

Labor Union members stance on major social issues in the 2016 general election.

Matthew Sauser
Bemidji State University

Dr. Patrick Donnay
Political Science Senior Thesis
Thesis and Career Preparation

Abstract:

In 2016, Democratic Candidate for President Hillary Clinton faced off against Republican Candidate Donald Trump in what was expected to be a lopsided victory for the Democrats. As the campaigns and researchers did a post-mortem on the results, they saw that white voters in key states of Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Michigan weren't as motivated to get to the polls for Candidate Hillary Clinton versus her opponent Donald Trump. I took a deep dive into trying to find the reason that why labor union members could have broken from their traditional ranks of Democrats to vote for Donald Trump by examining some of the biggest social issues in the 2016 general election. The data I am examining is the 2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Survey administered by YouGov. The CCES 2016 surveyed 64,400+ US citizens which was administered in two waves being the pre-election and post-election waves. I find that there is a small group of Democratic-identifying union members that break from the Democratic Party on major issues and I identify them as a part of those white voters who may have voted for Donald Trump over Hillary Clinton. Their defection may have resulted in Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania flipping from Democratic in 2012 to Republican in 2018.

Introduction

Labor Unions have been a pivotal part of American democracy. They've lobbied and campaigned for collective bargaining, end of child labor, higher quality of representation, legal assistance for unlawful terminations and *many* other benefits for the working people. At the height of labor union membership, there were 17.1 million blue and white-collar workers participating in organized labor in the 1980s. Public opinion was over 50% in the 80s as this membership continue to rise in the face of the President Reagan's right-to-work agenda. (Camobreco & Barnello, 2015) The membership started to decline with the great recession in 2008 then for the first time in 20-years the public opinion of Labor Unions dipped below 50% in favor. (Camobreco & Barnello, 2015) Soon after the great recession, six states (Alabama with Constitutional Amendment, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, West Virginia and Wisconsin) have passed right-To-work laws which have weakened the power of labor unions in those states.

To investigate this hypothesis, we will be looking into polling data from all around the nation of union members and households. We will be looking at their "temperature" on certain issues, party identification from 2016, labor union membership within certain states. The dataset I will be using is the Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCED) 2016 to gather the needed data to investigate my hypothesis.

Changes in Labor Union Demographics

The landscape of Labor Union membership has changed from the 1950s to the 2000s. One of the biggest changes has been the makeup of the Unionized workforce. In 1983, 34% of Union members were employed by public sector industries. Throughout the next 25 years, that would grow to become 49% of the Union membership. This change would be backed up according to Camobreco & Barnello in *The Changing Face of Unions and White Labor Support for the Democratic Party*, “A similar pattern reveals itself when examining a longer period of time. Between 1973 and 2011, union membership in the private sector declined precipitously (from 24.2% to 6.9%), but union membership among public sector workers actually increased from 23% to 37%.” (Camobreco & Barnello, 2015). In 2019, public union membership made up 7.1 million workers whereas the private unions workers made up 7.5 million. (2019, January 18) Also noted by (Schmitt & Warner, 2009, p. 01), Labor Union members are strongest in the Midwest and Northeast with 25% through 27% of the population in those regions being members of a labor union. Some of the lowest memberships are in states in the South and West. (Schmitt & Warner, 2009, p. 01)

Another major change would come from the gender make-up of labor union membership. Not only does the membership shift from private sector to public sector dominate but there is also a shift from males making up the majority of the demographics of the membership to a female majority. In the 50s, only 15.2% of union members were female, 50 years later women make-up 43.5% of the total membership. From 1983 to 2008, the number of women who are union workers has increased from 35% to 45%. (Camobreco & Barnello, 2015)

The third major shift of the union membership demographics is with level of education. Historically, membership with some college education has been very low, according to Table 1

in “The Changing Face of Unions and White Labor Support for the Democratic Party” by John F. Camobreco* and Michelle A. Barnello, in the 1950s only 9% of membership had some college. 50 years later that number has drastically risen to 57%. (Camobreco & Barnello, 2015)

These three major changes are all related to each other. As white uneducated males chose not to join unions the number of colleges educated women has drastically increased especially in the public sector jobs. According to the educationcorner.com, the number of public-school teachers has increased by over 12% which is equivalent to 479,000 jobs, this is why are seeing such a drastic increase in public sector women in the unions. (2019)

How these ties into the question is that it might help explain who broke ranks from the historic Democratic voting bloc. The theory is that it was private-sector, older white, uneducated, blue-collar union workers may have voted for the Republican candidate in 2016 which left public-sector, educated women who stuck with the democratic candidate.

