

*POLITICAL PARTICIPATION TRENDS
OF YESTERDAY AND TODAY*

BY: TRACY JUSTIS

Defended April 5th, 2002

DIRECTING PROFESSOR:

Thomas M. Carsey, Political Science

Committee Members:

William J. Claggett, Political Science

James M. Fendrich, Sociology

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1-2
II.	Review of Related Work	2-22
	The Revolutionary War Period	3-5
	The Civil War Period	5-6
	The Fight for Women’s Suffrage Period	6-8
	The Civil Rights Movement Period	8-13
	The Anti-Vietnam Movement Period	13-16
	The Present Day Movement Period	16-21
	Conclusion of Review of Related Work	21-22
III.	Research	22-46
	Hypothesis	25-26
	Research Design	26-28
	Age	28-36
	Education	37-41
	Year	41-45
	Conclusion of Research	45-46
IV.	Significance of Results Towards Political Science	46-48
V.	Possible Future Research	48-50
VI.	Conclusion	50-51
VII.	Appendixes	52-87
	A. National Election Study Questions	52-57
	B. Citizen Participation Study Questions	58
	C. National Election Study Frequency Tables	59-63
	D. Citizen Participation Study Frequency Tables	64-68
	E. Cross-Tabulation Tables	69-87
VIII.	Bibliography	88-90

INTRODUCTION

Democracy is defined as a “government by the people.” To have a government truly “by the people” then all people must participate. However, as research has shown, this is not the case in the United States. This does not mean that there is no one participating. In fact, there have been times throughout history where participation has been at higher levels than anyone could even dream of today.

A social movement occurs when many individuals work in unison to promote or prevent change in a society (Carter 1997). Social movements have occurred at numerous times in the United States history: during the Revolutionary War Period, the Civil War Period, during the fight for women’s suffrage, the Civil Rights Movement and the Anti-Vietnam Movement. Movements continue today around such issues as gun control, abortion and the continuation of the Civil Rights Movement. Political crisis often encourage the formation of new social movements and invigorate old ones (Carter 1997). Through this, the history of the United States is still affecting the political participation of today.

Political participation takes on many different forms. There is active participation, which includes protesting or going to political meetings. There are also passive forms of participation, such as voting.

Through my research, I hope to determine if during these periods of “social movements” and “crisis” if more people are likely to participate and if they are more likely to participate, what types of participation they will take part in. By looking at the history of political participation in America, it will show what different forms of participation have been used in the past and if they are still used today.

Through my research, I also hope to learn if age and education levels also effect the type of participation one engages in. Again, by looking at the history of participation, it is easier to understand why some age groups participate in one form and others do not.

Looking at the historical background of political participation in the United States is important because if we know what has happen in the past, we may be able to determine how it effects the participation of today. As stated, there is no question of whether participation is low in America, perhaps, if we knew at what times, if any, participation was high, then it may be possible to increase participation levels.

First, a look at the history of participation in America to determine what types of participation have been prevalent in history and what ones continue today. Next, a look at an analytical study of participation today. This will show how age, education and things happening in the world lead not only to the amount of participation but also to the types of participation. Through all this, maybe it will be possible to determine what needs to be done to truly make America a country run “by the people.”

REVIEW OF RELATED WORK

Throughout history, during times of crisis, participation has increased (Burkhart 1972). The history of the United States is filled with these crises. Examples of these times include the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the fight for women’s suffrage, the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960’s and the Anti- Vietnam Movement. During these times of crisis participation has increased, not only in the form of voting but also other forms of participation have been popular. This historical view of political participation can help shed some light on what is happening today, but first, the past must be looked at

and understood. By looking at these time periods, it is easy to see how they are all interrelated and how they have led to the participation of today.

The Revolutionary War Period

Riots and rebellions have often been seen as acceptable forms of participation in a free government (Hoffer 1988). However, the colonies were not really a “free government,” they just wanted to be one. In the beginning, they were not protesting and fighting for independence, but instead in protest against violations made by the crown and parliament against the basic rights of all freeborn Englishmen (Hoffer 1988). Those involved in these protests weren’t only those who were able to vote, but also the common people who were being affected by these violations (Raphael 2001). The riots and protest were a chance for the common and poor man to have their voices heard by the upper and ruling classes.

Numerous acts of defiance happen during the time before the American Revolutionary War against the different Acts and taxes passed by parliament. On August 14, 1765, a crowd numbering in the thousands gathered in Boston to protest the Stamp Act (Raphael 2001). The colonists continued to protest against other Acts too. They observed special fasting days in protest of the Boston Port Act (Hoffer 1988). However, perhaps the most well known act of defiance to occur during this time period is known as the Boston Tea Party.

The boycott of tea was one of the most enduring acts of resistance made by the colonist (Raphael 2001). On November 28, 1773, the ship *Dartmouth* landed in the Boston Harbor carrying a load of tea (Raphael 2001). Meetings were held to determine

what was to be done about the shipment. Everyone was allowed to attend these meetings, including women, African Americans and servants (Raphael 2001). At first the protestors tried to bargain with the governor to send the ship back to England, but he made it clear that the ship would not and could not be sent back; and the colonists were not going to allow the tea to be sold (Raphael 2001). The following evening, a large crowd gathered to watch as a group of less than one hundred, dressed as Indians dumped 342 chests of tea into the harbor (Raphael 2001).

After the Tea Party, Britain shut down the Boston Harbor. This did not stop the protests; if anything they only made them stronger. More and more people became involved in the resistance. In an article in the July 22nd issue of the New Hampshire Gazette, the phrase, “united we stand, divided we fall,” was stated to show the unity of the colonies (Hoffer 1988).

Through these boycotts, the colonists were hoping to cause further protest back in England due to the loss of jobs. This strategy finally paid off and the Stamp Act was repealed (Raphael 2001). Due to the success of such boycotts, protests spread throughout the thirteen colonies. Unlike the small numbers in the Stamp Act protests and the Boston Tea Party, a majority of the colonists participated in the nonimportation movement (Raphael 2001). Throughout the time of the nonimportation movement, the colonists would not purchase anything imported from England. They hoped that this would cause such a huge economic crisis that the people in England would start to support their cause.

In reaction to this outbreak of protest, the Parliament passed the Coercive Acts (Raphael 2001). The colonists realized the time had come to stand together and the first Continental Congress was formed (Raphael 2001). The colonists were willing to wage

war against Britain and declare independence. They had participated for the past ten years in economic boycotts against British goods and had come to realize that war was the only answer (Raphael 2001).

The years leading up to the Revolutionary War were a time of crisis for the colonist. They were being taxed unfairly and not being treated as British citizens. All of the social classes participated in these protests and in the end the colonists achieved independence from England. Had the colonist sat quietly by and not begun the protest, there is no telling what would have come of the colonies.

The Civil War Period

The new country of the United States had hardly been formed when the next major crisis began. In 1776 a group of Massachusetts's blacks petitioned the new government for their freedom (Sorin 1972). This was only the beginning of what would eventually rip the country apart and lead to the Civil War.

In the beginning, abolitionists turned to politics to try to end slavery. They tired petitioning the new government, voting for those candidates that were opposed to slavery and making sure everyone knew what each candidates views were (Sorin 1972). After the established parties turned their backs on the abolitionists, they formed their own party called the Liberty Party (Sorin 1972).

They soon realized that working through normal government functions was not the only option and they turned to more active forms of political participation. The first among these activities was the formation of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1833 (Sorin 1972). This group and others started the boycotting of all slave-produced goods

(Sorin 1972; Mabee 1970). They had “walk-alongs” where a black and white person would walk as equals (Mabee 1970). They started boycotting segregated schools (Mabee 1970). However, the most daring form of noncooperation with the government was helping slaves to escape, such as the Underground Railroad (Mabee 1970).

The Underground Railroad was done in secrecy to protect all of those involved. The chance of violence was very strong around the Railroad, but many worked hard to keep the violence away (Mabee 1970). They continued to resist laws nonviolently by such methods as outright ignoring the Fugitive Slave Laws, boycotts and through trying to pass legislation. The Railroad led to many slaves being brought to the North and escaping the harsh realities of slavery.

Although the Civil War was not completely started only because of slavery, it played a very big part. During this time of crisis, many people turned to different forms of participation. Even after the war ended, boycotting and other forms of protest continued. These forms of participation would continue in the background until they exploded into the mainstream during the 1960’s and the Civil Rights Movement (Mabee 1970). Also during the struggle for black rights, many of the abolitionists participated in another movement that was gaining steam, the movement for women’s rights (Sorin 1972).

The Fight for Women’s Suffrage Period

Before and throughout the Civil War, women’s and black’s rights were inseparable (Wagner 1988). Elizabeth Candy Stanton in 1855 was the first woman to address congress (Lumsden 1997). This was just the beginning of women delegates

speaking on behalf of women's suffrage. At the time, it was against the law for women to vote. However, in an act of defiance, many women tried and some succeed in voting (Wagner 1988). These were the first group of women suffragist to be arrested.

The movement continued throughout the war, but really began to move ahead after it ended. Starting in 1868, suffragists attended every political convention (Lumsden 1997). In 1873, on the one-hundredth anniversary of the Boston Tea Party, a tax resistance was begun by women to show that they were now the ones being taxed without representation (Wagner 1988). Mass meetings were also held to bring the issue out in the open (Lumsden 1997). At the dedication of the Statue of Liberty in 1886, suffragists rented a boat and hung banners from the sides and a speaker spoke to the crowds about the unjust laws of not allowing women to vote in such a "free country" (Wagner 1988).

Efforts continued into the next century. Women wore pins and sashes to show their support of the movement (Lumsden 1997). Petitions were signed and sent to legislators since there was no other way for women to directly reach their representatives (Lumsden 1997). Parades soon followed to show the strength of the movement. These parades helped the movement in numerous ways. They showed the number of supporters behind the suffragists, they connected those involved in the movement and they showed those who weren't involved how dedicated and serious the women were (Lumsden 1997).

Another large part of the movement was the continuous picketing in front of the White House, which started in 1917 (Ford 1991). In fact, they used President Wilson's own words on banners to show how unjust it was that women were not allowed to vote (Lumsden 1997). The picketing soon spread from the White House to all over the country (Lumsden 1997). Protest meetings were held throughout the country to try to

figure out bigger and better ways to get their opinions and thoughts out in the open (Ford 1997). By 1917 they realized that the political lobbying was not working and that it was time for a new strategy (Ford 1991). Militancy then became the new mode of action.

Militancy had three stages: first, the displaying of defiant messages at peaceful pickets; second, picketing using passive resistance in the face of mob attacks and arrests; and third, hunger strikes by those arrested so that they may obtain “political prisoner” status and be seen as martyrs (Ford 1991). The hunger strikes began in November of 1917 (Lumsden 1997). All women who were arrested applied for and demanded political prisoner status, however, the United States would not grant it (Lumsden 1997). The women did not give up and continued to protest.

