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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to use Marxist theory of alienation to explain voting patterns among impoverished Southerners. This research is important in explaining the relationship among alienation, religiosity, politics of opposition, and their impact on voting trends in the southern portion of the United States. I will construct a Marxian model based on the literature available and test it by using data in the General Social Survey of 1998. I will construct a concept of class based on the interaction of alienation and income. I will then test it by running multiple linear regressions to see if the hypothesized relationships of positive correlations exist among class and politics of opposition, apathy, and religion. I will also examine the relationship between religion and politics of opposition. And lastly I will see how all of these factors influence political ideology.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Problem Statement

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to use Marxist theory of alienation to explain voting patterns among poor Southerners. This research is important in explaining the relationship among alienation, religiosity, politics of opposition, and their impact on voting trends in the Bible Belt. I will be looking at data gathered from the General Social Survey (GSS). I will use a critical positivist analysis of quantitative data from the GSS, hypothesizing an inverse correlation between religiosity and politics of opposition.

According to Marxist theory, alienation causes religiosity, politics of opposition, and voter apathy that inevitably will affect voting behavior. Because I will be looking at proletariats workers in the South, I can conclude that they will suffer from alienation and thus succumb to these forms of false consciousness.

1.2 Introduction

The impact of the 2004 election may have many consequences on poor families, with continuing outsourcing of jobs, the rising deficit, and the cutting of social programs. In today’s materialist society, it seems intuitive that these concerns would be a primary factor in how one votes. However in the Southern portion of the United States you see other influences which affect voting. Marx would explain any distraction from materialist influences as false consciousness, created by the alienation formed from the contradictions of capitalism.
Support of the Grand Old Party by impoverished proletariat of the South has made me question the reasons why this group is so supportive of its platform. The primary reason I believe this population supports the Republican Party is that it has capitalized on claiming the right to the moral majority. Although they have claims to the moral vote, conservative policies do very little to benefit low-wage working class individuals. With cuts in social programs designed to benefit this group, it seems that it would be clear how its voting patterns would look. The counterintuitive voting trends lead me to believe that there is something more going on here. Marx viewed the social world relative to materialist interests. To vote not based on material interests would involve the presence of a false consciousness. The Republican Party’s claim of religious zealousness blinds the poor working class of the South from realizing its exploitation. I plan on showing that it is Marx’s concept of alienation that explains the relationship between poor Southerners and conservative voting.

In this project I will review the literature on alienation, focusing on the Marxist theory and definition of alienation. I will also look at literature regarding the Southern portion of the United States, and the role of alienation both in politics, and in religion. Finally I will look into Lenin’s theory of the union and construct a definition of politics of opposition. I will then hypothesize a Marxian model of alienation and how it will affect political affiliation. I will look at the effects of alienation on voter apathy, along with the effects of religion and politics of opposition on ideologies. My data will consist of secondary data obtained from the General Social Survey 1998. I will perform several regression analyses to determine the relationships between my variables.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

2.1 Alienation Theory

No other social theorist has had such a profound analysis of alienation as Karl Marx. Marx uses entäusserung, the German term translated to mean alienation, to describe the process of materialist capitalism’s effect on the workers, who essentially become separated from their labor and in turn alienated from the very work they do (Marx 1988, Ollman 1971, Schact 1970, Schaff 1980).

“This fact expresses merely the object which labor produces—labor’s product—confronts it as something alien, as a power independent of the producer. The product of labor is labor which has been congealed in an object, which has become material: it is the objectification of labor. Labor’s realization is its objectification. In the conditions dealt with by political economy this realization of labor appears as loss of reality for the workers; objectification as loss of the object and object-bondage; appropriation as estrangement, as alienation” (Marx 1988 p. 71).

Marx’s theory of alienation comes from his study of Hegel’s work. Although Marx was initially more interested in how one is alienated in their relationship with the state, he soon found with his constant interest in materialism that alienation occurs within the labor process. Unlike the view of Hegel, where all labor is viewed as alienating labor, Marx was far more concerned with the structural factors involved in the labor process (Mandel 1973). It is the market economy that is the cause of alienation for Marx. It is the capitalist system and the market economy that allows for oppression and exploitation that foster the relationship of the worker and their labor. Therefore, it is exploited labor that becomes the source of alienation for the worker (Marx 1988).

Marx uses alienation in several ways; his theory claims that one is alienated from his product, labor, other workers, and eventually from oneself (Schact 1970). It is the
capitalist system which causes this alienation; and in Marx’s theory, once one is alienated from the very product they produce, other forms of alienation will occur, creating a society where the proletariat is not just exploited by the capitalist class but alienated as well. Because of the ambiguity sometimes associated with the term alienation I will further define key terms necessary for a Marxist interpretation of alienation.

I now turn to the distinction between reification, objectification, and alienation in Marx’s work. Reification can be operationalized, therefore giving merit to an analysis of empirical data (Schaff 1980). I have explained alienation in a Marxist sense, but objectification is derived from alienation and comes from the use of people as objects. “Here the economists themselves say that people place in a thing (money) the faith which they do not place in each other. But why do they have faith in the thing? Obviously only because that thing is an objectified relation between persons; because it is objectified exchange value, and exchange value is nothing more than a mutual relation between people’s productive activities.” (Marx 1973 p. 106). It is this relationship that, therefore, leads to objectification. Marx also uses the term reification as a deformed version of objectification. Schaff describes reification as “… the dehumanization of relations between people taken as relations between things which are, after all in the products of the labour of these people” (Schaff 1980 p. 76). I will examine the greater concept of alienation as a dehumanizing affect, created by estranged labor, and make no distinction among alienation, objectification, and reification.
2.2 Impoverished South

Historically the southern United States has had a large working class. Having its roots in the agrarian economy, the South has a long history of poverty and in 1970 contained nearly 10 million of the 27 million poor people in America and had a poverty rate twice that of other regions (MacLachlan 1974). Since this time the south has been developing, but still houses the majority of poor whites. Southern states make up the top ten states (including the District of Columbia) with the highest poverty rates (DeNavas-Walt et. al. 2004).

