LABOR EDUCATION IN AMERICA

Kenneth D. Carlson

Rutgers University

An analysis of the educational practices of nonschool groups such as labor unions provides an opportunity for comparisons with schools. The goals, methodology, and content of nonschool organizations can be contrasted with those of the schools to ascertain areas of conflict and compatibility, as well as relative effectiveness.

An investigation of trade union education programs can be used by teachers to check the image of labor unions which they are presenting to their students. The study may suggest a necessity for revisions in the treatment of labor in social studies syllabi and in the teaching materials used in conjunction with the syllabi. The study may serve to enlighten social studies teachers about the availability of union education materials for use as primary sources in teaching about organized labor.

The legislative enactment of collective bargaining rights for teachers in a growing number of states makes it desirable that teachers and their organizational leaders have a knowledge of the operations by which other organizations have realized their goals under collective bargaining rules. This study supplies a knowledge of some of these operations.

The study can provide insights into the educational rationale of trade unions which may be of service to students of education, sociology, political science, or industrial relations. It may constitute a model for the analysis of other forms of social and leadership education.

The findings and conclusions of the study might be used by unions in evaluating and improving their educational function. The study also has significance for educators who will be assisting in the development and implementation of union education programs.

General Nature of Labor Education

Labor education reflects American trade unionism, which in turn reflects American culture. The pragmatic, materialistic, selfish, anti-intellectual, anti-aesthetic, and anti-humanitarian nature of American culture pervades organized labor and its education programs (Abbott, 1962; Bacon, 1962). Labor education, then, is not ideological. Rather, what Eby (1965) said of American trade unionism is also true of labor education: it was born out of Gomperism and pragmatism, not Marxism and Fabianism. The social

unionism of the thirties, expressed in the education programs of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the Ladies' Garment Workers, Brookwood Labor College, the Rand School, and the Wisconsin School for Workers, was only an interlude in the business unionism dominant throughout most of United States history (Taft, 1963).

Unions now operate "without questioning the ultimate capitalistic nature of the economy and with no grandiose plan for overhauling existing institutions [Cohen, 1957, p. 139]." This acceptance of capitalism prevails at all levels of organized labor. Walter Reuther was an ardent champion of capitalism (Brandon, 1959; Widick, 1964, pp. 188-189); most top labor leaders are even stronger supporters of the system. Labor's secondary leaders, too, "are firmly committed to the support of a capitalistic mode of production [Peck, 1963, pp. 296-297]." Since they have profited less from the system, the rank-and-file may feel less enthusiasm for capitalism; still, capitalism receives at least their acquiescence (Kornhauser, 1961; Walker & Guest, 1952).

It is not surprising that labor education echoes the pro-capitalism of business unionism. As the syllabus of a summer workshop for unionists indicates (Kerrison & Levine, 1960, pp. 139-145), capitalism is a subject for endorsement in labor education programs, not a subject for discussion.

Leadership Training

Business unionism puts the same stress on organizational concerns that business enterprises do. Union leaders and business leaders subscribe to the same categorical imperative: act so as to promote the survival and growth of the organization (Blau, 1956). Consequently,

> the central concern of workers' education, which of course reflects the way the labor movement views its vital interests, has necessarily been the effective and efficient functioning of the union [Barbash, 1955, p. 93].

In practice, this most often means leadership training. To a major extent, labor education is the training of the unions' lower level officers (Kerrison, 1951; Linton, 1965; Mire, 1956).

A reason frequently given for the stress on officer training is that it is necessary if union officers are to compete successfully with their college-trained counterparts in management. About one out of every seven college students is a business administration major, preparing for a career in the business community (Beirne, 1962; Clark, 1962). The facilities of higher education are not so lavishly extended in the training of union officers. Thus, most of this training is undertaken by the unions themselves (Mire, 1956).

The priority which unions give to leadership training is also justified by the increasing complexity of union affairs. As unions involve themselves

in more areas of their members' welfare, the tasks that the leaders must perform and coordinate increase in both number and subtlety. Issues are more intricate and techniques of resolution more sophisticated. Contracts, for example, provide ever more refined benefits and rights, complicating both the negotiation of the contracts and the settlement of grievances arising from them.