After seventy-two years of struggle, the women were finally successful and were enfranchised (Wagner 1988). The passing of the Nineteenth Amendment helped to make protest politics legitimate. Women had no other forms of participation. They were not able to use their votes as a tool of participation since they were not allowed to vote. However, their successful use of other means of participation helped to prove that voting is not the only way to participate and to change the status quo. The Revolutionary and Civil Wars were the result of mass participation, this time around; an Amendment was the result. Future movements learned from their example and would continue to use these alternative forms of participation.

The Civil Rights Movement Period

On August 28, 1963, one hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation was signed, two hundred thousand citizens marched on Washington to protest the

mistreatment of blacks (Muse 1968). Even after all this time, most blacks felt they still weren't completely free. The fight for equality had never stopped since the Civil War days, and it was only getting stronger. Numerous different types of protest were used during the Civil Rights Movement and in the end, their effectiveness was seen with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (Muse 1968). Yet, equality has never been completely reached and the Civil Rights Movement continues today.

The first type of protest politics used was boycotts. Boycotts were taking place as early as the 1950's (Riches 1997). A Mississippi woman told author Lomax in an interview for his book that, "Lord, child, we colored people ain't nothing but a bundle of resentments and sufferings going some where to explode (81)." The "explosion" that occurred was the arrest of Rosa Parks on December 1, 1955 (Lomax 1962). Word of her arrest spread quickly throughout the Black community and by the next day, plans were being made to begin one of the biggest boycotts in history (Lomax 1962). Reverend L. Roy was quoted in The Negro Revolt as saying that, "It is time to act. Let's act (82)." And act they did; buses were empty and mass meetings about the boycotts were full (Lomax 1962). The Montgomery boycott had more than fifty thousands participants, and in the end, the buses were desegregated (Lomax 1962). Although Montgomery is probably the most famous boycott, it was just one of many. In 1961 in Albany, Georgia, a college town, local students gathered at the bus terminals to desegregate the cities buses (Lomax 1962). The protest at first started as just a small number of students but soon grew much larger as students from all over the South joined in (Lomax 1962). However,

in the end, they were not successful and the buses were not desegregated until years later (Lomax 1962).

Another boycott that was successful happened in Tallahassee. On May 26, 1956, two Florida A&M University students refused to give up their seats on a bus (Chappell 1994). Within days, a bus boycott was started by all FAMU students (Chappell 1994). A small number of Florida State University students and faculty also participated in the boycott (Chappell 1994). The president of Lewis State Bank and his wife helped fund the boycott through donations and loans from the bank (Chappell 1994). Those who participated in the boycotts started running car pools and both blacks and whites served as drivers (Chappell 1994). Carpooling was soon made illegal (Chappell 1994). More and more walkers and bikers throughout the city became visible and carpools were continued in secrecy (Chappell 1994). When the boycott began, sixty-to-seventy percent of the bus riders were black and ninety percent of the black population participated throughout boycott (Chappell 1994). It was estimated that the boycott caused at least a sixty- percent loss in revenue for the city (Chappell 1994). The city and bus company tried to encourage riders. They offered free rides, orange juice, coffee, newspapers and even police protection (Chappell 1994). Nothing worked and the boycott continued. On November 13, 1956, the United States Supreme Court ruled that segregation of buses was illegal (Chappell 1994). Riders in Tallahassee were then told to go back to riding the buses and were taught how to “turn the other cheek” if attacked (Chappell 1994). However, the city told the bus company to continue with their segregation policies (Chappell 1994). By this time the bus company had lost a lot of money and refused to go along with the city's request (Chappell 1994). Bus drivers, black riders and company

managers were promptly arrested (Chappell 1994). From his home, Federal Judge Dozier Devane ordered their release and forbid the city from interfering with the integration (Chappell 1994). In Inside Agitators: White Southerners in the Civil Rights Movement, he is quoted as saying “every segregation act of every state or city [was] dead as a door nail (91, brackets in original).” Florida Governor LeRoy Collins then suspended the bus services to prevent the integration (Chappell 1994). The city commission quickly passed a law saying that bus drivers had the right to “assign seats” to passengers during the suspension (Chappell 1994). The bus company then sued the city and the city counter sued them (Chappell 1994). The suspension was lifted and the black community returned to the buses, at least the integrated buses (Chappell 1994). People were soon arrested under the new “seat assignment” law (Chappell 1994). Judge Devane quickly called on the federal courts to declare this action unconstitutional (Chappell 1994). Governor Collins soon realized that he had to change his point of view on segregation when he realized how powerful the black voters were becoming in Florida and desegregated the buses (Chappell 1994). In this case, the protest politics of the boycotters, the courts and the power of the vote lead to the desegregation in Tallahassee and Florida.

The strategy following the boycotts was sit-ins. In Nashville in 1960, approximately five hundred students from mainly the black college staged sit-ins at lunch counters throughout the city (Riches 1997). Students in North Carolina also staged sit-ins at lunch counters (Lomax 1962). The students who began the sit-ins in North Carolina didn't have a plan and weren't organized (Lomax 1962). They were just tired of what was happening and decided to act (Lomax 1962). Sit-ins involved more people than any other civil rights movement act in history (Lomax 1962). Numbers from the sit-ins

included seventy thousand participants, both black and white, in over eight hundred sit-ins, in over one hundred cities and around four thousand, mostly black students, were arrested (Lomax 1962). Sit-ins also had later variations, such as wade-ins and pray-ins (Muse 1968).

The 1963 End of Year Summary done by the Southern Regional Council showed that there had been nine hundred thirty individual public protest demonstrations in at least one hundred fifteen cities in eleven states (Muse 1968). Although 1963 was by no means the beginning of the participation, it was also nowhere near the end.

A third type of participation was marches. Numerous marches occurred, small ones throughout the country and some were very large, such as the Selma to Montgomery March or the March on Washington at which Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. gave his famous “I Have a Dream Speech.” The first attempt to march from Selma to Montgomery was on March 7, 1965 (Muse 1968). However, the over five hundred blacks were turned back with the threat of violence (Muse 1968). In protest, other marches formed; over ten thousand marched in Detroit, fifteen thousand in New York and marches appeared on university campuses across the country (Muse 1968). On March 9, a second attempt was made, this time with over one thousand blacks and around four hundred fifty whites (Muse 1968). Once again they were turned back. Finally, after the courts became involved, on March 21, there was going to be no turning back (Muse 1968). Over thirty-two hundred people gathered (Muse 1968). Among the marchers there were blacks, whites, students, clergymen and nuns (Muse 1968). About seven miles out, twenty-nine hundred people stopped marching, per the judge’s instructions that only three hundred could march through the narrow section of the road (Muse 1968). They marched for

three full days (Muse 1968). On the outskirts of Montgomery, they were met by over ten thousand people (Muse 1968). Thursday morning, twenty-five thousand people marched into Montgomery (Muse 1968). This and other marches showed the nation and the government that segregation was not going to be allowed to continue.

These are just a few of the forms of participation that were used during the Civil Rights Movement. These forms of participation helped lead to a great number of changes. Boycotts of buses and schools led to their integration, sit-ins and Freedom Riders integrated lunch counters, and the marches on Washington and Montgomery showed the government that it was time for change (Kasher 1996). All of these changes could not have occurred just through voting since a large majority of the black population in the South was unable to vote. It took a much more active form of participation to change the practices that had been around for generations. The Movement started way before the Civil War, and in some areas, still continues today.

The Anti-War Movement Period

During the last few years of the 1960's, the word "participation" became part of the popular vocabulary (Pateman 1970). It started with the Civil Rights Movement and continued with the movement against the war in Vietnam. The 1970's saw a large increase in the number of people willing to participate, either by signing petitions, testifying before decision-making groups, or by picketing (Burkhart 1972). The number of people willing to share in political participation was up from five percent to between fifteen and twenty percent of the population (Burkhart 1972).

The Anti-War movement was one of the largest social movements in United States history (Hall 2000). It grew out of the existing peace and social justice organizations formed during and involved with the Civil Rights Movement (Hall 2000). Like the Civil Rights Movement, numerous types of participation were used. Some of these included: education, electoral politics and peaceful protest (Hall 2000). A majority of those participating joined in petitioning, praying, marches, picketing, publishing of antiwar literature or working through the established political system (Chatfield 1990). Some within the movement even went as far as nonviolent sit-ins, occupation of draft boards and ROTC installations and organized draft resistance such as the burning of draft cards (Chatfield 1990). There were numerous advertisements placed in newspapers trying to persuade sentiments against the war and telegrams were sent to the White House (Wells 1994). Numerous pickets occurred outside of federal buildings and military bases (Wells 1994). Boycotts were also used as a form of participation. One was the boycott of Saran Wrap, made by the Dow Chemical Company, because of their production of napalm (Wells 1994). All of the protest were vocal, articulate, disruptive and persistent, all signs of a diminishing tolerance for the war (Wells 1994).

Not only were a variety of different types of participation used, but also a variety of different types of people participated in these activities. A large number of “housewives” were actively involved in the movement (Wells 1994). They would go door-to-door or throughout the community handing out leaflets (Wells 1994). They also organized a number of demonstrations (Wells 1994). Countless citizens played a role in the movement including liberals, leftist, men, women, blacks, whites, students, established intellectuals, clergy and laity (Chatfield 1990).

The first large organized demonstration occurred in August of 1963 during the annual commemorations by pacifists of the atomic bombings during World War II (Zaroulis and Sullivan 1984). On May 2, 1964, four hundred students, calling themselves “May 2 Movement,” marched into Time Square and to the United Nations building in New York (Zaroulis and Sullivan 1984).

A popular activity on college campuses was teach-ins. During the spring of 1965, over one hundred teach-ins took place, with both faculty and students participating (Wells 1994). These teach-ins were a combination of protest, education and festivity (Zaroulis and Sullivan 1984). On April 7, 1965, two hundred fifty members of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom spent the day in Washington DC lobbying for peace (Zaroulis and Sullivan 1984). On May 21 and 22, 1965, more than ten thousand people, at times as many as thirty thousand, attended “Vietnam Day” at the University of California at Berkeley for the spring’s final teach-in (Zaroulis and Sullivan 1984). The first International Days of Protest occurred October 15 and 16, 1965 (Zaroulis and Sullivan 1984). During these days, there were peaceful marches, teach-ins and rallies (Zaroulis and Sullivan 1984). On April 15, 1967, there were numerous peaceful and massive demonstrations throughout the country (Small 1994). One of these included a demonstration in New York which had three hundred thousand demonstrators, the largest in history (Wells 1994).

The movement came to a head on October 21 and 22 of 1967, with the Siege on the Pentagon (Small 1994). It started with a march on the Pentagon numbering nearly one hundred thousand (Hall 2000). This was one of several events that lead to Johnson’s decision to deescalate in Vietnam and to eventually drop out of the presidential race

(Small 1994). On January 27, 1968, the Student Mobilization Committee held a conference in Chicago (Zaroulis and Sullivan 1984). Over nine hundred students were in attendance, representing one hundred ten colleges from twenty-five states and forty high schools (Zaroulis and Sullivan 1984).