Method and Analysis

The data I am using is from the dataset 2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Study which is administered by YouGov.com and Harvard University. The survey had 64,600 respondents who all responded over the internet. Those respondents were selected anonymously and randomly. The study targeted people using a matched random sample method to find the respondents from all over the United States. This data has variables on each of the 64,600 respondents voted for US Representative, Senator to President then their stances and feeling thermometers on issues.

I chose this dataset because it is very detailed in categorizing the respondents into many different groups such as labor union members, party ID, industry class, income range, economic

class, etc. I found this dataset would help me break down the answer to my hypothesis in a specific as possible. With the level of detail in this dataset I will be able to make some very detailed arguments for or against my hypotheses.

Hypothesis

The question I am addressing is if union members may have voted for Republican candidate Trump over Democratic candidate Clinton in the 2016 election. My thesis is addressing Labor Union attitudes towards social issues and asking if there is this group of conservative labor union Democrats. There's a theory that this group of conservative labor union Democrats that voted for Donald Trump over Hillary Clinton and this thesis is researching if that group even exists. My hypothesis uses social issues like abortion, gun control, healthcare and immigration to determine if this group exists. Then we use that information to see if those conservative labor union Democrats could have caused Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania to swing Republican in the 2016 general election.

To get Table One, I used crosstabulation using the variable CC16_332a which is a question about allowing women to obtain abortions as a matter of choice and Pid3_V2 which identifies respondents on a three-point party scale of Democratic, Independent or Republican.

Breaking down Table One, when talking about the issue of "*Always allow a woman to obtain an abortion as a matter of choice By Three Party ID*". Of those who support it are 78.7% of Democrats, 55.6% of Independents and 34% of Republicans who agreed that women should be able to obtain an abortion by their choice. 21.3% of Democrats, 44.4% of Independents and 66% of Republicans oppose allowing woman the choice to have an abortion.

Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda results, the chi-square test came out to 8408.378 with a Lambda which is .221. This shows that there is a no statistical significance between the question about women's right to choose with Party ID which is not due to chance. Using Table 2 (below), we can break down these numbers down further by those who have union affiliation, used to have union affiliation or no union affiliation by Party.

Looking at Table Two, I used a crosstabulation of the variables *CC16_332a*, *Pid3_V2* and *Union*. I broke down the respondent's answers to the question "*Always allow a woman to obtain an abortion by a matter of choice*" by a 3 party ID and also by Union affiliation.

Breaking down Table Two, of those who are union members and democratic, 84.6% support allowing woman to obtain abortion whereas 15.4% oppose. Republican identifying Union members 46.7% support a woman to have the choice for an abortion where 53.3% oppose it. Lastly of independent identifying union members, 58.9% support and 41.1% oppose. This Table shows you have Democrats very lopsided in support of a woman's right to choose whereas Independents and Republicans split fairly down the middle on the issue.

What this shows is that there are a select group of Democratic-identifying union members who hold a minority opinion that there should not be the right for a woman to get an abortion if she chooses to do so which goes against the overall stance of the Democratic party who have a more liberal stances that they have the right to choose. Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda results, you can see across the board there is a not statistical significance between the Question, Party ID and labor union variables. The Lambda show that there is a no statistical significance with former union, no union affiliation and then total but there is a statistical significance with those who answered yes.

Looking at healthcare, the big campaign promise by Candidate Trump and the Republican party was that if they take control of the government, they will promise to finally repeal the Affordable Healthcare Act, otherwise known as Obamacare. Table 3 was assembled through a crosstabulation using the variable CC16_351I, and Pid3_V2. CC16_351I asked respondents “Would repeal the Affordable Care Act of 2009?” which had all 64,600 respondents answer the question.

Table Three shows that 30.2% support repealing the ACA whereas 69.8% of democratic-identifying respondents oppose it. This shows how popular the ACA was within the democratic ranks. Looking at Republican respondents, 87.8% support the repeal of the ACA and 12.2% oppose it. Independents stated that nearly 60.7% support the repeal and 39.3% oppose the repeal of the ACA. This table shows how intense of an issue this was on the campaign trail. Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda results, the chi-square test coming to 13.861.034 with a Lambda which is .356. This shows that there is a no statistical significance with the Lambda but not the chi-square test between the question about women’s right to choose and Party ID.