Explanations for this unequal poverty distribution have revolved around simple geographic problems of low population density leading to lower economic development, the Southern Subculture hypothesis, and historical systems of inequity. I feel it is a combination of these factors that contributes to the poor economic conditions in the South. I want to study this population because of its high rural white poverty rates and high religious involvement.

Voting behavior has been linked to strong religious influences, which are predominately found in the South. I choose to look beyond that in explaining these voting trends. Karl Marx’s theory of alienation would suggest that religion merely serves as a false consciousness and that it is the alienation of the working class that leads to religious involvement.

Another component of dealing with the South I must take into consideration is the differences attributed to race. I feel that theoretically Marx does not have an adequate explanation for the great disparities in ideology and inequality that persists among American blacks; it is for these reasons that in this project I will only be looking at
whites. I do think it would be interesting to study the different effects religion has on ideology for different races, but as a limitation of this project I will refrain from attempting this. There are interesting connections between religiosity and marginalized groups that would further support Marxist theory that would be quite interesting to explore.

2.3 Role of Alienation in Religion

The Marxist theory of alienation claims that the farther you are separated from the fruits of your labor, the more alienated you become. Alienated individuals must engage in forms of what Marx calls false consciousness. Marx views religion as the ultimate false consciousness, calling it the opiate of the masses.

To understand the role of alienation in religion, one must understand religion from a Marxist viewpoint. When Marx calls religion the opiate of the masses, he means that religion is a distraction and an escape from reality. Bertell Ollman best sums up a Marxist perspective of religion by saying:

“As a result, religious activity directed against oneself is inhibition of all those qualities which mark one out a human being: reason is replaced by faith, real love by love of god, and real will power by ‘will in Christ’. All striving after happiness in the here and now ceases, for only happiness in heaven counts. Man must die entirely to this world in order to prepare himself for the next” (Ollman 1971 p.223).

Marx claims that it is this use of religion that legitimizes and allows for exploitation. Therefore, religion becomes a false consciousness, blinding the laborers to their alienation.

The use of alienation when referring to religion does not originate from Marx himself, but rather from Hegel and his dialectical view of mind and society. Marx,
although respective of this dialectic relationship, views alienation as the cause for
religion rather than the opposite. Baum summarizes the Marxist relationship between
religion and alienation by stating “Religion is thus the measure of society’s social ills.
Religion is the product of alienation and, once produced, protects and fosters this very
alienation” (Baum 1975 p.24). It is in this Marxian view of religious alienation that I
plan to investigate in my research. Marx’s view of alienation can be summarized by his
analogy of religious alienation and labor alienation given in the Economic and
Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844.

“It is the same in religion. The more man puts into God, the less he retains
in himself. The worker puts his life into the object; but now his life no
longer belongs to him but to the object. Hence, the greater this activity, the
greater is the worker’s lack of objects. Whatever the product his labor is
he is not. Therefore the greater this product, the less is he himself. The
alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labor
becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him,
independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power on
its own confronting him; it means that like which he has conferred on the
object confronts him as something hostile and alien” (Marx 1988 p.72).

Marx recognized the importance of religion and its effects on politics, and he
always viewed the popular religion as a tool of the elites. It is the ruling elites who use
the attributes of deities and the mediated words of their dogmas to control the reality of
the masses for their own purposes, that being the perpetuation of the capitalist class
(Calvacanti 1990).

2.4 Religion and Voting

Numerous studies have evaluated the link between religion and voting behaviors.
The coalition of fundamentalist groups and evangelical leaders for the promotion of
political agendas is the newest influences of religion on politics but by far not the first.
Since the beginning of politics religion has played a key role, and only in the past few centuries have politics and religion been severed; yet religion remains a key component in any political discussion.

Because Marxist theory is preoccupied with the collective, it is the religion of the masses in the Southern United States and the role that religion has in affecting their voting behavior. This religious affiliation is overwhelmingly Christian and although many differences exist among the various denominations, from a Marxist religious view I see no need to treat them any differently. The Christian Coalition has been one of the most successful social movements in recent times. Clifton found that the involvement of the Christian Coalition with the Republican Party has led to stronger support for electoral mobilization and policy expertise than financial clout (Clifton 2004). These religious-based groups are having success in the promotion of political agendas. In a study, Knuckey notes, “Observers of the evolving US party system agree that the growing importance of religious conservatives within the Republican Party is of great significance” (Knuckley 1999). I am more concerned, however, with what this significant influence has on voting. Beyerlein and Chaves state, “Numerous studies have shown a significant positive relationship between frequency of religious service attendance and likelihood of voting” (Beyerlein and Chaves 2003 p.229). Their study revealed that although the influences of religion on politics are quantitatively important, it is the qualitative differences between denominations that affect political participation differently (Beyerlein and Chaves 2003). Nevertheless, all recent studies have showed the impact of religion having a positive correlation in voter trends. In the South, where
Protestant and Evangelical religions are most prominent, their affiliation with conservative ideologies has lead to a political swing towards conservative politics.

2.5 Voter Apathy

A very important concept which repeatedly comes up in the study of alienation and politics is that of the nonvoting population. The nonvoting group, which has large body of literature, continues to grow. The current elections of 2004 still show relatively low voter turnout. Boylan states that in the 1990 election there were over one third of eligible voters that did not vote (over 120 million Americans). He goes on to say that these proportions only varied a little since the post-Watergate elections of 1974 (Broylan 1991). With growing concerns over low voter turnout, I turn to Marxist theory of alienation to attempt to explain this phenomenon.

Marxist theory of alienation takes place in two ways, both at the infrastructure level and at the superstructure level. It is at the level of superstructure that political alienation occurs: “Political Alienation takes place at the level of the superstructure. Where lower-class economic alienation is justified ideologically through laws, discourses, practices, rituals, and symbols” (Calvacanti 1990 p.12). Cavalcanti goes on to further describe the effects of political alienation in this way: “Alienation takes away from the individual the powers to orient his/her own political actions, and takes away the kind of community which would support individual action” (Cavalcanti 1990 p.44).

Other accounts for nonvoter activity include reasons as given by Broylan, who claims that the lack of the “major parties to stimulate political activity or create agendas,” voter weariness of the “big business of office holding demands attention to year round
campaigning,” and “discouragement created by legal and procedural obstacles” are major factors contributing to nonvoting (Broylan 1991 p.33). He also gives the more individualistic explanations of the “non-voter party,” such as “cynicism, ignorance, and -the catchall term- apathy” (Broylan 1991 p.33).

