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In the study of the modern democratic state, the concept of political representation occupies a central position. The question relative to American women then becomes why are women under-represented in elective offices throughout government, particularly at the national level, and why do their policy problems persist. Since the early 1980s women have been voting differently than men, creating the well know "gender gap" in American politics. Women represent more than 50% of the eligible voters.

Since 1980 women have voted at higher rates than men. Census data indicate in the 1992 election the reported turnout of women was 62.3 percent and was 60.2 percent for men. These data also reveal that African-American and
Hispanic women vote at higher rates than their male counterparts, and the "gender gap" is more pronounced among these women of color than among white women. In the 1992 election women increased their presence in elective offices. However, at the national level women held only 55 of the 535 total seats or 10.3 percent in the 103rd Congress.

This dissertation moves research concerning the women's movement, group consciousness, and social movement theory in several ways. First, it advances measurement in research on group consciousness by developing the first original attitude scale to measure levels of feminist consciousness. Second, it employs multivariate analysis of the relationship between levels of feminist consciousness and political participation. Third, it examines levels of participation, not limiting the inquiry to just voting. Unlike previous research which has centered its analysis on voting behavior and has not considered party identification, this research examines the role of partisanship in explaining both levels of feminist consciousness and levels of participation.

This dissertation also examines several social movement theories and suggests a synthesis of existing theories to improve our overall understanding of social movements. Finally, it suggests to New Social Movement theorists the concept of group consciousness as a means to understanding the outputs of social movements on the mass public and to help identify "core members."
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In the study of the modern democratic state, the concept of political representation occupies a central position. There are many interpretations and definitions of the concept of representation and what it means to be a representative (Pitkin, 1967). "Descriptive representation" suggests that elected representatives should resemble the citizenry: "The way to do this ... is simply to make them part of the public they serve" (Mill in Pitkin, 1967, p. 201). "Interest representation" exists where elected officials represent the interests of their constituents. "Guardian representation" exists when representatives are elected to use their best judgment to represent the people.

In the case of women, however, representatives have not resembled them, represented their interests, or used their best judgment. Whatever type of representative model one chooses to advocate, the position and interests of women in the United States have been a low priority. However, women make up the majority of the voting population and have well-defined political interests.

Recent survey results in Florida indicate that the leading problems facing women in the 1990s are equal treatment at work, sexual harassment, dual mother/worker roles, abortion rights, and "not being taken seriously."
These top five “problems” were identified using an open-ended question format. Both women and men identified the same problems in the same order. This survey also found that women are viewed by both men and women as having “too little influence” in society. Moreover, respondents indicated that women and men are viewed as equally able to offer workable solutions to these problems (Mease, 1992).

Women suffer disproportionately from many of society's social ills including poverty and discrimination in health care, the workplace, and the economy. Women represent more than 50 percent of the eligible voters. Moreover, since 1980, women have voted at higher rates than men. Census data indicate in the 1992 election the reported turnout of women was 62.3 percent and was 60.2 percent for men. These data also reveal that African-American and Hispanic women vote at higher rates than their male counterparts. Therefore, the “gender gap” is more pronounced among these women of color than among white women (McGlen and O'Connor, 1995, p. 70). In the 1992 election, women increased their presence in elective offices. However, at the national level, women held only 55 of the 535 total seats or 10.3 percent in the 103rd Congress (McGlen and O'Connor, 1995, p. 76).

With women having superior registration and voting rates, the most feasible means for obtaining solutions to their policy problems is by women gaining elected office and/or by electing male representatives who will actively
support policy solutions to women's issues. These strategies would promote both descriptive and interest representation.

The question for American women then becomes why are women under-represented in elective offices throughout government, particularly at the national level, and why do their policy needs remain unfulfilled? Since the early 1980s women have been voting differently than men, creating the well know “gender gap” in American politics, and are more likely to be Democrats than men (McGlen and O'Connor, 1995). Despite the “gender gap” and the movement of a large number of women toward the Democratic party, little has been done on their policy agenda.

**Research Design and Goals**

This research examines theories of group consciousness and social movements to help unravel the apparent inconsistencies between the majority electoral status of women and persistent representation and policy needs. It is how individuals perceive the “women's movement” which drives the need for an original attitude scale to measure feminist consciousness. The “women's movement” has been linked with certain symbols over the last twenty-five years. These symbols include The National Organization for Women (NOW), the abortion issue, feminism, and, to some extent, gay rights and lesbianism.
I argue that these symbols, which are still currently used in major surveys, are distorted and offer a distorted measure of support for women's issues. Symbols become distorted for various reasons. This dissertation does not choose to debate how the distortion occurs, just that it often does.

This dissertation advances research concerning the women's movement, group consciousness, and social movement theory in several ways. First, it advances measurement in research on group consciousness by developing the first original attitude scale to measure levels of feminist group consciousness\(^1\). Second, it employs multivariate analysis of the relationship between levels of feminist consciousness and political participation. Third, it examines levels of participation, not limiting the inquiry to just voting. Moreover, it examines the role of partisanship on levels of feminist consciousness and levels of participation.

Previous research using group consciousness theory has centered its analysis on voting and has not considered party identification in its analysis (Gurin et al., 1980; Miller et al., 1981, Gurin, 1985). Fourth, it examines social movement theories and suggests a synthesis of existing

\(^1\) The use of the term "feminist" is not intended to represent any particular theoretical perspective of feminism. According to Webster's New International Dictionary, "feminism" is defined as "the theory of political, economic and social equality for women, a "feminist" is one who advocates or practices feminism (1986, p. 837). These definitions fit well with the theory of group consciousness which is used as a foundation for this research.
theories to improve our overall understanding of social movements. Finally, it suggests to New Social Movement theorists the concept of group consciousness as a means to understand the outputs of social movements on the mass public and to help identify "core members."
CHAPTER 2
THEORIES OF GROUP CONSCIOUSNESS/COLLECTIVE ACTION, REPRESENTATION, AND PARTICIPATION

This project seeks to illuminate the question of which theoretical lens offers the clearest view of group consciousness and the impact of group consciousness on attitudes and participation. Good theory is similar to a camera lens. Like the proper camera lens and aperture setting, good theory should provide a clear image of the subject being examined. It should include the relevant information and provide a sharp image and depth of field.

While striving to find such a lens is the ultimate goal of social science research, not every research project can meet all the criteria mentioned above. Some may provide us with a close-up view of some political phenomena, while others may capture a specific image sharply but provide no depth of field or linkage to a larger theoretical question or perspective. Simply put, no one method is likely to provide us with the ideal lens. Probably the best image is a time exposure captured by several lenses. Quantitative, qualitative, and historical inquiry, guided by theory, contribute to the quality of the lens at the disposal of the social science researcher.

Research in American political behavior has been primarily characterized by the use of quantitative survey
data and statistical data analysis. Since the early 1950s, American political scientists have had the luxury of working with large national samples, with many of the questions/items being repeated over the years. As statistical tools have become more sophisticated and computers more affordable and powerful, many of the theoretical assumptions of early researchers have been challenged and some of their findings have been found to be flawed.

Unfortunately, the important theoretical questions surrounding democracy and representative government have not been as easy to answer as critiquing the efforts of others. There have been a few political scientists, such as Hochschild (1981) and Button (1989), who broke ranks with mainstream quantitative analysis and attempted to understand important political phenomena by employing either qualitative analysis or a combination of several approaches. Often criticized for a lack of methodological rigor by the more "scientifically" minded, qualitative researchers have recently gained respect; not only has their form of inquiry incorporated some of the rigor that was previously lacking, but also the qualitative researchers, such as Button, are offering conclusions and theoretical findings which provide insightful explanations of social and political phenomena.

In the recent past, several fundamental assumptions concerning survey research studies and the data they provide have been challenged. These challenges range from the
number and type of response categories offered to question wording and order. When factors such as question wording or order are modified, significantly different responses are often the outcome. Factor analysis is commonly used by political scientists to construct attitude scales. When items are used from different portions of a survey instrument, the results are likely to suffer from one or more of the problems mentioned above (For a more detailed discussion of these issues, see Chapter 3). Other questions being asked about surveys relate to exactly what the responses really mean. Some social psychologists argue that respondents who answer primarily closed-ended survey questions, conducted over the telephone or face to face, may be offering their top-of-the-head opinion, but not the deeply held cognitive attitudes that many in the social sciences have assumed.

Indeed, measurement has always plagued the social sciences as a source of error. Recent work by psychologists such as Jon Krosnick (1991) suggests that dichotomous response categories are potential sources of increased random error. Items which allow respondents more choices and then branch to gauge the strength or consistency of the initial response are likely to offer more accurate measurement (Krosnick, 1991, p. 552).

Another problem with much of the research conducted over the last 30 years has been the rather esoteric theoretical questions being explored. That is, too many
studies only provide a limited snapshot of political phenomena, often sharply focused on an event or portion of the political process. They offer little "depth of field" or perspective in the larger theoretical debate. I argue that researchers are often constrained to limited theoretical questions by the reliance on secondary data and the limits of the particular tools they employ to conduct their analysis.

This research seeks to improve measurement in quantitative research through the development of an original measurement instrument by employing attitude scale construction theory and techniques. The data used in this research were recently collected. Rather than seeking "the answer," this research examines several hypotheses derived from multiple theoretical approaches, thereby increasing opportunities to gain more complete understanding. Finally, this research analyzes the relationship between levels of feminist consciousness and political behavior at the mass level using sophisticated statistical techniques which provide a multivariate analysis.

**Theories of Group Consciousness**

W. A. Elliot (1986) argues that group consciousness is a common occurrence found throughout humanity. The most common form of group consciousness is national consciousness. He describes group consciousness as hierarchical. National consciousness represents the big
“WE” in most United States citizens' lives. Other levels of group consciousness, often formed around various issues such as ethnicity, class, gender, or race, are subordinate “we's” existing in other areas of citizen consciousness (Elliot, 1986, p. 1). I posit that in the United States a friction exists between the big “WE” and the little “wes”. This friction centers around the concepts of rugged individualism and the Protestant work ethic which stress self-reliance rather than group action. Elliot also suggests that the levels of all types of group consciousness are subject to change. In effect, levels of consciousness tend to ebb and flow (pp. 10-11).

Elliot identifies the educational system, usually administered by the state, as the major agent of group consciousness and more specifically of national consciousness. Elliot's explanation of group consciousness as a hierarchical psychological phenomenon with many levels and often conflicting goals provides a foundation for defining and understanding this complex yet powerful component of social movements (Elliot, 1986, p. 10).

In the study of the relationship between group consciousness (the psychological dimension) and political participation, recent work using survey data involves a group of social psychologists and political scientists discussed below.
Recent Research on Group Consciousness

Patricia Gurin, Arthur Miller and Gerald Gurin (1980) explore the relationship between different types of group consciousness and their causes. "Stratum consciousness" is defined as "an ideology about the position of the stratum in society, (which) includes a sense of power discontent, evaluation of legitimacy of its position and the view that collective action is the best means to realize its interests" (Gurin et al., 1980, p. 30). The identification of unique elements of stratum consciousness later led to a more refined conceptualization of a multidimensional model of group consciousness. The authors examine both subordinate and superordinate groups. They conduct multivariate analysis of the effects of levels of group consciousness (as an independent variable) on collective orientation (as the dependent variable). In this early research, collective orientation is treated as the dependent variable. In later work by Gurin (1985) collective orientation is included in the multidimensional concept of group consciousness.

Gurin et al. (1980) discuss the linkage between politics and consciousness. This political connection proved to be important in later work conducted on group consciousness. Other researchers soon recognized the connection between consciousness, political participation, and collective action.
The Multidimensional Nature of Group Consciousness

Arthur Miller, Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin and Oksana Malanchuk (1981) identify a need to move beyond previous research, which primarily focuses on the study of group consciousness of Blacks and their levels of political participation (see also Verba and Nie, 1972). Moreover, Miller et al. (1981) seek to improve on the conceptual definitions and measurement used in earlier studies. Their research designs expand the psychological dimension of political participation and can be used in studying different groups, including those holding a dominant social standing (Miller et al., 1981, p. 494).

Miller and his associates reason that the definition of group consciousness used in the earlier research is too narrow. By moving beyond group identification and deprivation to group consciousness they remove the limitations of a too narrow vision of the psychological element in political participation of group members. However, many political scientists still view group consciousness solely through the lens of group identification (see Rinehart, 1992; Conover, 1984). Miller and his associates introduce the multidimensional nature of group consciousness. They identify four dimensions which include group identification, polar affect, polar power, and individual versus system blame (Miller et al., 1981, p. 496).
In addition to introducing this expanded concept of group consciousness, these authors provide valuable context to understanding the changing nature of levels of group consciousness and its effect on political participation. They write that, “A sense of group consciousness may also vary from individual, over time, and across strata, depending on social conditions” (p. 495). This variability of group consciousness presents a fluid state where the multidimensional model of group consciousness probably will not offer the researcher any definitive, predictable theoretical results from a single inquiry. Instead, one needs to move beyond a single snapshot in time to multiple observations of various individuals over time and across strata. These criteria are necessary to fully exploit the insights to be gained from this line of inquiry.

Miller et al. describe two ways of modeling the multidimensional conception of group consciousness: a linear additive model and an interactive model. With a multidimensional model, and therefore a multidimensional scale, it seems likely that some interaction would result, and they do find interaction. The question is, is this important? I think not. Interaction between different dimensions of group consciousness suggests that they are related. This seems logical because the individual dimensions are components of a larger concept and some interaction or overlap is expected. Miller et al. find that group consciousness does matter. They argue that
politicized group members participate at higher rates than simple socioeconomic characteristics might predict (Miller et al., 1981, p. 506).

Building on her previous research, Gurin (1985) takes the multidimensional group consciousness concept, refined by Miller and his co-authors, a step further. Gurin retains a four dimensional model of group consciousness, but redefines the four components. Gurin defines the four theoretical components as group identification, discontent, withdrawal-of-legitimacy, and collective orientation. These four components exist in the previous research conducted by Gurin (1980) and Miller et al. (1981). In the earlier research "collective orientation" is identified as the dependent variable. Gurin (1985) decides to include "collective orientation" in the multidimensional concept of group consciousness. In addition, the earlier studies identify "discontent" as "polar affect" and "polar power," while "withdrawal-of-legitimacy" appears as "individual verses system blame." Gurin (1985) and the earlier work treat group identification in a similar manner.

Gurin (1985) expands on the theoretical linkage between levels of group consciousness, political participation, and collective action. She suggests that two widely discussed theories relating to group consciousness and collective action -- relative deprivation and resource/solidarity mobilization -- are useful in attacking this research problem.
Gurin's research on gender consciousness reports that levels of group consciousness among women are weaker than levels of group consciousness for other groups such as Blacks, older people, and blue collar workers. During the 1970s, women under 30 with a college education who were employed and single at the time of these surveys displayed higher levels of discontent and withdrawal-of-legitimacy. A similar cohort of women and men, now between the ages of 39 and 51, are examined in this dissertation. She identifies a change in men's perception of women during the 1970s and early 1980s and reports that men adopted a pro-women's position on her gender consciousness scale. Moreover, men became more favorably disposed toward the needs of women as a group than toward those of Blacks (Gurin, 1985, p. 161).

Gurin emphasizes that while some shared consensus among men and women exists, there are critical differences. Men in a 1983 telephone survey still differ from women in assessing whether men have "too much power" in society versus women. Men and women also differ on the withdrawal-of-legitimacy dimension. She concludes that the "justice of men's advantage" defines the gender cleavages. While the number of women who see men with a legitimate advantage decreased, the number of men holding this same opinion increased in the 1983 data (Gurin, 1985, pp. 160-161).
Critique of Previous Research

As in the previous research discussed, Gurin (1985) uses secondary data analysis, basing her research on panel data from the 1972 and 1976 National Election Studies (NES) and a data set from a 1983 nationwide telephone survey conducted by the University of Michigan. She uses a factor analysis to identify the items used to construct her scale measuring the four dimensions of group consciousness. Because that study and the others discussed did not create an original attitude scale from a large pool of items derived from the theory, they risk significant measurement problems. These measurement concerns include capturing the theoretical components accurately, question order, and item formats. (For a detailed discussion of these potential problems, see the section on measurement in Chapter Three).

Examining some of the measures used in Gurin's study illuminates these measurement problems. For instance, the group identification component uses only one item. This item is from the NES face-to-face interviews and offers the respondent a choice from a set of sixteen groups. Respondents are asked which group they feel closest to. Then they are asked which other groups they feel close to. Gurin measures the degree of group identification on a three point scale. A value of one is given to respondents who do not mention "women," a two is given to respondents who answer they feel "close to women," and a three is assigned to those who say they felt "closest to women." I suggest
that many who support and identify with women's issues may not select them as the group to which they feel "close" or "closest" to. Therefore, this item may underestimate the amount of group identification and thus group consciousness. Moreover, a single item which offers only three response categories does not provide enough range to capture subtle differences. On the other hand, multiple items with more response categories allow finer measurement and broader theoretical interpretation.

Another potential problem area concerns her measurement of collective orientation. One of Gurin's measures of the collective orientation dimension uses a "feeling thermometer" question about the degree of "warmness" respondents feel toward the "women's liberation movement." I argue that the "women's liberation movement" item is a distorted and dated symbol of support for women's issues. It means many different things to different people. The media and opponents of women's issues have distorted the agenda and meaning of this measurement tool.

In addition, her research presents other difficulties. Unfortunately, several of the items from the NES surveys are not in the 1983 survey. Moreover, questions in the telephone survey are not in the NES surveys. Furthermore, the NES is a face-to-face survey while the 1983 Michigan study is a telephone survey. This mixing of surveys, items, and scales complicates the author's analysis. I argue that using secondary data sets, with items that are not
specifically designed for the research, cannot enhance measurement reliability or validity.

Gurin, while mentioning the role of politics in group consciousness, does not explore the linkage between group consciousness and political activity. However, Gurin's (1985) redefinition of group consciousness and her theoretical insights concerning social movement theory are cornerstones of this dissertation.

**Feminist Group Consciousness**

This research uses Gurin's definition of group consciousness for development of a feminist group consciousness scale. Using the definition in Chapter One, a feminist is someone who practices or advocates the theory of political, economic and social equality for women. Group consciousness theory fits well with attempting to identify levels of feminist consciousness in the mass public. Each theoretical component -- group identification, discontent, collective orientation and withdrawal-of-legitimacy -- speaks to the concepts of social, political and economic equality for women. Detailed definitions of each component and its application to a feminist group consciousness scale are discussed below. The development of this scale and the wording of its items are discussed in detail in Chapter Three.
Definitions of the Four Dimensions of Feminist Group Consciousness

Withdrawal-of-legitimacy. This component represents a structural element that encourages or restricts the development of a shared consciousness: the degree to which group members accept the prevailing social structure (Gurin, 1985, p. 147). In this dimension of group consciousness the plight of individual group members is viewed as the result of systemic and institutional factors, not individual blame (Gurin et al., 1980, p. 31). Therefore, disparity is not recognized as deprivation if the members believe it is legitimate (Gurin, 1985, p. 147). If withdrawal-of-legitimacy is present, women and men will agree with statements which suggest that the plight of women and their issues are linked to systemic causes, rather than individual blame.

Individual's discontent. Discontent is present when individuals recognize that members of a group do not have the same power as others in society (Gurin, 1985, p. 147). Discontent is indicated by the extent to which individuals draw comparisons between themselves and others, and recognize differences of either superordinate or subordinate status. In this study, women and men will agree with statements which identify women as the "out" group.

Collective orientation. Collective orientation is characterized by a shifting from earlier preferences of acting for one's own interest to a commitment to collective
action and adopting the interests of the group (Gurin et al., 1980, p. 31). If there is a sense of collective orientation present, men and women will agree with statements supporting group action on women's issues.

**Group identification.** Group identification reflects a recognition of shared values and interests that turns a category of individuals into a collectivity (Gurin, 1985, p. 147). This concept addresses both objective and subjective group identification. Much of the previous research is based only on objective membership. Simply put, many argue that women, because they are women, have objective membership in a group. This research attempts to include individuals, such as men, who might otherwise be excluded if only objective membership criteria were used to identify those who share interest on women's issues. In the feminist consciousness scale, women and men will agree with statements that ask respondents if they share the values and interests of women.