Using crosstabulation for *Table Four*, I used the same variables as *Table Three* but added in layering using the variable *union*. So, using the variables CC16_351I, Pid3_V2 and *union* I came up with a table that breaks down the respondents into the categories of union members, formers membership and no-membership based on the issue of Repealing the ACA and their party identification. This will help prove or disprove my hypothesis because of being able to separate that group of “blue dog” Democrats who voted for Trump over HRC.

Table Four shows some interesting points that directly pertain to my hypothesis. There are 34% of Democratic-identifying Union Members who are for the repeal of the ACA. 66% of those who responded that they are in a labor union and identify as a Democrat are opposed to the Repeal of the ACA. 24.1% of Democrats who were formally union members also supported the repeal of the ACA. Look at those against, 66% of union members oppose the repeal of the ACA which again shows that there is this minority group of Democrats who will vote against the party of key issues like healthcare but still identify as Democrats.

Taking a look at Republicans and Independents, 83.3% of Republicans and 60.8% of Independents who are members of a labor union support the repeal of the ACA. Looking at former labor union members, 89.9% of Republicans support and 10.1% oppose then 63.1% of independents support and 39.9% oppose. Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda results, this shows that there is a statistical significance between the question about women's right to choose and Party ID. The Chi-Squares show that there is no statistical significance.

Table Five shows all the respondent's stance on Gun Control, looking specifically at Universal Background Checks with party ID. The table was assembled through a crosstabulation using the variable CC16_330a, and Pid3_V2. CC16_331_8 asked respondents "On the issue of gun regulation, do you support or oppose each of the following proposals?" with the option "Background checks for all sales, including at gun shows and over the Internet". Looking at the responses; 64,385 respondents answered the question and only 215 skipped the question.

Breaking down the table, of those who support background checks on all gun's sales are 96.6% of Democrats, 83.9% of Republicans and 86.4% of independents. Looking at those who oppose are 3.4% of Democrats, 16.1% of Republicans and 13.6% of Independents. We will be

using this to show the bigger breakdown of union membership on these stances. Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda results, the chi-square test came out to 2127.815 with a Lambda which is .000. This shows that there is a statistical significance between the question about firearm background checks choose and Party ID.

Table Six shows all the respondent's stance on Gun Control, looking specifically at Universal Background Checks with party ID and union membership. The table was assembled through a crosstabulation using the variable CC16_330a and Pid3_V2 with a layering of the *Union* variable. CC16_331_8 asked respondents "On the issue of gun regulation, do you support or oppose each of the following proposals?" with the option "Background checks for all sales, including at gun shows and over the Internet". Looking at the responses; 64,385 respondents answered the question and only 215 skipped the question.

The biggest statistic this graph shows is the 3.5% of democratic-identifying union members opposed to a stance that 96.6% of democratic-identifying respondents support. What's even more surprising is that even 81.5% of Republican-identifying and 83% of independent respondents also support this gun control stance. This continues to support my theory of this group of labor union member Democrats are a minority faction of the party. Looking at the Chi-Square test, we got the results of yes are 254.199, former are 630.829, no is 1311.897 and the total is 2135.159. The Lambda results, all came out to .000. This shows that there is a statistical significance between the question about union member, firearm background checks and Party ID.

Table 7 was assembled through a crosstabulation using the variable CC16_331_8, and Pid3_V2. CC16_331_8 asked respondents “What do you think the U.S. Government should do about Immigration?”. With this variable being the option “Immigration – Ban Muslims from immigration to the U.S.” which had 13,269 respondents answer the question.

The table shows that 8.3% of Democratic-identifying respondents support the Muslim ban as a way to address immigration but 91.7% oppose it. Looking at Republicans, 43.3% support the ban of Muslims whereas 56.7% oppose it. Lastly, 27.6% of Independents support compared to the 72.4% who oppose it. Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda results, the chi-square test came out to 1305.236 with a Lambda which is .000. This shows that there is a statistical significance between the question about banning Muslim immigration and Party ID.