A study by Southwell and Everest finds that nonvoting is a form of protest voting and that “When an individual is faced with an external situation that is perceived as undesirable, he is presented with two options. (1) Take remedial action, or; (2) exit the scene” (Southwell and Everest 1998 p.43). Their study reveals that nonvoting results from a feeling of alienation perpetuated the electoral system itself, where the alienated voter does not vote as a result (Southwell and Everest 1998).

Another study that used a survey by the League of Women Voters found that nonvoters are not more alienated than voters. It concluded “…people do not vote because they do not grasp the importance of elections on issues that matter to them, that they are ill informed about their choices and that they perceive the actual process of voting as difficult and cumbersome” (Author Unknown 1997 p.2). This view is not necessarily contrary to a Marxist theory of alienation, which would suggest that these individuals simply are ill informed due to forms of false consciousness blinding them to the issues (economic factors) which affect them.

2.6 Decline of Class Voting

Mattei Dogan outlines another argument for non class-based voting. He outlines two major types of cleavage that divide society. “Vertical cleavages divide a society according to cultural criteria, such as religion, language, ethnicity and social memory;
horizontal cleavages relate to economic and social layers, such as profession, income, level of education, urban or rural environment” (Dogan 2004 p. 166). In his assessment between vertical and horizontal cleavages and their effects on voting, he notes the current trend in reasons for voting are moving from horizontal cleavages to vertical ones (Dogan 2004). This is even more pronounced among the lower classes. Dogan offers several reasons why this is occurring. “Class voting has declined for several reasons, three of which being particularly relevant: the reduction of the size of the industrial working class, the weakening of its cohesion as a conscious class, the hostility of many national workers against non-European immigrants at the bottom of the proletariat” (Dogan 2004 p. 170). The argument that classes are formed more on status incongruence is nothing new and was one of Weber and Pareto’s major revisions of Marx’s notion of class (Dogan 2004).

Jonathan Knuckey would support Dogan’s third reason for the reduction in class voting. In looking at the southern United States and evaluating racial resentment and political ideology, he found that racial resentment has played an important role in shaping party identifications in recent years (Knuckey 2005). Avoiding the argument that the South is conservative simply because white Southerners are racists, I will focus primarily on the role of religion. As a further extension of this project, it would be interesting to look at the relationship that religion has with political ideology while controlling for racial resentment.

Other arguments have been made to support the large role that culture plays in political decisions. Michael Hechter claims that class politics have given way to cultural politics (Hechter 2004). His argument surrounds the notion of lower solidarity among the lower class as opposed to cultural solidarity. Critical to my model and my interpretation
of Marxian theory is the impact religion plays in determining political ideology. Because
religion is an important part of cultural identity as well as a strong component of vertical
cleavage, I hope to show that religion has become a primary source of political identity
rather than more class-based issues. I explain this through the Marxian theory of
alienation in which the proletariat is alienated from the political system by the false
consciousness of religion and culture, further separating class from political ideology.

2.7 Politics of Opposition

One of the necessary problems I need to try to solve with my model of voting
patterns is how to address why some Southerners vote liberally despite their alienation.
This question can be answered in a couple of ways: The first is that the individual realizes
their alienation. Marx would claim that this is the first step in forming a collective
consciousness, therefore inciting the revolution. But because Marxist theory is a macro
level theory, he is less interested in the individual and more with the collective. I will,
therefore dismiss the simple realization of the proletariat in identifying their exploitation
and focus on politics of opposition which serves as an outlet for these individuals.
Although Marx himself never addressed the issues of those who support the union, Lenin
saw the union as being a great threat to the revolution and the communist dream (Lenin
1966).

Politics of opposition are those that counter the fundamental tendencies of
capitalism. By developing pro-socialist systems within a capitalist society, we are able to
neutralize the contradictions within capitalism, but it is in these small victories towards a
more socialist capitalism that the hope of a collective consciousness among the lower
class diminishes. For these reasons Lenin was against the regulation of capitalism, as he feared it only masked the greater evils that lay within. These socialist tendencies, although benefiting the quality of life for the poor, did nothing to stop the alienation and objectification of the proletariat.

Lenin saw politics of opposition as another form of false consciousness. By workers winning small gains, they become less likely to become completely dissatisfied with the current system. This impedes the formation of a collective consciousness and hope of a communist revolution. I define politics of opposition as support for social welfare and other proactive social support systems. Although they may be claimed as a form of false consciousness, the belief in these mechanisms of social change do support liberal ideology.
Chapter 3: Models, Questions, and Hypothesis

3.1 Positivist Approach to Marx

One of the most problematic aspects of this project is taking a positivist approach to Marx. Ideally, Marxist theory, which is a structural theory, should be evaluated on the superstructural level; the limitations of doing such are enormous. Attempts to quantify Marxist theory have been successful. Erik Olin Wright is one of the most well-known positivist Marxists in America. His justifications for quantifying Marxist theory and especially class have led to great developments in testing Marxist theory. He also defends the notion that attitudinal surveys can be justifiable in studying Marxist notions of class (Wright 1985). Because of limitations in gathering data, I will be using secondary data in the form of an attitudinal survey. Therefore, it is appropriate to take a positivist approach to evaluating my Marxist model of voting.

3.2 Hypothesized Relationship

According to Marxist theory a positive relationship should exist between alienation (Class) and religiosity. Therefore, using Marxist theory I have hypothesized several relationships to explain the importance of alienation and the intervening factors of religiosity and politics of opposition in voting patterns among Southerners. According to Marx the proletariat is alienated; this occurs on many levels starting with their relation in the labor production. Thus, in order to cope with this alienation the poor must turn to a form of false consciousness, which leads me to my first hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1:** Individuals who are poor and are alienated are more religious.
I want to see if alienation has an effect on voter apathy. I will also see if there is a
trend among impoverished voters towards voter apathy and nonvoting as Cavalcanti
suggests (Cavalcanti 1990).