**Conclusions on Group Consciousness Research and Social Movement Theory**

The work of Miller, Gurin, Gurin, and Malanchuk (1981) examines the relationship between group consciousness and collective action. However, most of this research focuses on variations in levels of group consciousness from group to group, subordinate and dominant, although Miller et
al. (1981) do use simple zero-order correlations to explain the relationship between group consciousness and voting.

The central focus of this dissertation is the identification of a causal link between feminist consciousness and political participation and the role of group consciousness in social movements. Gurin (1985) identifies a linkage between group consciousness and social movements. Miller et al. (1981) identify group consciousness as a multidimensional concept which is fluid, not fixed. Therefore, in searching for the proper social movement theory in which to place this research, I seek a theory which acknowledges the importance of the psychological dimension. To this end, this research examines several social movement theories. The theories include relative deprivation, resource mobilization, political process theory, new social movement theory, and finally a hybrid theoretical model, which incorporates several concepts from the aforementioned theories. I suggest that a combination of several of the theories discussed offers the best theoretical lens to understand social movements.

Relative Deprivation

Relative deprivation theory is an outgrowth of what some call "classic or mass society" social movement theory (McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1986; Button, 1989; Costain, 1992). Out of classic and mass society theories, Ted Gurr (1970) developed a theory based on relative deprivation.
Relative deprivation theory views social movements as spontaneous, without patterns, and often employing unorthodox means to achieve their ends. Gurr's relative deprivation theory emphasizes human agency, wherein the frustrations or grievances of a collectivity of actors are associated with the growth of a movement, usually with at least a loose set of common beliefs. Gurr argues that relative deprivation, not just dissatisfaction with the status quo, is the important factor in triggering social movements. Individuals perceive their position relative to others in society as significantly different, and their expectations of achieving what they think they should be able to, versus what they perceive as possible, lead to discontent (Gurr, 1970, pp. 22-23; see also McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1986).

When the levels of discontent become so widespread, strong, and politicized, then the possibility for the development of a social movement is high. The success of such a movement, either peaceful or otherwise, rests on the strength of the movement's members and their power in relation to the government (Costain, 1992, p. 5). Human agency defined as discontent is the key component of this social movement theory. Jo Freeman conducted early work on the women's movement using this theory. Freeman's (1975) study of women graduate students in the 1960s finds that these women, when comparing their job and social prospects with those of their male peers, displayed classic discontent
as hypothesized in relative deprivation theory (Freeman, 1975, p. 35). However, according to Costain, Freeman introduces elements of resource mobilization theory into her model by identifying the importance of a communication network among this group of women. Freeman's study is the only one to date which uses relative deprivation theory in the study of the American women's movement (Costain, 1992, p. 6). Today, social scientists who study American political change no longer think about just men rebelling.

Critiques of Relative Deprivation Theory

Critics of relative deprivation theory argue that social movements are just as likely to be organized as not and can be spontaneous. However, in the West, most movements operate within the political system. Thus, the emphasis on human agency, characterized as spontaneous and organized around "a loose set of beliefs," ignores the importance of the structure and resources of a movement and its organization. Attempting to understand social movements using just this theoretical lens leaves out too many elements crucial to understanding the formation and success or failure of movements in Western democracies. This narrow view restricts the understanding of social movements to just levels of discontent and the power balance between the "out" group and the "in" group. Most social movement theorists acknowledge the importance of the degree of discontent, but not at the exclusion of the structure of organizations,
access to resources, and politics (Costain, 1992; Button, 1989; Tesh, 1993).

Resource Mobilization

Developed in the 1970s, resource mobilization theory has its roots in sociology, as does mass society and relative deprivation theory. Resource mobilization theory is used widely in the social sciences and particularly in the study of the women's movement. In her review of social movement theories and their use in the study of the women's movement, Costain explains that resource mobilization has been widely used, although it has often been modified substantially to fit the case of women (Costain, 1992, pp. 6-7). Resource mobilization theory argues that the steadfastness of discontent and the access to resources, including the support of institutional actors such as the media and the government, as well as interaction among related organizations, are the keys to understanding social movements (Zald and McCarthy, 1977; Button, 1989; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald, 1986).

James Button (1989) links resource mobilization theory with elite theories of power. Button argues that discontent, while important in social movements, is overshadowed as a causal factor by the amount of resources to which the “out” group has access. Internal and external resources affect the formation and success or failure of social movements. Internal elements include leadership,
money, labor, and a communication network. External factors, which are critical for poor and powerless groups, include support from groups such as churches, foundations, organized labor, liberal groups, and the federal government. Button draws an important distinction about resource mobilization theory when he suggests that this theory views collective action as "explicitly political." Resource mobilization theory places more importance on sustained outside support from external groups and the amount of resistance from those in power than the psychological dimension of members (Button, 1989, p. 14; see also McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald, 1986).

Critique of Resource Mobilization Theory

Obviously in a study whose focus is the psychological perspective, the lack of importance of psychological factors in resource mobilization theory raises questions of the utility of using such theory in this research. I suggest that viewing any social event from either a strictly structural or purely agency perspective is inadequate. For instance, Button in his study of Blacks and social change modifies the basic assumptions of this theoretical perspective. Moreover, Costain explains that researchers studying the women's movement often see the need to modify theoretical assumptions.
Political Process Theory

Anne Costain (1992) argues that political process theory, which grew out of resource mobilization theory, is more appropriate for examining the women's movement than either relative deprivation or variants of resource mobilization theories\(^1\). The political process approach places more emphasis on political factors. Costain offers a definition of social movements based on political process theory which argues that excluded groups mobilize political pressure to advance their interests through noninstitutional means. These groups are often viewed as "mavericks" operating in a stable political system because they employ noninstitutional methods (Costain, 1992, pp. 11-12).

The nature and disposition of the political system toward the group's actions and agenda are seen as critical to the success of the movement by political process theorists. Costain argues that relative deprivation theorists, such as Gurr, suggest that social movements are more likely to form when elites are vulnerable and power differences between group members and the government are small. Political process theorists, on the other hand, argue that the government's disposition toward the group and their goals can outweigh large power differences. Unlike

\(^1\) For a more general discussion of political process theory see Doug McAdam, (1982) Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency 1930-1970. McAdam suggests that political process theory focuses on three components of the situation: the level of organizations of the group, the level of consciousness in the movement's mass base, and the "structure of political opportunities" (p. 40)
pure resource mobilization proponents, political process theorists do not exclude the psychological dimension. Members of movements must see their problems as having political roots and believe that they can act to change the existing situation (Costain, 1992, p. 12; see also McAdam, 1982; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald, 1986).

According to this theory, the strength and viability of the group's organization and the government's tolerance or support directly influence the success of the movement. Costain claims that the elements contained in political process theory "make more sense" when viewing the women's movement than do the resource mobilization or relative deprivation perspectives. Costain asserts that the timing between congressional activity (the political process) and advances by the women's movement explains the development and success of the women's movement better than other theories (Costain, 1992, pp. 12-13; see also Klein, 1984).

Critique of Political Process Theory

Political process theory expands on resource mobilization theory. It draws our attention to the role of government as a facilitator or suppresser of social movements and away from the resources of organizations. However, it still minimizes the importance of the psychological dimension in social movements.

No doubt the federal government, more specifically President Kennedy's creation of a Commission on the Status
of Women, sent a message to activists, the media, and the Congress that women were on the civil rights agenda.

However, White House staff, assigned to the Commission, did not allow participants to introduce and discuss resolutions. These actions led a group of the participants to distance themselves from the government sponsored forum to form an independent organization the National Organization for Women (NOW). While political process theory expands on concepts found in relative deprivation and resource mobilization scholarship, it leaves us wondering about the psychological chemistry in social movements.


This dissertation finds certain elements of the theories discussed above useful in guiding its inquiry. Relative deprivation theory identifies discontent and withdrawal-of-legitimacy as important characteristics of social movements. Resource mobilization theory illuminates the importance of internal and external support in understanding social movements. However, the psychological elements are very important also.

Political process theory contributes to the evolution of social movement theory by identifying the role of government as a facilitator or suppresser of movement activity. The facilitator role is clearly seen in governmental intervention in the early days of the women's
movement. This theory acknowledges the importance of members recognizing that their problems have political roots which is very similar to the withdrawal-of-legitimacy component identified by Gurin (1985) and Miller (1981).

However, these approaches fail to fully recognize the importance of the psychological dimension of social movements. We are left with theories that focus on organizations, their resources and support, and government as the key determinants of success or failure. What's missing is an understanding of why and how people get involved in movements, how the experience changes their lives and society, and what impact social movements have on the general or mass public.

Levels of group consciousness are critical to understanding the success or failure of social movements. Collective orientation is a key psychological element which turns the wheels of collective action, whether it is in the voting booth, at a fund-raiser, or in the streets during a peaceful assembly or unlawful riot. Withdrawal-of-legitimacy identifies whether the "out" group's plight is viewed as having systemic causes or if it is perceived as the responsibility of the individual. This too is an important ingredient in creating a successful movement. To create a more complete picture of what happens in social movements, we need to include all of these psychological factors. Without understanding these psychological factors and relationships we are left on the outside looking in.
New Social Movement Theory

Another theoretical perspective, new social movement theory, expands our understanding of what social movements are and the importance of the psychological dimension. What is "new" in new social movement theory is the emphasis on individual members and their ideological bond to the group or movement. Dalton and Kuechler (1990) explore the "new" in new social movement theory by examining the work of several researchers, such as Ronald Inglehart and Joyce Gelb, who examine several contemporary social movements, including the environmental, women's rights, and peace movements.

The ideological bonds and shared beliefs of the core members are the "essence" of a social movement. Therefore, new social movement theory stresses the importance of the psychological dimension in social movements. The politics of New Social Movements are not like those discussed in the relative deprivation model, which were often violent and spontaneous. New social movement theory views protest as organized and planned. The media are seen as a means to influence public opinion and get a movement's message to a wider audience (Dalton and Kuechler, 1990, p. 282). New social movement theorists are interested in getting inside the psychological dynamics of social movements and their members to better understand their success and impact on politics and policy. New social movement theory argues that there are a multiplicity of identities and that these
identities are not defined in a universal way, suggesting that the ideological bonds of the core members are not anything like a "strict doctrine." Therefore, members probably agree and disagree on a number of issues. Members who coalesce on one issue may go their separate ways on another (Dalton and Kuechler, 1990, p. 281).

Dalton and Kuechler explain that resource mobilization analysis emphasizes the organization of the movement and its leadership. The emergence of social movements by resource mobilization theorists is described as "arbitrary or unplanned," and Dalton and Kuechler state that "entrepreneurial elites" manufacture and manipulate the movement's ideological bonds (Zald and McCarthy, 1977). This scenario is seen in the proliferation of interest groups in the United States, many of which have overlapping interests and are managed by professionals (mostly lawyers) for profit. Dalton and Kuechler disagree with the interpretation of social movements which lumps social movements with pressure groups or interest groups (see Zald and McCarthy, 1977; Costain, 1992). Dalton and Kuechler do not include fabricated, checkbook-membership, for-profit interest groups as social movements. They argue that simply examining or studying the organization of social movements leaves a "glaring hole" that neglects the people in the movement and their shared beliefs (Dalton and Kuechler, 1990, pp. 279-280).
Expanding the Scope of New Social Movement Theory

A social movement is a “collective actor” constituted by individuals who understand themselves to have common interests, and for at least some part of their social existence share a common identity (Scott, 1990, p. 6). Scott expands the linkage between movements and the masses to those who have a common identity for part of their existence. Attempting to examine the substance of shared beliefs creates major research problems, including defining who is a member and who is not. The challenge is how to include the masses who may not be dues-paying members of “pressure groups.”

Psychological Impact of Social Movements on the Mass Public

Sylvia Tesh (1993) suggests expanding the study of social movements beyond the ideological bond of core members to analyzing how such movements impact on and modify the behavior of non-members. Tesh argues that most new social movement theorists are interested in ideological bonds and shared consciousness as “the glue which hold a social movement together, not as its creative product”. She characterizes the focus of this research as “inward looking”. However, a growing number of scholars are beginning to look beyond organizations to explore the impact that social movements have on the general public (Tesh, 1993, pp. 3-6).
New Social Movements and Power Relationships

Political theorists have identified at least three dimensions or faces of power relationships in society (Lukes, 1986; Gaventa, 1980). The one dimensional approach to power was essentially developed by pluralists in American political science, most particularly by Robert Dahl and Nelson Polsby. The first face of power is where “A” has power over “B” to the extent that “A” can get “B” to do something that “B” would not otherwise do (Gaventa, 1980, p. 9).

The second face of power is basically agenda setting. Political organizations, like all organizations, are likely to develop a “mobilization of bias” which favors the exploitation of certain kinds of conflict and the suppression of others. This approach to understanding power relationships includes non-participants and the issues which do not make the agenda (Gaventa, 1980, p. 9).

Lukes (1986) suggests there is a third face of power, where those in power “A” have ability to influence or shape what others “B” want and desire. He suggests this occurs even though these choices may not be in the best interests of “B” (Lukes, 1986, p. 10). Charles Lindblom (1990) similarly argues that elites actively work to influence the mass public's commitment to the status quo, political docility, and the acceptance of inequalities of income and wealth (Lindblom, 1990, p. 89.)
The molding of beliefs and the focusing of debate lead to negative outcomes for those who are not in a position of power. Tesh (1993) finds an interesting positive twist in these arguments which she applies to new social movement theory. She suggests that social movements can and do mold and shape how people conceive their world (Tesh, 1993, p. 4). The research reported in this dissertation attempts to determine whether attitudes about feminism have indeed been shaped by the women's movement by linking those elements described in group consciousness and new social movement theories.

Defining the Success of Social Movements

If the social movement is successful, a new ideological perspective may be accepted “unconsciously” by large numbers of people who adopt a new way of thinking. Social movements provide challenges to the dominant assumptions of the social order, which can create problems for the self-images of societies (Eyerman and Jamison, 1991, p. 165). Tesh (1993, p. 5) writes that we can expect more just policies and practices to result as non-members change their attitudes and behavior. This type of social change with both a change in policy and practice is evident in the United States environmental movement.

Scott's (1990) criteria for judging the success of social movements is met when previously excluded issues and groups are integrated into the “normal” political process.
Scott argues that adoption of previously excluded issues and the incorporation of excluded groups by collective actors such as political parties is crucial to the success of New Social Movements (Scott, 1990, pp. 10-11). Thus, new social movement theorists judge social movements on fairly relaxed criteria. These more relaxed criteria, as Tesh explains, focuses our attention on the impact of movements on non-members.

Measuring the Success of Social Movements

If results of movements are at least as important as the structure of movement organizations, then social scientists really have several dimensions or levels of analysis to consider when examining social movements and their impacts. The shaping of attitudes by social movements impacts the mass public and leads to behavioral changes in individuals and society. The acceptance and internalizing of the interests of the movement can be said to create a degree of collective orientation in the masses. It is this collective orientation that leads to Tesh's "more just policies and practices".

Several important points emerge from an examination of the evolution of social movement theory. First, social movement theory has evolved from the study of collective violence (Gurr, 1970) to a more in-depth focused study of organizations (Zald and McCarthy, 1977). Expanding on the latter, Costain (1992) includes the impact and role of the
government on social movements. New social movement theorists moved to the psychological dimension of social movements. This group examined the ideological bonds of core members and the impact of movements on the mass public. The final step focuses our attention on changes in attitudes and behavior at the level of the group, government, and the mass public (Tesh, 1993; Boggs, 1986; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald, 1986; Gamson, 1992; Eyerman and Jamison, 1991).

What I find of great interest in Tesh's (1993) analysis of power is how the scholars cited above have found a good side in what many scholars of power identified as its darkest side, the third dimension of power (Lukes, 1986; Lindblom, 1977; Lindblom, 1990). The concept of shaping and molding desires, of constrained volitions, usually tied to reinforcement of an unjust, oppressive regime, is turned on its head. If the third dimension of power can do harm, why can't it do good? Tesh (1993) argues that this third dimension of power can mold positive desires that are in the interest of the individual and that social movements are molders. The outputs of social movements modify the perceptions of people, leading them to accept new ways of understanding their reality and how they should act without them being active, card carrying, dues paying movement members.

I contend that the "ideological bonds of core members" and New Social Movement theory's interest in the impact of social movements on the mass public fit well with the work
of the social psychologists discussed earlier in this chapter. However, the psychological dimension, while important, is not singularly so. Therefore, the concluding section of this chapter focuses on a synthesis of the theories discussed and provides a theoretical framework with which to better examine and understand the dynamics of social change.

A New Theoretical Framework To View Social Movements

It appears that no matter what the methodology or theoretical point of view, no unidimensional theory explains the complex nature of human beings and their political activities. When one does adopt a particular theoretical lens, many times it is modified to fit the circumstance of the moment (see Costain, 1992; Button, 1989). A common theme found in the literature on group consciousness, social movements, and power is multidimensionality. Miller (1981) suggests that group consciousness is a multidimensional concept and Button (1989) asserts that social change is multidimensional. Finally, Gaventa (1980) and Lukes (1976) argue that power is multidimensional.

Therefore, this paper presents a broadly conceived theoretical model of social change. This model includes power, politics, social organizations, their leaders and members, and finally the mass public whom all these forces eventually impact. What is central to this thesis is the idea of multidimensionality. To properly study a social
movement, a combination or synthesis of theories and measurement strategies is necessary.

First, theories of power, as they relate to the social structure of a society, offer important insights into the understanding of the success or failure of any social movement. Resource mobilization theory, with its emphasis on organizations and resource access, illuminates the importance of structure in understanding social movements. Political process theory's focus on the role of governments in facilitating or suppressing social movements provides an important view of why movements succeed or fail. Finally, new social movement theory adds the psychological dimension of both the ideological bonds of "core members" and the impact of movements on the thinking and behavior of non-members. These elements, synthesized, allow for a more complete examination and understanding of social movements from different points in the process.

**Research Goals: Understanding the Impact of Social Movements on the Mass Public and Addressing Measurement Challenges**

This dissertation concentrates on the psychological level of the analysis of social movements -- the impact on changes in the consciousness in the mass public and how consciousness affects political participation. It is informed by the perspectives of new social movement theorists such as Tesh (1993) and Scott (1990). New social movement theorists mention that measuring the effects of
movements on the mass public presents significant research challenges, and this dissertation takes innovative steps to address these challenges.

To meet these measurement challenges, this dissertation relies on an original attitude scale developed to measure levels of feminist consciousness in the mass public in the state of Florida. It then searches for possible linkages between levels of feminist consciousness and levels of political behavior. To gain a better understanding of these linkages, this research moves beyond voting and creates a scale of participation which includes activities such as working on campaigns, contributing money to candidates, and participating in demonstrations. Measuring the effect of levels of feminist consciousness on levels of political participation offers new social movement theorists a tool to help understand the "outputs" or success of social movements upon members of the mass public.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS - MEASUREMENT AND STATISTICAL APPROACH

This chapter begins with a discussion of measurement in the social sciences, particularly quantitative survey research. It examines attitude scale theory and development as well as the steps taken in developing the attitude scale for this research. This section concludes with a discussion of the statistical methods, the sample and the research hypotheses.

Measurement Issues in the Social Sciences Survey Research

In the recent past, several fundamental assumptions have been challenged concerning survey research data and the findings they provide. Questions arise concerning the number and type of response categories offered, as well as concerns regarding question wording and order. The research of social scientists is likely to be compromised when they do not pay close attention to question formats, wording, and order.

For instance, many researchers use items from different portions of a survey instrument to construct a scale. The type of questions in-between the scale items can greatly influence responses. Some research employs a variety of response formats. To compare responses across scale items it is preferable to use consistent formats. Furthermore,
some formats, such as the dichotomous type, are less reliable than others, such as labeled Likert-style, so mixing of formats is likely to lead to less reliable findings. In addition, scholars argue that respondents who answer typical closed ended survey questions, over the telephone or face to face, may be offering their "top of the head" opinions, and not the deeply held cognitive attitudes that social scientists have assumed.