It will never truly be clear what led to the final withdrawal from Vietnam. It could have been the costs, both money and in life or it could have been the government finally succumbing to the pressures of the Anti-War Movement. One thing is clear though: the numbers involved in the movement and the different forms of participation that were used definitely had a lasting impact on the government.

The Present Day Movement Period

The days of the Anti-War Movement were not the last ones of protest politics. Although there has not been a large mass movement since then, that does not mean that there have not been issues recently that have led to other forms of participation. The United States has become a nation of interest groups. Numerous different organizations and groups have formed behind issues of today. Some of the issues include, but are not limited to, abortion, gun control and the continuation of the Civil Rights Movement.

Before and after the historic decision by the United States Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade*, there have been Pro-Life and Pro-Choice organizations. The abortion issue has successfully mobilized religious groups (Tatalovich and Dayne 1981). The National Organization of Women is also very active in the movement (Tatalovich and Dayne 1981). The forces behind the pro-life groups have been mainly the religious groups (Tatalovich and Dayne 1981). Where as the pro-choice organizations have been

supported by a majority of the health-care organizations (Tatalovich and Dayne 1981). The abortion issue has moved people who normally would not get involved in political participation to become very active (Tatalovich and Dayne 1981). Pro-life groups have successfully picketed outside abortion clinics, held rallies, petitioned candidates, and held sit-ins at clinics (Tatalovich and Dayne 1981). Pro-choice activists have not been as active since the *Roe v. Wade* decision, there are still occasional rallies in support of the decision (Tatalovich and Dayne 1981). Both sides have continuously lobbied the government, held marches and contributed money to those who support their side of the issue (Tatalovich and Dayne 1981).

On January 22, 2000, hundreds of activist from both sides of the issue gathered in Washington DC to mark the twenty-seventh anniversary of the *Roe v. Wade* decision (Carter 2000). During the weekend, vigils, marches and protests were conducted by both sides (Carter 2000). Although this movement is in no way as large as those in the past, it is still enough to motivate people to be involved in the political process.

Another issue that is discussed and argued about a lot these days is that of gun control. Both sides of the gun control debate also have been very active in recent years. The National Rifle Association first started lobbying against gun control laws as early as 1911 when New York passed a law requiring gun permits and they haven't stopped since then (Vizzard 2000). Other groups, such as Gun Owner's of America and Citizens' Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms, have also joined the NRA's fight against gun control laws (Vizzard 2000). On the other side of the debate, the Handgun Control Incorporated and the Coalition to Ban Handguns have lead the way for pro-gun control activist (Vizzard 2000).

On May 14, 2000, Mothers' Day, both sides of the issue brought their viewpoints to Washington DC (<http://www.9.cnn.com/2000/US/05/15/million.moms/index.html>).

The pro-gun control group called it "The Million Mom March," and was countered by a rally by the Second Amendment Sisters Inc. (<http://www.9.cnn.com/2000/US/05/15/million.moms/index.html>). The number of women gathered for pro-gun control greatly outnumbered the counter rally. According to organizers, approximately five hundred thousand took part in the march in comparison with about twenty-five hundred to three thousand at the counter rally (<http://www.9.cnn.com/2000/US/05/15/million.moms/index.html>).

Throughout the day, there were protest by both sides of the issue throughout the country. Seventy cites from coast to coast were the sites of protest (<http://www.9.cnn.com/2000/US/05/15/million.moms/index.html>).

At the lakefront in Chicago, a crowd of approximately four thousand gathered in support of more gun control (<http://www.9.cnn.com/2000/US/05/15/million.moms/index.html>). In Los Angles, a group of parents and teachers, numbering about fifteen hundred, from the daycare center that had recently been the victim of gun violence gathered to support stronger gun control legislation (<http://www.9.cnn.com/2000/US/05/15/million.moms/index.html>).

Like the abortion issue, gun control has not gotten the numbers of other movements through history, but it has drawn a significant number of participants. Not to mention, it is one of the more successful movements in the sense that gun control is always a top issue in any election.

The final issue is the continuation of the Civil Rights Movement. Even with the passage of the Civil Rights Acts, equality for all people was not realized. Since the time

of the Civil Rights Movement, participation in activities such as marches and protest has continued to be important. Boycotts have also continued. In fact, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People recently held a boycott of an entire state, South Carolina, in protest of the confederate flag being flown from the capitol and to make Martin Luther King Jr's Birthday a state holiday (<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/US/DailyNews/flag000117.html>).

Attorney Tom Turnipseed was quoted in *U.S. News* as saying, "That Dixie Symbol is comin' down. We're gonna take it down (Smith 1999)." Those in favor of the flag coming down say it is a symbol of slavery, whereas those who defend the flag remaining say that it is a symbol of southern heritage, honoring those who fought for the Confederacy during the Civil War (<http://www9.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/17/sc.flag>). Organized by the NAACP, the Nation Urban League and more than seventy-five other civil rights groups, a boycott of South Carolina began on January 1, 2000 (<http://www9.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/17/sc.flag>). The economic boycott of South Carolina included boycotting any sporting events, the film industry and most importantly, tourism (<http://www10.cnn.com/2000/US/07/01/scflag.01>). At first, the governor offered to make King's birthday a national holiday if the boycott idea would be abandoned (Smith 1999). However, the NAACP rejected his offer and said the boycott would continue till the flag came down (<http://www9.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/17/sc.flag>). The business community also supported the flag's removal (Gurganion 2000). They felt that it was offensive and bad for business, especially after the boycott started (Gurganion 2000).

On January 17, 2000, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Day, thousands gathered in South Carolina's capitol to protest the flag (<http://www9.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/17/sc.flag>). A majority of the marchers, in the spirit of the boycott, stayed at churches instead of in hotels (<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/US/DailyNews/flag000117.html>). The state police estimated that there were forty-six thousand participants, the expected number had been around twenty thousand (<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/US/DailyNews/flag000117.html>). Both blacks and whites marched together in support of the flag's removal (<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/US/DailyNews/flag000117.html>). In the spirit of King, the march was peaceful and all participants were told not to respond to any of the hecklers (<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/US/DailyNews/flag000117.html>). A counter rally was held across town in support of the flag, numbering more than six thousand (<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/US/DailyNews/flag000117.html>).

On July 1, 2000 the flag was removed from the capitol (<http://www10.cnn.com/2000/US/07/01/scflag.01>). The flags from the Senate and House chambers were also removed and placed in a museum of state history (<http://www10.cnn.com/2000/US/07/01/scflag.01>). It is estimated that the boycott that lasted from January to July cost the state approximately twenty million in lost revenue (<http://www10.cnn.com/2000/US/07/01/scflag.01>). The number of people who participated in the boycott will never be known, but to cause that much of an economic damage, it is safe to say that a very large number did participate.

All three of these issues in no way can be compared to the movements in the past. However, they are still forms of political participation. Political participation takes many forms in today's society, be it in voting or in participation in boycotts.

Conclusion of Review of Related Work

Throughout the history of the United States, political participation has occurred. It was there at the beginning, to create the United States, and it is still present today. Many different forms of participation have been used to further different causes and issues. Some of them have been within the established political system, such as voting and lobbying, and some have been way outside it, such as sit-ins and burning draft cards. But, no matter what form it takes, it has all been political participation. One generation has learned from the previous what has worked. The suffragist of the late 1800's and the early 1900's learned from the early Civil War Period who learned from those pushing for American independence. The Civil Rights Movement learned from those suffragists the same way that the Anti-War demonstrators learned from them. The groups and organizations of today have continued to follow the patterns that were established back during the Revolution days and continued throughout history.

The information presented has given an important background to political participation in America by showing what types of political participation have been used. It is important to understand what factors have lead to this participation. Individual characteristics are also important when it comes to political participation. Social Scientists often point to two variables that are predictors on telling whether one will participate or not. These are a person's age and a person's educational background.

With these two factors, definite patterns emerge within the different types of participation. Another factor, as just discussed, is what is happening in the world. It is through these three variables that the story of participation is told.

RESEARCH

Compared to other industrialized Democracies, political participation in the United States is very low. This may seem surprising given that Verba et al (1995) argues that it is through political participation that citizens communicate their interests, preferences and needs to government. Participation demands a lot of time, which is often a reason why people do not participate (Burkhart 1972).

Those who do participate have different social characteristics than those who chose not to participate (Verba et al 1995). Demographic characteristics and social characteristics that are linked to levels of political participation include, but are not limited to, age, income, education, occupation, family orientation, race and gender (Verba et al 1995; Burkhart 1972). In the research that follows, I will focus on two of these characteristics that are especially important and interesting: age and education.

To be able to participate in politics, citizens must have the resources of time, money and civic skills (Verba et al 1995). I focus on education and age in this research because of their links to these resources. Education, income and occupation make up a person's overall socioeconomic status (SES), though education is argued to be the most important element of SES as it relates to political participation (Verba et al 1995). Those who are more educated are more likely to participate in political activities because

education is related to levels of civic skill. Also those with more education tend to have careers that produce higher wages and more flexibility in work schedules.

Another individual-level characteristic related to the development of political participation resources is age. Quite simply, the availability of time and money, along with the development of civil skills, tends to increase with age (Verba et al 1995). Also, Verba et al (1995) suggests that a person's priorities tend to change with age in a manner that might create a greater desire to participate in politics.

This argument about resources, however, seems to treat all forms of political participation equally. As my historical review made clear, there are many different types of activities that people engage in when participating in the political process. I will examine several different forms of participation in my study. A key distinction between these different activities that I will consider is how active (like protest involvement) or passive (like voting) the form of participation is. It may be that the impact of age, education or even periods of historical crisis is different for different types of political participation.

Most studies of participation have been done within the context of electoral politics, such as voting (Verba and Nie 1972). However, this is not the only type of participation. In the book Strategies for Political Participation by James Burkhart et al there is a list of different forms of participation. It starts with the least intense form of participation and ends with the most intense. The list included: voting and joining groups for social interest; talking about politics and trying to persuade others; contributing money and going to rallies; actual campaigning and supplying information for research to party; working at headquarters during campaigns; distribution of literature and soliciting

money and support; seven, running for office (public or party); and holding office (public or party) (Burkhart et al 1972).