**Hypothesis 2**: The poor are more likely to be apathetic voters and nonvoters.

Because of the current use of religious leaders and religious movements by
political forces to support their agenda, it is clear to assume that religiosity has a great
affect on one’s ideology, leading to the next hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3**: Those who are more religious will identify as being conservative.

Although Marx himself never explicitly identifies this, Lenin makes claims for
alienation causing politics of opposition, which introduce small trends of socialist
policies into capitalism. Those who have higher incomes and are alienated are more
likely to support politics of opposition, because of their elevated class status and
educational attainment.

**Hypothesis 4**: Alienation can lead to politics of opposition for the economically
advantaged.

Next I want to look at the relationship between religiosity and counter capitalist
beliefs. These socialist beliefs (which from a historical view and literal translation of
Judeo-Christian texts would seem to coincide with religion) counter religiosity. This leads to my next hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 5:** Religiosity is negatively correlated with politics of opposition.

Socialist beliefs counter those of the dominant capitalist system; therefore support for them are by nature liberal in that way of thinking. It is because of this that I make this next hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 6:** Those who favor more socialist policies (politics of opposition) will identify as liberal.

The strongest source of false consciousness Marx identified in the time of his writing was Religion. And even today the power of religion is very evident. It is because of this that I predict those who are religious will be less apathetic and more involved in the political realm. This leads me to my seventh hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 7:** Those who are religious will be less apathetic in their voting behavior.

Counter to this are those who are alienated, yet realize their alienation and support politics of opposition are more complacent and more likely to be apathetic in their voting realizing their powerlessness within the capitalist system. This leads to the next hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 8:** Those who favor more socialist policies (politics of opposition) will be more apathetic in their voting behavior.
My last hypothesis is that those who are part of the capitalist class (high incomes and low alienation) will support the current capitalist system from which they benefit. Marx would claim because of their position within society they have no other choice but to support conservative ideologies to preserve Capitalism at its purest. This leads to my final hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 9:** Those with high incomes and low levels of alienation will have conservative ideologies.

Based on these nine hypotheses I have formed a model in which I explain political ideology by using Marx’s theory of alienation (see Figure 3.1).
Figure 3.1. Path model of variable relationships.
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3.3 Nominal Definitions

Dependent Variables:

Apathy:

My nominal definition is whether or not the individual voted. Apathy, therefore, becomes nonvoting behavior.

Ideology:

Ideology is defined as an individual’s political sentiments; this is whether or not they identify their political beliefs as conservative or liberal.

Independent Variables:

Alienation:

Alienation is defined in this project as how separated the individual is from the fruits of their labor.

Income:

Income is defined as total earnings over the past year.

Class:

Class is defined in Marxist terms, where one is either in control of the means of production (bourgeoisie) or they must sell their labor power (proletariat).

Religiosity:

Religiosity is how involved the individual is in otherworldly beliefs and fundamental practices involving the sacred.

Politics of opposition:

Politics of opposition are support of anti-capitalist programs. These are pro-socialist policies designed to aid those in lower positions in society.
Chapter 4: Methods

4.1 Population and Scope Conditions:

The population I will be looking at consists of Southerners in the US of voting age. I will be looking at the traditionally Southern United States as defined by the states that seceded from the Union. My justification for this is that the political climate has been uniquely affected by agrarian culture, the Civil War, and Reconstruction. This is defined in the GSS variable REGION as individuals who live in the South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central regions (see appendix A-1.1). This is determined by the location in which the survey is taking place. I will also limit my scope to only include whites (see appendix A-1.2) and Christian denominations; this is to eliminate other factors that may influence political ideology.

4.2 Unit of Analysis:

The unit of analysis is the individual. Although it seems contradictory to be talking in Marxist terms and evaluating the individual, I justify this use of analysis based on the positivist Marxist approach outlined by Erik Olin Wright. However, many people would disagree, claiming it is absurd to think in Marxist terms of the human individual. Throughout Marx’s work, although he mainly deals with a macro theory, there are aspects of individual behavior and agency that he addresses. Marx theorized at a multitude of levels and the underlying framework of his macro theory can be reduced to individual agency.
4.3 Sample

The sample I will be using is the General Social Survey 1998 (GSS 98). The General Social Survey is an independently drawn sample of English-speaking persons 18 years of age or older, living in non-institutional arrangements within the United States. The GSS 98 Survey I will be using was administered to a sample of 2,832 United States residents and is representative of the English-speaking, adult non-institutionalized population. Once I narrow my scope down to include only those cases in the South and of Christian whites, I will be dealing with a sample size of 760 respondents.

4.4 Dependent Variables:

Apathy:

Apathy is operationalized by determining whether or not the individual votes. Questions on voting behavior are used to determine if they vote or not. The GSS 1998 inquires about voting behavior both in the 1992 (VOTE92) and the 1996 (VOTE96) presidential elections. Only the respondents who were eligible to vote in both elections were considered for this research. On the apathetic scale, those who voted in both elections were ranked as having a low level of apathy. Those who did not vote in either election were considered very apathetic. Respondents who only voted in one election were considered mildly apathetic. For this variable I will be looking at 659 cases (see appendix A-1.1 for coding information).

Ideology:

In operationalizing ideology, a self report question was used to obtain the individual’s belief of whether or not they are liberal or conservative. The question from
the GSS 98 asks whether or not the respondent thinks of themselves as either being liberal or conservative (POLVIEW). The responses range from extremely liberal to extremely conservative and will be coded such that a high score would indicate a high level of conservativism and a low score will show liberalism. I will be looking at 716 valid cases for this variable (see appendix A-2.2).

4.5 Independent Variables:

Alienation:

One of the most difficult aspects of this project was determining how to measure alienation. From a Marxian view alienation becomes almost immeasurable. Geis and Ross identify alienation as perceived powerless (Geis and Ross 1998). Melvin Seeman argues that the root ideas that are identified with alienation are powerlessness, meaninglessness, social isolation, and self-estrangement (Seeman 1983). This becomes very problematic when studying religion. With religion one’s life is not meaningless or worthless; it is all part of god’s plan and it is god who gives meaning and worth to one’s life. Marx would simply claim religion as a false consciousness blinding those to their alienation, but measuring Marxist alienation using GSS data is very difficult. To do so I conceptualize alienation as the laborer being alienated from their product of labor. Using this conception I argue that dissatisfaction in labor can be a surrogate measure for Marx’s notion of structural alienation. The greater workers are dissatisfied with their labor, the more alienated they will become. Therefore, I used the GSS 98 and the question that asked if the respondent is satisfied with their job or housework (SATJOB). I coded satisfaction as having a low level of alienation and dissatisfaction as having a high level
of alienation. I included moderately satisfied with a high level of alienation because of the skewed distribution of the variable (see appendix A-3.1) For this variable I had 601 valid cases.