Statistical Assumptions

Few interesting interval or ratio measures of variables exist in the social sciences. Unfortunately, most of the statistical procedures used by social scientists to demonstrate causality and prediction assume that the dependent variables are interval. Interval means that there is an equal distance between each of the values of the variable. Age is one of the few variables which is used extensively that qualifies. Education, another popular variable, is often treated as interval even though most would agree that once in college the distance between each unit (year) becomes less similar.

Most of the statistical procedures used in the social sciences are based on variance such as correlation coefficients and regression coefficients. Variance is the difference between the mean of the values observed and the values themselves squared. There are two counter arguments social scientists use to rationalize a less than strict
adherence to statistical rules when conducting their research. First, if researchers genuinely only considered interval and ratio variables, very little multivariate research would be attempted. Second, if the research they conduct predicts or explains relationships, they feel justified breaking or bending the statistical rules. This dissertation, like most, violates some of the assumptions associated with regression analysis. For example, the responses to the feminist consciousness scale items are really ordinal; however they are treated as interval in the regression analysis.

Attitudes, Measurement, and Reliability

There is much debate regarding the stability of different types of attitudes. Jon Krosnick (1991), a psychologist, argues that symbolic attitudes like party identification, liberal/conservative ideology, and nonracial attitudes are not more stable than nonsymbolic attitudes such as those held toward certain governmental programs. Much of the difference in the stability between symbolic and non-symbolic attitudes can be attributed to increased levels of random measurement error in non-symbolic questions due to their response formats. If Krosnick is right (and I think he is), there may be a need for revision of conventional wisdom about the viability of some central assertions of survey research and democratic theory (Krosnick, 1991, p. 547; see also Alwin and Krosnick, 1991; Achen, 1975).
Symbolic process theory suggests that attitudes ranging from symbolic to nonsymbolic lie on a continuum. The range begins with symbolic attitudes such as party identification, liberal/conservative ideological measures, attitudes toward social groups, and racial policy issues, then moves toward more nonsymbolic attitudes such as non-racial issues, attitudes toward trust in government and feelings of efficacy (Sears, 1983).

Krosnick (1991) explains that there may be some disagreement about the ordering of the above attitudes; however, party identification has long been identified as the "single most potent and persistent political orientation" (p. 549). He argues that this perception of party identification can be traced back to the publication of *The American Voter* by Campbell et al. in 1960. He suggests that since 1960 party identification has been the single most important determinant in political/voting behavior. Many other scholars suggest that party identification is inherited at an early age from parents. It is highly resistant to change thereafter, and is a powerful organizer of individual's political sympathies throughout her or his life (see Campbell, 1960; Converse, 1964; Converse and Markus, 1979; Markus, 1982).

One exception to this majority opinion is found in the work of Morris Fiorina (1981), who suggests that party identification actually changes over time. Krosnick agrees and suggests that question format has contributed greatly to
these widely held assumptions regarding American political behavior. Response options which are verbally labeled and/or items which employ branching have higher levels of reliability than items formatted in other ways. Thus, seven point Likert type scale items with verbal labels for each choice are the most reliable. On the other hand, dichotomous items are the least reliable and subject to the most random measurement error. (Krosnick, 551-552; see also Alwin and Krosnick, 1991; Andrews, 1984)

Simply put, formats with clear labels, more response choice and branching reduce random error and offer more reliable results. Alternative formats, such as feeling thermometers, are subject to increased levels of random error and are, therefore, less reliable. Feeling thermometers are used frequently in surveys concerning women's issues. Early work by Converse (1964) finds that respondents with no real opinion frequently offer one so they would not appear uninformed (Converse, 1964, p. 243). Moreover, respondents may think of opinions in a range, rather than a specific number, which could introduce another source of random error. Real attitude change is a likely source of the error.

Conclusions on Response Categories

Krosnick suggests that party identification has had an artificial advantage over other variables, through the inclusion of non-symbolic variables in predictive regression
equations. This advantage is due to superior measurement. He writes that, "The portrait of party identification emerging from this research reveals that it is a more flexible attitude than has been acknowledged in the past" (1991, p. 569). History reminds us that Verba, Nie, and Petrocik (1979) believed they had discovered a real change in attitudes but later found their results were caused by a change in question format in the 1964 NES questionnaire (Krosnick, pp. 569-570; see also Bishop, Tuchfarber and, Oldendick, 1978).

It appears that symbolic attitudes do not seem to influence new attitudes anymore than nonsymbolic ones. Research which relies on measures of simple association, which may be spurious, should be replaced with more rigorous analysis. Social scientists must conduct research using causal models and more sophisticated analysis. The evidence presented above suggests that different response categories affect reliability which can induce error and influence findings.

**Measurement and Attitude Scales**

Poor measurement imposes an absolute limit on the validity of the conclusions one can reach in conducting research (DeVellis, p. 10). The major assumptions regarding error and attitude scales include: I) it is assumed that error associated with the items is random and errors are not correlated; II) errors are not correlated with the true
score of the latent variable; III) the influence from the latent variable to each item is assumed to be the same for all items; IV) error for each item is assumed to be the same as any other item (DeVellis, 1991, pp. 18-19).

Random errors are assumed to be from a population with a mean of zero. This implies that with multiple observations errors will tend to average zero. Respondents also make mistakes which contribute to random error. As few as one or several items suffering from any source of error increases the chance that random error could impact the measurement of the theoretical construct. Spector argues, as does Krosnick, that dichotomous items minimize choice and increase the affect of random error if respondents are forced to choose from just two choices, rather than a range of choices (Spector, 1992, p. 10).

Measurement Error and Regression Analysis

If the interest group ratings are as untrustworthy as critics claim, problems of measurement error can affect the statistical relationship between the group index and other variables. Only the accuracy of the prediction is affected if the dependent variable suffers from error. While the R-square value would be incorrect, the estimated coefficients of the independent variables and their T values would still be accurate. However, when error is found in the independent variable, both parameters are influenced (Fowler, 1982, p. 402; see also Blalock, 1982 p. 14).
In Fowler's study the position of members along a continuum is ordinal and it is likely there is error in calculating these relative positions. As mentioned above, the use of these “scale” scores in regression violates several important statistical assumptions. First, regression is, by definition, based on the assumption of interval level or ratio data. Second, the ideological make up of Congress can change from one session to another (Dodd and Oppenheimer, 1976). These changes can make individual members appear to be more or less conservative than they were in the previous session, when in reality their positions have not really changed. Moreover, because the executive boards of the interest groups usually determine the issues and votes used in the construction of their scale, most scale construction techniques are either compromised or ignored (Fowler, 1982, p. 402).

**Attitude Scales and Reducing Measurement Error**

Summated scales with multiple items address the measurement deficiencies described above in several ways. The key is to give respondents more choices than they are able to use. For example, a 20 item attitude scale using a 5 point Likert type range gives a range from 20 to 80, or 61 different possible scores for each case. This allows those who feel strongly to be distinguished from those with more moderate feelings. Good scale construction requires clearly defining the construct or latent variable, deciding on a
scaling format, and then how the item pool will be created. A sound summated rating scale has four important characteristics. First, multiple items are summed to capture the latent variable of interest. Second, each item measures something that can vary quantitatively on a continuum. Third, there is no right answer to an item. Finally, each item is a statement (Spector, 1991, p. 1). The next section describes the process of how scale theory and development contribute to this dissertation.

Scale Theory and Development

Much of the "science" found in today's social sciences stems from psychology. Psychologists were the first to measure attitudes and develop scaling techniques to measure these attitudes more accurately. Psychometrics is concerned with measuring psychological and social phenomena. Measurement scales or instruments are collections of items intended to reveal levels of theoretical variables, not readily observable by direct means. It seems that social scientists are increasingly concerned with numerous theoretical models that narrowly circumscribe certain phenomena where as theories in physics are fewer and more comprehensive. Social scientists who do not develop scales using rigorous scaling techniques end up with a set of items which fail to exploit theory (DeVellis, 1991, p. 6-8; see also Edwards, 1956).
Most variables or constructs of interest to social scientists are not directly observable. The construct that cannot be observed is known as the "latent variable". The latent variable, by definition, is latent rather than manifest, variable rather than constant, and is assumed to cause an item or set of items to take on a certain value. A well conceived and constructed scale is both reliable and valid. Many social scientists put theory into practice by creating a set of questions which they believe measure a social or political attitude or set of attitudes (Spector, 1992, p. 12-13).

Classic Theory

The classic test theory concerns the difference between the true score and the observed score. Classic test theory argues that test score or observed score (O) given by respondents is comprised of the true score (T), or theoretical value that each individual has regarding the latent variable of interest, plus some measure of error (E). Spector (1992) also includes the possibility of an additional factor of bias (B) (discussed below). This is formulated as \( O = T + E + B \) (p.10).

Inductive and Deductive Scale Development

Inductive scale development begins with a clearly defined construct which guides scale development. Hypotheses are developed about the scale and other
variables. In contrast, deductive scale construction employs factor analysis to identify related items which are then used as a scale. Validation is difficult and tricky using this approach and great caution should be used. It is easy to read into the results that which the researcher may find useful (Spector, 1992, pp. 13-14). This dissertation employs inductive development construction techniques.

Developing Summated Rating Scales

A well thought out scale should be created taking into account the education and reading ability of the population of people who will use it. Second, the items should be clear, well written and contain a single idea. Third, the researcher should pay particular attention to the introduction of bias into a scale (Spector, 1992, p. 7; see also DeVellis, 1991; Edwards, 1956).

Bias can introduce error into the scale and social desirability is the most troublesome source of bias. In this era of political correctness, potential bias from respondents saying what is “correct” is becoming an irritating challenge to the social scientist. However, paying close attention to the wording is the best approach to minimize this factor. Potential bias associated with past measures of support for women's issues was an important reason to develop an original instrument to measure levels of feminist consciousness. Therefore, a well constructed
scale should avoid "hot buttons," and use more subtle items to measure the latent variable in order to minimize bias.

**Item Selection and Analysis**

Generally if one desires a 15 item scale one should have at least 60 to 70 items which comprise the item pool. Once an item pool has been created a pilot test is performed. The pilot test is used to identify items which cannot be understood by respondents. Thereafter, a full administration of the item pool to 100 to 200 respondents is conducted. After the full administration an item analysis is performed to choose a set of items that form an internally consistent scale. The statistical measure used most often to check for internal consistency is Coefficient Alpha developed by Cronbach in the early 1950s (Spector, 1992, p. 9; see also Bohrnstedt, 1969). Nunnally (1978) set the widely accepted Alpha score at .70; however, scales with an Alpha score of .60 and above are commonly used and reported in major academic journals.

**Multidimensional Scales**

Multidimensional scales are scales in which the latent variable contains several dimensions that may be related but are conceptually distinct. The concept of group consciousness, as defined by Miller et al. (1981), is such a multidimensional concept. This type of latent variable requires the construction of a multidimensional scale which
varies from a unidimensional scale in several ways. First, the scale items written for each dimension are mixed in the item pool and then administered to the respondents. Second, subscales should not share items. Finally, a separate item analysis is performed on each subscale. Often subscales intercorrelate though the subscales are conceptually distinct. When appropriate, the items are analyzed for a total score (Spector, 1992, p. 39).

Reliability

Reliability is the fundamental issue in psychological measurement (DeVellis, 1991, p. 24). Scale reliability is the proportion of variance attributable to the true score of the latent variable. Reliability and statistical power are interrelated. As reliability increases, so does the statistical power of the scale. Reliability is inversely related to errors of measurement; the larger the error the worse the reliability (Spector, 1992, pp. 31-32). One method to increase reliability is the increase the number of scale items. In other words, scales with more items are likely to generate higher Alphas.

The most common statistical approach to measure internal consistency is Cronbach's Alpha (Spector, 1992; DeVellis, 1991; Comrey, 1988). Internal consistency is attained when multiple items which are designed to measure the same construct interrelate with one another (Spector, 1992 p. 31; see also Bohrnstedt, 1969; Comrey, 1988;
DeVellis, 1991). The best method to examine scale reliability is by comparing the Alphas from different samples. This test/retest method should demonstrate that the scale yields consistent measurement over time.

Validity

Validity is defined as the property that a scale measures its intended construct (Spector, 1992, p.9; see also Comrey, 1988). Validation usually involves testing a hypothesis about the scale. This research uses the known-groups validity test. It uses criteria-related variables to test the validity of attitude scales\(^1\). In addition, it uses confirmatory factor analysis to demonstrate validity of attitude scales.

Criteria-related validity tests

Criteria-related validity tests must be anchored in sound theory. Spector reminds us that conducting tests on

\(^1\) There are two other common tests for validity, concurrent and predictive. Concurrent validity is usually tested while collecting data from a sample of respondents. One way to test concurrent validity is to hypothesis about correlations of the scale with one or more criteria hypothesized to relate to the scale. If there are significant relations or acceptable correlations between the scale and the hypothesized variables then the scale has demonstrated validity (Spector, 1992, p. 48; see also Comrey, 1988). Predictive validity, which is similar to concurrent validity, involves collecting data for the criterion variables first. Predicting future the values of criteria variables in relation to scale scores demonstrates validity (Comrey, 1988, p.761).
theory and scales at the same time is tricky. When things go wrong it is often difficult to identify where the problem lies. Carefully choosing the criteria to test is crucial. Choosing poor criteria may spuriously suggest that the scale lacks validity (Spector, 1992, p. 49; see also Bohrnstedt, 1969; Comrey, 1988).

Known-groups validity

In known-groups validity hypotheses are developed concerning the feminist consciousness scale scores of certain groups. In the present research, possible known-groups include those based on gender and party identification. Several hypotheses were developed in the research design about the scale scores of certain groups in the sample. Women were hypothesized to have higher scales score than men and Democrats are hypothesized be higher scores on the feminist consciousness scale\(^2\). T-tests are conducted on the mean scale scores of the groups being tested (Spector, 1992, p.49; see also Comrey, 1988).

Factor analysis and validity

There are two types of factor analysis usually associated with scale construction: confirmatory and exploratory. Confirmatory factor analysis is used to confirm the multidimensionality of a scale. In the case of

\(^2\) The use of the known-groups validity test is independent of any findings reported in the regression analysis of these data. While these variables may prove significant in regression analysis, the known groups test is only a test of significant difference, not causality.
a unidimensional scale, factor analysis can also confirm that all scale items are measuring a single factor. Generally, in multidimensional scales the subscale factors will appear stronger and the amount of variance accounted for will be higher if more items are entered. Ideally, items in a group will interrelate with one another more strongly than they relate to items in other groups. These groups will form factors that fit with the theoretical design of the scale (Comrey, 1988, p. 760).

Exploratory factor analysis can be used to explore the dimensionality of a scale. It is also used by many social scientists to "explore" data sets in search of a potential scale. However, even though factor analysis is a sophisticated mathematical tool, the final judgment or interpretation of results rests as much with subjective judgment as it does with statistical rules (Spector, 1992, p. 54; see also Comrey, 1988)

Interpreting factor analysis

Once the number of factors are identified the next step is to perform an orthogonal rotation. After the rotation, the items will load on all the factors. One hopes that each item will have a large loading on only one of the factors. A loading matrix contains statistics that are correlations of each original variable with each factor. Generally, a correlation of .30 to .35 is the minimum required for loading on a factor (Spector, 1992, p. 55).
In the end, factor analysis can only suggest the presence of more than one dimension. Scales with a small number of items or a multidimensional scale with subscales containing only a few items should use this type of analysis carefully (Comrey, 1988). The addition or deletion of a single item can profoundly affect the results of factor analysis. Although a useful tool, factor analysis should be used cautiously and the results interpreted conservatively. With all the caution offered regarding reading too much into the results of factor analysis, one gets the feeling that original scale development needs to be rediscovered.

This Research

The research reported in this dissertation draws on the work of social psychologists who conducted group consciousness research focusing on groups defined in terms of race, age, gender, and social class. Their research designs and findings raised important questions and provided innovation in conceiving and operationalizing group consciousness. To move beyond understanding women's issues through the distorted lens of items which provide researchers with "knee jerk" reactions, an original attitude scale was developed for this dissertation. In addition to distorted symbols, much of the research on group consciousness relied on items based on "feeling thermometers", which introduced random error (Krosnick, 1991). Moreover, none of the research to date has used an
original instrument and data set. Instead, secondary data and scales developed from factor analysis dominate the research in this important area (see Miller et al., 1981; Gurin, 1985).

To advance research on women's issues it became clear that developing a feminist group consciousness scale from theory was necessary. The development of a feminist consciousness using the scale construction techniques outlined above would avoid many of the important methodological weaknesses previously discussed above. In addition, several other actions were taken to improve the measurement. First, eliminating all references to the National Organization for Women, abortion, feminist, and other symbolic "hot buttons" allowed for a more subtle approach to measure levels of feminist consciousness. Second, developing an item pool based on theory, from both experts and the opinions of average women, broadens the interpretation of the theoretical underpinnings of feminist consciousness. Third, men were included in the sample on which the item analysis is based to move the focus of the study beyond a single gender. Fourth, by having all the scale items in a specific section of the survey, concerns about the effects of question order were minimized. Questions of spurious correlation among items in factor analysis caused by a preceding question or set of questions are not a problem in this research design.
In conclusion, this dissertation pays particular attention to improving how feminist consciousness is operationalized and how it is measured. The use of a more sophisticated statistical approach permits exploration of possible causal links between levels of feminist consciousness and levels of political behavior. These measures of political participation include voting, giving money to a candidate, working for a candidate, attending a meeting, and participating in a march or demonstration. What follows is a detailed explanation of the steps followed in the scale development stage of the dissertation.

The Attitude Scale Construction

The attitude scale used to measure levels of feminist consciousness was developed using the scaling techniques outlined above. This research relies on recent work in political science and social psychology (see for example Gurin et al., 1980; Miller et al., 1981; Gurin, 1985). For the purposes of this research, feminist consciousness is characterized by identification with a group, combined with an ideology or set of political beliefs where the relative position of the group is recognized, and there is collective action directed at realizing goals relating to the group (Miller et al., 1981; Gurin et al., 1980).

Four subscales representing each of the aforementioned theoretical components of feminist consciousness — group identification, discontent, collective orientation, and
withdrawal of legitimacy -- were developed. The goal was to collect a set of items which tapped each of the four dimensions of group consciousness identified by Gurin (1985). Scales with multiple items allow the researcher to distinguish those who feel strongly from those with more moderate feelings.

**Item Development**

This dissertation attempts to avoid potential bias of using items developed by a single male researcher by seeking items from the Women's Studies faculty, previous surveys, and from interviews conducted with women in Gainesville. The group of Women's Studies scholars represent over 20 different departments. Each member was mailed a packet which contained a letter of introduction from M. Margaret Conway, a member of the Women's Studies faculty and well known authority on women and politics. In addition, a letter outlining the research design and definitions of the four components of group consciousness was included. Each participant was asked to create at least one item for use in the item pool from which the final scale would be drawn.

Potential item writers were given guidance in creating a good item. First, they were instructed that the items should all share a Likert type format which offers the respondent five choices ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Second, they were informed that there was no right answer to an item. Finally, they were told
that each should be a clearly written direct statement using high school level English. Examples were provided to demonstrate the characteristics found in a well crafted item and to demonstrate how easy it is to create one. Unfortunately, the response rate to this approach was less than inspiring. To increase the response rate appointments were made with members whom the author had some previous contact. Other members of the Women's Studies faculty were mailed two additional requests for a single item written to the theory enclosed in the original packet. The item development stage lasted approximately six weeks. In the end 15 members of the group responded with items. Luckily, many of those who responded enclosed several items for each theoretical component of feminist consciousness. The item development process was supplemented with a series of non-randomly selected qualitative interviews conducted with female graduate students and working women in the greater Gainesville area. Items were also used from previous surveys on women's issues which fit the group consciousness theory.

Next, the items were judged for categorical theoretical appropriateness by Professor M. M. Conway of Political Science, Natalie Cornell, MA Political Science, Professor Constance Shehan of Sociology, and the author. Then the items, which now consisted of four sets (one for each component of feminist consciousness) of approximately 20 items each, were administered to a group of undergraduate
students enrolled in several different classes including, Women and Politics, Classics, Film Studies, American Government, and English Composition.