Verba and Nie in their book Participation in America also differentiate between the different types of participation. First, they discuss the different factors that lead people to participate. They are what one gets for participating, such as whether it is gratification for the act or more concrete forms of payoffs; what kind of situations the act involves, such as whether there will be conflict or not; and what it takes to be involved in the act, such as initiative, time, resources and skill (Verba and Nie 1972). They go further in describing these different aspects. In regard to what type of influence the act may have on the government depends on how much pressure can be exerted and how much information can be conveyed regarding the preference of society (Verba and Nie 1972). Next, is the scope of the outcome (Verba and Nie 1972). This depends on the number of people affected by the government activity and whether it takes one individual or a group to voice their opinions; in a sense, whether narrow or broad goals are to be achieved (Verba and Nie 1972). Next, is the conflict dimension, which means the extent to which conflict with others will be involved (Verba and Nie 1972). Finally, the initiative required, how difficult the act is, the time and effort it will take and how much initiative is needed to determine whether to participate or not (Verba and Nie 1972).

It is through these factors that Verba and Nie rate and group their different modes of activity. The first group is Voting. This is an electoral activity that is conflictual, with a collective outcome and requires little initiative (Verba and Nie 1972). The second group is Campaign Activity. This includes working for a party, attending meetings, contributing money and trying to influence others to vote (Verba and Nie 1972). These

activities are also electoral activities, conflictual, have a collective outcome but require some initiative (Verba and Nie 1972). The third group is Cooperative Activity. This is a nonelectoral activity that includes working with a group to deal with social and political problems (Verba and Nie 1972). These activities are usually nonconflictual, have a collective outcome and require some or a lot of initiative (Verba and Nie 1972). The final mode is Citizen-Initiated Contacts. This includes contact with local and extra-local officials. These activities are nonelectoral, nonconflictual, have either a collective or a particularized outcome and require a lot of initiative (Verba and Nie 1972).

It was within the context of these four different modes of activity that they studied political participation. For my research, I also grouped the different forms of participation. My two groups were passive and active forms of participation. To be considered a passive form of participation it must have the characteristics of being a private act; nonconflictual, in the sense that no one would be in active conflict with the act; require little initiative, time and effort and have no major consequences. To be considered an active form of participation it must have the characteristics of being a public act, involving other people; have conflict, in the sense that there could be the possibility of open conflict with those supporting the other side; require considerable initiative, time and effort; and have the possibility of consequences, such as being labeled an activist and in some extreme cases the possibility of arrest.

Hypothesis

It is my belief that participation trends depend on three factors: age, education, and what is happening in the world. When it comes to age, I believe that younger

generations are more likely to participate in active forms of participation, such as: working for a campaign, attending political meetings, being a member of a political organization, taking place in a political protest, trying to influence people to vote or displaying a candidates button or sticker, then the older generations who are much more likely to participate in passive forms of participation such as contributing money, being registered to vote and actually voting in an election. These older generations will also be much more interested in national politics and public affairs.

It is also my belief that those who have a higher level of education will be more likely to participate in all types of participation than those who have lower, if any, education. Those with higher educational levels will also be more likely to be paying attention to what is going on in national politics and public affairs.

I also believe that during times of strong issues in the country, such as the Civil Rights Movement and the Anti-War Movement of the late 1950's through the 1970's, participation of all kinds will increase, but especially those that I have previously listed as active forms of participation.

Research Design

I used two data sets for all of my analytical tests. The first data set was a composite of all the National Election Study's data from 1948 to 2000. This data included independent variables of the respondent's age (VCF0102), education level (VCF0110) and what year the question was asked (VCF0004). It supplied the dependent variables of different types of participation: the donation of money to a party or candidate (VCF0721), the attendance at political meetings (VCF0718), working for a

party or candidate (VCF0719), the display of a candidate button or sticker (VCF0720), voting in elections (VCF0702) and whether the respondent tried to influence someone to vote (VCF0717). The complete questions from the National Election Study can be found in Appendix A.

The second data set came from the Citizen Participation Study done by the Public Opinion Laboratory of Northern Illinois University and the National Opinion Research Center in 1990. This data set was compiled for the book Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics, by Sidney Verba, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Henry E. Brady. This data set supplied the independent variables of age (YEARBORN 711) and education (EDGRADE 210). It contained the dependent variables of different types of participation: membership in a political issue organization (OGMEMI 824), working for an election campaign (CW88 21), participation in a political protest in the past two years (PT2YRS 241), the attention paid to national politics and public affairs (READNAT 624), whether currently registered (VTREG 134) and the participation in Presidential Elections since old enough (VTPRES 135). The complete questions from the Citizen Participation Study can be found in Appendix B.

For the independent variables of age and education, different groups were made from the data. The age groups were age 0 to 24, 25 to 44, 45 to 64 and 65 to 100 years old. Education was divided into Grade School or less, 0 to 8 years; High School, 9 to 12 years; and College, some college or advance degree or degrees.

The data was imported into the computer program SPSS to be analyzed. I ran frequency tables to determine if the number responding were significant. The frequency

tables for the National Election Study can be found in Appendix C and for the Citizens Participation Study in Appendix D.

I then ran cross-tabulations for all of the dependent variables in reference to each of the independent variables. For some of the dependent variables, when available, I tested all three of the independent variables, for other just one or two. I did this because of the independent variables were either not available or did not have enough responses to be reliable. These cross-tabulation tables for both studies can be found in Appendix E by there variable names.

From the cross-tabulations, I figured out the percentage of each group that participated in a type of political participation. These results are what I based my findings on and can be found in the tables within each discussion of the independent variables. I will first look at the results of the independent variable of age, then education and finally the different time periods. It is through these tests that I determined parts my hypothesis to be true, and parts of it to be false.

Age

Personally, for me, the variable of age is one of the most fascinating and important variables. As discussed earlier, during times of upheaval, such as the Civil Rights Movement and the Anti-Vietnam movement, it was students on college campuses that were involved. However, the data does not support the hypothesis that those in the age group from 0 to 24 years of age are the most active. In fact, they are almost always the group that is the least active. The following tables show the complete results from

both the Nation Election Study and Citizen Participation Study data sets in regard to age, which will be individually discussed:

AGE	Contributed Money (NES)	Member of a Political Issue Organization (CPS)	Attended Political Meetings (NES)	Displayed a Candidate Button/Sticker (NES)
0-24	4%	7%	6%	10%
25-44	9%	13%	8%	11%
45-64	12%	14%	8%	10%
65-100	9%	9%	6%	7%

AGE	Worked For a Campaign (CPS)	In Past 2 Years Taken Part in a Protest (CPS)	Tried to Influence Others to Vote (NES)	Registered to Vote (CPS)	Voted in Election (NES)
0-24	12%	18%	26%	62%	41%
25-44	16%	13%	29%	78%	64%
45-64	21%	10%	28%	88%	75%
65-100	16%	4%	20%	91%	72%

The first type of political participation is that of contributing money. This data is from the National Election Study. The lowest age group to donate money is that of 0 to 24. This is not much of a surprise since this age group does not normally have full time jobs or the money to spend on contributions. This data supports my hypothesis that this age group would not be as likely to participate in this form of participation. The data further shows that the age group from 45 to 64 is the most likely to contribute money. Again, this is not much of a surprise. Within this age group, a majority of the workforce that can afford to make contributions can be found.

The surprise from this data is that both the age groups 25 to 44 and 65 to 100 are just as likely to contribute. This is probably due to the fact that neither group has the resources to contribute, the younger group is just starting within the workforce and is probably starting families, and the older is retired and does not have a constant income.

However, overall, a very small percentage of each age group contributes money. This in no way can be seen as the most popular form of participation.

The next form of participation is that of being a member of a political issue organization. This data comes from the Citizen Participation Study. Again, the age group of 0 to 24 is the least likely to participate and the age group of 45 to 64 is the most likely to. However, in this case, the age group of 25 to 44 is not significantly different from that of the participation of the age group of 45 to 64. Numerous explanations can be made for why these numbers are true, from the younger groups being too involved in other things to the older group not being mobile enough to join. Either way, again, like contributing money, the percentage of people involved from all age groups in this activity is very small.

However, unlike that of contributing money, this data goes against my hypothesis. I believed that the younger generations would be more likely to participate in this activity than the older. I believed this to be true because membership in an organization is a more active form of participation than most, and I believe that younger age groups are more likely to be involved in active participation than the passive types such as voting. Unfortunately, my hypothesis does not stand up under this test.

The next form of participation is the attendance at political meetings. This data is from the National Election Study. It is very closely related to that of membership in a political issue organization. Thus, it is not at all surprising that the results are the exact same when it comes to the groups that participate more. In this group, not only do the age group of 0 to 24 and 65 to 100 have the lowest percentage participating, they are actually the exact same with only 6% of the population in that age group attending a

political meeting. Also, the exact same percentage, 8%, of those in the age groups of 25 to 44 and 45 to 64 attended a political meeting. Again, the same types of explanations could be used to explain these results.

Unfortunately, again, my hypothesis is also proven untrue. I believed that attendance at political meetings, also an active form of participation, would be more likely to be done by the younger group, especially since it included college students. However, this is not at all the case. Again, this form of participation has a very low number of people participating and is not one that can be seen as the predominate form of political participation.

Displaying a candidate's button or sticker does not seem like it would be an important form of participation. Although it is not difficult to do and normally takes very little time or money, this "free advertisement" for candidate or party could help to influence the way someone votes. The data pertaining to this question comes from the National Election Study. Once again, the results are surprising. This data shows that the age group most likely to display a candidates sticker or button is that containing 25 to 44 year olds.

Although this is not surprising, the fact that the age groups including 0 to 24 and 45 to 64 year olds are the same is. In no other type of participation does this happen, in fact, in all but one, the group containing 45 to 64 year olds always has a larger number participating. However, it must be noted that the percentage difference between all three of these groups is only 1%. Again, the numbers are so low throughout the age groups, that it is clear that this is not a popular form of participation. Since the numbers of those

participating are so close, it disproves my hypothesis that younger generation would be more likely to display a candidate's button or sticker.

Closely related to the activity of displaying a candidate button or sticker is that of working for a candidate's campaign. Both are to show one's support for a candidate and possibly influence someone else's vote. The data for this analysis comes from the Citizen Participation Study. With this activity there are two interesting trends.

The first interesting trend seen in this data is the fact that the age groups of 25 to 44 and 65 to 100 years old are just as likely to work for a campaign. Again, this low percentage may be seen because the younger age group is too busy to participate and the older age group is not mobile enough to. However, it is surprising that the age group including 45 to 64 year olds has the largest number of those working when you look at the fact that this is the age group that is most likely to be members of the workforce.

The second interesting trend is the fact that the age group of 0 to 24 years old is the least likely to work for a campaign. Once again, this proves my hypothesis wrong that the younger generations are more likely to participate in the active forms of participation. However, like the correlation seen in the age group of 45 to 64, this was also the age group least likely to contribute money. This would be an area that would be interesting to do more research in: whether age plays a factor in whether a person supports a candidate or party versus an issue centered form of participation.