*Income:*

In measuring income idealistically I would like to only use the lower and higher strata of the income spectrum. By doing this I could look at the effects of poverty (extremely low incomes) relatively to those at the upper end of the economic division. But unfortunately with such a small sample size that would not be feasible. The 2004 HHS Poverty Guidelines place the poverty line for a family of four in the continental US at 18,850 (Federal Register 2004). Realizing that this number is grossly low and looking at the income distribution provided by the GSS in the Southern regions I decided to go with a more realistic poverty level of under 30 thousand a year family income. The reason for going with family income, rather then personal income, is because I feel this is more representative of actual spending power. I know that income is in itself an inadequate measure of actual spending power, but using a measure like net worth would be too difficult for this type of project. I recoded the family income (INCOME98) distribution into a dichotomous variable with high and low incomes consisting of those over 30 thousand and those below 30 thousand annual incomes respectively (see appendix A-3.2). I used the 659 valid cases for this variable.

*Class:*

Because I am using a Marxist analysis, it becomes very clear what definition of class becomes most applicable in this research. Although the nominal definition is fairly simple, to operationalize someone relative to the means of production becomes rather
difficult. I once again must turn to Wright, who uses income indicators to estimate where someone belongs in relationship to the means of production. Wright justifies using income by assuming that those with low incomes have no other choice but to sell their labor power. I combined alienation level with income to construct a more complex notion of class in which looked at four groups that vary in alienation and income (see appendix A-3.3). The interaction I used was between the two dummy variables of alienation and income. This was done so I could look at the four categories and compare them against one another. For this variable I used 535 valid cases.

Religiosity:

Religiosity will be constructed as an index of several indicators, which will use church attendance, belief in god, finding strength and comfort in god, religious affiliation, frequency of prayer, and degree of religious belief.

In creating my religiosity index I experienced several problems. Initially I was quite pleased to discover that I had a large Cronbach’s Alpha of .84; and a factor analysis revealed that all my measures were highly correlated with each other. I then realized that the problem I had was my number of cases had dropped from my original 760 white Southerners to only 289 cases. Looking back through the GSS codebook I realized that the survey used a rotation on several of the indicators that I wanted to use with my religiosity index. After great debate and even imputing values to solve my low case number, I realized everything I had done made little difference (look in appendix B-1). So for the sake of simplicity and parsimony I decided to move from an index of religiosity to a single variable indicator. The reason for this is that only one of my indicators was asked to everyone in the GSS 1998. And because the indicators are all so
highly correlated with one another a single value indicator will boost my case numbers to an appropriate level and still measure the underlying religiosity factor I want to get. Therefore, for my measure of religiosity I will be using church attendance. By doing this I increased my sample to include 623 valid cases.

Politics of opposition:

To measure politics of opposition, I will use an index of several factors designed to measure the support an individual has for pro-social concerns. These questions will range from support for welfare, social security, improving education, improving medical care, and helping the poor. These questions will be conjoined into an index, where a high score will reflect strong approval for politics of opposition.

I created an index to represent socialist tendencies within a society. I wanted a wide range of pro-social attitudes by which to construct an index that would measure politics of opposition. For this index I selected five measures from the GSS 98. The first of these measures were whether or not the government spends enough on improving the national education system (NATEDUC). I coded this so that a low score represented that government spends too much and a high score indicates that they spend too little. The next question that I wanted to use involved whether or not the government spends enough on welfare programs (NATFARE). This variable was coded the same respectively. I also wanted to see whether or not people believed the government spent enough on social security (NATSOC). This variable was coded in a similar fashion. The next two measures I wanted to use involved whether or not the government should improve the standard of living (HELPPOOR), and medical care (HELPSICK). These variables were recoded so that if the respondent favored government action it would result in a high
score. These variables were then added together to construct an index of politics of opposition, where a high score indicated support for pro-social policies (see Appendix A-3.4). Although I only get an Alpha of .53 because of the differences in measures of pro-social attitudes, there is no way to separate out variables. Furthermore, because there is relatively low inter-correlariety among measures, it becomes impractical to separate measures, or impute values (see Appendix B for information on imputing values).

**4.6: Statistical Analysis**

I performed several statistical tests in this project to determine the relationship of the variables in my model. I ran linear regressions to determine if the variables are correlated to one another and to test my hypothesized model. I tested to see if class is inversely correlated with alienation and whether or not this relationship is significant. I then looked to see if there existed positive correlations between alienation and religiosity or politics of opposition. Then I tested to see if there is a relationship between religion and politics of opposition and then tested each one against voter apathy. Finally I wanted to see if, as hypothesized, there is a positive relationship between religion and conservative ideology and a negative relationship between politics of opposition and conservative ideology. All statistical tests were evaluated at least at a 95% confidence interval to determine if a significant correlation exists.
Chapter 5: Analysis

The Purpose of this analysis is to test my nine hypotheses and the model that I presented in Figure 3.1.