The training that union officers receive is in keeping with the pragmatic nature of business unionism. It consists of such tool subjects as speaking, writing, parliamentary procedure, union administration, contract negotiation, and grievance settlement. That is, labor education consists of "very little education and a sizable chunk of training and information [McCollum, 1962, p. 42]." Union schools and institutes have become almost exclusively trade schools (Widick, 1964). The Ladies' Garment Workers Union Institute is so practical that trainees are taught to overcome localized accents and dress (Kerrison & Levine, 1960).

Stewards' manuals are a simple method of leadership training. These typically enumerate specific behaviors which stewards should and should not perform. Union locals sometimes have training classes which accomplish or supplement the function of the manuals. For officers above the rank of steward, training is commonly carried out in conferences and summer camps. These are conducted on an inter-local and sometimes inter-union basis.

Much of the training of union officers is conducted through university extension classes, although the recommendation made by Counts and Brameld that colleges and universities create full-scale degree granting departments of workers' education for training union officers (Kerrison, 1951) has not been implemented. In addition, labor institutes are held on university campuses. This cooperation between unions and universities has often been strained, however. Unions are suspicious of universities. They see them as middle class enclaves which service the business community. They know about the prevalence of businessmen on university boards of trustees. They question the objectivity (or perhaps the direction of the bias) of university teachers. These misgivings are not allayed by the university administrators who propose establishing labor education programs within schools of business administration. Even when unionists are sure the university does not intend to undermine labor, they doubt whether the university can understand and meet labor's needs (Kerrison, 1951).

For their part, universities are sometimes reluctant to undertake labor education because they think this will make them collaborators of a pressure group. They worry about their objectivity and whether they will be able to maintain it and still meet the expectations of their labor clients. Universities worry about programs becoming biased, while labor worries about them being diluted (Kerrison & Levine, 1960). London (1962)

proposed another reason for the universities' lack of enthusiasm. The service function of the university, he avers, is ignored in favor of teaching and research functions. Only when large consulting fees are involved does the university concentrate on its service role.

Another problem experienced by universities in their attempts at union leadership training is the shortage of suitable instructional materials, a problem which has also plagued nonuniversity conducted leadership training. Reading materials are often too complicated or do not cover the desired ground (Barbash, 1955; Gould, 1962). Even when appropriate reading materials are available, there is not always a carefully planned use of them. Films have been found inappropriate or have been inappropriately used. In recent years, steps have been taken to overcome the materials obstacle. For example, the University of Chicago developed written materials and guides for teachers, and Roosevelt College in Chicago acquired films and developed film catalogs and discussion guides (Barbash, 1955).

Evaluation is another weakness of leadership training programs, as it is of all functions of labor education (Kerrison, 1951; Kerrison & Levine, 1960; Liveright, 1962; Mire, 1956). Typically, no attempt or only a perfunctory attempt is made to determine how successful a program was in accomplishing its objectives.

The efforts of leadership teachers to gear their presentations to the interests and abilities of their audience have partly compensated for these weaknesses. The Union Leadership Academy at Rutgers administered an extensive battery of tests to increase the relevance of its efforts (Kerrison & Levine, 1960). To keep the attention of their audiences, leadership teachers usually employ a lecture-discussion method. They also adjust their vocabularies to the backgrounds of the students. These devices may sound like good teaching methods under any circumstances, but in union leadership training programs a great effort is made to practice them. Because of this attention to effective teaching methods, Kerrison (1951) remarked that "workers' education has maintained a close relationship with progressive education and educators [p. 97]."

There were several attempts made in recent years to liberalize the education of union officers, but the casual observer can easily be misled by this. The attempts were well publicized precisely because they were exceptions to the rule. Many, if not most, were foundation sponsored and were conducted through universities. This makes it difficult to gauge the extent of the unions' commitment to them. Actually, experience has shown that unions are not concerned with liberal education (Allen, 1962; Gould, 1962). At least one union publicly disclaimed responsibility for the general education of its membership (Kerrison & Levine, 1960). The total number of unionists involved in liberal education projects constitutes a minuscule proportion of the union officers in America; some of the projects were

doomed to a poor response even before they began operating. They were designed to be sequential programs extended over a period of years (for examples, see Bacon, 1962; Kerrison & Levine, 1960), and since the programs were intended for union officers, only the students who managed to retain both their union posts and their educational motivation could reap the benefits.