The next type of participation results is the most exciting in the fact that it supports the first part of my hypothesis. The question asked was whether the respondent had taken part in a protest in the past two years. This data is from the Citizen Participation Study. This data showed that the age group with the highest percentage

taking part in a protest was that of the age group from 0 to 24 years of age. This data proves exactly what I believed to be true and what was stated in my hypothesis, that the younger generation would be more likely to participate in an active form of participation. This data further proves my hypothesis in the sense that age increases, the percentage of people participating in the protest falls.

In the form of participation of trying to influence others to vote is also some interesting results. This data is from the National Election Study. An interesting aspect about this form is that fact that the age group including 25 to 44 year olds is the one with the highest percentage of participants. As has been shown, it is normally the case that the group including 45 to 64 years old has the largest percentage, however, in this case they are 1% behind the previous group. Although this is not a large difference, it is still a difference that is normally not seen.

A second interesting point is the fact that for only the third time, the age group including 0 to 24 year olds has a higher percentage participating than those in the age group including 65 to 100 year olds. The only other times this has occurred was in the percentage displaying a candidate button or sticker and in taking part in a protest in the past two years. This may possibly be explained by the fact that this age group is not as mobile and unable to get out and try to influence others.

This however does not change the fact that once again my hypothesis has been proven wrong, the younger generation has not been more likely to participate in such an active form of political participation.

The final two forms of participation, being registered to vote and voting show almost identical trends. The data regarding registration comes from the Citizen

Participation Study. The results from this data show clearly that as age increases, the likelihood of being registered also increases. Registration is a passive form of participation. Thus, since the older generations are more likely to be registered to vote than the younger, this data supports my thesis.

The data for voting comes from the National Election Study. This shows, yet again, the trend that as you go up in the age groups, the likelihood of voting increases. However, it peaks at the age 45 to 64 age group. The 65 to 100 years old age group is lower than the 45 to 64 but still higher than the 25 to 44. This may have to do with the fact that after retirement, it is harder for people to get around and there is the possibility of the fact that they may have moved to retirement communities, such as in Florida, and may not be registered to vote there.

This trend, other than the last part with the decrease for the 65 to 100, goes exactly with my hypothesis. I believed that those in higher age groups were more likely to take part in passive forms of participation, such as voting, as opposed to active forms, such as protest. The data for voting and protesting in the past two years follows this hypothesis exactly. However, the rest of the data does not hold up to this.

Two additional questions were asked in the Citizen Participation Study. The first being how much attention was paid to national politics and public affairs and how often one had voted in all presidential elections since old enough. These questions were answered on different scales than just a yes or no question such as the previous questions so they must be looked at differently and separate from the previous tests.

First, how often the respondent had voted in presidential elections since old enough. This table showed a clear trend that as age increased, it is more likely that the

respondent would have voted in more if not all elections since they were old enough. In the responses of “Never Voted” and “ Rarely Voted” the highest percentage was from the younger age groups, and the smaller percentage were from the higher age groups. In “Voted in Most” and “Voted in All” the exact opposite is true. The only time that the results stray from this pattern is in “Voted in Some.” In this case, the 25 to 44 age group is higher than the 45 to 64 age group. This may be due to the fact that those in this age group are just coming out of the younger age groups and just starting to participate in the passive forms of participation. Also, when looking at this question, it must be understood that as one grows older, there were more opportunities for to vote in elections.

AGE	Never Voted	Rarely Voted	Voted in Some	Voted in Most	Voted in All	Not Old Enough	Never Eligible	Total
0-24	32%	4%	5%	7%	33%	13%	7%	100%
25-44	14%	5%	13%	19%	45%	-	5%	100%
45-64	5%	3%	9%	23%	58%	-	2%	100%
65-100	4%	3%	8%	21%	64%	-	1%	100%

Next, is the amount of attention paid to national politics and public affairs. The results from this test are very difficult to understand and must be looked at closely. To begin with, the answer of “No Attention” shows the expected results of the 0 to 24 age group showing the highest percentage of respondents. This is also true for the answer of “Very Little Attention.” However, for this answer, the age group of 45 to 64 is lower than that of the 65 to 100 age group. One would think, especially after all the results from the levels of participation, that the pattern would continue that the first two responses of “No Attention” and “Very Little Attention” would have the highest percentages in the younger generations and get smaller as the age increases. Then, for the answers of “Some Attention” and “A Great Deal of Attention” the older age groups

would have a higher percentage, with the percentage falling as the age decreases.

However, this is not the case.

For the response of “Some Attention” the age group of 0 to 24 actually has the highest percentage and it goes down from there as age increases. However, the expected pattern does appear for the response of “A Great Deal.”

What can be inferred from this data is that fact that although previous tests have shown that the age group 0 to 24 does not participate nearly as much as the other age groups, it does not mean that they are not paying attention to what is going on, they are just not acting on it.

AGE	No Attention	Very Little Attention	Some Attention	A Great Deal	Total
0-24	7%	23%	51%	20%	100%
25-44	3%	14%	48%	35%	100%
45-64	3%	11%	43%	43%	100%
65-100	2%	15%	35%	48%	100%

In my hypothesis I stated that I believed that the younger age groups would be more likely to take part in the active forms of participation and that the older age groups would be more likely to take part in the passive forms of participation. However, in its totality, it was not proven with this data. However, some of the data did support it. It was shown that the older generations were more likely to participate in passive forms of participation, however, other than protesting, they were also more likely to participate in all forms of participation. However, as the last table shows, this does not mean that the younger age groups are not paying attention to what is going on, they are just not acting on it.

Education

The next independent variable that I tested was age. It was divided into three groups of Grade School or Less (0-8yrs), High School (9-12yrs) and College/Advance Degree(s). My hypothesis was that as education increased, a larger percentage would participate in all forms of participation. The following tables show the complete results from both the National Election Study and Citizen Participation Study data sets in regard to education:

EDUCATION	In Past 2 Years Taken Part in a Protest (CPS)	Member of a Political Issue Organization (CPS)	Worked For a Campaign (CPS)	Attended Political Meetings (NES)
GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	1%	4%	5%	4%
HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	7%	6%	9%	5%
COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(s)	17%	18%	24%	12%

EDUCATION	Contributed Money (NES)	Displayed a Candidate Button/Sticker (NES)	Voted in Election (NES)	Registered to Vote (CPS)
GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	3%	7%	55%	58%
HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	6%	9%	62%	74%
COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(s)	15%	12%	78%	87%

All eight of the different test, some from the National Election Study and some from the Citizen Participation Study all show the same trend, that as education increases the probability that one will participate increases. This data clearly supports my hypothesis.

First, when testing the data from the dependent variable of taking part in a protest in the past two years, which comes from the Citizen Participation Study, the pattern holds up that the percentage increases as education increases. It also has some of the lowest percentages for all of the education groups. This pattern follows for all the active forms of participation.

Being a member of a political issue organization and working for a campaign are also forms of active participation and have a very low percentage in all levels of education. This data comes from the Citizen Participation Study.

Other forms of active participation are attendance at political and displaying a candidate button or sticker. Again, as education increases, so does the probability that one will participate increase, however, all levels of education have very low percentages of participation. All of this data comes from the National Election Study.

The passive forms of participation, contributing money, voting in an election and registering to vote, continue with the pattern of as education increases so does involvement. The data for contributing money and voting comes from the National Election Study and the data for registering comes from the Citizen Participation Study. These forms of passive participation show a dramatic increase in all levels of education when compared to the active forms of participation previously discussed.

All of this data supports my hypothesis that as education increases so does participation. The passive forms of participation have such a dramatic increase of participation probably because as a whole, the passive forms of participation are always the ones with a larger percentage of the entire population participating, no matter the age or education level.

I performed two other tests regarding the independent variable of education with data from the Citizen Participation Study. These tests were that of how much attention was paid to national politics and public affairs and whether one had voted in all presidential elections since old enough.

The following table summarizes the responses to the amount of attention paid to national politics and public affairs:

EDUCATION	No Attention	Very Little Attention	Some Attention	A Great Deal	Total
GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	11%	38%	33%	18%	100%
HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	6%	20%	49%	25%	100%
COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(s)	1%	8%	44%	46%	100%

Again, the expected trend is seen with the results from this data. The two responses in which “No Attention” or “Very Little Attention” is paid to national politics and public affairs, the percentages of people responding decreases as education increases. The exact opposite is true for the responses of “Some Attention” and “A Great Deal” of attention paid to national politics and public affairs. This data supports my hypothesis that those with higher education levels will be more likely to pay attention to what is going on in national politics and public affairs.

The other data was whether one had voted in all presidential elections since old enough and test results are summarized in the following table:

EDUCATION	Never Voted	Rarely Voted	Voted in Some	Voted in Most	Voted in All	Not Old Enough	Never Eligible	Total
GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	23%	4%	15%	17%	27%	-	14%	100%
HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	20%	6%	13%	19%	36%	3%	3%	100%
COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(s)	6%	2%	8%	19%	62%	1%	3%	100%

This data produced some interesting results. Overall, it shows the expected result that as education increases, the likelihood that one would vote in most if not all elections since old enough would increase. However, when broken down to some of the individual responses, this pattern does not completely hold up.

To the responses of “Never Voted,” “Voted in Some” and “Voted in All” the expected results were seen. However, to the responses of “Rarely Voted” and “Voted in Most” this is not the case.

To the response of “Rarely Voted” a higher percentage of those with an education level of high school, at least 9 to 12 years, responded at a higher percentage than those with an education level of college or advance degree(s). The results differ from the expected in the response of “Voted in Most” in the fact that both education levels of high school and college or advance degree(s) responded at the same percentage. This may be due to the fact that there is such a large increase between these education groups when it comes to the response of “Voted in All.” Yet, overall, the data supports my hypothesis that those with higher levels of education will be more likely to participate.

Education, when compared to age, is a much better predictor of whether one will be likely to participate or not. From these tests, it was clear that there were significant differences between the education levels. This is probably due to the fact that as education increases, one has a better understanding and belief that politics effect ones life

in every aspect. It may also be due to the fact that as ones education increases, one has a stronger sense that participation is a civic duty.