**Item Analysis with Student Group**

Item analysis began by identifying the 25% of respondents with the lowest score on each subscale and the 25% of respondents who had the highest score. This was accomplished by examining frequency distributions of the items in each subscale. Items were recoded where necessary to make interpretation of negatively and positively worded items consistent. After the high and low groups were identified, a difference of means test comparing the 25% with the highest scores on each of the items in the specified subscale with the mean score of the 25% with the lowest scale scores on the five point Likert type scale was performed. After analyzing the T-tests for the differences of the means of the "high" and "low" groups some items were removed due to insignificant differences. The remaining items were analyzed for internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha. After careful analysis of the items by comparing T statistics of the means, the Alpha scores of reliability, positive and negative wording, and theoretical fit, ten items were chosen for each subscale.

Both the individual subscales and the total scale were then analyzed. The impact of subscale items on the total scale Alphas were taken into account in constructing the
final scale. *Alphas* ranged from the high .60s to the low .80s and the *Alpha* for the entire scale was over .85. At this point an orthogonal rotated factor analysis was conducted to examine how the items were related to each other. The process produced a final scale with *Alpha* scores of between .55 and .80 for the subscales and an *Alpha* of .85 for the summed scale. Final item selection decisions sometimes required a choice between statistical significance and theoretical appropriateness. When that problem occurred a subjective decision was made in favor of theory. Happily, the statistically significant items and identified factors were consistent with the theory guiding the development of the scale.

**A Second Item Selection With Gainesville Residents**

Many social scientists use students in developing attitude scales. This research could have ceased with the scale developed with the student group described above. However, further scrutiny revealed the need for an additional group because of little variation in “life experience”. Life experience consists of age, work experience, marriage and divorce, asset ownership, managing income, experiencing discrimination in the work place, etc. Revealing levels of discontent is dependent upon respondents recognizing women as an “out” group. I hypothesized that young students with little life experience were not likely to identify the same types of items as men and women with
more life experience. To address these shortfalls and reduce possible measurement error, I approached the Graduate School for a small grant to conduct item selection and analysis on a group of Gainesville residents.

In June of 1993, a second sample of 154 respondents was drawn from the Gainesville phone book. A list of random numbers was generated to identify page numbers, columns, and which name in the column to call. Respondents were offered $5.00 for the twenty minutes it took to respond to the refined list of 70 items if they refused. Several graduate students were paid $5.00 per interview plus travel expenses to enable respondents to participate either at their home or work. About half the respondents came to the author's office on campus.

More than 1800 phone numbers were generated and called to conduct 154 surveys used in the item analysis. Demographic information such as race, age, work experience, and party identification were gathered for each respondent. The item analysis sample was fairly representative as far as gender and party identification were concerned when compared with the monthly Consumer Attitude Survey conducted by the University. However, the item analysis sample was younger and more highly educated than the Consumer Attitude Survey sample.

The items were then analyzed in the same manner as the earlier analysis of the student respondents. The end product is a scale which developed items based on the
expertise of academics but left the selection of the items to a sample of men and women from the general Gainesville population. This group which had more variance in life experience chose a different set of items than did the student group. The combination of original item creation, exhaustive attention to the fit between theory and the criteria of statistical significance and reduction of error resulted in an improved scale to measure and understand feminist consciousness.

The Survey and Sample

The feminist consciousness scale items and the political participation questions were included in the November, 1993, Consumer Attitude Survey conducted monthly by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research's Survey Program at the University of Florida. The Survey Program has a 24 station computer assisted telephone interviewing system (CATI) survey operation staffed with a full time director and field director. The interviewing staff is primarily composed of undergraduates, along with a few graduate students and Gainesville residents. The survey utilizes the “CASES” telephone interviewing software developed at the University of California at Berkeley. Interviews are conducted Sunday evenings through Thursday evenings and daily Monday through Saturday.

The sample is a stratified random digit dialing design. There are four strata. Three of the strata cover three of
Florida's major metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs): Southeast Florida, Orlando, and Tampa-St. Petersburg. The fourth strata covers the remaining portions of the state. The telephone numbers are generated from a list of exchanges throughout the state. Therefore, a county with more exchanges is likely to make up a larger percentage of the fourth strata. The sampling frame for the survey is the calendar month with the ideal distribution of 250 surveys from each of the four strata. A total of 995 households were interviewed in the month of November, 1993. However, not every respondent answered all the questions asked, and in this sample 854 respondents answered all the questions pertaining to this research.

The number of callbacks are a factor in evaluating the quality and representativeness of a sample. In the Consumer Attitude Survey, respondents are called up to 10 times before the case is finalized. People who work more than one job, are temporarily away, or work at odd hours, may have different opinions than those easy to reach.

Data Analysis: Statistical Procedures Analyzing the Results of Feminist Consciousness and Political Participation Models

Levels of Feminist Consciousness

The model displayed in Figure 3-1 below is examined from several theoretical perspectives. First, the scale scores of the different subscales are summed and then
regressed against a wide range of potential explanatory variables. All responses to the scale items are in a Likert format ranging from 1 to 5. The items are a combination of positively and negatively worded statements, recoded such that a score of 1 suggested low consciousness and a score of 5 high consciousness.

Figure 3-1. A Model Of Factors Affecting Feminist Consciousness.

**INDEPENDENT VARIABLES**
- Race
- Education
- Employment Status
- Party Identification
- Urban Environment
- Marital Status
- Age
- Income
- Sixties Generation

**DEPENDENT VARIABLE**
- Levels Of Feminist Consciousness

The independent variables examined include sex, income, party identification, education, having a female as congressional representative, race, urban residence location, the “sixties generation” (respondents between the ages of 38 and 50), size of household, work status, retired, marital status, age, and support for the Clinton health care program (these are listed in no particular order). Additional regressions were performed on the individual subscales for some groups.
Political Activity

The dependent variable in the model displayed in Figure 3-2 below is a scale of political participation. Respondents were asked about their political participation in the past twelve months. The survey was conducted in November of 1993, thus participation in the 1992 presidential election and "the year of the woman" were included in the time frame. The participation question asked respondents if they had participated in such things as voting, giving money to a candidate or campaign, working for a candidate, attending meetings or participating in a demonstration or whether they didn't have the time or interest to participate. Respondents offered up to three different types of political participation. A four point scale of participation was created from the responses.

Figure 3-2. Model Of Factors Affecting Levels Of Political Participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Levels Of Political Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Consciousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties Generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton's Health Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These data were analyzed using multi-nomial probit. The same explanatory variables listed above were tested in this model along with the summed scale scores, the individual subscales and the interaction terms created from the various combinations of the subscales. In addition, some additional variables were created. A “high consciousness” variable was created from the top 25% of the summed scale scores.

Furthermore, various sub groups were examined. These included women and men, Republicans, Democrats, Independents, and several models based on Blacks and Hispanics were also explored. Models limited to specific age cohorts and income levels were also examined.

Research Hypotheses

Factors Affecting Levels of Feminist Consciousness

1. Respondents who are employed, better educated and have higher incomes will have higher levels of feminist consciousness. These respondents are more likely to be aware of women's issues.

2. Democrats will have higher levels of feminist consciousness than Republicans (due to the "gender gap" and the move to the Democratic party by many women).

3. Blacks will have higher levels of feminist consciousness. This is because of civil rights and extraordinary number of African American women in poverty.
4. Women will have higher levels of feminist consciousness than most men.

5. Men and women from the “sixties generation,” respondents between the ages of 38-50 will have higher levels of feminist consciousness. These respondents identified as the “sixties generation” were in their early teens and twenties during the 1960s. In addition many of these respondents have memories of the Civil Rights Movement, the early “Women's Movement” and the anti-war period.

Political Participation and Levels of Feminist Consciousness

1. Those displaying higher levels of feminist consciousness will have higher levels of political participation.

2. Income, Party membership, Education, Race, and Age will be the major predictors of political activity.

3. Democrats are likely to have an association between high level of feminist consciousness and higher levels of political participation due to the “gender gap.”

Sample Characteristics

Below are several tables which provide basic descriptive statistics of the Consumer Attitude Survey sample and the feminist consciousness scale. Table 3-1 provides some basic frequencies of the respondents by sex, race and ethnicity, party identification and marital status.
Table 3-2 provides the means and standard deviations for the sample based on age, education and household size. In addition, Table 3-2 provides the mean scores and the standard deviations of the discontent, collective orientation, withdrawal of legitimacy, and group identification subscales, as well as the summed feminist consciousness scale.

**Dependent and Independent Variables**

**Dependent Variables**

**Feminist consciousness.** Feminist consciousness scale scores, is a measure of the strength of feminist consciousness. The reader will remember that the feminist consciousness scale is comprised of four dimensions: group identification, discontent, withdrawal of legitimacy, and collective orientation. There are 8 items in the scale, with two items from each subscale displayed below in Figure 3-3. The feminist consciousness scale has a possible range from a low of 8 to a high of 40. Each sub-scale has a range between 2 and 10. Higher scale scores represent higher levels of feminist consciousness.

**Levels of political participation.** The other dependent variable is a scale which measures levels of political participation. The four-level scale measures political participation of various types, from no participation to
voting, voting plus one activity, and voting plus two additional activities.

Table 3-1. Consumer Attitude Survey Sample Respondent Characteristics in Percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE AND ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Non Hispanic</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY R FEELS CLOSEST TO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2. Consumer Attitude Survey Sample Means and Standard Deviations of Respondent Characteristics and the Feminist Consciousness Scale and Subscales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age Of Respondent</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>45.2641</td>
<td>18.2841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Level Of Education</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>13.6517</td>
<td>2.5684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean # Of Persons In House</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>2.4917</td>
<td>1.2912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCALE STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discontent</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>6.7713</td>
<td>2.2880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Of Legitimacy</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>6.3212</td>
<td>2.5828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Orientation</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>6.1465</td>
<td>2.2809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Identification</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>6.9953</td>
<td>2.2181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Consciousness</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>26.2344</td>
<td>6.5018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3-3 Feminist Consciousness Scale Items by Theoretical Dimension.

GROUP IDENTIFICATION
1. I identify closely with women as a group with special needs.
2. I vote for candidates who want to address woman's issues.

DISCONTENT
1. In general, women have as good a chance as men to get any job for which they are qualified?
2. The effort by women to organize in order to gain economic, social, and legal equality has gone far enough.

COLLECTIVE ORIENTATION
1. Women need to work individually to gain equal pay for comparable work, not as a group.
2. Women should organize, work together, and bring pressure as a group in order to have influence and get the things they want.

WITHDRAWAL OF LEGITIMACY
1. The federal government is paying too much attention to the needs and problems of women.
2. Women have an equal influence on what the government does

Group consciousness and social movement theory suggest that members of social movements engage in political activities as a result of higher levels of group consciousness (Miller et al., 1981).

Independent Variables

This research examines eleven different independent variables in its search to identify factors which influence levels of feminist consciousness and political participation. In the analysis of levels of political participation the feminist consciousness scale scores, as
well as the scores of each of the four individual components—discontent, group identification, withdrawal of legitimacy, and collective orientation—are included as independent variables in the probit analysis of levels of political participation.

**Income.** Income is the total income for the household from all sources. It is measured in seven ranges from under $10,000 to over $100,000. Higher levels of income have been identified with higher levels of voting. Therefore, it is hypothesized that levels of income will affect levels of participation. In addition income is examined for explanatory power in feminist consciousness models.

**Education.** Education is measured in increments of years from 0 to 16. This range covers primary through undergraduate college education. A value of 17 indicates some graduate education, while 18 indicates a graduate or professional degree. Education is treated as an interval variable in this analysis.

**Race.** Respondents are categorized as white, black, and of Hispanic origin. There are also two additional categories for race — Asian or Pacific Islander, and Other. There are very few respondents who chose categories other than Black, Hispanic or White. All respondents are asked if they are of Hispanic origin. White, Black and Hispanic are coded as "dummy variables" where a value of one is given to the category chosen, otherwise the value is zero. Race is included in this analysis to examine whether different races
or ethnic groups influence levels of feminist consciousness and political participation.

**Party identifiers.** Party indicates whether the respondent feels close to the Democratic or Republican party. In a similar manner as the race variable, respondents who feel close to one of the two major parties are coded as one for party member and zero if they are not.

**Closeness to the Democratic party.** Closeness to the Democratic party is a scale based on the strength of party identification. Respondents who identify themselves as either Democrats or Republicans are then “branched” to a follow-up question which gauges their strength of party identification as either a strong or weak partisan. Strong Republicans are coded as 1, Weak Republicans as 2, Independents as 3, Weak Democrats as 4, and Strong Democrats as 5.

**Married.** The marital status question has four possible responses, married, single, divorced/separated and widowed. Four “dummy” variables are created from this question. Respondents are coded as one for the category they choose and as zero for the others. The marital status of respondents is likely to influence levels of feminist consciousness and levels of participation. Therefore, if the respondent is currently married the variable takes on a value of one otherwise it is zero.

**Single.** If the respondent is currently single the variable takes on a value of one otherwise it is zero.
Divorced or separated. If the respondent is currently single the variable takes on a value of one otherwise it is zero.

Widowed. The values of widow are always zero to allow for variance within the categories.

Employed. Employed measures whether the respondent is employed or not. Respondents who are employed are more likely to be aware of women's issues in the work place. Moreover, this may be especially significant for women who work. As with other dummy variables respondents are given a value of one if employed and zero if they are not.

Percentage of income in relation to the United States poverty level. Poverty is a combination of census data which provides the official poverty thresholds for the year 1993 for families of different sizes and the level of household income reported by the respondent. The Poverty variable is calculated from the number of people living in the household in relation to the total household income from all sources. This variable is placed in the survey to examine the influence of living at different levels of the poverty threshold on levels of feminist consciousness and political participation. Previous research suggests that class can help explain levels of political participation and on feminist consciousness. Respondents living below the poverty level face many obstruction to participating in politics including difficulty in registering and finding
time to vote. Moreover, many of the families living in poverty are headed by women.

**Age.** Age is measured in years and ranges from 18 to over 90 and is treated as an interval variable. Increased age is a well known predictor of increased political participation. Similarly age and the accumulation of life experience is likely to influence levels of feminist consciousness. Issues. In addition to exploring the influence of age as an interval variable, several cohorts are examined including respondents 65 or over (old) and younger respondents under 30 (young).

**The sixties generation.** The age cohort variable is based on an age cohort of individuals, female and male, whose ages range from 39 to 51. These respondent are in their mid- to late teens and into their mid- to late 20s during the late sixties and early seventies. Jo Freeman (1975) discovered that women in this age group had high levels of discontent. This group also witnessed wide spread protest on a variety of issues, including civil rights, the Vietnam War and women's issues.

**Urban.** Urban is derived from census data and indicates that the respondent lives in an urban area as defined by the Census as a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Button (1989) identifies an Old South/New South dichotomy where New South communities, which are predominately urban, are more progressive. Urban dwellers in Florida have long been identified as more liberal than their rural counterparts.
An urban area may also offer better opportunities for communications on subject such as women's issues.

**Interviewer gender.** Interview gender is a dummy variable which represents the gender of the interviewer. Male interviewers are coded as a one; a zero is assigned for a female interviewer. This variable explores the possible influence of interviewer gender and its possible effect on responses to the feminist consciousness scale items and political participation.

**Clinton health care proposal.** A question on the survey asks respondents whether they supported the Clinton health care proposal. The questions uses a 5 point Likert type format, which is recoded so that a score of 5 indicates strong support and a score of 1 strong opposition.

The next chapter discusses the reliability and validity of the feminist consciousness scale.
CHAPTER 4
SCALE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

The findings presented in this chapter provide evidence that the attitude scale developed to measure levels of feminist consciousness demonstrates both reliability and validity. Reliability is discussed first, followed by validity. This chapter concludes with a review of measurement and this dissertation's contributions to the development of a better measure of feminist consciousness.

Reliability

When comparing the Alpha scores calculated for the feminist consciousness scale drawn from the item analysis sample with the Alpha scores calculated from the Consumer Attitude Survey sample, the scale demonstrates acceptable levels of reliability. The feminist consciousness scale (the summed feminist subscale scores) Alpha score from the Gainesville item analysis sample is .855 and .694 for the Consumer Attitude Survey sample. Nunnally (1978) set the threshold at .70, only slightly above the Alpha for the summed scale in the Consumer Attitude Survey sample and well below that of the Gainesville item analysis sample. Generally, studies with Alphas above .60 are considered reliable.
However, on one of the subscales, measuring collective orientation, there was an unexpected change in the reliability measures between the Gainesville item analysis sample and the Consumer Attitude Survey sample. Comparing the Alphas from the two samples, we find that in the Gainesville item analysis sample the two collective orientation items have the highest Alpha score and in the Consumer Attitudes Survey sample they have the lowest. A sizable proportion of the sample differed on the two collective orientations items. The first collective orientation item (V3) states “Women should organize, work together, and bring pressure as a group in order to have influence and get the things they want.” The second collective orientation item (V7) states “Women need to work individually to gain equal pay for comparable work, not as a group.”

Two hundred forty-one respondents went from “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” on item (V3) to a “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree” on item (V7). The difference in the response patterns for these two items is the primary cause of the lower Alpha coefficient in the Consumer Attitude Survey sample. I conclude that the item may be tapping attitudes toward organized labor. Florida, while not considered a true “Southern” state by most political scientists, is however, a “right to work” state. Another possible explanation is the tension between the “rugged individualism” that defines America's national consciousness
and the concept of collective action by a group. I believe the tapping of anti-labor attitudes to be the more plausible answer.

Table 4-1. Feminist Consciousness Scale and Subscale Alpha Coefficients. (# of items in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Gainesville Item Analysis Sample</th>
<th>Consumer Attitude Survey Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discontent</td>
<td>.667 (2)</td>
<td>.546 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Of Legit.</td>
<td>.731 (2)</td>
<td>.527 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Ident.</td>
<td>.754 (2)</td>
<td>.488 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Orient.</td>
<td>.793 (2)</td>
<td>.409 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Con. Scale</td>
<td>.855 (8)</td>
<td>.694 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in Chapter Three, the number of items greatly affects the Cronbach Alpha score of reliability. Generally, the more items in a scale or subscale, the higher the Alpha and therefore, the higher the reliability. Originally, this scale consisted of twenty items with each subscale having approximately five items. Unfortunately due to time constraints on the Bureau of Economic and Business Research Consumer Attitude Survey, a more compact scale was required. The drop in the Alphas from the Gainesville Item Analysis sample to the Consumer Attitude Survey sample is greatly influenced by the small number of items in each subscale (two). Having four or five items in each subscale would likely reduce the differences in the reliability coefficients between the Gainesville item analysis and Consumer Attitude Survey samples. In upcoming research on the Bureau of Economic and Business Research survey, an
additional collective orientation item will be added that will address this problem. Scale development does not offer any guarantees. The time involved in developing and constructing scales is an investment which increases our knowledge of measurement.

Validity

**Known Groups Validity**

The "known groups" validity test is used to test the validity of the scale developed for this research. Several hypotheses made in the research design described in the previous chapter lend themselves to testing the validity of the scale. The first hypothesis predicted that women would have higher feminist consciousness scores than men. This hypothesis is based on the belief that women will be more conscious of women's issues due to their objective membership as women. The results in Table 4-2 indicate that women do score significantly higher on the feminist consciousness scale and the individual subscales representing discontent, withdrawal of legitimacy, group identification, and collective orientation.

The second hypothesis predicted that Democrats would have higher levels of feminist consciousness than Republicans. In the early 1980s, women began to vote differently than men. This is commonly known as the "gender gap". Moreover, since
the early 1980s many women have moved to the Democratic party (Costain, 1992; McGlen and O'Connor, 1995).