Loyalty Building

Next to officer training, the greatest emphasis in labor education is on developing rank-and-file loyalty to the union. Loyalty is usually construed to mean participation in the business of the union and support for the policies of the union's leaders. The loyalty-building function of labor education is under constant pressure as various forces operate to diminish the loyalty of union members. Among these forces are prosperity, industrial harmony, workers' aspirations, bureaucracy, the mass media, and the schools.

Of these, prosperity has probably had the most debilitating effect on member loyalty. In a sense, unions succeeded too well in economically advancing their members. Now unions must compete for the attention of their members with distractions which the unions themselves made possible. Many of today's workers live in suburbia, have the surburban orientation toward leisure (Spinrad, 1964), and can afford to pursue more leisure-time activities. Added to the economic gains which workers enjoy through union membership are gains in security. Increased personal security means decreased dependence on organizations, including the union. As dependence on the union decreases, loyalty also decreases, for to a considerable degree that loyalty derives from a feeling of need (Raskin, 1966).

While it is true that for most workers the union was never a way of life (Linton, 1965; Sayles & Strauss, 1953), at one time it was a community of friends engaged in a common struggle for survival and dignity. Today it is more likely to be viewed by its members as a service agency (Magrath, 1959). This is especially so for the younger workers, whose loyalty is not deepened by personal recollections of the early organizing and bargaining battles. The battles have become less frequent and less dramatic. Where once war was the natural order, there is now diplomacy. Contracts are negotiated for longer periods and resolve more routine issues. Union leaders are still wary of being co-opted by management (Lipset, 1962; Miller & Form, 1964), but they are also more adept at treading the line between co-optation and cooperation.

This industrial harmony has dichotomous results. It lessens the workers' loyalty to the union and increases their loyalty to the company. The phenomenon of dual and diluted loyalty is widespread. "Research evidence supports the generalization that dual loyalty is the rule rather than the

exception [Miller & Form, 1964, p. 424]." The more amenable the working condition and the more paternalistic the employer, the greater is the workers' loyalty to the company. (On the effect of working conditions, see Blauner, 1964; on the effect of paternalism, see Purcell, 1954.) It should be noted, however, that there is some evidence indicating that job satisfaction also tends to increase the amount of participation in union affairs (Spinrad, 1960).

The aspirations of workers constitute another force which affects loyalty to the union. These aspirations generally decrease with age. Insofar as union participation, as an index of loyalty, increases with age (Fitch, 1957; Kyllonen, 1951; Attitudes, 1966), there is a negative, or at least a curvilinear correlation between aspiration and participation. The younger worker, envisioning his elevation into a nonlaboring class, will consider his relationship with the union a temporary one and feel a loyalty congruent with that perception. Riessman (1955) suggested that the psychodynamics of aspiration can work in the opposite direction, i.e., that aspiration to escape the working class actually increases union participation. The fact of age-related participation, however, indicates that generally this is not the case.

Union growth and bureaucratization are also inimical to loyalty. It is difficult for a worker to feel much loyalty to the international when it is "but a shadowy, though perhaps powerful, organization far in the background [Seidman, London, Karsh, & Tagliacozzo, 1958, p. 7]." In addition, the working class often feels uncomfortable when confronted with the impersonality of a bureaucracy (Riessman, 1955).

Unions, in their attempts to develop loyalty, must also deal with the influence of the mass media. The mass media have long been considered unfair to organized labor (Linton, 1965; Peck, 1963; Sultan, 1963). Labor gets less media coverage and less favorable media coverage than that given to business. Mass entertainment reflects this discrimination by consistently presenting nonlaboring culture heroes (Mills, 1948). This means that workers are caught in cross-pressures, coming on one side from other members of the working class and on the other side from the upper classes who control the mass media. These cross-pressures can create an enervating confusion which keeps loyalties tentative. (For a further discussion of the concept of cross-pressures, see Riessman, 1955.)

The schools in America are also considered to be anti-union (Linton, 1965; Reuter, 1962). Since at least as early as 1923, organized labor has been concerned with the treatment it receives in school textbooks (Berelson, 1952). Labor's fears were recently confirmed in studies (Doherty, 1964; Scroggins, 1966) which found that textbooks being used in the American public schools are biased against labor. Moreover, the supplementary materials which schools use were also found to have an anti-labor bias (Linton, 1965).