Year

The final independent variable tested was that of what year the study was done in. All of this data comes from the National Election Study and was compiled from 1948 to 2000. During this time, significant movements were happening as previously discussed: the Civil Rights Movement during the late 1950's and 1960's and the Anti-Vietnam Movement during the late 1960's and 1970's. The election of 1974 came closely after the Supreme Court decision in Roe v. Wade and the election of 2000 followed the removal of the confederate flag from the South Carolina capitol. The test run in regard to the different years the questions were asked is summarized in the following table:

YEAR	Contributed Money	Worked for a Campaign	Displayed a Candidate Button/Sticker	Voted in Election	Attended Political Meetings	Tried to Influence Others to Vote
1948	NA*	NA	NA	64%	NA	NA
1950	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1952	4%	3%	NA	73%	7%	27%
1954	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1956	9%	3%	16%	73%	7%	28%
1958	NA	NA	NA	61%	NA	17%
1960	12%	6%	21%	82%	9%	34%
1962	9%	4%	10%	60%	8%	18%
1964	11%	5%	16%	78%	9%	31%
1966	8%	NA	NA	62%	NA	22%
1968	9%	6%	15%	76%	9%	33%
1970	NA	7%	9%	59%	9%	27%
1972	10%	5%	14%	72%	9%	32%
1974	9%	5%	6%	59%	6%	16%
1976	17%	5%	8%	73%	6%	37%
1978	13%	6%	9%	55%	9%	21%
1980	8%	4%	7%	71%	8%	36%
1982	9%	6%	8%	60%	9%	23%
1984	8%	4%	9%	74%	8%	32%
1986	10%	3%	7%	53%	7%	21%
1988	9%	3%	9%	70%	7%	29%
1990	7%	3%	7%	47%	6%	17%
1992	7%	3%	11%	75%	8%	38%
1994	7%	3%	7%	59%	6%	23%
1996	9%	3%	10%	77%	6%	29%
1998	8%	2%	6%	54%	6%	20%
2000	9%	3%	10%	76%	5%	35%

*NA: NOT ASKED THIS YEAR

The results show that attendance at political meetings and trying to influence others to vote have no correlation with the different time periods and no major changes throughout the different years. The only major changes are increases in trying to influence others to vote during Presidential Election years. The other four variables, contributing money, working for a campaign, displaying a candidate button or sticker and voting in an election, showed some changes and patterns, but none that were incredibly telling.

The first variable of contributing money showed a high level of correlation with the activities that were going on in the different years. There is a significant increase in the percentage of people donating money in 1976 and 1978, during the time of very intense Anti-Vietnam activity. Another possible explanation for this jump maybe the fact that this was when major changes were made in campaign finance laws, especially since during the rest of the 1960's and 1970's there is not much of a change.

This may be due to the fact that the majority of people active in the Civil Rights Movement and the Anti-Vietnam Movement were working outside the usual political system. The political parties were not incredibly involved in the Civil Rights Movement and the Anti-Vietnam Movement except when laws were broken.

The second variable of working for a campaign does point towards higher levels of participation during the 1960's and the 1970's. However, even during these years, the highest percentage is only 7%. Again, this may be due to the fact that a majority of the American public does not get involved in such an active form of participation. However, it does point towards an increase level of participation during the movements of the 1960's and 1970's, supporting my hypothesis that during times of strong issues in the country, participation will increase.

This is a form of active participation. This variable does show an increase during periods of conflict. This points to the fact that during periods of crisis, more active forms of participation may be used. However, when compared with voting, a passive form of participation, this type still has a much smaller percentage in all years.

The next form of participation was the displaying of a candidate's button or sticker. The highest percentage of responses to this question occurred in 1960 and the

highest numbers throughout the years are during the late 1950's to the early 1970's. This data again supports my hypothesis that during times of crisis, such as inequality for blacks and the war in Vietnam, more people will participate.

There is a rise again in the percentage of people displaying political buttons or stickers in 1992, 1996 and 2000. This could be due to the fact that the Presidential Elections in all three of these years were very contested and showed some of the highest percentages of people voting. However, once again this is an active form of participation that still shows very small percentages of people participating in when compared to the passive form of participation of voting.

This leads to the final form of participation examined, voting in elections. The highest percentage throughout all of the data was in 1960, during the Civil Rights Movement. This could also be due to the circumstances of the election. John F. Kennedy was running, the first Catholic ever, and this was also the first time debates between the candidates were televised.

Throughout the Civil Rights Movement and a majority of the Anti-Vietnam Movement, there are high percentages of people voting. However, throughout all of the years, there is not much of a variation in the percentage of people voting. Yet, overall, this data for voting points to the fact that during the periods where such issues as the Civil Rights Movement and the Anti-Vietnam Movement were prevalent, participation in voting was higher than the other periods.

This data does support my hypothesis that during periods of crisis participation will increase. However, the data is not very strong in its support of my hypothesis that more active forms of participation will increase at these times. Yet, it does show a trend

that during the periods of the Civil Rights Movement and the Anti-Vietnam Movement, participation was slightly higher than at the times when no significant crisis were happening.

Conclusion to Research

Levels of political participation and types of participation depend upon three key variables: age, education and the year. The data and tests that I performed in some ways supported and in other ways did not support my hypotheses.

When it comes to age, my hypothesis was not supported. In all forms of participation, except protesting, older generations are more likely to participate. However, the fact that the younger generation is more likely to take part in a protest does support the section of my hypothesis that those who are younger will be more likely to participate in active forms of participation. The data clearly supported my belief that older generations will be more likely to participate in the passive forms of participation.

The variable of education is easily the most reliable predictor of participation. Throughout all the tests a clear trend was seen, that those with higher levels of education are much more likely to participate. This is exactly what I stated in my hypothesis and is supported by this data and tests.

The variable of different years and times of crisis both supported and did not support my hypothesis. It supported my thesis in the sense that with a few of the different types of participation, there were changes in the number of participants during the times of crisis. Yet, the other variables showed no difference and in some cases the differences were very small.

The second part of my hypothesis having to do with active participation was not supported by this data. The percentage of people who participated during the years of crisis in active forms of participation were significantly lower than those who participated in voting every year, a very passive form of participation.

Overall, my hypotheses received mixed support. However, a general conclusion that can be drawn from this research is the fact that age, education and the different crisis that occur during different years do effect the amount of and type participation.

SIGNIFICANCE OF RESULTS

My research was significant in the sense that it brought together two aspects of research that have not always been looked at together before: the historical forms of participation and those predictors that are influencing participation today. By combining these two, it was possible to get a more detailed history of political participation and to come to a better understanding of why political participation trends are what they are.

The results of my research are also very significant to the field of Political Science in the sense that it pinpointed at least two, if not three definite predictors of political participation and types of participation. A person's age and education level can definitely be looked at to determine the probability that one will participate. As a person gets older and has higher levels of education, it is clear that one will be more likely to participate in all forms of participation, except protest, in which younger people are more likely to participate.

Different crisis or issues may compel people to participate and participate in more active forms of participation than they normally would. It may be a huge issue, such as

the Civil Rights Movement, or a smaller issue such as the removal of a flag. Either way, issues can drive people to act in ways they normally would not.

All of these results are also important to the field of Political Science because they may help solve the problem of low levels of participation. The fact that a very small percentage of people in America participate in any form of political participation has never been in question. However, by knowing what are characteristics of those who do participate at higher levels, it may be possible to increase participation.

With the variable of age, not much can be changed. Everyone will eventually grow older and thus probably participate more. However, what can be done to increase participation in younger generations may be answered by looking at what causes older generations to participate.

Higher levels of education are clearly a reason one participates. Throughout all of the test, it is clear that as education increases so does participation in all forms. This is very significant because that means that education can be used as a predictor of whether someone is likely to participate or not. This means that if higher levels of education were made available to more of the population, then more of the population would be likely to participate.

As to the different crisis that cause people to participate, we can not “create a crisis” just to get people to participate. However, we can try and develop the passion that people feel for such crisis around things such as social security and health care and then it may be possible to get more people involved.

Increasing the level of political participation is a very important aspect of Political Science. However, to do this, you must first know why people are or are not

participating. My research has pointed to some of the variables that lead to participation. Hopefully through this and other research, more can be learned and participation of all types and at all age and education levels can be increased.

POSSIBLE FUTURE RESEARCH

Through my research, there were clearly areas that arose that should be more closely looked at and more research should be done. Some of these have to do with my hypothesis and others have to do with issues outside my hypothesis but that arise around the general area of it.

The part of my hypothesis having to do with the different crisis and the relationship between those years and the different types of participation could be expanded. If data could be gathered on what were the popular types participation, such as if people believed that boycotts worked better than sit-ins, then this could point to what should or could be used in the continuing Civil Rights Movement or if another anti-war movement were to happen.

Another extension of my hypothesis would be to research why there are differences between the different age groups and education levels. The age group differences may be due to the fact that at different stages in life one has other responsibilities, such as family, to think about or one doesn't have the time to participate. Also, as one grows older, their perception of government might change. This would correlate with one's level of education and the understanding of how government affects one's life. This could then be used to determine new and different ways to get more people involved.

Also, a study could be done where the respondents were studied throughout their lives. This could be used to look at what one's own personal changes in participation are like. It could then be determined if this pattern of more education and getting older is the same within one person, or if it is just a matter of an entire group. This could look at if a person is from an active family, then will they be more or less likely to be active? Also, if one is active at a young age, will they continue to be active throughout their life or will they become disillusioned with politics and back away from it?

There are also questions outside my hypothesis that were brought up that could be further studied. One of these is whether age is a factor in whether someone will be more likely to support an issue versus a political party or a candidate. It was shown that older generations were more likely to work for a campaign or contribute money. Was this because they supported the candidate, supported the side of an issue that candidate stood for or an interest group they belonged to supported that candidate? Another would be whether during times of crisis, especially those that directly effect a certain age group or education level, if the age and education barriers are broken. An example of this would be with the elderly becoming very active in issues such as Social Security or college students becoming more active when there is a possibility of tuition increases.

During the year that I did this research a new "crisis" occurred, September 11, 2001. This horrific event brought out very patriotic feelings in a number of people. An interesting question is whether this patriotism will continue until the next election and if this patriotism will influence more people to go out and do their "civic duty" of political participation? Another area to look at will be the number of anti-war activities that are already starting to happen. Will they follow the pattern of those during the Vietnam

War? The political environment after September 11th is bound to change, will these changes occur throughout all the age groups and education levels?

These are just a few of the different areas that could be further researched. Political participation is a very important factor of the political process in the United States and thus deserves to be studied continuously and from different angles.

CONCLUSION

A nation's political life is linked closely to the "moods, manners and values of its people" (Dawson and Prewitt 1969). Throughout my research, it has been clear that people will only participate when they want to. They may be compelled to participate at times of national crisis, such as during the Civil Rights Movement, or they may simply be compelled to vote due to the fact that throughout their education experience they were taught that is what is expected. Whatever the case is, there are definite patterns to participation. These patterns include the fact that those with higher levels of education are more likely to participate and as one grows older one will be more likely to participate.

These patterns can be seen throughout the history of the United States, a history that is full of periods of political participation. In fact, it is through a very active form of political participation, demonstrations and protesting, a war was eventually began that would lead to the formation of the new country, the United States of America. The participation continued throughout the history of the growing country, through a civil war and the changing of a Constitution by very active forms of participation allowing more of the population to participate in one form of passive participation, voting.

However, the story does not end in the history books. Participation trends can still be looked at concerning the participation that is happening daily. However, outside the context of the history books, these trends would not make anywhere near as much sense. It is through the United States history that a clear understanding of participation comes.

The United States does not have the highest levels of participation of all other democratic countries. However, this does not mean that the United States people do not participate. They participate in numerous different forms of participation. Yet, the numbers are still very low. Things must be changed so that the United States may truly become a strong democracy, run completely by the people.