5.1 Class Relationships

I constructed my concept of class so that I could test the various relationships between class and religion, politics of opposition, and apathy that I had hypothesized. I found that 15.9% of total sample were poor and alienated. Next I found that 37.2% were high income and low alienation. I found that those who had high income and high alienation made up 32.5% of my sample and those with low income and low alienation accounted for the remaining 14.4 percent of the sample (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1. Class Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High-Alienation</th>
<th>Low-Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Income</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=535

Next I tested my 1st, 2nd and 4th hypothesis by seeing what the relationship between class and religion, apathy, and politics of opposition. None of the correlations between class and religion, voter apathy, or politics of opposition were significant in the direction I had hypothesized (see Table 5.2).
Testing my notion of an interaction between income and alienation to form a pseudo class structure revealed that there are no significant relationships in the hypothesized directions between class and religion or politics of opposition or apathy. In fact alienation seems to have an inverse relationship to religion. Although Marx would be quick to dismiss these findings by claiming religion as a false consciousness blinding people to their alienation, I would have to say that the real error is in my attempt to measure alienation. Although I cannot think of any better way to quantify alienation when using a self-report attitudinal survey, I still feel as if my measure of alienation is flawed. I think Marx is partially right in that those who are religious would never consider themselves as being alienated. Further, I think it is not surprising that they would claim to enjoy their jobs (my measure of structural alienation) simply because their job has little importance compared to that of the afterlife. They are satisfied with their job because their job has little to do with what brings meaning to their life. I will further explore this finding in my discussion.
5.2 Relationships among Religiosity, Politics of Opposition, Apathy, and Ideology

Religiosity and Politics of Opposition:

Slightly disappointed in my initial findings of the impact of alienation and income on religion and politics of opposition, I was quite pleased to see the relationship between religiosity and politics of opposition emerge. As I had hypothesized in my fifth hypothesis, religiosity is negatively correlated with politics of opposition. With a significant correlation on a 99% confidence interval, I get a -.114 coefficient between religiosity and politics of opposition with 230 cases. Although this is what I had predicted, this finding seems rather interesting and I will further investigate this in my discussion.

Religiosity and Ideology:

As outlined in my third hypothesis I predicted that those who are more religious would identify themselves as being conservative. I found a significant correlation between religiosity and conservativism. I found a positive correlation that was significant beyond .001 with a standard coefficient of .404 with 623 cases. This strong relationship between religion and ideology supports my prediction based on previous literature.

Politics of Opposition and Ideology:
In my sixth hypothesis I stated that those who favor more socialist policies would identify as liberal. This assertion was supported by the overwhelmingly significant correlation I found between politics of opposition and liberal ideology. The correlation was significant beyond .001 and had a standardized coefficient of -.909 with 230 cases. Although many of the measures I used to judge politics of opposition are very closely associated with liberal ideology, I wanted to look at how they compare to the self-reported ideological view.

Religiosity and Apathy:

As the literature suggests I hypothesized that those who are religious will be less likely to be apathetic voters and non-voters. This was the premise of my seventh hypothesis and is supported by the fact that I found a significant negative correlation between religiosity and voter apathy. With a standardized coefficient of -.168 this relationship is significant beyond the .001 level with a sample size of 539.

Politics of Opposition and Apathy:

In my eighth hypothesis, I predicted that those who favor more socialist policies will be more apathetic in their voting behavior. This was supported by my findings. I found that there is a positive relationship between politics of opposition and apathy. I got a standard coefficient of .390, which was significant beyond .01 level with a sample of 230 cases.
Apathy and Ideology:

I wanted to see what apathetic voters identified as their ideology. Knowing that this has great political ramifications, I think it is important to see how the non-voters could have voted. Not surprisingly I found a significant relationship between apathy and liberal ideology. With a standard coefficient of -.204, non-voters are significantly liberal beyond .01 level of significance with a sample of 617 cases.

Figure 5.1. Relationship among Religiosity, Politics of Opposition, Apathy, and Ideology.
5.3 Relationship among Income, Apathy, and Ideology

In my second hypothesis I wanted to look at whether or not income was related to voter apathy. I predicted that those who have lower incomes will be more likely to be non-voters than those with higher incomes. By running a linear regression I discovered that income is inversely related to voting apathy. With a standardized coefficient of, - .281 they are correlated beyond a .001 level of significance. I have already established that those who are apathetic are more liberal. This shows that low-income families have a tendency to be apathetic, and those apathetic voters are more liberal.

Figure 5.2. Relationship among Income, Apathy, and Ideology.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

In this project I have examined Marx’s theory of alienation and have attempted to apply it to explain the modern political patterns in the southern United States. By looking at religion and politics of opposition as two very different forms of false consciousness in response to alienation created by the capitalist system, I was able to construct a model based on the interaction of income and alienation to form a concept of class. I also wanted to look at how voter apathy serves as a false consciousness, and furthermore how religiosity and politics of opposition affect voter apathy. By constructing a model, I wanted compare the relationship of class with religiosity, politics of opposition, and voter apathy. Lastly, I wanted to clarify their relationship to each other and how they are related to political ideology.

To sum up my findings, my research indicated that alienation is inversely correlated with religiosity, and that my measurement of class was not significantly associated with the various types of false consciousness I explored. Although the initial link was missing, I did establish correlations between religiosity, politics of opposition, apathy, and ideology. These relationships were all significant and in the directions I hypothesized: those who are more religious, are less in favor of socialist policies, less apathetic in voting, and more conservative, while those who are in favor of politics of opposition are more apathetic voters and more liberal. I also found that low income is correlated with voter apathy and apathetic voters are more liberal.
Chapter 7: Discussion

In this project I realized that there were several problems in my attempts to quantify Marxist theory; along with other issues I feel need to be discussed in the hopes of guiding future research in an appropriate direction. First, I must examine further my attempts to measure alienation and evaluate how realistic this surrogate measure is to what Marx had envisioned. Next, I need to examine an adequate explanation of why I found the relationship between religiosity and politics of opposition, and what this relationship means. Finally, I will look at the relationship between poverty and voter apathy and discuss the impact that this has on representation in the political system and the preservation of capitalism.

7.1 Measuring Alienation

Although I was unable to show a connection between my construction of class and religion, politics of opposition and apathy, I am not convinced that these connections do not exist. The toughest and possibly the largest shortcoming of this project were using an attitudinal survey to measure alienation. Because Marxist theory is a very complex theory and was initially intended to be evaluated on a historical more structural level, my attempts to quantify alienation did not adequately test Marx’s theory. Some of these inadequacies simply come from the limitation of using an attitudinal survey. When Marx called something a false consciousness, he meant that in this state individuals are blinded to the greater forces acting on them. Although current theorists have looked at everything from drugs to consumer culture as forms of false consciousness, Marx himself identified religion as being the most dangerous. The religion of the masses is used as a
tool of the elite to ensure the preservation of capitalism (Marx 1988). Furthermore, if one is preoccupied with that of the sacred world and the afterlife, they are blinded to the objectification of their labor. When one’s job is their calling in life, satisfaction does not lie in the work itself, but in the belief that they are serving god’s will. This faith that the true rewards for their hardships will come in the afterlife allows workers to ignore their position in the labor force and their financial suffering. Furthermore, satisfaction in life comes from knowing that one is fulfilling god’s will and doing the best regardless of one’s position. Although I will not make the argument that the bible supports slavery, Peter says “Slaves, submit yourself to your masters with all respect, not only to those who are good and considerate, but also to those who are harsh. For it is commendable if a man bears up under the pain of unjust suffering because he is conscious of God” (Peter 2:18-19). The implications of this are that even slave work is satisfying when it is done for the lord.