Table 4-2. Difference of Means Tests for Feminist Consciousness Comparing Men and Women -- Consumer Attitude Survey Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>T stat.</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discontent</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With. Of Legit.</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>-7.63</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Ident.</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>-4.54</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll. Orient.</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>-4.99</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Con.</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>-9.30</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given this information, higher feminist consciousness scores were expected for Democrats. The results of the T-tests performed in Table 4-3 indicate there are significant differences between Democrats and Republicans on the feminist consciousness scale, as well as on three of the four subscales.

Table 4-3. Differences of Means Tests for Feminist Consciousness Comparing Democrats and Republicans -- Consumer Attitude Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republican</th>
<th>T-stat.</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discontent</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.0512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With. Of Legit.</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Ident.</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect. Orient.</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Con.</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor Analysis

In addition to the testing of the hypotheses on "known groups", a factor analysis was performed on the items from the Gainesville sample and another on the Consumer Attitude Survey sample. Initially, an orthogonal factor analysis was performed to identify and confirm the four dimensions of the attitude scale. Another orthogonal factor analysis was performed on the entire 853 Consumer Attitude Survey responses to the feminist group consciousness scale. In both tests the same four factors were identified. This second factor analysis provides further evidence that the scale developed to measure levels of feminist consciousness not only performs in the predicted manner, but also maintains its multidimensionality.

The results, displayed in Tables 4-4 and 4-5, are convincing given the sensitivity of factor analysis to scales with relatively few items, such as the one examined here. As in the reliability tests on the Consumer Attitude Survey sample discussed above, the collective orientation subscale exhibits a very significant factor identification in the item analysis sample; however, it falls off in the Consumer Attitude Survey factor analysis. Factor analysis, similar to Alpha scores, is very sensitive to the number of items. Therefore, the results of the Consumer Attitude Survey sample should be interpreted conservatively. Overall, the scale demonstrates excellent validity characteristics.
Table 4-4. Factor Analysis of Feminist Consciousness Scale Items -- Gainesville Item Analysis Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
<th>FACTOR 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With. Of Legit. 1</td>
<td>.48770</td>
<td>.35648</td>
<td>*.90251</td>
<td>.25473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With. Of Legit. 2</td>
<td>.43199</td>
<td>.49926</td>
<td>*.85014</td>
<td>.45619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontent 1</td>
<td>.39132</td>
<td>.22766</td>
<td>.46201</td>
<td>*.88903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontent 2</td>
<td>.05318</td>
<td>.55522</td>
<td>.22453</td>
<td>*.82423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll. Orient. 1</td>
<td>.39401</td>
<td>*.88277</td>
<td>.44874</td>
<td>.39521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll. Orient. 2</td>
<td>.59570</td>
<td>*.82635</td>
<td>.53298</td>
<td>.28196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Ident. 1</td>
<td>*.90790</td>
<td>.33236</td>
<td>.55824</td>
<td>.27141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Ident. 2</td>
<td>*.83566</td>
<td>.56077</td>
<td>.40068</td>
<td>.19042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 154

Table 4-5. Factor Analysis of the Feminist Consciousness Scale Items -- Consumer Attitude Survey Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
<th>FACTOR 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With. Of Legit. 1</td>
<td>.02819</td>
<td>.24673</td>
<td>*.84243</td>
<td>.00787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With. Of Legit. 2</td>
<td>.20011</td>
<td>.32072</td>
<td>*.49758</td>
<td>.41500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontent 1</td>
<td>.10646</td>
<td>*.75636</td>
<td>.22856</td>
<td>.04742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontent 2</td>
<td>.01161</td>
<td>*.82354</td>
<td>.10067</td>
<td>.13055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll. Orient. 1</td>
<td>.54382</td>
<td>.03520</td>
<td>.31091</td>
<td>*.45460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll. Orient. 2</td>
<td>-.00862</td>
<td>.11370</td>
<td>.00512</td>
<td>*.91910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Ident. 1</td>
<td>*.72017</td>
<td>-.02227</td>
<td>.35555</td>
<td>.07025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Ident. 2</td>
<td>*.82884</td>
<td>.16136</td>
<td>-.22251</td>
<td>-.05624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 853
Measurement - Conclusions

In concluding this discussion on measurement my only regret is that I have felt somewhat compromised by restricting the scale to only 8 items. With proper funding, a 20 item scale would provide an opportunity to capture the range of each subscale more completely and would likely lead to better measurement. Measurement in the social sciences has not kept pace with the innovations for analyzing the data gathered. It may not be as thrilling as the latest statistical technique, but measurement represents the first step in testing hypotheses drawn from theory. This dissertation advances measurement of women's issues, group consciousness, and the understanding of the outputs of social movements on the general public.

Original scale development is not without risks. Moreover, it is a demanding and time consuming process. Indeed, the scale development stage of this research took approximately 7 months. However, I strongly believe that the effort and time invested rewarded this project with improved measurement of feminist group consciousness.
CHAPTER 5
REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first section explains the statistical approaches used in the data analysis. The second section examines the findings concerning feminist consciousness. Finally, factors which affect levels of political participation are examined.

Strategy in the Data Analysis

This research casts a wide net in attempting to uncover which factors influence levels of feminist consciousness and to what extent levels of feminist consciousness influence political activity\(^1\). Previous research using the multidimensional model of group consciousness has not examined these links in depth. Moreover, none of the previous studies have used multivariate analysis. A wide variety of potential explanatory variables are examined with this in mind. The explanatory variables include socio-economic status (SES) characteristics such as sex, race, age, income, occupation, employment status, marital status, education, party identification, and political participation.

\(^1\) Because I am using an original attitude scale in this research, I will report variables with p-values up to .10.
**Group Consciousness**

In this dissertation, the scores of respondents on the attitude scale measuring levels of feminist consciousness are treated as an interval variable. A series of models are analyzed for the entire sample, as well as for sub-samples of female and male respondents, racial and ethnic groups, and party identification. Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression is used to analyze these data for the dependent variable, feminist consciousness\(^2\). Similarly, ordinary least squares regression is employed to analyze the individual feminist consciousness subscales\(^3\).

**Overall Results - Consumer Attitude Survey**

The mean feminist consciousness score for the Bureau of Economic and Business Research Consumer Attitude Survey Florida sample is 26.23. The scale has a range from a low of 8 to a possible high of 40. Several variables—being a woman, closeness to the Democratic party, living in an urban county, and increased levels of education—are linked to higher levels of feminist consciousness. As this is a feminist consciousness scale, it is not surprising that being a woman is associated with higher scale scores.

\(^2\) The coefficients reported are unstandardized. For a discussion of why unstandardized coefficients are preferable, see Gary King (1986) "How Not to Lie with Statistics: Avoiding Common Mistakes in Quantitative Political Science."

\(^3\) All of the data analysis in this research uses the SAS statistical software, version 6.08.
Urban environments are generally more liberal than rural areas; therefore, it is reasonable that respondents from urban counties are more likely to exhibit higher levels of feminist consciousness. Increased levels of education are linked, as well, with higher levels of feminist consciousness. This finding reinforces the theory that feminist consciousness is a cognitive psychological process. Age and income, while not significant explanatory variables, are important control variables in this analysis. Their lack of significance as explanatory variables indicates that levels of consciousness are broad based, not only among different age groups, but also across different household income levels. Therefore, further evidence exists that the attainment of feminist consciousness is likely a cognitive process and not necessarily related to variables such as household income or increased age.

Being interviewed by a male interviewer is significant and negatively affects reported levels of feminist consciousness. Respondents may feel that when being interviewed by a woman, they should exhibit a more liberal attitude and thus respond in a more positive manner so as to appear to be more conscious of women's issues. In addition, it is plausible that respondents who are interviewed by a male may try to appear more conservative. The analysis by gender below sheds some additional light on these possible explanations.
The “sixties generation” age cohort variable (which identifies respondents between the ages of 39 and 51) proved significant and indicates that respondents who were in their teens through late twenties in the very politically active period of the late sixties and early seventies exhibit higher levels of feminist consciousness. The significance of this variable fits well with similar research conducted by Freeman (1975) regarding a similar age cohort of women. However, these findings expand our understanding of the effect of this cohort. It finds that both men and women are positively affected regarding women's issues by having lived during these times.

When examining the entire Consumer Attitude Survey sample, marital status, employment status, and being African American or of Hispanic origin have no significant effect on levels of feminist consciousness. Taken together, these findings suggest that levels of feminist consciousness are broad-based and not dependent on factors such as age, income, employment status, race, ethnic background or marital status. On the other hand, education, an urban environment, closeness to the Democratic party, and membership in the “sixties generation” age cohort all increase the likelihood of higher levels of feminist consciousness. Education leads to more awareness of the world around us; the Democratic party is the home for most of the women's policy agenda; and urban areas not only in Florida, but across the nation, are generally more liberal
and offer women more opportunity to participate socially, economically, and politically.

Table 5-1. Regression Analysis of Feminist Consciousness Scale in the Consumer Attitude Survey Sample and the Samples of Women and Men. Entries are Unstandardized Coefficients from Ordinary Least Squares Regression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Gender</td>
<td>3.9145***</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4936)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0107</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0172)</td>
<td>(0.0223)</td>
<td>(0.0284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>-0.0472</td>
<td>-0.1064</td>
<td>-0.0311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0499)</td>
<td>(0.0711)</td>
<td>(0.0740)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>0.0981</td>
<td>-0.4739</td>
<td>1.0051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6014)</td>
<td>(0.7952)</td>
<td>(0.9632)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.2082**</td>
<td>0.4195***</td>
<td>0.0775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1010)</td>
<td>(0.1527)</td>
<td>(0.1371)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>1.1142**</td>
<td>0.9497</td>
<td>1.2641*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4922)</td>
<td>(0.6749)</td>
<td>(0.7272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty Level</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0009)</td>
<td>(0.0015)</td>
<td>(0.0012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>1.7962</td>
<td>1.6587</td>
<td>3.0872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1395)</td>
<td>(1.4062)</td>
<td>(2.2453)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.9426</td>
<td>0.5312</td>
<td>2.7207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0183)</td>
<td>(1.2116)</td>
<td>(2.1170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0.9864</td>
<td>1.0241</td>
<td>2.3561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2056)</td>
<td>(1.5363)</td>
<td>(2.2715)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-1.3989</td>
<td>-1.8048</td>
<td>-0.8555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8871)</td>
<td>(1.2757)</td>
<td>(1.2423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.3663</td>
<td>-0.3644</td>
<td>4.6618***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8981)</td>
<td>(1.1749)</td>
<td>(1.4882)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness To</td>
<td>0.8163***</td>
<td>0.8816***</td>
<td>0.7614***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>(0.1861)</td>
<td>(0.2529)</td>
<td>(0.2789)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties Generation</td>
<td>1.4734**</td>
<td>2.1759***</td>
<td>0.6802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6156)</td>
<td>(0.8361)</td>
<td>(0.9385)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Interviewer</td>
<td>-0.9652*</td>
<td>-0.5820</td>
<td>-1.3981**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4914)</td>
<td>(0.7089)</td>
<td>(0.6975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>13.1176***</td>
<td>19.0042***</td>
<td>16.3456***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.1947)</td>
<td>(2.6622)</td>
<td>(3.3479)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 651 455 384

ADJ. R SQ. 0.1587 0.0799 0.0480

* P < 0.10 ** P < 0.05 *** P < 0.01
(Standard Errors in Parentheses)
Women

The mean feminist consciousness score for women is 28.07 out of a possible high of 40. For female respondents, closeness to the Democratic party, increased education, and membership in the “sixties generation” age cohort are all significant and have independent effects on higher levels of feminist consciousness. The “gender gap” and viewing the Democratic party as the “home” of women's policy needs is again a useful way to interpret these findings. The relationship between higher levels of feminist consciousness and education suggests a cognitive link between the two. The male interviewer variable is not significant, indicating that women are not influenced by the sex of the interviewer.

Men

The mean feminist consciousness score for men is 24.06. When examining the Ordinary Least Squares regression analysis of the feminist consciousness scale score as the dependent variable, there are several significant explanatory variables. Closeness to the Democratic party, living in an urban county, and being a Black man all are positive and significant. Unlike the sub-sample of women, being interviewed by a male is significant for the men in the sample and has an independent negative effect on reported levels of feminist consciousness.
Subscale Analysis - Consumer Attitude Survey Sample

Group identification. The mean score for the group identification dimension is 6.99 out of a possible 10. Group identification relates to the degree to which the respondent identifies with the values and interests of feminism. The results displayed in Table 5-2 indicate that identifying with the Democratic party, being Black, and being a women are all positive and significant in the Ordinary Least Squares regression. Being interviewed by a male interviewer has a significant negative effect on higher levels of group identification being reported.

Collective orientation. The mean scale score for the collective orientation dimension is 6.17. This subscale has the lowest mean score of the four subscales for the Consumer Attitude Survey sample. The collective orientation dimension taps attitudes toward group activity when addressing women's issues. Being female is associated with higher levels of collective orientation. Living in an urban county and closeness to the Democratic party have independent effects on higher levels of collective orientation. Unlike the summed findings of the feminist consciousness scale, increased levels of household income are significant and negative. Being interviewed by a male interviewer has an independent significant effect on lower levels of collective orientation being reported.

The collective orientation dimension may also tap negative attitudes toward group action found in many
individuals with higher incomes. The "rugged individualism" persona of Americans may be at work in the minds of respondents from higher income households. Moreover, one of the collective orientation scale items addressed the idea of women working together as a group to win economic equality. It may be that respondents from higher income households are opposed to organized activities that could reduce their household incomes. They may also equate group activity on issues of equal pay with labor unions.

Being Black has a positive independent effect on higher levels of collective orientation as it relates to feminist consciousness. African-Americans may be more comfortable and familiar with the idea of collective, organized activity to address problems. Their recent social history as participants in the civil rights movement may help explain their higher levels of collective orientation.

Discontent. The mean scale score on the discontent dimension is 6.32. Discontent measures the degree to which respondents see feminists as members of the "out" group. Being a woman, having increased levels of education, and being divorced or separated all have independent effects on higher levels of discontent in the Ordinary Least Squares regression equation. Membership in the "sixties generation" age cohort also has an independent effect on higher levels of discontent, although only at the .10 significance level. Respondents of Hispanic origin have significant negative coefficients.
Table 5-2. Regression Analysis of Discontent, Withdrawal-of-legitimacy, Group Identification, Collective Orientation Subscales for the Consumer Attitude Survey Sample. Entries are Unstandardized Coefficients from Ordinary Least Squares Regression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Gender</td>
<td>1.4806***</td>
<td>1.2480***</td>
<td>0.5318***</td>
<td>0.6539***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1982)</td>
<td>(0.1765)</td>
<td>(0.1762)</td>
<td>(0.1802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
<td>-0.0012</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td>-0.0065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0069)</td>
<td>(0.0061)</td>
<td>(0.0061)</td>
<td>(0.0063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>-0.0060</td>
<td>-0.0527***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0200)</td>
<td>(0.0178)</td>
<td>(0.0178)</td>
<td>(0.0182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-0.2954</td>
<td>0.2393</td>
<td>0.1698</td>
<td>-0.0156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2415)</td>
<td>(0.2151)</td>
<td>(0.2147)</td>
<td>(0.2196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Income</td>
<td>0.1668***</td>
<td>0.0437</td>
<td>-0.0545</td>
<td>0.0521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0405)</td>
<td>(0.0361)</td>
<td>(0.0360)</td>
<td>(0.0368)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>0.2307</td>
<td>0.5781***</td>
<td>-0.0109</td>
<td>0.3163*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1976)</td>
<td>(0.1760)</td>
<td>(0.1757)</td>
<td>(0.1797)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>-0.0000</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>(0.0003)</td>
<td>(0.0003)</td>
<td>(0.0003)</td>
<td>(0.0003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>0.9157**</td>
<td>0.3039</td>
<td>0.2238</td>
<td>0.3526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.5367</td>
<td>-0.0701</td>
<td>0.2070</td>
<td>0.2689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0.6187</td>
<td>0.0592</td>
<td>0.2969</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-1.0055**</td>
<td>-0.7640**</td>
<td>0.4180</td>
<td>-0.0473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3563)</td>
<td>(0.3173)</td>
<td>(0.3168)</td>
<td>(0.3240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.4589</td>
<td>0.1406</td>
<td>0.7276**</td>
<td>0.9569***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3607)</td>
<td>(0.3212)</td>
<td>(0.3207)</td>
<td>(0.3280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness To Dem. Party</td>
<td>-0.0024</td>
<td>0.2552***</td>
<td>0.3070***</td>
<td>0.2565***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties</td>
<td>0.4103*</td>
<td>0.4834**</td>
<td>0.3090</td>
<td>0.2706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>0.2472</td>
<td>0.2201</td>
<td>0.2198</td>
<td>0.2248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.2134</td>
<td>-0.0495</td>
<td>-0.6310***</td>
<td>-0.4979***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>0.1973</td>
<td>(0.1757)</td>
<td>(0.1755)</td>
<td>(0.1795)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.6411</td>
<td>2.8377***</td>
<td>5.6152***</td>
<td>4.0234***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8814)</td>
<td>(0.7850)</td>
<td>(0.7838)</td>
<td>(0.8015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N           651  651  651  651
ADJ. R-SQUARE 0.1232 0.1206 0.0880 0.0877

* P<0.10  ** P<0.05  *** P<0.01
(Standard Errors in Parentheses)
Withdrawal-of-legitimacy. The mean scale score on the withdrawal-of-legitimacy dimension is 6.77. Withdrawal-of-legitimacy measures whether respondents see the group's plight as the fault of the individual or whether there are systemic reasons for the group's problems. Being a woman, urban county residency, closeness to the Democratic party, and respondents who are members of the “sixties generation” age cohort all have independent effects on higher levels of withdrawal-of-legitimacy. The male interviewer variable is not significant in this model.

Subscale Analysis for Women

The regression analysis for women on each of the subscales appear below in Table 5-3.

Group identification. The mean score for women on the group identification dimension is 7.13. Identifying closely with the Democratic party and being a member of the “sixties generation” age cohort are significant and positive. Respondents who are interviewed by a male interviewer have significantly lower scores.

Discontent. The mean scale score on the discontent dimension is 6.96. Increased years of education is the only variable below the .05 significance level with a positive effect. Several variables -- employed respondents, those of Hispanic origin, and African Americans -- have negative slope coefficients at the .10 significance level. Being interviewed by a male has an independent effect on higher
levels of discontent for women, but only at the .10 significance level.

**Collective orientation.** The mean scale score on the collective orientation dimension of the feminist consciousness scale is 6.51. Higher levels of household income are significant, but negative. Closeness to the Democratic party has a positive independent effect on higher levels of collective orientation for women. Living above the United States poverty level has a positive effect on levels of collective orientation, but at the .10 significance level.

**Withdrawal-of-legitimacy.** The mean scale score on the withdrawal-of-legitimacy dimension for women is 7.31. More education, respondents in the “sixties generation” age cohort, and closeness to the Democratic party all have significant independent effects on higher levels of withdrawal-of-legitimacy for the women in the sample.