To do this, further research must be done to determine how with the key factors of age, education and what is happening, participation can be increased. With increased knowledge of participation trends, the future of the United States may involve more people participating, possibly in ways that those throwing tea into the Boston Harbor would never have even dreamed possible.

APPENDIX A

NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY QUESTIONS

NES

0004-Year of Study
 0102-Age Group
 0110-Education
 0702-Vote in Election
 0717-Influence Others to Vote
 0718-Attend Political Meetings
 0719-Work for Party or Candidate
 0720-Display Candidate Button/Sticker
 0721-Donate Money to Candidate/Party

=====

VAR CF0004 YEAR OF STUDY
 COLUMNS 16 - 19
 NUMERIC
 NO MISSING DATA CODES

 YEAR OF STUDY

 1948-2000 coded.

=====

VAR CF0102 RESPONDENT AGE GROUP
 COLUMNS 89 - 89
 NUMERIC
 MD EQ 0

AGE: CATEGORIZED

 USE WEIGHT VARIABLE VCF0009/VCF0009A/VCF0009B.

BUILT FROM VCF0101 (EXCEPT 1948,1954). SEE NOTES VCF0101.

Code 6 from 1948 and 1954 includes respondents 65 years and older (no code 7).

- 1. 17 - 24
- 2. 25 - 34
- 3. 35 - 44
- 4. 45 - 54
- 5. 55 - 64
- 6. 65 - 74
- 7. 75 - 99 and over (except 1954)

0. NA; DK; RF; no pre IW (1952)

=====

VAR CF0110 R EDUCATION (1)
 COLUMNS 99-99
 NUMERIC
 MD EQ 0

1952-1972: How many grades of school did you finish?

1974 and later: What is highest grade of school or year of college

you have completed?

R'S EDUCATION [1]

USE WEIGHT VARIABLE VCF0009/VCF0009A/VCF0009B.

SEE ALSO VCF0140 (FULL-CODE SUMMARY)

Question wording in 1948 is undocumented.

Personal data forms were completed for no-pre cases in 1960: data from these forms were incorporated into the (pre) education var listed here for 1960.

In 1992, this question was not part of the short-form questionnaire; for short-form 'panel' cases, however, 1990 study data were incorporated into the 1992 education summary var (V3908).

In 1948, no distinction was made between Rs holding college degrees and those Rs who attended college but did not receive a degree. All cases coded 'college' in 1948 are coded 3 -- there are no cases coded 4 for 1948.

Code 4 includes 1 cases in 1968, 2 cases in 1976 and 4 cases in 1974 which were designated by respondents as 'honorary degrees.'

In 1994, 1992 data was incorporated for panel cases.

1. Grade school or less (0-8 grades)
2. High school (12 grades or fewer, incl. non-college training if applicable)
3. Some College (13 grades or more but no degree; 1948 ONLY: college, no identification of degree status)
4. College or advanced degree (no cases 1948)
0. DK; NA; no pre IW (1952); short-form 'new' cross section

=====

```
VAR CF0702    DID R VOTE IN ELECTION
              COLUMNS 470-470
              NUMERIC
              MD EQ 0
```

1948: In the election, about half the people voted and about half of them didn't. Did you vote?

All years 1952-1998 exc. 1962: In talking to people about the election we (1972 and later: often) find that a lot of people weren't able to vote because they weren't registered or they were sick or they just didn't have time. (1956-1960: How about you, did you vote this time?) (1964-1970: How about you, did you vote this time, or did something keep you from voting) (1972-1976: How about you, did you vote in the elections this fall?) (1978 and later: How about you, did you vote in the elections this November?)

1962: One of the things we need to know is whether or not people really did get to vote this fall. In talking to people about the election we find that a lot of people weren't able to vote because

they weren't registered or they were sick or something else came up at the last minute. Do you remember for sure whether or not you voted in the November election?

2000: In talking to people about elections, we often find that a lot of people were not able to vote because they weren't registered, they were sick, or they just didn't have time. Which of the following statements best describes you:

- One, I did not vote (in the election this November);
- Two, I thought about voting this time - but didn't;
- Three, I usually vote, but didn't this time; or
- Four, I am sure I voted?

USE WEIGHT VARIABLE VCF0009/VCF0009A/VCF0009B.

In 1982, for congressional districts GA04 and GA05, an additional question appeared: How about the special US Congressional elections held November 30th. Did you vote in that election? From 1982, code 2 includes all GA04, GA05 respondents who voted in either the November 2 general election or the November 30 special election, or both.

Code 2 includes 8 respondents from 1958, 8 respondents from 1962 and 14 respondents from 1968, who replied "yes, I think so." Code 2 for 1956 includes 3 cases coded by NES into the following category which combined types of respondents: "Nonvoter, NA preference; voted, but not for president" (3 cases).

- 1. No, did not vote
- 2. Yes, voted

- 0. DK; NA; INAP, no post IW (1952,1960,1964,1968,1972,1976, 1980,1984,1988,1992,1996,2000); refused to say if voted; Washington D.C. (presidential years only); question(s) not used

=====
VAR CF0717 DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHERS VOTE
COLUMNS 486-486
NUMERIC
MD EQ 0

1952,1956,1960-1964 intro: I have a list of some of the things that people do that help a party or a candidate win an election. I wonder if you could tell me whether you did any of these things.

1968,1972 and later intro: Now I'd like to find out (1990 and later: We'd/we would like to find out) about some of the things that people do to help a party or candidate win an election.

All years: During the campaign, did you talk to any people and try to show them why they should vote for (1984 and later: or against) one of the parties or candidates?

USE WEIGHT VARIABLE VCF0009/VCF0009A/VCF0009B.

The order of items corresponding to VCF0717-VCF0722 (participation vars) may vary from year to year.

- 1. No

- 2. Yes
- 0. DK; NA; INAP, no post IW (presidential years exc.1956); form III or IV (1972); abbrev.telephone IW (1984); question not used

=====

VAR CF0718 DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS
 COLUMNS 487-487
 NUMERIC
 MD EQ 0

Did you go to any political meetings, rallies, (1984 and later: speeches,) (1978,1980,1982: fund raising) dinners, or things like that (1984 and later: in support of a particular candidate)?

USE WEIGHT VARIABLE VCF0009/VCF0009A/VCF0009B.

SEE VCF0717.

The order of items corresponding to VCF0717-VCF0722 (participation vars) may vary from year to year.

- 1. No
- 2. Yes
- 0. DK; NA; INAP, no post IW (presidential years exc.1956); form III or IV (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984); question not used

=====

VAR CF0719 DID R WORK FOR PARTY OR CANDIDATE
 COLUMNS 488-488
 NUMERIC
 MD EQ 0

Did you do any {other} work for one of the parties or candidates?

USE WEIGHT VARIABLE VCF0009/VCF0009A/VCF0009B.

SEE VCF0717.

The order of items corresponding to VCF0717-VCF0722 (participation vars) may vary from year to year.

- 1. No
- 2. Yes
- 0. DK; NA; INAP, no post IW (presidential years exc.1956); form III or IV (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984); question not used

=====

VAR CF0720 DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER
 COLUMNS 489-489
 NUMERIC
 MD EQ 0

1956,1960,1962-1982: Did you wear a campaign button or put a campaign sticker on your car?

1984 and later: Did you wear a campaign button, put a campaign sticker on your car, or place a sign in your window or in front of your house?

USE WEIGHT VARIABLE VCF0009/VCF0009A/VCF0009B.

SEE VCF0717.

The order of items corresponding to VCF0717-VCF0722 (participation vars) may vary from year to year.

1. No
2. Yes

0. DK; NA; INAP, no post IW (presidential years exc.1956); form III or IV (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984); question not used

=====

VAR CF0721	DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE
	COLUMNS 490-490
	NUMERIC
	MD EQ 0

1952,1956,1960,1962: Did you give any money or buy any tickets or anything to help the campaign for one of the parties or candidates?

1964: Did you give any money or buy any tickets or anything to help a party or candidate pay campaign expenses this year?

1966,1968: During this last year were you or any member of your household asked to give money or buy tickets to help pay the campaign expenses of a political party or candidate? (IF YES) Did you give any money or buy any tickets?

1972,1974: Did you give any money to a political party this year?

1976: Did you give any money to a political party or make any other contribution this year? (responses coded: 1. yes, 5. no, 7. tax check-off).

1978: Did you give any money to a political party or candidate this year?

1980,1982: 2 questions. (In 1982 only, these questions are preceded by: "Now a few questions about giving money during this last election campaign"):

- 1.) What about other political contributions [other than tax check-offs]. Did you give any money this year to a candidate running for public office?;
- 2.) Apart from contributions from specific candidates, how about contributions to any of the political parties. Did you give money to a political party during this election year?

1984: 3 questions. (First question is filter question):
As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a

contribution to support campaigns. During the past year, did you give any money to an individual candidate, to a political party organization, people supporting a ballot proposition, or to a particular issue or interest group?

IF YES:

- 1.) Apart from contributions from specific candidates, how about contributions to any political party organization. Did you give money to a political party during this election year?
- 2.) Now, apart from contributions to a political party, did you give any money to an individual candidate running for public office?

1986: As you know, during an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. During the past year, did you give any money to an individual candidate, or to a political party organization?

1988 and later: 2 questions.

- 1.) During an election year people are often asked to make a contribution to support campaigns. Did you give money to an individual candidate running for public office?
- 2.) Did you give money to a political party during this election year?

USE WEIGHT VARIABLE VCF0009/VCF0009A/VCF0009B.

SEE VCF0717. SEE ALSO VCF0739-VCF0741.

The order of items corresponding to VCF0717-VCF0722 (participation vars) may vary from year to year.

For 1980, 1982, 1984, 1988 and later, a "yes" response for either or both questions has been coded 2. A "no" response combined with another "no" response or with "DK" have been coded 1. Two "DK" responses have been coded 0. (A "no" response with "NA" is coded 0.)

In 1984, if R's response was "No," DK, NA to the filter question, then the subsequent two contribution questions were not asked. If R's response to the filter was "no," VCF0721 has been coded 1; if R's response to the filter was DK or NA, then VCF0721 has been coded 0. 1984 Rs who responded "yes" to the filter question: if s/he responded "yes" to either or both of the following contribution questions, then VCF0721 has been coded 2. If R responded "yes" to the filter but then responded "no" to both follow-up contribution questions or if s/he responded "no" to one contribution question and replied "DK" to the other, then VCF0721 has been coded 1. Rs who responded "yes" to the filter but "DK" to both followups have been coded 0.