The foregoing discussion of the forces inhibiting loyalty to the union should help one to understand the emphasis which unions place on the loyalty-building function of labor education. Of course, the forces which inhibit loyalty also reduce the workers' receptiveness to the unions' loyalty-building efforts. Furthermore, there are forces which undermine the efforts which the union does make. The union press is the most common means used to promote loyalty, but anti-intellectualism is a prominent feature of the working class (Miller & Riessman, 1964); the worker who reads risks ostracism (Linton, 1965). In addition, many workers cannot read well enough to cope with union publications. Workers also have relatively little familiarity with education, or perhaps too great a familiarity with its demoralizing possibilities. Thus, they do not embrace things associated with education.

Union efforts to build loyalty are often ineffective because of their own deficiencies. Many union publications reflect an indifference to the reading level of the audience for whom they are intended. And while union publications often overestimate the reading level of union members, they sometimes underestimate the members' sophistication. The propaganda is not always subtle, especially when it concerns the leaders' images. The tributes paid to the leaders can be quite unctuous and leave no doubt that "on subjects that matter, the union journals are . . . the organs of the administration in power . . . [Barbash, 1948, p. 171]."

One of the most effective loyalty-building items that can appear in a union paper or journal is a report of the gains realized through a newly negotiated contract. But even this can backfire. Reporting a gain achieved by one local has often caused discontent in other locals (Wilensky, 1956). A crisis item is also an effective inspirer of loyalty, but if the item exhorts the members to militancy and then the leaders settle for less than they led the members to expect, disloyalty to the extent of a wildcast strike can occur (Sayles & Strauss, 1953; Wilensky, 1956).

Unions also use film discussion and consumer education programs as techniques to increase member loyalty. As with the films used in leadership training, the films in the discussion programs are frequently inappropriate to the backgrounds of the members or are not presented to maximum effect. Consumer education, which includes information on health and welfare matters, is usually conducted through the union press, either in the form of leaflets or as items in the papers and journals. It may serve to make a unionist more loyal; it also enables him to live more satisfactorily within his environment.

If one accepts Barbash's contention (1955, p. 3) that union-sponsored bowling tournaments are educational when consciously designed to heighten the worker's sense of identification with his union, the loyalty-building function of labor education can be expanded to include additional tech-

niques. Union sponsored athletic activities, picnics, scholarships and Christmas parties for members' children, and committees to cheer the sick may be considered loyalty-building techniques of labor education.

However, a message which is not received cannot be acted upon, and the loyalty-building efforts of labor education largely fail in the initial task of communication. Wilensky (1956) contended that union publications reach only a small proportion of the workers. A Pennsylvania State University study showed that union members are little influenced in their attitude formation by the union paper (Barbash, 1955). It was also asserted that three widely circulated union publications, *Rubber Worker, Steel Labor,* and *UAW Solidarity,* do not greatly succeed in their efforts to build union loyalty (Miller, Zeller, & Miller, 1965). Most significant, however, is the report from the Union Leadership Academy at Rutgers that only one-fifth of the union *leaders* in attendance there read their union papers regularly (Kerrison & Levine, 1960).

Since the message is not communicated, it is not surprising that an avowed purpose of the message—increased member participation in the business of the union—is also unrealized. Member participation is high at strike votes and on picket lines but sharply decreases for other union business. Unless there is a crisis, union meetings are notoriously poorly attended. Sayles & Strauss (1953) claimed that in most industries less than 6% of the members attend union meetings. Family nights, films, door prizes, beer, even fines have failed to produce a large turnout. Participation is low in other activities as well. Some unions have had to abolish committees because there were no volunteers to staff them, and many elective posts go uncontested (Sayles & Strauss, 1953).

To be sure, this passivity has roots in the backgrounds of the members and the structure of unions; the point is that labor education has not succeeded in overcoming these background and structural impediments to participation.