Table Eight shows all the respondent’s stance on immigration, looking specifically at a Muslim Ban as a way to dealing with US immigration. The table is made with a party ID and union membership variables for the way to identify respondents. The table was assembled through a crosstabulation using the variable CC16_331_8 and Pid3_V2 with a layering of the *Union* variable. CC16_331_8 asked respondents “On the issue of gun regulation, do you support or oppose each of the following proposals?” with the option “Background checks for all sales, including at gun shows and over the Internet”. Looking at the responses; 12,335 respondents answered the question with the rest respondents not asked or not responding to the question.

Breaking down Table Eight, of those respondents who identified as democratic and a union member 6.8% of those respondents support a Muslim ban as a way of dealing with US immigration. 93.2% of those same democratic-identifying union respondents oppose the idea.

Looking at Republican-identifying union member, 42.1% support the stance while 57.9% oppose. Finally, Independents, 34.3% support and 65.7% oppose the US banning Muslims to deal with immigration. Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda results, the chi-square test came out to no statistical significance between the question about whether to ban Muslim immigration to the US and Party ID.

Addressing Table 9, I want to show the overall union membership within the three states that I am concentrating on with this thesis. I used the variables *Union*, *InputState_WIMICHPA* and *PiD3_V2*. Shown in Table 9, you can see that all three of these states have high percentage of current and former union members within their state. Another thing shown that isn't much of a surprise is that Democrats make up a majority of the union members or former members. Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda results, the chi-square test came out to yes being 12.715, former being 44.160, No being 79.725 and total being 99.742 with the Lambdas varying between .000 and .005 in the same order. This shows that there is a statistical significance in these groups of current, former and union affiliation.

Table 10 shows the overall support and opposition to the question "*Always allow a woman to obtain an abortion as a matter of choice By Three Party ID*" which is variable *CC16_332a*. The table was made up using a cross-crosstabulation of variables *CC16_332a*, *PiD3_V2* and *InputState_WIMICHPA*. The table is also filtered to only include current and former labor union members respondents. Shown in Table 10, as shown Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania have the same amounts of those who support or are against of the general population who was surveyed. The general population though is slightly more in support of having a women's right to choose than against it. Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda

results, the chi-square test came out to .282 for Wisconsin, .302 for Michigan, .275 for Pennsylvania, .229 for other states/territories /235 for total. The Lambda across the board are no significances when comparing the question about abortion in Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Michigan with party ID.

Table 11 shows the overall support and opposition to the question “*Repeal the ACA*” which is variable CC16_351I. The table was made up using a cross-crosstabulation of variables CC16_351I, PiD3_V2 and InputState_ *WIMICHPA*. The table is also filtered to only include current and former labor union members. This is showing in Table 11, as shown Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania have the same amounts of those who support or are against of the general population who was surveyed. The general population though is slightly more in support repeal than against it. Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda results, the chi-square test came out to 33.557 for Wisconsin, 55.931 for Michigan, 54.282 for Pennsylvania, 602.796 for other states/territories and 736.584 for total. The Lambda across the board are not significant when comparing the question with party ID of union members in Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Michigan.

Table 12 shows the overall support and opposition to the question “*If you support background checks for all firearm sales, including at gun shows and over the counter?*” which is variable CC16_330a. The table was made up using a cross-crosstabulation of variables CC16_330a, PiD3_V2 and InputState_ *WIMICHPA*. The table is also filtered to only include current and former labor union members. This survey response with the Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania variable shows that the general population in those states heavily support background checks as a gun control policy. Beside Wisconsin with 11.9%, Michigan and

Pennsylvania fall under 10% opposition for background checks. Looking at the Chi-Square test and Lambda results, the chi-square test came out to 12.448 for Wisconsin, 11.043 for Michigan, 11.045 for Pennsylvania, 222.205 for other states/territories and 253.223 for total. Across all group's lambda is .000. This shows that there is not a statistical difference between the question and the variables included.

Discussion & Conclusion

Overall, the data above proves that there is no statistically proven strong group of conservative union members that exist within the Democratic party. There are of course conservative members logically but they're not a sizeable group that could cause a Democratic Candidate to struggle without them. With more data and time, I would have liked to have expanded this to the overall timespan from 2008 to 2018 to see if these theories have changes in a 10-year span. I would have also liked to have included a section strictly on further breaking down these union members to see if there are any voting patterns within blue collar union vs white collar union. Concluding, the research question overall is debunked.