**Subscale Analysis for Men**

**Group identification.** The mean score for men on the group identification dimension is 6.61. Identifying with the Democratic party and being an African American male are significant with positive coefficients. The effect of having a male interviewer on levels of group identification is significant and negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
<td>-0.0031</td>
<td>0.0093</td>
<td>-0.0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0089)</td>
<td>(0.0076)</td>
<td>(0.0079)</td>
<td>(0.0080)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>-0.0077</td>
<td>-0.0287</td>
<td>0.0087</td>
<td>-0.0787***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0285)</td>
<td>(0.0244)</td>
<td>(0.0252)</td>
<td>(0.0258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.5735*</td>
<td>0.1304</td>
<td>0.1633</td>
<td>-0.1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2861***</td>
<td>0.1067**</td>
<td>-0.0629</td>
<td>0.0896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed/Not Employed</td>
<td>0.0613</td>
<td>(0.0523)</td>
<td>(0.0541)</td>
<td>(0.0554)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0252)</td>
<td>(0.0244)</td>
<td>(0.0252)</td>
<td>(0.0258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Of</td>
<td>0.2189</td>
<td>0.3524</td>
<td>0.0671</td>
<td>0.3113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2708)</td>
<td>(0.2314)</td>
<td>(0.2393)</td>
<td>(0.2449)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.0000</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>0.0010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0061)</td>
<td>(0.0052)</td>
<td>(0.0055)</td>
<td>(0.0055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives In</td>
<td>0.6123</td>
<td>0.2949</td>
<td>0.3684</td>
<td>0.3829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5642)</td>
<td>(0.4822)</td>
<td>(0.4986)</td>
<td>(0.5103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>0.1910</td>
<td>-0.1373</td>
<td>0.1464</td>
<td>0.3311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4861)</td>
<td>(0.4155)</td>
<td>(0.4296)</td>
<td>(0.4397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty</td>
<td>0.4075</td>
<td>0.1508</td>
<td>0.4426</td>
<td>0.0230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6164)</td>
<td>(0.5269)</td>
<td>(0.5447)</td>
<td>(0.5575)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>-1.0776**</td>
<td>-0.6877</td>
<td>0.3097</td>
<td>-0.3491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5118)</td>
<td>(0.4375)</td>
<td>(0.4523)</td>
<td>(0.4629)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/ Separated</td>
<td>-0.8086*</td>
<td>-0.5437</td>
<td>0.3554</td>
<td>0.6324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4713)</td>
<td>(0.4029)</td>
<td>(0.4165)</td>
<td>(0.4263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.1910</td>
<td>-0.1373</td>
<td>0.1464</td>
<td>0.3311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4861)</td>
<td>(0.4155)</td>
<td>(0.4296)</td>
<td>(0.4397)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0.4075</td>
<td>0.1508</td>
<td>0.4426</td>
<td>0.0230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6164)</td>
<td>(0.5269)</td>
<td>(0.5447)</td>
<td>(0.5575)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.8086*</td>
<td>-0.5437</td>
<td>0.3554</td>
<td>0.6324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4713)</td>
<td>(0.4029)</td>
<td>(0.4165)</td>
<td>(0.4263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.0159</td>
<td>0.3287***</td>
<td>0.2750***</td>
<td>0.2938***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5118)</td>
<td>(0.4375)</td>
<td>(0.4523)</td>
<td>(0.4629)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness To Dem. Party</td>
<td>0.1014</td>
<td>(0.0867)</td>
<td>(0.0896)</td>
<td>(0.0918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0985*</td>
<td>0.7131**</td>
<td>0.5837**</td>
<td>0.2905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties</td>
<td>0.3354</td>
<td>(0.2867)</td>
<td>(0.2964)</td>
<td>0.3034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>0.4982*</td>
<td>-0.0202</td>
<td>-0.6554***</td>
<td>-0.4045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.2844</td>
<td>(0.2431)</td>
<td>(0.2513)</td>
<td>(0.2572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>2.5762**</td>
<td>4.7007***</td>
<td>6.5674***</td>
<td>5.1597***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>(1.0681)</td>
<td>(0.9130)</td>
<td>(0.9439)</td>
<td>(0.9661)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-SQUARE</td>
<td>0.0982</td>
<td>0.0791</td>
<td>0.0469</td>
<td>0.0681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<0.10    ** P<0.05    *** P<0.01
(Standard Errors in Parentheses)

**Discontent.** The mean scale score on the discontent dimension of the feminist consciousness scale is 5.61. This subscale has the lowest mean score for the men in the
sample. Being either divorced, married, or single are all significantly positive in the Ordinary Least Squares regression for the men. Being a widow is not significant. Being Hispanic is negative, but only significant at the .10 level.

**Collective orientation.** The mean scale score on the collective orientation dimension scale is 5.71 for the men. Closeness to the Democratic party is significant and has an independent effect on higher levels of collective orientation. Being an African-American male is significant and positive. Being interviewed by a male interviewer has a negative independent effect on levels of collective orientation.

**Withdrawal-of-legitimacy.** The mean scale score on the withdrawal-of-legitimacy dimension is 6.12. Living in an urban county and being a Black male are significant and have positive slope coefficients. Closeness to the Democratic party has a positive coefficient for the men, but is only significant at the .10 level.

**Summary of Subscale Analysis for Women and Men**

Women have higher levels of discontent and withdrawal-of-legitimacy. Moreover, the results of T-tests on the sample means of men and women (on the feminist consciousness scale, as well as on all of the subscales) indicate that significant differences exist. These findings are similar to research conducted by Jo Freeman (1975) and Gurin (1985).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0114)</td>
<td>(0.0106)</td>
<td>(0.0103)</td>
<td>(0.0106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
<td>0.0179</td>
<td>-0.0333</td>
<td>-0.0329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0297)</td>
<td>(0.0276)</td>
<td>(0.0269)</td>
<td>(0.0276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.0513</td>
<td>0.4464</td>
<td>0.1487</td>
<td>0.3586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3869)</td>
<td>(0.3598)</td>
<td>(0.3509)</td>
<td>(0.3593)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>0.0748</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>-0.0365</td>
<td>0.0306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0550)</td>
<td>(0.0512)</td>
<td>(0.0499)</td>
<td>(0.0511)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>0.2110</td>
<td>0.8273***</td>
<td>-0.1199</td>
<td>0.3457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2921)</td>
<td>(0.2717)</td>
<td>(0.2649)</td>
<td>(0.2713)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty Level</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>-0.0000</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/</td>
<td>2.0839**</td>
<td>0.6147</td>
<td>0.3040</td>
<td>0.0844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>(0.9018)</td>
<td>(0.8388)</td>
<td>(0.8179)</td>
<td>(0.8377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.8911**</td>
<td>0.3160</td>
<td>0.5134</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8503)</td>
<td>(0.7909)</td>
<td>(0.7712)</td>
<td>(0.7898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1.7825*</td>
<td>0.3377</td>
<td>0.3350</td>
<td>-0.0992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9124)</td>
<td>(0.8486)</td>
<td>(0.8275)</td>
<td>(0.8475)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.8990*</td>
<td>-0.7403</td>
<td>0.4705</td>
<td>0.3133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4990)</td>
<td>(0.4641)</td>
<td>(0.4526)</td>
<td>(0.4635)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.3370</td>
<td>1.3035**</td>
<td>1.5854***</td>
<td>1.4358**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5977)</td>
<td>(0.5560)</td>
<td>(0.5421)</td>
<td>(0.5552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness To</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
<td>0.1720*</td>
<td>0.3469***</td>
<td>0.2140**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem. Party</td>
<td>(0.0120)</td>
<td>(0.1042)</td>
<td>(0.1016)</td>
<td>(0.1040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties</td>
<td>0.3066</td>
<td>0.2208</td>
<td>-0.1265</td>
<td>0.2792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>(0.3769)</td>
<td>(0.3506)</td>
<td>(0.3419)</td>
<td>(0.3501)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.0689</td>
<td>-0.1065</td>
<td>-0.6104**</td>
<td>-0.6121**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>0.7201</td>
<td>3.9827***</td>
<td>6.1619***</td>
<td>4.4803***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>(1.7447)</td>
<td>(1.2508)</td>
<td>(1.2196)</td>
<td>(1.2491)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N  384  384  384  384  384  384  384  384
R-SQUARE  0.0139  0.0331  0.0621  0.0271

* P<0.10    ** P<0.05    *** P<0.01
(Standard Errors in Parentheses)

For men, having a male interviewer is a negative influence on levels of feminist consciousness, but is not significant for the women. One of the more interesting findings is that
African-American men have higher levels on the feminist consciousness scale than either Hispanic or White men in the sample. Blacks males also have significantly higher scores on the discontent, group identification, collective orientation, and withdrawal-of-legitimacy subscales.

**Party Identification and Levels of Group Consciousness**

In the Ordinary Least Squares regression analysis for the entire sample, being a woman has significant independent effects on feminist consciousness for Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. For Democrats and Republicans, having strong party identification is significant; however, for the Democrats, it is positive, while for the Republicans, it has a significant negative effect on levels of feminist consciousness. Higher levels of education have an independent effect for Democrats. Age and being a member of the “sixties generations” have independent significant effects on higher levels of feminist consciousness for Independents. Being an African-American has independent significant effects for both Independents and Republicans.

The results displayed in Table 5-5 suggest that party identification is an important factor in understanding levels of feminist consciousness. These findings also suggest that cognitive factors such as increased education and life experiences contribute to higher levels of feminist consciousness.
Table 5-5. Regression Analysis of the Feminist Consciousness Scale for Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. Entries are Unstandardized Coefficients from Ordinary Least Squares Regression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
<th>Independents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Gender</td>
<td>4.0972***</td>
<td>3.3545***</td>
<td>3.5263***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9176)</td>
<td>(0.7799)</td>
<td>(0.9719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.0358</td>
<td>0.0028</td>
<td>0.0796**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0294)</td>
<td>(0.0291)</td>
<td>(0.0343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>-0.0768</td>
<td>-0.0108</td>
<td>-0.1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0888)</td>
<td>(0.0826)</td>
<td>(0.0961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.5510</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
<td>0.9835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0623)</td>
<td>(1.0116)</td>
<td>(1.1160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.5412***</td>
<td>0.0843</td>
<td>0.1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1769)</td>
<td>(0.1751)</td>
<td>(0.1873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>-0.1663</td>
<td>1.1223</td>
<td>1.4050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8667)</td>
<td>(0.7693)</td>
<td>(0.9642)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td>-0.0000</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>(0.0018)</td>
<td>(0.0013)</td>
<td>(0.0020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/</td>
<td>0.7393</td>
<td>1.0002</td>
<td>2.1401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>(1.9378)</td>
<td>(1.8833)</td>
<td>(2.3575)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.5512</td>
<td>-1.0371</td>
<td>3.2746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.6125)</td>
<td>(1.6831)</td>
<td>(2.2603)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>-1.0991</td>
<td>-0.1835</td>
<td>3.6501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.9537)</td>
<td>(2.0899)</td>
<td>(2.4610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-2.9263</td>
<td>-1.7017</td>
<td>0.7206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.8422)</td>
<td>(1.2200)</td>
<td>(1.9282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.9240</td>
<td>7.2052**</td>
<td>6.2273***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1462)</td>
<td>(3.4047)</td>
<td>(1.9324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Party</td>
<td>1.9965**</td>
<td>-1.7236**</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifiers</td>
<td>(0.8713)</td>
<td>(0.7855)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties</td>
<td>0.5091</td>
<td>0.9362</td>
<td>2.7896**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>(1.0789)</td>
<td>(0.9940)</td>
<td>(1.1814)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-1.3714</td>
<td>-0.8652</td>
<td>-0.7446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>(0.8992)</td>
<td>(0.7691)</td>
<td>(0.9156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>15.5214***</td>
<td>16.6373***</td>
<td>12.7305***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.8694)</td>
<td>(3.8835)</td>
<td>(3.9231)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 197 244 183

R-SQUARE 0.1674 0.1777 0.1287

* P<0.10  ** P<0.05  *** P<0.01

(Standard Errors in Parentheses)
Table 5-6. Regression Analysis of the Feminist Consciousness Scale for Blacks and Hispanics. Entries are Unstandardized Coefficients from Ordinary Least Squares Regression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Gender</td>
<td>3.4823*</td>
<td>3.2726**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.9051)</td>
<td>(1.2547)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.0719*</td>
<td>0.1289**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0425)</td>
<td>(0.0573)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>-0.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1572)</td>
<td>(0.1372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>0.6103</td>
<td>5.1347***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.8564)</td>
<td>(1.8168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.1176</td>
<td>0.3295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2373)</td>
<td>(0.2425)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>-0.9219</td>
<td>1.6263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.7211)</td>
<td>(1.5876)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty Level</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>-0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0047)</td>
<td>(0.0036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>4.8119</td>
<td>-2.4657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.5617)</td>
<td>(1.6941)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2.0107</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.6954)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1.8627</td>
<td>-0.5941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.3982)</td>
<td>(1.6739)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness To Dem.</td>
<td>-1.1064</td>
<td>1.0249*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9215)</td>
<td>(0.5136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>4.6615**</td>
<td>1.8511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.2191)</td>
<td>(1.7466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties Generation</td>
<td>1.5971</td>
<td>1.5224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.7132)</td>
<td>(1.4536)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Interviewer</td>
<td>25.2630***</td>
<td>3.1433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.1752)</td>
<td>(6.2841)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N                          | 57              | 60               |
R-SQUARE                   | 0.1353          | 0.1879           |

* P<0.10                    ** P<0.05                    *** P<0.01
(Standard Errors in Parentheses)
Race and Ethnicity

The mean feminist consciousness scores for African Americans are significantly higher than for Whites or Hispanics. In the Ordinary Least Squares regression being a woman is significant for both Hispanics and Blacks. For African-Americans, increased age is a negative factor, while membership in the “sixties generation” age cohort has a positive independent effect on levels of consciousness. For Hispanics, closeness to the Democratic party, and being employed have independent effects on higher levels of feminist consciousness. The small sample sizes for these two groups reduces variance and therefore likely affects the regression results.

Levels of Political Participation

In these models, levels of political participation are regressed using multi-nominal probit regression against the set of variables described in Chapter Three, with level of political participation as the dependent variable. There are four possible levels of participation: no participation, voting, voting plus one activity and voting plus two additional activities. A series of models are analyzed for the entire sample, as well as for sub-samples of female and male respondents, African-Americans, Hispanics, Democrats, Republicans and Independents.
Overall sample. In the probit analysis of the entire Florida Consumer Attitude Survey sample, displayed in Table 5-7, feminist consciousness is not a significant independent variable. The significant variables which influence higher levels of political participation include increased age, higher income, more education, being either married, single or divorced, and being a member of either the Republican or Democratic parties. African-Americans and respondents who reside in urban counties are less likely to have higher levels of political activity. Opposition to the Clinton health care proposal has an independent effect on higher levels of political participation.

Women. Factors contributing to higher levels of political participation for the sub-sample of women include age, education, and income, as well as identifying with either the Republican or Democratic parties. Being either married or single also contributes to higher political activity. Living in an urban county negatively affects the levels of political participation. Increased levels of feminist consciousness is not a significant explanatory variable for the women in the Consumer Attitude Survey sample.

Men. Factors which contribute to higher levels of political participation for men include increased education and being a member of either of the two major political parties. Being an African-American has a negative independent effect on levels of political participation,
Table 5-7. Probit Analysis of Increased Levels of Political Participation for the Overall Sample, the Women and Men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Gender</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0967)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0094***</td>
<td>0.0115***</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0031)</td>
<td>(0.0041)</td>
<td>(0.0049)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>0.0201**</td>
<td>0.0255*</td>
<td>0.0169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0094)</td>
<td>(0.0135)</td>
<td>(0.0137)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-0.1674</td>
<td>-0.1693</td>
<td>-0.1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.1101)</td>
<td>(0.1485)</td>
<td>(0.1724)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.0988***</td>
<td>0.1131***</td>
<td>0.0869***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0202)</td>
<td>(0.0298)</td>
<td>(0.0285)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>-0.1637*</td>
<td>-0.3070**</td>
<td>-0.0368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0916)</td>
<td>(0.1273)</td>
<td>(0.1357)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0001)</td>
<td>(0.0002)</td>
<td>(0.0002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>0.5651**</td>
<td>0.4941</td>
<td>0.6408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.2217)</td>
<td>(0.2775)</td>
<td>(0.4053)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.6729***</td>
<td>0.7411***</td>
<td>0.6009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.1982)</td>
<td>(0.2422)</td>
<td>(0.3791)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0.6539***</td>
<td>0.8946***</td>
<td>0.4630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.2327)</td>
<td>(0.3007)</td>
<td>(0.4119)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.1093</td>
<td>-0.1535</td>
<td>-0.0292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.1627)</td>
<td>(0.2314)</td>
<td>(0.2342)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.3472**</td>
<td>-0.3178</td>
<td>-0.5725*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.1709)</td>
<td>(0.2198)</td>
<td>(0.3001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Identifiers</td>
<td>0.3630***</td>
<td>0.4149***</td>
<td>0.3204**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0959)</td>
<td>(0.1415)</td>
<td>(0.1328)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>-0.0889***</td>
<td>-0.0780</td>
<td>-0.1096**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0335)</td>
<td>(0.0494)</td>
<td>(0.0472)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>0.0089</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>0.0073</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
<td>0.0107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties</td>
<td>0.0896</td>
<td>0.1426</td>
<td>0.0302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>0.1136</td>
<td>0.1556</td>
<td>0.1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.0082</td>
<td>-0.1352</td>
<td>0.1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>0.0921</td>
<td>0.1344</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.2668***</td>
<td>-4.2990***</td>
<td>-3.9983***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.4489)</td>
<td>(0.5865)</td>
<td>(0.6669)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N  642  330  312

* P<0.10  ** P<0.05  *** P<0.01

(Standard Errors in Parentheses)
although the significance level is just beyond the usual .05 level at .0564. For men, opposition to the Clinton health care proposal has an independent effect on higher levels of political participation. The feminist consciousness variable is not significant for the men.

**Summary.** Opposition to the Clinton health care proposal has an independent effect on higher levels of political participation for the men, but not the women. Being Black and living in an urban environment favor higher levels of feminist consciousness. However, African-Americans and those living in urban counties are significantly less likely to engage in higher levels of political participation. These findings may help explain why there is a lack of fit between electoral strength and representation of those with higher levels of feminist consciousness.

**Subscale Analysis - Entire Consumer Attitude Survey Sample**

A separate model includes the sub-scales of the four dimensions of feminist consciousness. Generally, variables which were significant in the model examining the summed feminist consciousness scale are also significant in the subscale model. In addition, the discontent subscale has an independent effect on higher levels of political participation. The collective orientation variable is significant at the .10 level, but is negative.
Table 5-8. Probit Analysis of Levels of Political Participation for the Overall Sample, the Women and Men. -- Feminist Consciousness Subscales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Gender</td>
<td>0.0359</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0980)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0087***</td>
<td>0.0104**</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0031)</td>
<td>(0.0042)</td>
<td>(0.0050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>0.0166*</td>
<td>0.0209</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0095)</td>
<td>(0.0138)</td>
<td>(0.0139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Income</td>
<td>-0.1693</td>
<td>-0.1599</td>
<td>-0.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1105)</td>
<td>(0.1494)</td>
<td>(0.1731)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Income</td>
<td>0.0942***</td>
<td>0.1034***</td>
<td>0.0867***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0204)</td>
<td>(0.0306)</td>
<td>(0.0287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>-0.1771*</td>
<td>-0.3035**</td>
<td>-0.0725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0922)</td>
<td>(0.1277)</td>
<td>(0.1377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0022)</td>
<td>(0.1277)</td>
<td>(0.1377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>(0.0002)</td>
<td>(0.0002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>0.5294**</td>
<td>0.4622*</td>
<td>0.5725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2229)</td>
<td>(0.2790)</td>
<td>(0.4084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.6652***</td>
<td>0.7595***</td>
<td>0.5374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1989)</td>
<td>(0.2434)</td>
<td>(0.3820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0.6304***</td>
<td>0.8961***</td>
<td>0.3938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2333)</td>
<td>(0.3020)</td>
<td>(0.4156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.06517</td>
<td>-0.1023</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1641)</td>
<td>(0.2332)</td>
<td>(0.2371)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.2518</td>
<td>-0.2118</td>
<td>-0.5009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1743)</td>
<td>(0.2251)</td>
<td>(0.3030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>0.3575***</td>
<td>0.4095***</td>
<td>0.3111**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifiers</td>
<td>(0.0963)</td>
<td>(0.1422)</td>
<td>(0.1335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>-0.0753**</td>
<td>-0.0491</td>
<td>-1.066**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>(0.0344)</td>
<td>(0.0513)</td>
<td>(0.0483)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontent</td>
<td>0.0565***</td>
<td>0.0613**</td>
<td>0.0574*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0203)</td>
<td>(0.0285)</td>
<td>(0.0301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal-of-legitimacy</td>
<td>0.0242</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.0366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0238)</td>
<td>(0.0355)</td>
<td>(0.0329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>-0.0139</td>
<td>-0.0142</td>
<td>-0.0158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>(0.0217)</td>
<td>(0.0320)</td>
<td>(0.0306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>-0.0422*</td>
<td>-0.0516</td>
<td>-0.0327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>(0.0220)</td>
<td>(0.0321)</td>
<td>(0.0311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties</td>
<td>0.0853</td>
<td>0.1306</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>(0.1139)</td>
<td>(0.1564)</td>
<td>(0.1759)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.0558</td>
<td>-0.1823</td>
<td>0.0934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer</td>
<td>(0.0939)</td>
<td>(0.1374)</td>
<td>(0.1339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.0298***</td>
<td>-4.1762***</td>
<td>-3.7542***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.4607)</td>
<td>(0.5980)</td>
<td>(0.6864)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 642 330 312

* P<0.10  ** P<0.05  *** P<0.01
(Standard Errors in Parentheses)
Subscale Analysis for Women

The results of the model containing the four sub-education, and closeness to either the Democratic or Republican parties all have independent effects on higher levels of political participation. For women, being single, married, or divorced or separated also contributes to higher levels of political participation. Being a widow did not affect levels of political participation. Living in a urban county negatively affected higher levels of participation. Of the four sub-scales, only higher levels of discontent have an independent effect on higher levels of political participation.