In the other dimension of loyalty—support for the leaders' policies—labor education has been somewhat more effective. It is rare for union members to reject a contract recommended to them by their leaders. Most of the less crucial policies of the leaders are also passively accepted. However, acquiescence, or "disinterested allegiance [Miller & Young, 1955, p. 44]," does not really speak well for labor education's success in securing support for the policies of union leaders. Furthermore, labor education cannot take all the credit, even for this dubious support. Many policies are not submitted for member ratification; it is almost impossible to organize opposition to one of these, especially after the fact. Often the policies are incomprehensible or inconsequential to the members. When they do submit policies for ratification, labor leaders are careful to select those which they think are attractive to the members. And unless the members find a recom-

mended policy to be highly repugnant, they are likely to give their leaders the benefit of the doubt.

Because support is usually forthcoming without participation, it has been suggested that union leaders really do not care if members participate and may even seek to discourage informed and ambitious participation (Eby, 1951b; Linton, 1965; Seidman, 1954; Sultan, 1963). If this is true, labor education may be succeeding in ways which only union leaders can appreciate.

Political Education

The third major function of labor education is to enlist support for politicians and legislation that favor the programs of organized labor. There are as many reasons for a union's interest in political education as there are governmental powers affecting that union and its members. The power of government to pass regulatory legislation concerning unions is a major reason for labor's interest in political education. Once such legislation has been passed, the chief executive has the power to appoint members of the agency charged with applying the legislation. The power of the judges who interpret the legislation affects union members.

Government also has the power to affect the lives of unionists simply as members of society. Tax laws, price control laws, minimum wage laws, compulsory school attendance laws, consumer protection laws, and social security and health legislation are just a few examples of the many ways government involves itself in the lives of individual unionists.

Besides the governmental powers which concern all unions, there are powers which are of particular concern to certain unions. The power of government to undertake construction programs is of special interest to the building trades unions. If the government considers building a St. Lawrence Seaway, its power to do so also becomes a matter of interest to the railroad brotherhoods. Federal aid to education is a power which concerns construction unions and teacher unions. The esoteric extent to which a union's interest in government can be carried is illustrated by the painters' union demand for legislation curtailing the use of the spray gun (Barbash, 1948).

Unions find political education especially necessary because of the strength of those who oppose the policies of organized labor. Again, unions consider themselves in conflict with the conservative forces of the mass media and the schools. Political education is also the unions' answer to the "dollar votes" which the rich cast during an election campaign (Carey, 1958).

Political education, like the other functions of labor education, reflects the pragmatism of American trade unions. "The American labor leader in politics as elsewhere works for narrow goals in short order [Mills, 1948, p. 153]." Furthermore, labor's political education programs do not work

for anything which cannot be obtained within the present political structure. Even the idea of a third party was abandoned. Mills (1948) and Widick (1964) both attributed labor's political tameness to the failures of past leftist movements, which further certifies labor's basic pragmatism. Labor's political education continues to be characterized by the pragmatism of Gompers. Unions practice nonpartisan endorsement, whereby they award their friends votes and their enemies, hopefully, defeat. An elected official of any importance can be sure that his voting record will be scrutinized by various unions' Committees on Political Education, and this record will be summarized in the union press.

Political education is conducted mainly through the union press. Thus it suffers from the same conditions which undermine the loyalty-building function of labor education. Another problem of political education is that, to be effective, it must somehow appeal to the workers' liberal sentiments while appeasing or neutralizing their conservative attitudes. This is not a problem when political education is concerned solely with issues, since issues on which there is marked agreement between labor leaders and the rank-and-file can be dealt with. For example, there is a near unanimous liberalism within the labor movement concerning economic issues (Miller & Riessman, 1964). The problem arises when a union endorses candidates who are liberal in areas other than economics, as most union-endorsed candidates happen to be. Since the working class tends to be conservative in matters of civil liberties, civil rights, and foreign affairs (Howe & Widick, 1949; Kornhauser, 1961; Miller et al., 1965; Miller & Riessman, 1964), union-endorsed candidates are almost inevitably at odds with workers on these issues. Again, this is not a problem when a campaign is clearly dominated by economic issues; in such cases a union's political education effort may be superfluous. However, economic issues have lately become secondary issues, partly because of labor's own success in reducing economic distress. The subsequent realignment in the public consciousness of economic and noneconomic issues, causing rank-and-file "defections" at the polls, is resulting in the embarrassment of union leaders. The historical "labor vote" (Attitudes, 1966; Kornhauser, Sheppard, & Mayer, 1956; Peck, 1963; Sheppard & Masters, 1959), then, may be more an index of labor's ability to get out the vote than of its success in determining how workers vote. There is evidence that labor is unable to do the latter (Reeves, 1970).