Appendix

Table 1: Always allow a women to obtain an abortion as a matter of choice by Three Party ID

				Total
	Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
Support	18739 78.7%	10924 55.6%	5975 34.0%	35638 58.4%
Oppose	5058 21.3%	8708 44.4%	11581 66.0%	25347 41.6%
Total	23797 100.0%	19632 100.0%	17556 100.0%	60985 100.0%

Total Chi Square = 8408.378 | Lambda = .221* | *Significant at .05 level

Table 2: Always allow a woman to obtain an abortion as a matter of choice by Three Party ID and Labor union member

Labor union member		Three Party ID			Total
		Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
Yes, I am currently a member of a labor union	Support	2001 84.6%	707 58.9%	469 46.7%	3177 69.5%
	Oppose	363 15.4%	493 41.1%	535 53.3%	1391 30.5%
	Total	2364 100.0%	1200 100.0%	1004 100.0%	4568 100.0%
I formerly was a member of a labor union	Support	3412 80.3%	1918 53.0%	964 33.4%	6294 58.5%
	Oppose	835 19.7%	1704 47.0%	1923 66.6%	4462 41.5%
	Total	4247 100.0%	3622 100.0%	2887 100.0%	10756 100.0%
I am not now, nor have I been, a member of a labor union	Support	13291 77.6%	8273 56.0%	4519 33.2%	26083 57.3%
	Oppose	3844 22.4%	6502 44.0%	9090 66.8%	19436 42.7%
	Total	17135 100.0%	14775 100.0%	13609 100.0%	45519 100.0%
Total	Support	18704 78.8%	10898 55.6%	5952 34.0%	35554 58.4%
	Oppose	5042 21.2%	8699 44.4%	11548 66.0%	25289 41.6%
	Total	23746 100.0%	19597 100.0%	17500 100.0%	60843 100.0%

Yes Chi Square = 565.636, Lambda = .047
 Former Chi Square = 1630.136, Lambda = .215*
 No Chi Square = 6115.754, Lambda = .235*
 Total Chi Square = 8403.844, Lambda = .221*
 *Significant at .05 level

Table 3: Repeal Affordable Care Act by Three Party ID

				Total
	Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
For	7191	11981	15410	34582
	30.2%	61.0%	87.8%	56.7%
Against	16590	7656	2134	26380
	69.8%	39.0%	12.2%	43.3%
Total	23781	19637	17544	60962
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Total Chi Square = 13861.034 | Lambda = .356* | *Significant at .05 level

Table 4: Repeal Affordable Care Act by Three Party ID and Labor union member

Labor union member					Total
		Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
Yes, I am currently a member of a labor union	For	805 34.0%	727 60.7%	837 83.3%	2369 51.9%
	Against	1560 66.0%	471 39.3%	168 16.7%	2199 48.1%
	Total	2365 100.0%	1198 100.0%	1005 100.0%	4568 100.0%
I formerly was a member of a labor union	For	1022 24.1%	2304 63.5%	2590 89.9%	5916 55.0%
	Against	3217 75.9%	1324 36.5%	292 10.1%	4833 45.0%
	Total	4239 100.0%	3628 100.0%	2882 100.0%	10749 100.0%
I am not now, nor have I been, a member of a labor union	For	5348 31.2%	8928 60.4%	11932 87.7%	26208 57.6%
	Against	11780 68.8%	5848 39.6%	1671 12.3%	19299 42.4%
	Total	17128 100.0%	14776 100.0%	13603 100.0%	45507 100.0%
Total	For	7175 30.2%	11959 61.0%	15359 87.8%	34493 56.7%
	Against	16557 69.8%	7643 39.0%	2131 12.2%	26331 43.3%
	Total	23732 100.0%	19602 100.0%	17490 100.0%	60824 100.0%

Yes Chi Square = 735.757, Lambda = .343*
 Former Chi Square = 3156.581, Lambda = .454*
 No Chi Square = 9978.523, Lambda = .333*
 Total Chi Square = 13817.423, Lambda = .356*
 *Significant at .05 level

Table 5: Background checks for all firearm sales, including at gun shows and over the counter by Three Party ID

