. The factor analysis of the six group consciousness items suggests this, as already presented in Table 6 .

The political effects of structural variables are minimal. This can be seen on several ways:

(1) In the analyses of variance of structural measures upon the eight dependent variables, only six (of 32) are statistically significant, with no evident pattern. Again, the personal impact measure is of some arguable conceptual status, having both structural and evaluative components, and accounts for half these significant results

Table 6

VARIMAX ROTATION, GROUP CONSCIOUSNESS ITEMS
WOMEN ONLY

Evaluation

Fraternal deprivation	.45	--
System blame	.35	--

Structure

Political closeness	--	.37
Personal interdependence	.31	.43
Group/organizational interdependence	--	.40
Have women's organizations helped you	.59	--

(2) In the factor analyses which included both group consciousness and the dependent variables, one might have expected both to come out on an early factor if they were closely related. However, both closeness and interdependence load rather heavily on a sixth factor in the varimax rotation, long after most of the dependent variables have shown up.

(3) In the regression analyses, only 3 of the ^{structural} 31 group consciousness terms are even marginally significant at step 1 (i.e., before other variables have been entered).

The conclusion is that these 4 ^{structural} indices of group consciousness do not have systematic main effects on any of the dependent variables used.

Evaluative versions of group consciousness have somewhat stronger effects. By all the same criteria, there is more payoff in the two evaluative measures -- system blame, relative deprivation.

(1) In the analyses of variance, 8 of 16 comparisons are at least marginally significant.

(2) In the factor analyses, fraternal deprivation, system blame show up on the third factor (along with interdependence and discrimination). Not great, but better.

(3) In the regression analyses, however, they still do not show up very strongly -- only 3 of 16 were significant.

Where do the significant relationships appear? Primarily in the relationships of fraternal deprivation and system blame to perceptions of discrimination against women. There is additionally some evidence of a link between system blame, as an independent variable (presumably), and anti-Reagan, pro-government-spending attitudes (as dependent variables, presumably). Finally, there is some mild evidence that perceived personal impact of the women's issue is related to being a member of the issue public for women's issues.

Conclusion: Main Effects of Group Consciousness are Weak. In the regression analyses, the R^2 contributed by the sum of the six group consciousness variables averages 1% and does not exceed 5% except in one case: prediction of perceptions of discrimination, where the variance accounted for is 15%, almost exclusively due to the link to system blame and fraternal deprivation. Indeed, in the regression the former is not significant but the latter yields a beta of .32.

The centrality of feminism.

In contrast, there seems to be ample evidence for a central role of feminism as a political symbol. It is easiest to see in the factor analysis which included all independent and dependent variables. Factor 1 is a clear feminism factor, as shown in Table 7. As might be expected, the thermometer measure of support for feminism therefore comes through as a powerful variable in regressions on government aid for women, collective action, and traditional femininity.

Table 7

Varimax Rotation, Women Only

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Group Consciousness			
Structure			
Political Closeness	-.05	-.03	.02
Interdependence	.03	-.08	.31+
Organizational Interdependence	-.11	.09	.11
Personal Impact	-.10	-.15	.16
Evaluation			
System Blame	-.05	-.21	.44+
Fraternal Deprivation	-.06	-.13	.47+
Thermometers			
Feminism	.54+	.12	-.03
Gender	-.12	-.05	-.08
Gender Gap			
Reagan	.04	.50+	-.09
Government Spending	.04	.99+	-.09
Defense Spending	.09	.14	-.10
Women's Issue			
Government Aid to Women	.42+	-.06	.00
Collective Action	.80+	.06	-.27
Perceived Discrimination	.02	-.12	-.70+
Traditional Femininity	.54+	-.02	.07
Political Participation	.08	.06	.04