The union has always been one of several influences on the worker. As the worker loses his sense of identity with the union, his susceptibility to its influence diminishes. Considering the workers' limited liberalism, the advice that unions should arouse the support of their members by adopting new social goals (Bell, 1959; Howe & Widick, 1949; *Labor*, 1963; Raskin, 1965) suggests an unwarranted faith in the persuasive power of labor's political education. In fact, since the propriety of political education by

unions has often been questioned by union members (Miller et al., 1965; Seidman et al., 1958; Sultan, 1963), the widening political gap between unionists and union leaders could result in a rank-and-file refusal to support the right of unions to conduct political education.

Initiation and Control of Labor Education

American trade unions reflect American culture in their tendency toward centralization. Unions feel compelled to centralize because of the centralization of the institutions they deal with, namely business and government (Eby, 1955; Lipset, 1964). Centralization provides pooled resources with which experts can be hired to assist in the efficient implementation of union functions. It also requires coordination, thereby eliminating much wasteful duplication. In short, centralization holds the same attractions for unions as it does for other institutions of society.

Consequently, unions are now highly centralized organizations.

> The locals are completely creatures of the international. Policy is positively laid down for the locals by the international and the locals are subject to the direction of their respective internationals with respect to a wide range of functions . . . [Barbash, 1948, p. 45].

One of these functions is education. Union education departments are centered at the national or international headquarters and for many unions they exist nowhere else but there (Linton, 1965; Liveright, 1954).

This does not mean, however, that the power to initiate and control labor education is reserved to the director of the central education department. This power belongs to the elected national or international leaders by virtue of their authority to appoint and retain the education director. It is a power which the leaders actively exercise because of its bearing on the success of their policies and the perpetuation of their incumbencies. The role of the education director, then, is to implement the education policy of the national leaders. Eby (1951a), the former education director of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, once complained that "the power structure of the labor movement as I've experienced it is hierarchical, monolithic, and guilty of persistent top level policy decisions [p. 39]."

In addition to their appointive control, a union's national officers supervise the education effort through their control of the union press. Union journals often carry several columns by the international president (Barbash, 1948). Leaders have used the press to thwart the ambitions of their rivals within the union (Miller & Form, 1964). They control the education function by deciding what does not as well as what does get published. For example, "the UAW hierarchy . . . never allowed a review of the

book *The UAW and Walter Reuther* to appear in any official publication [Widick, 1964, p. 35]."

The leaders' control of the financial resources of the union is another means by which they determine education policy. Funds are allocated or withheld according to the leaders' enthusiasm for a given education project. Even the salary of the education director is a matter often left to the judgment of the leaders. The fact that the education director is usually the poorest paid union expert (Eggheads, 1961), and one who enjoys little status or security (Liveright, 1954), indicates the minor extent of the leaders' dependence on him.

Since the union convention is both an educational experience for the delegates in attendance and a congress at which decisions affecting the education program are reached, it is relevant to remark on the leaders' control of the convention. The leaders are able to stage manage the convention. They can refuse to recognize dissidents; they can appoint committee members who share their biases; they can schedule unfavorable reports for the moment of least reaction; they can resubmit pet proposals until they are passed; they can have photographs of themselves enlarged to heroic and intimidating proportions and placed about the convention hall; they can wear down delegates with a raft of introductory speakers, all of whom extol the leaders' virtues; they can confuse the delegates with needlessly complicated reports; they can even place assistants throughout the audience to lead "spontaneous" ovations. These tactics have made union conventions skillfully manipulated ratifying bodies and public relations showpieces (Widick, 1964).

Powerlessness, lack of recognition, and dissatisfaction with narrow goals have caused many union education specialists to join the general exodus of intellectuals from the labor movement. (For discussions of this exodus, see Harris, 1964; Liberals, 1964; Neufeld, 1963.) The result is that labor education is now, more than ever before, the exclusive province of national union leaders.