Thus, I feel that my attempt to measure alienation based solely on job satisfaction is problematic when dealing with religion. Someone who is religious within a traditional sense has faith that their job is part of god’s will and satisfaction comes from doing *his* work regardless of one’s occupational status. As a further extension of this project I feel that attitudinal measures of alienation are inadequate and that the only appropriate way to measure Marx’s notion of alienation is to look at the occupational conditions in which the worker is placed. Only by measuring the objectification of the worker’s labor can we determine how alienated they are.
7.2 Religiosity and Socialism

Although Karl Marx didn’t fully develop the relationship between capitalism and religion, Max Weber, in his work the *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, gives a detailed analysis of the role of religion in the development of capitalism. Weber criticized Marx for taking a one-sided, materialistic view of society. In his analysis he looks at both the economic reasons and the spiritual ideology that allowed for the formation of capitalism. “But it is, of course, not my aim to substitute for a one-sided materialistic and an equally one-sided spiritualistic causal interpretation of culture and of history” (Weber 1985 p. 183). Weber claims that it is the ideology of the religious calling that resulted in the reformation and the teachings of Luther and Calvin, which in turn allowed for capitalism to thrive.

In the Christian dogmas of the old and new testaments, many socialist themes are visited over and over again. Helping the poor and warning against the dangers of accumulating wealth appear countless times. “Wealth as such is a great danger; its temptations never end, and its pursuit is not only senseless as compared with the dominating importance of the Kingdom of God, but is morally suspect” (Weber 1985 p.157).

After the reformation, the concept of the calling was used to help with the formation and preservation of capitalism. These teachings emphasized that leisure and enjoyment are sins, and only productive activity increases the glory of god (Weber 1985).
In Weber’s analysis he goes on to talk about how hard work and wealth are signs of serving god well.

“Wealth is thus bad ethically only in so far as it is a temptation to idleness and sinful enjoyment of life, and its acquisition is bad only when it is with the purpose of later living merrily and without care. But as a performance of duty in a calling it is not only morally permissible, but actually enjoined. The parable of the servant who was rejected because he did not increase the talent which was entrusted to him seemed to say so directly. To wish to be poor was, it was often argued, the same as wishing to be unhealthy; it is objectionable as a glorification of works and derogatory to the glory of God” (Weber 1985 p. 163).

In my project I found that those who were religious were against socialist policies. My partial explanation for these findings lies in the work of Weber. His evaluation and relationship between the Protestant ethic and capitalism explains why there is such a strong connection between religion and capitalist ideology. Because the southern portion of the United States is predominately made up of Protestant and Evangelistic religions, it becomes apparent why anti-socialist sentiments appear and support for capitalism is so prevalent.

7.3 Voter Apathy Among the Poor

Voter apathy among the poor would not surprise Marx in the least. Marx’s theory of alienation can be characterized as progressing from alienation of labor to political alienation, and finally, self-alienation. This is, however, very important in its consequences to our political system. In Marxist theory it is the capitalist class that controls society. This is not a conspiracy theory in that the capitalist class is purposely trying to keep the poor down, but in that the structure of the capitalist system allows and mandates control. This is important in that the capitalist class is able to create laws and policies that benefit itself and often disadvantages the poor. It is understandable that
these alienated proletariat are less likely to vote, but the absence of their voices only strengthens the domination of a small and powerful elite, which run the country. Marx hoped through education a collective class-consciousness could be formed that would allow for the workers to unite against their exploitation.

In the United States the poor are the least represented in our political system; this has detrimental effects for the creation of policies that can combat the relative inequality that is spiraling out of control. As more poor do not vote or are enslaved in our country’s prisons, the control of the capitalist class is solidified and conservative ideologies prevail.

7.4 Final Thoughts

The United States political system is very complex and a multitude of factors are influential in determining its course. Of these various factors, religion seems to play an essential role in influencing political ideology. The question of whether or not Marx was right in his theory of alienation remains unanswered by this project. The complexity of Marxist theory and the challenges of empirically testing an almost tautological argument limit the ability to adequately test this theory. Of course one could say that because alienation was not correlated with religion that Marx was wrong (assuming you accept the measures of alienation used), but Marx would simply reply that this only further proves him right. He would claim that religion is such an opiate that the individual is completely blinded of the objectification of their labor. Nevertheless, the economic factors that are expected to be a driving force in this materialistic society succumb to the more powerful religious and cultural ideologies that support and propagate conservativism and preserve the capitalist way of life.
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APPENDIX A: Variables

Section 1: Scope Conditions

1.1 SOUTH

(REGION) Respondents region

0 = not assigned
1 = New England
2 = Middle Atlantic
3 = East North Central
4 = West North Central
5 = South Atlantic
6 = East South Central
7 = West South Central
8 = Mountain
9 = Pacific

0,1,2,3,4,8,9 -> sysmis
5,6,7 -> 1 (South)

Table A-1.1. Just South Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 WHITE

(RACE) Respondent’s Race

1 = White
2 = Black
3 = Other

2,3 -> sysmis
1 -> (White)

Table A-1.2. Just White Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3: SCOPE

760 cases will be used in this research.

Table A-1.3. Just South and White Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>White Southerners</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2: Dependent Variables

2.1 APATHY

(VOTE92) Did respondent vote in the 1992 presidential election?
(VOTE96) Did respondent vote in the 1996 presidential election?