Subscale Analysis for Men

The results for men, displayed in Table 5-8, which include the four sub-scales as independent variables, indicate that education, closeness to either the Republican or Democratic parties and higher levels of discontent have independent effects on higher levels of participation. Again, being African-American has an independent negative effect on levels of political participation. Closeness to either the Democratic or Republican parties have an independent effect on higher levels of political participation. Men who opposed the Clinton health care plan were more likely to participate at higher levels.
Table 5-9. Probit Analysis of Increased Levels of Political Participation for Blacks and Hispanics -- Feminist Consciousness Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Gender</td>
<td>0.9239</td>
<td>-0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5931)</td>
<td>(0.4190)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
<td>-0.0012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0124)</td>
<td>(0.0189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>-0.0334</td>
<td>-0.0215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0454)</td>
<td>(0.0398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-0.6868</td>
<td>-0.4764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4846)</td>
<td>(0.6006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.0710</td>
<td>0.0748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0723)</td>
<td>(0.0783)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>-0.3468</td>
<td>-0.0334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4410)</td>
<td>(0.4290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty Level</td>
<td>0.0041***</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0014)</td>
<td>(0.0010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>1.6293</td>
<td>1.3872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9965)</td>
<td>(1.2463)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.0713</td>
<td>0.1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.0030)</td>
<td>(1.2419)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1.6340*</td>
<td>0.2566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9314)</td>
<td>(1.3765)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness To Democratic Party</td>
<td>0.1837</td>
<td>-0.1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2893)</td>
<td>(0.1667)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Health Care</td>
<td>0.1495</td>
<td>-0.0054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1788)</td>
<td>(0.1540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
<td>-0.0214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness Scale</td>
<td>(0.0441)</td>
<td>(0.0466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties Generation</td>
<td>0.6949</td>
<td>-1.2620**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6339)</td>
<td>(0.5786)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Interviewer</td>
<td>0.5318</td>
<td>-0.2310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4933)</td>
<td>(0.4040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-8.9255***</td>
<td>-2.1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.6245)</td>
<td>(2.2904)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 48 48

* P<0.10  ** P<0.05  *** P<0.01

(Standard Errors in Parentheses)
Table 5-10. Probit Analysis of Increased Levels of Political Participation for Democrats, Republicans, and Independents – Feminist Consciousness Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
<th>Independents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Gender</td>
<td>0.3205</td>
<td>0.0286</td>
<td>0.1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1996)</td>
<td>(0.1580)</td>
<td>(0.1917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
<td>0.0100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0060)</td>
<td>(0.0057)</td>
<td>(0.0066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>0.0271</td>
<td>0.0033</td>
<td>0.0146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0184)</td>
<td>(0.0161)</td>
<td>(0.0193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-0.4399**</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
<td>-0.2921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2155)</td>
<td>(0.1971)</td>
<td>(0.2214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.0979**</td>
<td>0.0753**</td>
<td>0.1198***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0392)</td>
<td>(0.0345)</td>
<td>(0.0434)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>-0.8170***</td>
<td>0.1951</td>
<td>-0.0932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1851)</td>
<td>(0.1530)</td>
<td>(0.1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>-0.0000</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0003)</td>
<td>(0.0002)</td>
<td>(0.0003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>0.8971**</td>
<td>0.2331</td>
<td>0.8209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4282)</td>
<td>(0.3689)</td>
<td>(0.5378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/ Separated</td>
<td>1.2441***</td>
<td>0.4369</td>
<td>0.7160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3724)</td>
<td>(0.3271)</td>
<td>(0.5230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.5634***</td>
<td>0.1684</td>
<td>0.5328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4355)</td>
<td>(0.4073)</td>
<td>(0.5597)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.2212</td>
<td>-0.1160</td>
<td>-0.3146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3777)</td>
<td>(0.2394)</td>
<td>(0.4265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.2906</td>
<td>-0.5675</td>
<td>-0.3878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2348)</td>
<td>(0.8671)</td>
<td>(0.4264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>0.6832***</td>
<td>0.2527</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifiers</td>
<td>(0.1880)</td>
<td>(0.1568)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Health</td>
<td>0.0349</td>
<td>-0.0955</td>
<td>-0.0757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0770)</td>
<td>(0.0595)</td>
<td>(0.0668)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Con.</td>
<td>0.0388**</td>
<td>-0.0054</td>
<td>-0.0061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0152)</td>
<td>(0.0129)</td>
<td>(0.0143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>-0.0894</td>
<td>0.2201</td>
<td>0.1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2174)</td>
<td>(0.1966)</td>
<td>(0.2272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties</td>
<td>0.1061</td>
<td>-0.1917</td>
<td>0.0843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1857)</td>
<td>(0.1535)</td>
<td>(0.1802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>-6.3988***</td>
<td>-2.8967***</td>
<td>-4.3195***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.9418)</td>
<td>(0.8084)</td>
<td>(0.9316)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 191 236 175

* P<0.10  ** P<0.05  *** P<0.01

(Standard Errors in Parentheses)
Race and Ethnicity

Only a few variables prove significant in explaining why Hispanics and Blacks participate more. In the case of Hispanics, membership in the "sixties generation" age cohort have independent negative effect on higher levels of political participation. No other variables are significant for Hispanics. For Blacks, being single and above the poverty level are both positive. The feminist consciousness variable is not significant for Blacks or Hispanics. However, the slope is positive for African-Americans and negative for Hispanics. Again, it is unfortunate that the sample sizes for these two important groups were so small. Due to the small sample sizes and the further reduction of the cases used in the regression due to missing values these findings should be interpreted cautiously.

Party Identification and Political Participation

Due to the high levels of feminist consciousness and the consistent significance of closeness to the Democratic party, an examination of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents is warranted.

Variables which have an independent effect on higher levels of political participation for Democrats include education, strong party identification, higher levels of feminist consciousness, and being either married, single, or divorced (but not widowed). Being employed has an independent negative effect on levels of political.
Table 5-11. Probit Analysis of Increased Levels of Political Participation for Democratic Women and Men -- Feminist Consciousness Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Democratic Women</th>
<th>Democratic Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>0.0072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0073)</td>
<td>(0.0128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>0.0439*</td>
<td>-0.0080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0241)</td>
<td>(0.0384)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-0.6622**</td>
<td>0.0665*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2829)</td>
<td>(0.4187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.0756</td>
<td>0.1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0525)</td>
<td>(0.0678)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>-0.9619***</td>
<td>-0.7355**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2406)</td>
<td>(0.3321)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty Level</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0004)</td>
<td>(0.0007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>1.1228**</td>
<td>0.9978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5212)</td>
<td>(0.9683)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.4030***</td>
<td>1.6433*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.4591)</td>
<td>(0.8573)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1.8683***</td>
<td>1.5386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5460)</td>
<td>(0.9459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.3789</td>
<td>0.6395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.5599)</td>
<td>(0.5602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.3530</td>
<td>0.3040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3105)</td>
<td>(0.4960)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness To Democratic Party</td>
<td>0.7118***</td>
<td>0.7870**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2464)</td>
<td>(0.3424)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Health Care</td>
<td>-0.0927</td>
<td>0.1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1043)</td>
<td>(0.1430)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td>0.0496**</td>
<td>0.0183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0207)</td>
<td>(0.0247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Consciousness Scale</td>
<td>0.0851</td>
<td>-0.5042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2841)</td>
<td>(0.4373)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties Generation</td>
<td>1.4860</td>
<td>-0.0794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2517)</td>
<td>(0.3222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Interviewer</td>
<td>-5.6583***</td>
<td>-6.8171***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1486)</td>
<td>(1.6394)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 123 68

* P<0.10  ** P<0.05  *** P<0.01

(Standard Errors in Parentheses)

participation for Democrats. Residing in an urban county, again, negatively influences levels of political activity.
The only significant variable for the Republicans and Independents is education. While the feminist consciousness variable has a significant independent effect for Democrats, it is not significant for either Republicans or Independents, and the slope is negative in both cases.

Gender and Partisanship

Democrats. Higher household income, strength of identification with the Democrats, higher levels of feminist consciousness, and being either married, single or divorced all have independent effects on higher levels of political activity for female Democrats. Being employed has an independent negative effect on levels of political participation for women. Again, as above, living in an urban county has a negative effect on levels of political activity.

The levels of political activity for male respondents who identify with the Democratic party are positively influenced by higher levels of education, strong party identification, and being married. Employment was not significant for the men, however the slope is positive. This is a significant difference for the Democratic men and women. It suggests that employment may hinder women from participating at higher levels of political participation. The feminist consciousness variable is not significant, but the sign of the slope coefficient is positive. Residing in
a urban county has a negative independent effect on levels of participation.

Table 5-12. Probit Analysis of Increased Levels of Political Participation for Republican Women and Men -- Feminist Consciousness Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Republican Women</th>
<th>Republican Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0018 (0.0080)</td>
<td>0.0104 (0.0088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>0.0089 (0.0237)</td>
<td>-0.0008 (0.0242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-0.1364 (0.2755)</td>
<td>0.0539 (0.3108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.0615 (0.0596)</td>
<td>0.0652 (0.0448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>0.3532 (0.2366)</td>
<td>0.0480 (0.2306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty Level</td>
<td>-0.0004 (0.0004)</td>
<td>0.0001 (0.0003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>0.1730 (0.4664)</td>
<td>0.0866 (0.7205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.5267 (0.4158)</td>
<td>0.1323 (0.6505)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0.6860 (0.5738)</td>
<td>-0.2042 (0.7247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.5494 (0.3489)</td>
<td>0.2853 (0.3557)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-6.7120 (13819.1)</td>
<td>-0.1483 (1.1717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness To Republican Party</td>
<td>0.4050* (0.2366)</td>
<td>0.1385 (0.2252)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Health Care</td>
<td>0.0276 (0.0851)</td>
<td>-0.2293** (0.0893)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td>-0.0276 (0.2877)</td>
<td>0.0221 (0.2845)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness Scale</td>
<td>(0.0184) (0.2001)</td>
<td>(0.0194) (0.2903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties Generation</td>
<td>(0.2001) (0.2877)</td>
<td>(0.2903) (0.2845)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Interviewer</td>
<td>-0.4566* (0.2397)</td>
<td>0.0157 (0.2159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.3307** (1.0734)</td>
<td>-2.9988** (1.2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<0.10 ** P<0.05 *** P<0.01

(Standard Errors in Parentheses)
Table 5-13. Probit Analysis of Increased Levels of Political Participation for Independent Women and Men -- Feminist Consciousness Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Independent Women</th>
<th>Independent Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.0336***</td>
<td>-0.0114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0119)</td>
<td>(0.0103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>0.0583</td>
<td>0.0082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0375)</td>
<td>(0.0273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>0.0254</td>
<td>-0.8384**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3663)</td>
<td>(0.3427)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.1307*</td>
<td>0.1393**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0710)</td>
<td>(0.0662)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>-0.4833</td>
<td>0.4703*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.2964)</td>
<td>(0.2841)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of Poverty Level</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0010)</td>
<td>(0.0004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>0.9916</td>
<td>1.1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.7114)</td>
<td>(1.2792)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.9044</td>
<td>0.6533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6954)</td>
<td>(1.2422)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1.3560*</td>
<td>-0.0590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8016)</td>
<td>(1.2244)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.7135</td>
<td>-1.1799*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6839)</td>
<td>(0.6263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.7059</td>
<td>-1.9230**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.6048)</td>
<td>(0.7844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Health Care</td>
<td>-0.2204*</td>
<td>0.0255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.1208)</td>
<td>(0.0921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td>-0.0290</td>
<td>0.0118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consciousness Scale</td>
<td>(0.0238)</td>
<td>(0.0198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties Generation</td>
<td>0.3541</td>
<td>-0.0803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3438)</td>
<td>(0.3449)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Interviewer</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>0.4406*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.3199)</td>
<td>(0.2574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.9907***</td>
<td>-4.2248**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.3027)</td>
<td>(1.6402)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 74                      101

* P<0.10                     ** P<0.05                     *** P<0.01
(Standard Errors in Parentheses)

Republicans. For female Republicans, stronger party identification has significant independent effects on higher
levels of political participation. Being questioned by a male interviewer has significant negative effect on reported levels of participation. For men, opposition to the Clinton health care proposal has an independent effect on higher levels of political participation. The feminist consciousness variable is insignificant for both men and women; however, the slope of the effect is positive for the men, but negative for the women.

Independents. For Independent women, age, education, and being single all have significant positive effects on levels of political participation. Opposition to the Clinton health care plan has a positive effect. Independent men are positively affected by higher levels of education and living in an urban county. The significant negative factors include being employed, being Black or Hispanic. Interviewer gender has an independent effect for the men.

Conclusions on Levels of Political Participation and Group Consciousness

A link exists between levels of feminist consciousness and levels of political participation for those who identify with the Democratic party. While the feminist consciousness variable is not significant for the entire sample or for the men or women, the discontent dimension proved significant in all of these models in the subscale analysis. These results fit nicely with previous research which identifies the Democratic party as the principal base of support for
feminist issues. This research suggests that the women identifying with the Democratic party who have higher levels of feminist consciousness are more likely to be more politically active than others.

There are several variables, including being African-American, a member of the “sixties generation” and living in an urban environment, which are consistently significant in the Ordinary Least Squares regression analyses of feminist consciousness. The significance of these same variables is quite different in the probit analyses of levels of political participation. For instance, the “sixties generation” is significant for Hispanics and is negative. In all the other models the “sixties generation” variable is not significant. Being Black and living in an urban environment are significant in many of the political participation models, but the effect on levels of political participation is negative. Another troubling finding for Democratic women is the negative effect that being employed has on higher levels of political participation. These variables may provide insight into the missing links between levels of feminist consciousness and political participation and are discussed in detail in the next chapter.

The next chapter draws together the theory, method, and research results discussed in Chapter Two, Chapter Three, Chapter Four, and Chapter Five. Finally, Chapter Six offers suggestions for future research on feminist consciousness, the women's movement, and social movements.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

This chapter compares the research goals and the theoretical basis of the research hypotheses with the results reported in Chapters Four and Five. First, it examines the tests for reliability and validity of the feminist group consciousness scale developed for this project. Second, the models designed to test the various research hypotheses found in Chapter Three are examined and the results discussed. It then draws conclusions about the relationship between feminist consciousness and political participation, followed by a review of these conclusions and their implications for social movement theory. In closing, this chapter reviews the contributions of this research and presents a research agenda for the future.

Measurement - Scale Development, Reliability, and Validity

The research results reported in Chapter 4 demonstrate that the attitude scale developed to measure levels of feminist consciousness is both reliable and valid.

Reliability. The research results reported in Chapter Four indicate that the scale developed for this dissertation meets acceptable levels of reliability. The feminist consciousness Alpha score from the Gainesville item sample is .855 and .694 for the Consumer Attitude Survey Florida
sample. Generally studies with Alphas above .60 are considered reliable and published widely.

**Validity.** Results of the “Known-Groups” validity tests confirm the scale's validity. The hypothesized relationships of groups within the Consumer Attitude Survey sample are supported. In addition to the “known-groups” tests, a factor analysis was performed on the Gainesville item sample and again on the Consumer Attitude Survey sample. The results of these factor analyses provide further evidence that the scale not only performs in the predicted manner, but also maintains its multidimensionality.

**Factors Explaining Levels of Feminist Consciousness**

In this dissertation, the respondents' scores on the feminist consciousness scale have been treated as interval variables. A series of models were analyzed for the entire sample as well as for sub-samples of female and male respondents, Blacks and Hispanics, and for different party identifications. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression was used to analyze these data for the dependent variable made up of the summed feminist consciousness scores. Similarly, Ordinary Least Squares regression was used to analyze the individual subscales -- “group identification”, “withdrawal of legitimacy”, “discontent”, and “collective orientation”. The mean level of feminist consciousness for the Consumer Attitude Survey sample is right around the midpoint of the scale at 26.24. Overall, the Ordinary Least
Squares regression of these data suggest that feminist consciousness was affected by cognitive factors such as education and life experiences. Simply put, education leads to more awareness of the world around us; the Democratic party is the “home” for most of the policy agenda of women; and urban areas (not just in Florida, but across the nation) are generally more liberal and offer women more opportunities to participate socially, economically, and politically. Factors such as being a woman, being a member of the “sixties generation” age cohort, and being an African-American are extremely important links to higher levels of feminist consciousness. The research hypotheses regarding feminist consciousness are now reviewed and discussed.

**Hypothesis I.** The first hypothesis predicted that respondents who were better educated, employed, and had higher levels of income would have higher levels of consciousness. Income was not a significant explanatory variable. Education was significant in most of the models examined. Employment status was not significant. The significance of education is an indication that the acquisition of higher levels of feminist consciousness is a cognitive process. The fact that employment status was not significant indicates that being employed is not a determining factor in having higher levels of feminist consciousness. I originally thought that those who were employed might be more aware of women's issues. The type of
employment may be important, and may have implications for future research. The fact that income was not a significant variable indicates that levels of feminist consciousness are not influenced directly by income. This implies that feminist consciousness is a broad-based phenomena, cutting across class lines.

**Hypothesis II.** The second hypothesis predicted that Democrats would have higher levels of feminist consciousness than Republicans. Not only did Democrats have significantly higher levels of feminist consciousness, but the degree of closeness to the Democratic party was highly significant in much of the multivariate analysis. This suggests that the degree of partisan consciousness had an independent effect on higher levels of feminist consciousness (see section on future research regarding the possible effect of ideology on this relationship). These findings suggest that the Democratic party and its issue positions may attract those who have high levels of feminist consciousness.

**Hypothesis III.** The third hypothesis suggested that Blacks would have the highest levels of consciousness. Blacks do have higher levels of consciousness than either Whites or Hispanics. African-American heritage had a significant positive effect on higher levels of feminist consciousness in many of the models examined. African-American males may have higher levels of consciousness due to the Civil Rights Movement and the plight of many Black women and children who live in poverty. They may also
recognize the double whammy faced by women of color: racism and sexism by White men and women. In previous research conducted by Gurin et al. (1980), Blacks were found to have the highest levels of group consciousness. It appears that they not only have a strong sense of their own group but of feminist group consciousness too. The results of this study also find that African-Americans have the highest levels of feminist consciousness.

**Hypothesis IV.** The fourth hypothesis predicted that women would have higher levels of consciousness than men. Women consistently displayed significantly higher levels of consciousness. Moreover, gender was highly significant in every multivariate model which included it as an independent variable. In examining the mean scale scores of men and women, women did have statistically significantly higher scores; however the difference was relatively small. This suggests that men are not far behind women when it comes to feminist consciousness or possibly that women are not that far ahead.

**Hypothesis V.** The fifth hypothesis predicted that respondents who are members of the "sixties generation" age cohort would have higher levels of feminist consciousness. The "sixties generation" cohort was significant in the multivariate analysis of the entire sample, women, and Blacks. The "sixties generation," those whose age is currently 39 to 51, represents a cohort of individuals who have experienced the rapid social change of the 1960s.
These changes included the civil rights movement, the women's movement, the anti-war movement, and the early environmental movement. These "life experiences" have had an effect on how this group views women's issues.