Summary

Labor education reflects the pragmatism of American culture. It emphasizes the training of lower level union officers in the routine tasks necessary in the daily operation of a union. This emphasis results from the organizational focus of business unionism. Most leadership training is conducted by the unions themselves, although some is done in cooperation with universities. Leadership training suffers from a shortage of instructional materials and from poorly developed evaluation procedures. It benefits, however, from the efforts of the teachers to relate their subject to their audience.

Labor education also stresses the development of union loyalty among rank-and-file union members. This function is difficult due to the many forces which weaken allegiance to the union. In addition, the loyalty-building program itself loses effectiveness because it is not sufficiently sensitive to the worker traits which inhibit a positive response to it. Nevertheless, the kind of loyalty most desired by the leaders, i.e., support for their policies, is realized despite the ineffectiveness of the loyalty-building program.

The third major task of labor education is to produce political support for union goals and policies. Government's exercise of more and more powers affecting labor has increased the unions' emphasis on political education. At the same time, however, union leaders have strained their relations with members by endorsing political candidates who are more broadly liberal than the members.

It should be noted at this point that the functions of labor education are not as distinguishable in practice as they are in analysis. Leadership training, for instance, often includes loyalty-building and political education. And political education and loyalty-building can be mixed together to reinforce each other.

Note should also be made here of the public relations purpose which labor education serves as a result of the esteem which American culture confers upon education. That labor exploits the public relations possibilities of its education programs is indicated in Barbash's comment (1948): "many of the research and educational activities of unions are directed more toward their effect on the general public than to the problems of union functioning [p. 167]."

The people responsible for making labor education what it is are the elected national or international leaders. The goals of these men become the functions of labor education. The leaders determine the education program by their use of the powers which have accrued to them through union centralization.

Finally, in fairness to organized labor, it should be noted that unions have long engaged in apprenticeship training and skill upgrading programs. This kind of education is quite common in skilled trades unions, although it is often nonexistent in industrial unions. At any rate, an examination of this narrowly vocational education would constitute another study; the focus of the study reported here was on labor's general education.

References

Abbott, W. L. Can idealism lift labor education out of its outdated dogma? *Adult Leadership,* 1962, 11 (2), 37-38.

Allen, R. Resident study program for union staff. In F. Goldman (Ed.), *Reorientation in labor education.* Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962.

Attitudes toward unionism of active and passive members. *Monthly Labor Review*, 1966, **89**, 175-177.
Bacon, E. Fourth year institute: The world of ideas. In F. Goldman (Ed.), *Reorientation in labor education.* Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962.
Barbash, J. *Labor unions in action.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1948.
Barbash, J. *Universities and unions in workers' education.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1955.
Beirne, J. A. Unionists must prepare for a different future. *Adult Leadership*, 1962, **10** (7), 195-196.
Bell, D. The capitalism of the proletariat: American trade unionism today. In J. Barbash (Ed.), *Unions and union leadership.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1959.
Berelson, B. *Content analysis in communication research.* Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952.
Blau, P. *Bureaucracy in modern society.* New York: Random House, 1956.
Blauner, R. *Alienation and freedom: The factory worker and his industry.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
Brandon, H. A. A conversation with Walter Reuther. In J. Barbash (Ed.), *Unions and union leadership.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1959.
Carey, J. Organized labor in politics. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1958, **319**, 52-62.
Clark, B. R. *Educating the expert society.* San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.
Cohen, S. Conservatism, radicalism, and unionism. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 1957, **16**, 127-143.
Doherty, R. *Teaching industrial relations in high schools: A survey.* Ithaca: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 1964.
Eby, K. A critical look at labor. *Labor and Nation*, 1951, **7** (4), 39-42. (a)
Eby, K. The expert in the labor movement. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1951, **57**, 27-32. (b)
Eby, K. Organized labor and American ethics. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1955, **297**, 83-89.
Eggheads who help run unions. *Business Week*, November 11, 1961, 47+.
Fitch, J. *Social responsibilities of organized labor.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.
Gould, A. Liberal arts for labor. In F. Goldman (Ed.), *Reorientation in labor education.* Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962.
Harris, H. Why labor lost the intellectuals. *Harper's*, June 1964, 79-80+.
Howe, I., & Widick, B. J. *The UAW and Walter Reuther.* New York: Random House, 1949.
Kerrison, I. L. *Workers' education at the university level.* New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1951.
Kerrison, I. L., & Levine, H. *Labor leadership education.* New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1960.
Kornhauser, A., Sheppard, H., & Mayer, A. *When labor votes.* New York: University Books, 1956.
Kornhauser, R. *Some social determinants and consequences of union membership.* Berkeley, Calif.: Institute of Industrial Relations, 1961.
Kyllonen, T. Social characteristics of active unionists. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1551, **16**, 528-533.
Labor looks at labor: A conversation. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, 1963.
Liberals and the labor movement. *Monthly Labor Review*, 1964, **87**, 132-135.
Linton, T. *A historical examination of the purposes and practices of the educational programs of the United Automobile Workers of America, 1936-1959.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan School of Education, 1965.
Lipset, S. M. *Trade unions and social structure.* Berkeley, Calif.: Institute of Industrial Relations, 1962.
Lipset, S. M. The political process in trade unions: A theoretical statement. In M. Berger, T. Abel, & C. Page (Eds.), *Freeedom and control in modern society.* New York: Octagon Books, 1964.