				Total
	Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
Support	22942 96.6%	16818 85.9%	14695 83.9%	54455 89.5%
Oppose	806 3.4%	2771 14.1%	2810 16.1%	6387 10.5%
Total	23748 100.0%	19589 100.0%	17505 100.0%	60842 100.0%

Total Chi Square = 2127.815 | Lambda = .000 | *Significant at .05 level

Table 6: Background checks for all firearm sales, including at gun shows and over the counter by Three Party ID and Labor union member

Labor union member		Three Party ID			Total
		Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
Yes, I am currently a member of a labor union	Support	2274 96.5%	992 82.6%	818 81.5%	4084 89.5%
	Oppose	82 3.5%	209 17.4%	186 18.5%	477 10.5%
	Total	2356 100.0%	1201 100.0%	1004 100.0%	4561 100.0%
I formerly was a member of a labor union	Support	4099 96.7%	2943 81.4%	2246 78.1%	9288 86.6%
	Oppose	141 3.3%	671 18.6%	629 21.9%	1441 13.4%
	Total	4240 100.0%	3614 100.0%	2875 100.0%	10729 100.0%
I am not now, nor have I been, a member of a labor union	Support	16522 96.6%	12852 87.2%	11578 85.3%	40952 90.2%
	Oppose	579 3.4%	1887 12.8%	1995 14.7%	4461 9.8%
	Total	17101 100.0%	14739 100.0%	13573 100.0%	45413 100.0%
Total	Support	22895 96.6%	16787 85.8%	14642 83.9%	54324 89.5%
	Oppose	802 3.4%	2767 14.2%	2810 16.1%	6379 10.5%
	Total	23697 100.0%	19554 100.0%	17452 100.0%	60703 100.0%

Yes Chi Square = 254.119, Lambda = .000,
 Former Chi Square = 630.829, Lambda = .000
 No Chi Square = 1311.897, Lambda = .000
 Total Chi Square = 2135.159, Lambda = .000
 *Significant at .05 level

Table 7: Ban Muslims from immigrating to the U.S. By Three Party ID

	Three Party ID			Total
	Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
Yes	367 8.3%	1197 27.7%	1556 43.3%	3120 25.3%
No	4051 91.7%	3128 72.3%	2036 56.7%	9215 74.7%
Total	4418 100.0%	4325 100.0%	3592 100.0%	12335 100.0%

Total Chi Square = 1305.236 | Lambda = .000 | *Significant at .05 level

Table 8: Ban Muslims from immigrating to the U.S. by Three Party ID and Labor union member membership

Labor union member					Total
		Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
Yes, I am currently a member of a labor union	Yes	25 6.8%	101 34.0%	90 42.1%	216 24.5%
	No	345 93.2%	196 66.0%	124 57.9%	665 75.5%
	Total	370 100.0%	297 100.0%	214 100.0%	881 100.0%
I formerly was a member of a labor union	Yes	73 7.3%	352 33.5%	316 41.9%	741 26.4%
	No	924 92.7%	700 66.5%	439 58.1%	2063 73.6%
	Total	997 100.0%	1052 100.0%	755 100.0%	2804 100.0%
I am not now, nor have I been, a member of a labor union	Yes	269 8.8%	743 25.0%	1149 43.9%	2161 25.0%
	No	2780 91.2%	2231 75.0%	1471 56.1%	6482 75.0%
	Total	3049 100.0%	2974 100.0%	2620 100.0%	8643 100.0%
Total	Yes	367 8.3%	1196 27.7%	1555 43.3%	3118 25.3%
	No	4049 91.7%	3127 72.3%	2034 56.7%	9210 74.7%
	Total	4416 100.0%	4323 100.0%	3589 100.0%	12328 100.0%

Yes Chi Square = 113.087, Lambda = .000
 Former Chi Square = 306.351, Lambda = .000
 No Chi Square = 922.269, Lambda = .000
 Total Chi Square = 1304.633, Lambda = .000
 *Significant at .05 level

Table 9: Labor Union Member in Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Michigan by Party ID