The significance of the "sixties generation" variable fits well with earlier research conducted by Jo Freeman (1975), who found that women had higher levels of discontent and withdrawal-of-legitimacy. Although the studies are 20 years apart and the questions, sample, and methodology different, the findings reported here indicate that women continue to have higher levels of discontent and withdrawal of legitimacy than men. Moreover, the results of T-tests on the Consumer Attitude Survey sample means of men and women on the summed feminist consciousness scale, as well as all the sub-scales, indicates that significant differences still exist. Similarly, Gurin's (1985) study of gender consciousness discovered significant differences between levels of consciousness between men and women. While differences persist, it is encouraging that men are not too far behind. It will be interesting to see how and if these relationships change in future research using this scale.

An important finding was the significance of living in an urban county. Respondents from urban counties were more likely to exhibit higher levels of consciousness. Urban environments in Florida are generally more liberal and offer increased opportunity for communication than rural areas.
Feminist Consciousness and Levels of Participation

At the beginning of this dissertation, I drew attention to the apparent lack of fit between theories of representation and the political position of women and their issues in the United States today. I argued that this lack of fit might best be understood by exploring the levels of feminist consciousness surrounding women's issues and their relationship to levels of political participation.

This research increases our understanding of the linkage between levels of feminist consciousness and levels of political participation. By moving beyond the process of voting, and employing a more sophisticated multivariate analysis, this study suggests that a relationship exists between levels of feminist consciousness and higher levels of political participation.

The relationship between levels of feminist consciousness and political participation suggests that for some respondents, higher levels of consciousness have an independent effect on higher levels of political participation, while for others it does not. The findings of the probit analysis of levels of political participation are consistent with previous general research in this area.

The resources of political participation. Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) describe certain "resources" as consistently associated with higher levels of electoral participation. Among these resources are increased income, education, and experience. While the importance of income
and education are widely acknowledged, some discussion of experience is needed. The concept of life experience is well documented in the political participation literature (see Campbell, Converse, Miller, and Stokes, 1960; Verba and Nie, 1972; Conway, 1991; Rosenstone and Hansen, 1995). Recent research by Rosenstone and Hansen suggests that "experience" is a multifaceted concept for which they offer two specific hypotheses which are of interest in analyzing these data. First, they argue that "life experience" results in Americans generally becoming more involved in American politics. The authors explain that as people age they acquire other resources, such as higher incomes and education which increase the likelihood of increased participation (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993, pp. 133-137). Individuals become socialized to the political process, personalities, issues, and political parties. Simply put, as people age they gain more information, political and social skills (p. 137). Another hypothesis related to experience they identify as "generational". The "generational" explanation suggests that individuals who reach maturity during critical periods of high social and political activity, are more likely to participate in electoral politics (p. 139). The "sixties generation" cohort used in this research offers an opportunity to examine Rosenstone and Hansen's generational hypothesis.

The findings in this research fit well with the effect of resources identified by Rosenstone and Hansen on
political participation. Income, formal education, and life experience are consistently significant in the models examined. These data indicate that the "sixties generation's" participation rates were significantly less than younger respondents and about the same as older respondents. The feminist consciousness variable was significant only for Democrats. The research hypotheses presented in Chapter Three are now discussed.

**Hypothesis I.** The first hypothesis predicted that those with higher levels of feminist consciousness would participate in politics at higher levels. While levels of feminist consciousness were not significant for overall sample, women, or men, the slope coefficient for the feminist consciousness variable was positive in all cases. It is important to remember that women's issues are just one set of issues affecting political participation.

**Hypothesis II.** The second hypothesis predicted that income, party membership, education, race, and age would be the major factors affecting higher levels of political participation. The results of the probit analysis support this hypothesis. These findings are similar to many previous studies such as Verba and Nie (1972) and Rosenstone and Hansen (1993).

**Hypothesis III.** The third and final hypothesis predicted that Democrats with higher levels of feminist consciousness would participate in politics at higher levels. Scholars have linked the Democratic party with the
interests of the women's movement since the early 1980s (McGlen and O'Connor, 1995). For Democrats, higher levels of feminist consciousness had an independent effect on higher levels of political participation. Unfortunately for the Democrats, being employed had a negative independent effect on higher levels of political participation. In today's economy it is quite common for women to work. Women who work and have children face the lingering problem of "dual role." "Dual role" means that women are both workers outside the home and also primary care givers. Moreover, even in households where both the man and woman work full time, the women does most of the unpaid labor in the home (Okin, 1989). The growing number of female headed households amplifies this problem of "dual roles." This is an important finding which sheds new light on the linkage between economics, partisanship, feminist consciousness, and higher levels of political participation.

These data suggest that the Democratic party is the "home" for women's issues and its members are more likely to have higher levels of feminist consciousness. These results suggest that for Democrats in Florida a strong causal relationship exists between levels of feminist consciousness and higher levels of political participation.

The problems of small samples. One nagging problem in the analysis of the subsamples was sample size. Obviously this was a problem for the Blacks and the Hispanics: however, similar problems were encountered when examining
the different partisan identities. The feminist consciousness variable was significant for all Democrats, controlling for gender. However, it was not significant for Democratic men. The most plausible explanation is that as the number of cases was reduced some of the variance was lost resulting in the feminist consciousness variable not being significant for the Democratic men. I truly appreciate the value of a large sample and the increased variance it provides. I was fortunate that only two months before my survey the BEBR decided to double its monthly Consumer Attitude Survey sample.

The missing links. In the final analysis, there is a lack of fit between factors influencing feminist consciousness and political participation. These findings may help explain why levels of feminist consciousness were not significant in the probit analysis of levels of political participation. Three variables which were consistently significant and positive in the regression analysis of factors affecting higher levels of feminist group consciousness -- being African-American, living in an urban environment, and membership in the sixties generation -- have a negative or are not significance in the probit analysis of levels of political participation. Being Black and living in an urban area have significant negative effects on level of political participation, and membership in the sixties age cohort has no significant affect. This
is exactly the opposite effect of these factors in the Ordinary Least Squares regression of feminist consciousness. Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) also found that the "generational" explanation did not fit with their findings (p. 140). These same authors also suggested that the participation rates of Blacks have fallen over the past twenty years (pp. 219-223). In the past, many urban areas were very politically organized and contact with party representatives likely. Most of Florida's urban areas are relatively young and don't fit the "machine style" politics of older urban centers. Finally, the negative significance of employment for Democratic women may suggest that the "dual role" problem which many working women face may effect their ability to participate in politics at higher levels. Moreover, single women with dependent children may be even more constrained in their ability to participate in such things as voting, campaigns, contributing money, attending rallies, etc. Regardless of the explanation, this lack of fit between factors influencing feminist consciousness and political participation may partially explain the representation and policy deficits faced by women in Florida.

So What

Social movement theory. In Chapter Two, I offered a multi-level theoretical framework which synthesizes elements found in different theoretical approaches to social
movements. This theoretical framework acknowledges the multidimensionality of power, social movements, and group consciousness by suggesting that different theoretical approaches have a role to play in forming a more complete understanding of social movements and political change. Instead of a single lens through which one examines an isolated element of a social movement such as the organization or the role of the government, this framework allows for a wide angle or panoramic view of a social movement. It allows us to view the organization, its resources, the political process, the ideological bonds among "core group" members and the impact of a social movement on the mass public.

This powerful lens not only allows this wide angle perspective, but also provides for depth of field to understand how time effects a movement, its members, and the public. Finally, this lens allows us to zoom in on each of the strengths of the different theories without losing sight of the total picture.

This research has moved the theoretical linkage between group consciousness and social movements well beyond relative deprivation and resource mobilization (Gurin, 1985). Moreover, it has suggested a new place for group consciousness theory to reside -- new social movement theory. The results relating to party identification, feminist consciousness, and higher levels of political participation have provided valuable new insights into the
relationship between politics and social movements. Understanding social movements is central to understanding when, how, and why a society changes the way it behaves.

The research design used in this dissertation provides scholars interested in the psychological and ideological factors of members and non-members a method of empirically demonstrating and interpreting those elements: the multidimensional concept of group consciousness, attitude scale construction, and modern telephone survey methods. Social scientists and social movement theorists now have a tool with which to examine the relationship between issue based groups and their levels of political participation.

New social movement theory suggests that new social movements are made up of “core members” and supporters who coalesce on one issue and may disagree on others. New social movement theorists recognize the challenge of identifying “core members” who may not belong to an organization or pay dues. The findings reported suggest that higher levels of feminist consciousness have an effect on levels of political participation and offers new social movement theorists a tool to help identify and understand core members. I argue that those individuals with higher levels of feminist consciousness, which has an independent effect on higher levels of participation, may indeed be illusive “core members.”

On the other hand, there are Republicans and Independents who have high levels of feminist consciousness
but are not likely to translate their consciousness into higher levels of political participation. These data indicate that Independents had significantly higher mean scores on the political participation scale. However, the probit analysis suggests that major party identification increases the likelihood of higher levels of political participation. In addition, there are also those individuals in the mass public -- such as non-Democratic women, African-Americans, members of the "sixties generation" age cohort, and urban dwellers -- who exhibit higher levels of feminist consciousness but do not exhibit higher levels of political participation. I suggest that their higher level of group consciousness represents the "outputs" or success of the women's movement on the mass public.

Therefore, the concept of group consciousness is a useful tool with which to understand not only the general impact of social movements, but also to identify "core members" by analyzing the relationship between levels of group consciousness and levels of political participation. As the level of feminist consciousness increases in the general public along with the number of those who are influenced to participate at higher levels, the gap between representation and electoral advantage should narrow. These predictions can only be validated with the passage of time and by repeating this study.
Social scientists. This dissertation provides an attitude scale which measures levels of feminist consciousness without using loaded or distorted symbols. Group consciousness theory will provide a powerful tool to examine and understand the increasingly important psychological dimension of politics. With attention to measurement and access to funding, this area of social psychology is very likely to attract the interest of more political scientists.

In conclusion, the contributions of this dissertation are improved measurement, increased understanding of the relationship between group consciousness, feminist group consciousness, and levels of political participation. Moreover, it draws attention to issues of measurement and their importance, not only for social scientists who report their findings in academic journals, but also what effect poor measurement may have on the public who is more likely to read or see public opinion data reported in the media.

Politicians and activists. For politicians and policymakers the message is that women's issues are salient. Democrats should pay close attention to the linkage between high levels of feminist consciousness and closeness to the Democratic party, and keep women's issues out in front. Democratic Candidates seeking office in Florida have additional information regarding the likelihood of enlisting support and help from those with higher levels of feminist consciousness. Republicans, on the other hand, who want the
support of women and individuals who are likely to have higher levels of political participation should consider women's issues as a means to attract both.

The women's movement should keep the pressure on the Democrats. They now have data that suggests that higher levels of feminist consciousness are associated with higher levels of political participation. Most importantly for Democrats and women's groups are the findings regarding the lack of fit factors which have a positive effect on group consciousness, but act differently in the analysis of political participation. First, there is the urban environment which has an independent positive effect on feminist consciousness, but a negative effect on higher levels of political participation. Second, there is a similar situation for Blacks in the Florida sample. Finally, there is the "sixties generation," again a dominant positive variable in the feminist consciousness analysis, but an insignificant factor on higher levels of political participation. Politicians and Women's groups should concentrate on turning these positive influences on feminist consciousness into positive influences for higher levels of political participation. They should also try to figure out ways to include women who work into higher levels of politics and more importantly make sure they get to the polls.

Women's groups should be encouraged by the finding reported in this dissertation. First, when "hot buttons"
are avoided, support for women's issues emerges. Second, these data suggest that for some Democrats there is a link between high levels of feminist consciousness and higher levels of political participation. Finally, supporters of women's issues should consider forming a new organization which would avoid the aforementioned "hot buttons," such as abortion and take advantage of consensus where it exists.

Future Research

While a causal link between political participation and levels of feminist consciousness has been identified for Democrats, the explanatory power of the model was not overwhelming. However, the slope coefficients for the feminist consciousness scale were consistently positive. Future research may further demonstrate the strength of the effect of feminist consciousness on political participation.

Interviewer gender. One potential bias in research such as this is the effect of the gender of the interviewer on responses. In many of the models which examined feminist consciousness respondents with male interviewers reported lower levels of feminist consciousness. As a field director for a major survey this is troubling. As a social scientist, I wonder how often the effect of interviewer gender has been missed in other studies?

Questions not asked. One reason for the low amount of explained variance is directly related to unasked questions. The Consumer Attitude Survey of the Bureau of Economic and
Business Research collects a wide array of demographic information. However, there are several important questions that, if asked, might have affected the results of this research. First, the important relationship between religion, feminist consciousness, and participation could not be explored. Second, questions about why people are motivated to vote, not vote, or more importantly, to engage in activity beyond voting could not be directly addressed. Third, it would be beneficial to ask respondents about several policy issues, including some which have been identified as women's issues. Ideally, a survey with three or four policy issues would enrich our understanding of the relationship between policy and political participation. Fourth, more precise information on the household composition, including information on dependents, their ages, and sources of support is equally important in a study such as this. Fifth, future research should examine the type of jobs in which respondents are employed. Sixth, there should be an effort to determine ideological positions and the values of respondents (especially Democrats), to check for a possible spurious association between partisanship, higher levels of feminist consciousness and higher levels of political participation. Finally, future research should include some variables related to the concepts found in new social movement theory. These variables would help expand our understanding of the relationship between group consciousness and social
movements, specifically their outputs and identification of "core members."

**The qualitative difference.** Asking why an individual scores high or low on a scale would really fill in some gaps about our understanding group consciousness and social movements. Including a qualitative sub-sample will not only provide "the qualitative difference," but complement and inform about the findings observed by both methods. Finally, expanding the number of items in the scale would likely improve both reliability and validity.

**Myths, symbols, and measurement.** Lance Bennett (1980) suggests that differences of opinion on social and economic issues can be linked to people believing in different myths. If he is right, the creation of these myths is an important area for social scientists to examine. In concluding this project, I was struck by the fact that I increasingly believe that public opinion has become much more than just a tool for political scientists and a means for the media to report how people feel about the issues of the day. I believe that we have reached a point in American society where the reporting of public opinion is actually shaping public opinion. I would argue that the media now plays an important role in what and how opinions are formed by the public, not just through the reporting of the news, but also through the reporting of public opinion. As the American public increasingly relies on the lens of public opinion to understand how it feels about issues, social scientists and
especially the media must be careful to insure that what is reported is done properly and not just news worthy.

I suggest that we as social scientists re-double our efforts to understand what we know and how we know it. For the social scientist, measurement is a logical place to begin. If we are to fully assume our responsibilities as political scientists, we must pursue and measure "the moving target of truth" to the best of ability. Simply put, there are "no short cuts to progress."
APPENDIX

Feminist Consciousness Scale Items and Questions Used in the Consumer Attitude Survey, November, 1993

Feminist Group Consciousness Scale Items

Introduction. Now I would like to ask you some questions about the roles of men and women in society. I would like you to respond to each statement by using a 5 point scale where 1 is Strongly Agree; 2 is Agree Somewhat; 3 is Undecided; 4 is Disagree Somewhat; and 5 is Disagree Strongly.

Interviewer instructions. INTERVIEWER MAY NEED TO REMIND RESPONDENT OF MEANING OF EACH CHOICE. THIS IS EASILY DONE BY EITHER IDENTIFYING THE END POINTS OF THE SCALE OR CONFIRMING THE NUMBER THEY GIVE YOU WITH ITS MEANING.

Withdrawal-of-Legitimacy No. 1
>VL< The federal government is paying too much attention to the needs and problems of women.
Discontent No. 1
> V2< In general, women have as good a chance as men to get any job for which they are qualified?

Collective orientation No. 1.
> V3< Women should organize, work together, and bring pressure as a group in order to have influence and get the things they want.

Discontent No. 2.
> V4< Women have an equal influence on what the government does.

Withdrawal-of-Legitimacy No. 2
> V5< The effort by women to organize in order to gain economic, social, and legal equality has gone far enough.

Group Identification No. 1
> V6< I vote for candidates who want to address woman's issues.

Collective Orientation No. 2.
> V7< Women need to work individually to gain equal pay for comparable work, not as a group.
Group Identification No. 2
>V8< I identify closely with women as a group with special needs.

Political Participation Questions
>V9< Have you participated in politics in the last year or so, by doing such things as voting, contributing money to a candidate or party, working on a campaign, or attending a rally or demonstration? Or did you not have the time or interest to participate in politics?

<1> Has not had the time
<2> Has not had the interest
<3> Neither time or interest
<4> voting
<5> gave money to a candidate or party
<6> worked on campaign
<7> attended rally or demonstration
<8> other political activity
<-8> Don't know
<-9> N/A

>V10< Was there another way you participated?

>V11< Was there another?
Policy Question

>HLT1< What is your opinion about President Clinton's Health Care Plan? Do you strongly favor, somewhat favor, somewhat oppose or strongly oppose this plan?

Independent Variable Questions

>XI< The next set of questions I have will help us analyze your answers along with the answers of others.

Are you currently married, separated, divorced, widowed or have you never been married?

>Y1< What is the highest grade of school or year in college you yourself completed?

<0> None........0  <10> High School 10
<1> Elementary 01  <11> High School 11
<2> Elementary 02  <12> High School 12
<3> Elementary 03  <13> College......13
<4> Elementary 04  <14> College......14
<5> Elementary 05  <15> College......15
<6> Elementary 06  <16> College......16
<7> Elementary 07  <17> Some Graduate School
<8> Elementary 08  <18> Graduate/Prof. Degree
<9> High School 09

<-8> Don't know
<-9> Not available

>Z1< What race do you consider yourself?

INTERVIEWER, IF NECESSARY READ CHOICES.

<1> White [goto Z3]
<2> Black [goto Z3]
<3> Asian or Pacific Islander [goto Z4]
<4> American Indian [goto Z4]
<5> Other [goto Z2]
<6> Multi-racial or mixed race
<-9> Not available [goto Z4]
>Z2< And what would that be? [allow 12]

===>

>Z3< Are you of Spanish or Hispanic origin?

<1> Yes
<2> No
<-8> Don't know
<-9> Not available

===>

>Z4< Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or what?

<1> Republican [goto Z4A]
<2> Democrat [goto Z4B]
<3> Independent [goto AA1]
<4> Other party [goto AA1]
<5> No preference [goto AA1]
<-9> Not available [goto AA1]

===>

>Z4A< Would you consider yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?

<1> Strong
<2> Not very strong
<-8> Don't know
<-9> Not available

=== [goto AA1]

>Z4B< Would you consider yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?

<1> Strong
<2> Not very strong
<-8> Don't know
<-9> Not available

===>

>AA1< Are you currently employed outside the home?

<1> Yes [goto AA2]
<2> No
<-9> Not Available [goto EE1]

===>
>FF1< In 1993, was your total household income, from all members and all sources, before taxes less than $25,000 or more than $25000?

  <1> Less than $25000 [goto FF2]
  <2> More than $25000 [goto FF5]
  <-9> Not Available [goto GG1]

  ===>

>FF2< Was it less than $20,000?

  <1> Yes [goto FF3]
  <2> No [goto GG1]
  <-9> Not Available [goto GG1]

  ===>

>FF3< Was it less than $15,000?

  <1> Yes [goto FF4]
  <2> No [goto GG1]
  <-9> Not Available [goto GG1]

  ===>

>FF4< Was it less than $10,000?

  <1> Yes
  <2> No
  <-9> Not Available

  === [goto GG1]

>FF5< Was it more than $35,000?

  <1> Yes [goto FF6]
  <2> No [goto GG1]
  <-9> Not Available [goto GG1]

  ===>

>FF6< Was it more than $45,000?

  <1> Yes [goto FF7]
  <2> No [goto GG1]
  <-9> Not Available [goto GG1]

  ===>
>FF7<  Was it more than $75,000 ?

  <1> Yes [goto FF8]
  <2> No [goto GG1]
  <9> Not Available [goto GG1]

====>

>FF8<  Was it more than $100,000 ?

  <1> Yes
  <2> No
  <9> Not Available

====>
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