1 = Voted
2 = Did not vote
3 = Not eligible

3 -> sysmis

1 -> 0 Voters
2 -> 1 Non Voters

Apathy = vote92 + vote96

Apathy

0 = Non apathetic
1 = Moderately apathetic
2 = Apathetic voters

Table A-2.1. Voter Apathy Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Val. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Non-Apathetic</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Apathetic</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathetic</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Ideology

(POLVIEWS) Do you think of yourself as being liberal or conservative

1 = Extremely Liberal
2 = Liberal
3 = Slightly Liberal
4 = Moderate
5 = Slightly Conservative
6 = Conservative
7 = Extremely Conservative

Table A-2.2. Ideology Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY LIBERAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIGHTLY LIBERAL</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIGHTLY CONSERVATIVE</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATIVE</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRMLY CONSERVATIVE</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 716

Missing 44
Total 760
Section 3: Independent Variables

3.1 Alienation

ALIENATION

(SATJOB) satisfaction in job. or housework
“Are you satisfied with your job or housework?”

0,8,9 -> sysmis

1 = very satisfied
2 = moderately satisfied
3 = somewhat dissatisfied
4 = very dissatisfied

1 -> 1 (not alienated)
2,3,4 -> 2 (alienated)

Table A-3.1. Alienation Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Val. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-Alienated</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienated</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Income

(INCOME98) total family income

0,24,98 -> sysmis

1, … , 15 -> 1 (low income) $0-29,999
16, … , 23 -> 2 (high income) $30,000-and up

Table A-3.2. Income Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Val. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Income</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Class

CLASS (4 way class distribution)

1 = low income high alienation (main group… religious)
2 = High income high alienation (liberals)
3 = High income low alienation (Rich)
4 = low income low alienation (contradiction… apathetic)

Table A-3.3. Class Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Val. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income High-Alienation</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Income Low-Alienation</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Income High-Alienation</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Low-Alienation</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sys. Missing 225
Total 760

3.4 Religion

(ATTEND) How often attend service
“How often do you attend religious services”

1 = Never -> 0
2 = Less then once a year -> 0
3 = once a year -> 0
4 = several times a year -> 0
5 = once a month -> 1
6 = 2-3X a month -> 1
7 = Nearly every week -> 1
8 = Every week -> 2
9 = More then once a week -> 2

Table A-3.4. Attendance Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Attendance</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Moderately</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Frequently</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sys. Missing</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Politics of Opposition

Politics of opposition Index:

1) nateduc
“Does the government spend _____ improving the national education system?”

1 = Too little -> 2
2 = About right -> 1
3 = Too much -> 0

2) welfare
“Does the government spend _____ on welfare?”

1 = Too little -> 2
2 = About right -> 1
3 = Too much -> 0

3) Social security
“Does the government spend _____ Social Security?”

1 = Too little -> 2
2 = About right -> 1
3 = Too much -> 0

4) Standard of Living
“Should the government improve the standard of living?”

1 = Government action -> 2
2 = Some government action -> 2
3 = Agree with both -> 1
4 = People should mostly help themselves -> 0
5 = People help themselves -> 0

5) Medical Care
“Should the government improve medical care?”

1 = Government action -> 2
2 = Some government action -> 2
3 = Agree with both -> 1
4 = People should mostly help themselves -> 0
5 = People help themselves -> 0
Table A-3.5. Correlation Matrix for Politics of Opposition Indicators (n=230).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Soc. Security</th>
<th>Help Poor</th>
<th>Help Sick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. Security</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>.166**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Poor</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.156**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Sick</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.266**</td>
<td>.157**</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-Tailed Significance Tests:
* p. <= .05.
** p. <= .01.

Cronbach’s Alpha = .5322
Appendix B

Imputing variables

The basic theory surrounding imputing values assumes that the values are missing at random. In constructing my religiosity index I had high inner-correlarity among my measures. Because of this I justified imputing the average means for missing values. This method is referred to as imputing the means (Allison 2002). After doing this, I realized that it had made little difference in my regressions; and because religious measures are so highly correlated, it makes sense simply to use the single measure that had the highest response. The more measures I use for constructing an index the more error I introduce. By simplifying my measure of religiosity to one indicator I decrease the risk of my findings being dependent on my decisions. Below I give the original measures of religiosity.

Original Index for Religion

1) God’s presence
“How often do you feel God’s presence?”

1 = Many times a day -> 2
2 = Every day -> 2
3 = Most days -> 1
4 = Some day -> 1
5 = Once in a while -> 0
6 = Never/almost never -> 0

2) Find strength and comfort
“How often do you find strength and comfort in religion?”

1 = Many times a day -> 2
2 = Every day -> 2
3 = Most days -> 1
4 = Some day -> 1
5 = Once in a while -> 0
6 = Never/almost never -> 0
3) Religious affiliation
“How strong is your religious affiliation?”

1 = Strong -> 2
2 = Not very strong -> 1
3 = Somewhat strong -> 1
4 = No religion -> 0

4) Belief in the bible
“Do you believe the bible is?”

1 = Word of God -> 2
2 = Inspired word -> 1
3 = Book of fables -> 0

5) How often pray
“How often do you pray?”

1 = Several times a day -> 2
2 = Once a day -> 2
3 = Several times a week -> 1
4 = Once a week -> 1
5 = Less than once a week -> 0
6 = Never/almost never -> 0

6) How often attend service
“How often do you attend religious services?”

1 = Never -> 0
2 = Less than once a year -> 0
3 = once a year -> 0
4 = several times a year -> 0
5 = once a month -> 1
6 = 2-3X a month -> 1
7 = Nearly every week -> 1
8 = Every week -> 2
9 = More than once a week -> 2

7) How religious are you
“Do you consider yourself a religious person?”

1 = Very religious -> 2
2 = Moderate religious -> 1
3 = Slight religious -> 1
4 = Not religious -> 0
### Table B-1.1. Correlation Matrix for Religion Indicators (n=289).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel God</th>
<th>Feel God</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Bible</th>
<th>Bible</th>
<th>Pray</th>
<th>Pray</th>
<th>Attend</th>
<th>Attend</th>
<th>Rel. Person</th>
<th>Rel. Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>.748**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.474**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pray</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>.487**</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel. Person</td>
<td>.448**</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-Tailed Significance Tests:
* p. <= .05.
** p. <= .01.

Cronbach’s Alpha = .8394