Labor union member						Total
		Wisconsin	Michigan	Pennsylvania	Other State/Territories	
Yes, I am currently a member of a labor union	Democrats	36 39.6%	112 52.8%	115 46.4%	2103 52.3%	2366 51.7%
	Independent	28 30.8%	63 29.7%	76 30.6%	1035 25.7%	1202 26.3%
	Republicans	27 29.7%	37 17.5%	57 23.0%	886 22.0%	1007 22.0%
	Total	91 100.0%	212 100.0%	248 100.0%	4024 100.0%	4575 100.0%
I formerly was a member of a labor union	Democrats	97 32.7%	193 41.1%	305 46.0%	3653 39.1%	4248 ^a 39.4%
	Independent	131 44.1%	158 33.6%	159 24.0%	3185 34.1%	3633 33.7%
	Republicans	69 23.2%	119 25.3%	199 30.0%	2501 26.8%	2888 26.8%
	Total	297 100.0%	470 100.0%	663 100.0%	9339 100.0%	10769 100.0%
I am not now, nor have I been, a member of a labor union	Democrats	277 32.0%	409 32.1%	970 40.4%	15489 37.8%	17145 37.6%
	Independent	338 39.0%	470 36.9%	634 26.4%	13354 32.6%	14796 32.5%
	Republicans	251 29.0%	395 31.0%	799 33.3%	12175 29.7%	13620 29.9%
	Total	866 100.0%	1274 100.0%	2403 100.0%	41018 100.0%	45561 100.0%
Total	Democrats	410 32.7%	714 36.5%	1390 41.9%	21245 39.1%	23759 39.0%
	Independent	497 39.6%	691 35.3%	869 26.2%	17574 32.3%	19631 32.2%
	Republicans	347 27.7%	551 28.2%	1055 31.8%	15562 28.6%	17515 28.8%
	Total	1254	1956	3314	54381	60905

Yes Chi Square = 12.715, Lambda = .000
 Former Chi Square = 44.160, Lambda = .005
 No Chi Square = 79.725, Lambda = .004
 Total Chi Square = 99.742, Lambda = .002
 *Significant at .05 level

Table 10: Always allow a woman to obtain an abortion as a matter of choice by Union Member, Three Party ID and Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Michigan^a

InputState_WIMICHPA					Total
		Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
Wisconsin	Support	223	173	69	465
		80.5%	51.2%	27.5%	53.7%
	Oppose	54	165	182	401
		19.5%	48.8%	72.5%	46.3%
	Total	277	338	251	866
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Michigan	Support	298	261	105	664
		72.9%	55.5%	26.6%	52.2%
	Oppose	111	209	289	609
		27.1%	44.5%	73.4%	47.8%
	Total	409	470	394	1273
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pennsylvania	Support	757	354	257	1368
		78.0%	55.8%	32.2%	56.9%
	Oppose	213	280	542	1035
		22.0%	44.2%	67.8%	43.1%
	Total	970	634	799	2403
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Other State/Territories	Support	12013	7485	4088	23586
		77.6%	56.1%	33.6%	57.6%
	Oppose	3466	5847	8077	17390
		22.4%	43.9%	66.4%	42.4%
	Total	15479	13332	12165	40976
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Support	13291	8273	4519	26083
		77.6%	56.0%	33.2%	57.3%
	Oppose	3844	6501	9090	19435
		22.4%	44.0%	66.8%	42.7%
	Total	17135	14774	13609	45518
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Wisconsin Chi Square = 13.319, Lambda = .282*
 Michigan Chi Square = 57.404, Lambda = .302*
 Pennsylvania Chi Square = 20.414, Lambda = .275*
 Other State/Territories Chi Square = 485.917, Lambda = .229*
 Total Chi Square = 567.567, Lambda = .235*
 *Significant at .05 level

Table 11: Repeal Affordable Care Act by Union Member, Three Party ID and Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Michigan

InputState_WIMICHPA					Total ^a
		Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
Wisconsin	For	73	208	215	496
		26.4%	61.5%	85.3%	57.3%
	Against	203	130	37	370
		73.6%	38.5%	14.7%	42.7%
	Total	276	338	252	866
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Michigan	For	110	246	354	710
		26.9%	52.5%	89.8%	55.8%
	Against	299	223	40	562
		73.1%	47.5%	10.2%	44.2%
	Total	409	469	394	1272
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pennsylvania	For	290	374	697	1361
		29.9%	59.0%	87.2%	56.6%
	Against	680	260	102	1042
		70.1%	41.0%	12.8%	43.4%
	Total	970	634	799	2403
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Other State/Territories	For	4875	8100	10666	23641
		31.5%	60.7%	87.7%	57.7%
	Against	10597	5235	1492	17324
		68.5%	39.3%	12.3%	42.3%
	Total	15472	13335	12158	40965
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	For	5348	8928	11932	26208
		31.2%	60.4%	87.7%	57.6%
	Against	11779	5848	1671	19298
		68.8%	39.6%	12.3%	42.4%
	Total	17127	14776	13603	45506
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Wisconsin Chi Square = 33.557, Lambda = .351*
 Michigan Chi Square = 55.931, Lambda = .336*
 Pennsylvania Chi Square = 54.282, Lambda = .374*
 Other State/Territories Chi Square = 602.796, Lambda = .330*
 Total Chi Square = 736.584, Lambda = .333*