Liveright, A. A. A long look at labor education. *Adult Education*, 1954, **4**, 101-108, 137-145.
Liveright, A. A. A summary of problems and directions. In F. Goldman (Ed.), *Reorientation in labor education*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962.
London, J. Labor education and the universities. In F. Goldman (Ed.), *Reorientation in labor education*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1962.
Magrath, C. P. Democracy in overalls: The futile quest for union democracy. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 1959, **12**, 503-525.
McCollum, J. Labor education: Education, training, or information? *Adult Education*, 1962, **13**, 42-48.
Miller, D., & Form, W. *Industrial sociology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
Miller, G., & Young, J. Member participation in the trade union local. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 1955, **15**, 31-47.
Miller, R., Zeller, F., & Miller, G. *The practice of local union leadership*. Columbus, O.: Ohio State University Press, 1965.
Miller, S., & Riessman, F. The working-class subculture: A new view. In A. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), *Bluecollar world*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
Mills, C. W. *The new men of power*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1948.
Mire, J. *Labor education: A study report on needs, programs and approaches*. Madison, Wisc.: Inter-University Labor Education, 1956.
Neufeld, M. The historical relationship of liberals and intellectuals to organized labor in the United States. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 1963, **250**, 115-128.
Peck, S. *The rank-and-file leader*. New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1963.
Purcell, T. *The worker speaks his mind on company and union*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954.
Raskin, A. H. The fat cats of labor. *The Nation*, September 20, 1965, 103-107.
Raskin, A. H. Payment by the hour? the week? the year? for life? *New York Times Magazine*, September 4, 1966, 29 & 36+.
Reeves, R. Doubt is raised on 'labor vote.' *New York Times*, October 15, 1970, 53.
Reuter, R. Who says labor education ineffective? *Adult Leadership*, 1962, **11**(4), 110-112.
Riessman, F. *Workers' attitudes toward participation and leadership*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
Sayles, L., & Strauss, G. *The local union*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1953.
Scoggins, W. *Labor in learning*. Los Angeles: Institute of Industrial Relations, 1966.
Seidman, J. The labor union as an organization. In A. Kornhauser, R. Dubin, & A. Ross (Eds.), *Industrial conflict*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
Seidman, J., London, J., Karsh, B., & Tagliacozzo, D. *The worker views his union*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
Sheppard, H., & Masters, N. The political attitudes and preferences of union members: The case of the Detroit auto workers. *American Political Science Review*, 1959, **53**, 437-447.
Spinrad, W. Correlates of trade union participation: A summary of the literature. *American Sociological Review*, 1960, **25**, 237-244.
Spinrad, W. Blue collar workers as city and suburban residents—effects on union membership. In A. Shostak & W. Gomberg (Eds.), *Blue-collar world*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
Sultan, P. *The disenchanted unionist*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
Taft, P. On the origins of business unionism. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 1963, **17**, 20-38.
Walker, C., & Guest, R. *The man on the assembly line*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952.
Widick, B. J. *Labor today*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1964.
Wilensky, H. *Intellectuals in labor unions*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956.

AUTHOR

KENNETH D. CARLSON *Address*: Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University *Title*: Assistant Professor *Degrees*: B.S. and M.S., State University College—Buffalo; Ed.D., State University of New York—Buffalo *Specialization*: Social studies education; Urban education.