*Significant at .05 level

Table 12: Background checks for all firearm sales, including at gun shows and over the counter by Union Member, Three Party ID and Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Michigan

InputState_WIMICHPA					Total
		Democrats	Independent	Republicans	
Wisconsin	Support	272 98.2%	302 89.1%	204 81.3%	778 89.7%
	Oppose	5 1.8%	37 10.9%	47 18.7%	89 10.3%
	Total	277 100.0%	339 100.0%	251 100.0%	867 100.0%
Michigan	Support	401 98.0%	412 87.7%	340 86.5%	1153 90.6%
	Oppose	8 2.0%	58 12.3%	53 13.5%	119 9.4%
	Total	409 100.0%	470 100.0%	393 100.0%	1272 100% ^a
Pennsylvania	Support	946 98.1%	578 91.3%	720 90.3%	2244 93.7%
	Oppose	18 1.9%	55 8.7%	77 9.7%	150 6.3%
	Total	964 100.0%	633 100.0%	797 100.0%	2394 100.0%
Other State/Territories	Support	14904 96.5%	11561 86.9%	10314 85.0%	36779 90.0%
	Oppose	548 3.5%	1737 13.1%	1817 15.0%	4102 10.0%
	Total	15452 100.0%	13298 100.0%	12131 100.0%	40881 100.0%
Total	Support	16523 96.6%	12853 87.2%	11578 85.3%	40954 90.2%
	Oppose	579 3.4%	1887 12.8%	1994 14.7%	4460 9.8%
	Total	17102 100.0%	14740 100.0%	13572 100.0%	45414 100.0%

Wisconsin Chi Square = 12.448, Lambda = .000
 Michigan Chi Square = 11.043, Lambda = .000
 Pennsylvania Chi Square = 11.045, Lambda = .000
 Other State/Territories Chi Square = 222.205, Lambda = .000
 Total Chi Square = 253.223, Lambda = .000
 *Significant at .05 level

Sources

Ansolabehere, Stephen; Schaffner, Brian F., 2017, "CCES Common Content, 2016", <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/GDF6Z0>, Harvard Dataverse, V4, UNF:6:WhtR8dNtMzReHC295hA4cg== [fileUNF]

Job Outlook for Teachers through 2019. (2019). Retrieved December 10, 2019, from <https://www.educationcorner.com/job-outlook-for-teachers.html>

(2018, July 21). Retrieved from <https://prod-cdn-static.gop.com/static/home/data/platform.pdf>

(2019, January 18). Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/union2.pdf>

Camobreco, J. F., & Barnello, M. A. (2015). The Changing Face of Unions and White Labor Support for the Democratic Party. *The Forum*, 13(2). doi: 10.1515/for-2015-0018

Dave Jamieson. (November 8, 2016 Tuesday). Labor Unions Spent A Record Amount On The Elections. But Not As Much As These 5 People. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from <https://advance-lexis-com.bsuproxy.mnpals.net/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:5M4F-93C1-F03R-N2F3-00000-00&context=1516831>.

DARYL LEVINSON and BENJAMIN I. SACHS (November 2015). ARTICLE: Political Entrenchment and Public Law. *Yale Law Journal*, 125, 400. Retrieved from <https://advance-lexis-com.bsuproxy.mnpals.net/api/document?collection=analytical-materials&id=urn:contentItem:5HHK-9CV0-02BN-11TH-00000-00&context=1516831>

Schmitt, John, and Kris Warner. "The Changing Face of Labor, 1983-2008." *Www.cepr.net*, Nov. 2009, www.cepr.net/documents/publications/changing-face-of-labor-2009-11.pdf.