1. No (includes "not asked for money" in 1966,1968)
2. Yes (includes "tax check-off" in 1976)

0. DK; NA; INAP, no post IW (presidential years exc.1956); form III or IV (1972); abbrev. telephone IW (1984); DK/NA if asked for money (1966,1968 only); question not used

=====

APPENDIX B

CITIZAN PARTICIPATION STUDY QUESTIONS

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION STUDY

CW88 21-Work for Campaign

VTREG 134-Registered to Vote

VTPRES 135 -Voted in All Presidential Elections Since Old Enough

EDGRADE 210 -Education

PT2YRS 241-Taken Part in Protest in Past 2 Years

READNAT 624-Pay Attention to National Politics and Public Affairs

YEARBORN 711-Yearborn

OGMEMI 824-Member of Political Issue Organization

3.1 Since January 1988, the start of the last national election year, have you worked as a volunteer -- that is, for no pay at all or for only a token amount -- for a candidate running for national, state, or local office?

Variable name: CW88

10.1 Are you currently registered to vote?

Variable name: VTREG

10.2 In talking to people about elections, we find that they are sometimes not able to vote because they're not registered, they don't have time, or they have difficulty getting to the polls. Think about the presidential elections since you were old enough to vote. Have you voted in all of them, in most of them, in some of them, rarely voted in them, or have you never voted in a presidential election?

Variable name: VTPRES

13.1 What is the highest grade of regular school that you have completed and gotten credit for? If necessary say: By regular school we mean a school which can be counted toward an elementary or high school diploma or a college or university degree.

Variable name: EDGRADE

15.1 In the past two years, since (Current month 1988), have you taken part in a protest, march, or demonstration on some national or local issue (other than a strike against your employer)?

Variable name: PT2YRS

25.15a When you read the newspaper, how much attention do you pay to stories on national and world politics and public affairs? A great deal, some, very little, or none?

Variable name: READNAT

27.32 In what year were you born?

17.1i Are you a member of an organization active on one particular political issue such as the environment, or abortion (on either side), or gun control (again on either side), or consumer rights, or the rights of taxpayers, or any other issue?

Variable name: OGMEMI

APPENDIX C

NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY FREQUENCY TABLES

0004

Statistics

YEAR OF STUDY

N	Valid	44715
	Missing	0

YEAR OF STUDY

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1948	662	1.5	1.5
	1952	1899	4.2	5.7
	1954	1139	2.5	8.3
	1956	1762	3.9	12.2
	1958	1450	3.2	15.5
	1960	1181	2.6	18.1
	1962	1297	2.9	21.0
	1964	1571	3.5	24.5
	1966	1291	2.9	27.4
	1968	1557	3.5	30.9
	1970	1507	3.4	34.3
	1972	2705	6.0	40.3
	1974	1575	3.5	43.8
	1976	2248	5.0	48.9
	1978	2304	5.2	54.0
	1980	1614	3.6	57.6
	1982	1418	3.2	60.8
	1984	2257	5.0	65.8
	1986	2176	4.9	70.7
	1988	2040	4.6	75.3
	1990	1980	4.4	79.7
	1992	2485	5.6	85.2
	1994	1795	4.0	89.3
	1996	1714	3.8	93.1
	1998	1281	2.9	96.0
	2000	1807	4.0	100.0
Total	44715	100.0	100.0	

AGEGROUP-FROM 0102

Statistics

GROUPING LIKE 6635

N	Valid	44398
	Missing	317

GROUPING LIKE 6635

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	4372	9.8	9.8	9.8
	2.00	19156	42.8	43.1	53.0
	3.00	13346	29.8	30.1	83.1
	4.00	7524	16.8	16.9	100.0
	Total	44398	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	317	.7		
Total		44715	100.0		

0110

Statistics

R EDUCATION (1)

N	Valid	44258
	Missing	457

R EDUCATION (1)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	7757	17.3	17.5	17.5
	2	20990	46.9	47.4	65.0
	3	8339	18.6	18.8	83.8
	4	7172	16.0	16.2	100.0
	Total	44258	99.0	100.0	
Missing	0	457	1.0		
Total		44715	100.0		

0702

Statistics

DID R VOTE IN ELECTION

N	Valid	40794
	Missing	3921

DID R VOTE IN ELECTION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	13749	30.7	33.7	33.7
	2	27045	60.5	66.3	100.0
	Total	40794	91.2	100.0	
Missing	0	3921	8.8		
Total		44715	100.0		

0717

Statistics

DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHERS VOTE

N	Valid	39910
	Missing	4805

DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHERS VOTE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	29098	65.1	72.9	72.9
	2	10812	24.2	27.1	100.0
	Total	39910	89.3	100.0	
Missing	0	4805	10.7		
Total		44715	100.0		

0718

Statistics

DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS

N	Valid	37199
	Missing	7516

DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	34421	77.0	92.5	92.5
	2	2778	6.2	7.5	100.0
	Total	37199	83.2	100.0	
Missing	0	7516	16.8		
Total		44715	100.0		

0719

Statistics

DID R WORK FOR PARTY OR CANDIDATE

N	Valid	37175
	Missing	7540

DID R WORK FOR PARTY OR CANDIDATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	35655	79.7	95.9	95.9
	2	1520	3.4	4.1	100.0
	Total	37175	83.1	100.0	
Missing	0	7540	16.9		
Total		44715	100.0		

0720

Statistics

DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER

N	Valid	35475
	Missing	9240

DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	31929	71.4	90.0	90.0
	2	3546	7.9	10.0	100.0
	Total	35475	79.3	100.0	
Missing	0	9240	20.7		
Total		44715	100.0		

0721

Statistics

DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE

N	Valid	36912
	Missing	7803

DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	33497	74.9	90.7	90.7
	2	3415	7.6	9.3	100.0
	Total	36912	82.5	100.0	
Missing	0	7803	17.5		
Total		44715	100.0		

APPENDIX D

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION STUDY FREQUENCY TABLES

CW88 21

Statistics

election campaign

N	Valid	2516
	Missing	1

election campaign

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	2096	83.3	83.3	83.3
	YES	420	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	2516	100.0	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.0		
Total		2517	100.0		

VTREG 134

Statistics

R CURRENTLY REGISTERED TO VOTE

N	Valid	2515
	Missing	2

R CURRENTLY REGISTERED TO VOTE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	502	19.9	20.0	20.0
	YES	2013	80.0	80.0	100.0
	Total	2515	99.9	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	2	.1		
Total		2517	100.0		

VTPRES 135

Statistics

voted in all presidential elections since old enough

N	Valid	2514
	Missing	3

voted in all presidential elections since old enough

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NEVER	314	12.5	12.5	12.5
	RARELY	99	3.9	3.9	16.4
	SOME	258	10.3	10.3	26.7
	MOST	476	18.9	18.9	45.6
	ALL	1235	49.1	49.1	94.7
	NOT OLD ENOUGH	37	1.5	1.5	96.2
	NEVER ELIGIBLE	95	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	2514	99.9	100.0	
Missing	DONT KNOW	1	.0		
	MISSING	1	.0		
	System	1	.0		
	Total	3	.1		
Total		2517	100.0		

EDGRADE 210

Statistics

HIGHEST GRADE OF REGULAR SCHL COMPLETED

N	Valid	2517
	Missing	0

HIGHEST GRADE OF REGULAR SCHL COMPLETED

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 0 YEARS	7	.3	.3	.3
1ST GRADE	2	.1	.1	.4
2ND GRADE	6	.2	.2	.6
3RD GRADE	5	.2	.2	.8
4TH GRADE	10	.4	.4	1.2
5TH GRADE	12	.5	.5	1.7
6TH GRADE	24	1.0	1.0	2.6
7TH GRADE	19	.8	.8	3.4
8TH GRADE	64	2.5	2.5	5.9
9TH GRADE	58	2.3	2.3	8.2
10TH GRADE	84	3.3	3.3	11.6
11TH GRADE	107	4.3	4.3	15.8
12TH GRADE	761	30.2	30.2	46.0
1ST YEAR OF COLLEGE	197	7.8	7.8	53.9
2ND YEAR OF COLLEGE	299	11.9	11.9	65.8
3RD YEAR OF COLLEGE	110	4.4	4.4	70.1
4TH YEAR OF COLLEGE	357	14.2	14.2	84.3
5TH/HIGHER YEAR COLL	393	15.6	15.6	99.9
18	1	.0	.0	100.0
20	1	.0	.0	100.0
Total	2517	100.0	100.0	

PT2YRS 241

Statistics

PAST 2 YEARS TAKEN PART IN A PROTEST

N	Valid	2517
	Missing	0

PAST 2 YEARS TAKEN PART IN A PROTEST

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid NO	2222	88.3	88.3	88.3
YES	295	11.7	11.7	100.0
Total	2517	100.0	100.0	

READNAT624

Statistics

ATTENTN TO NAT'L POLITCS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS

N	Valid	2397
	Missing	120

ATTENTN TO NAT'L POLITCS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NONE	79	3.1	3.3	3.3
	VERY LITTLE	349	13.9	14.6	17.9
	SOME	1094	43.5	45.6	63.5
	A GREAT DEAL	875	34.8	36.5	100.0
	Total	2397	95.2	100.0	
Missing	REFUSAL	2	.1		
	MISSING	13	.5		
	System	105	4.2		
	Total	120	4.8		
Total		2517	100.0		

AGEGROUP-FROM AGE-FROM YEARBORN 711

Statistics

age group per nes

N	Valid	2509
	Missing	8

age group per nes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	279	11.1	11.1	11.1
	2.00	1311	52.1	52.3	63.4
	3.00	608	24.2	24.2	87.6
	5.00	311	12.4	12.4	100.0
	Total	2509	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	8	.3		
Total		2517	100.0		

OGMEMI 824

Statistics

MEMBER OF POLITICAL ISSUE ORGANIZATION

N	Valid	2499
	Missing	18

MEMBER OF POLITICAL ISSUE ORGANIZATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	2202	87.5	88.1	88.1
	YES	297	11.8	11.9	100.0
	Total	2499	99.3	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	18	.7		
Total		2517	100.0		

APPENDIX E CROSS-TABULATION TABLES

CONTRIBUTE MONEY 0721 AGE

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE	36645	82.0%	8070	18.0%	44715	100.0%

AGE GROUP * DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE		Total
		DID NOT DONATE	DONATED	
AGE GROUP	0-24	3545	157	3702
	25-44	14436	1354	15790
	45-64	9556	1309	10865
	65-100	5712	576	6288
Total		33249	3396	36645

0721 EDUCATION

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EDUCATION LEVEL * DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE	36537	81.7%	8178	18.3%	44715	100.0%

EDUCATION LEVEL * DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE
Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE		Total
		DID NOT DONATE	DONATED	
EDUCATION LEVEL	GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	5482	185	5667
	HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	16110	1118	17228
	COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(S)	11555	2087	13642
Total		33147	3390	36537

0721 YEARS

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
YEAR OF STUDY * DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE	36912	82.5%	7803	17.5%	44715	100.0%

**YEAR OF STUDY * DID R DONATE MONEY TO
PARTY/CANDIDATE Crosstabulation**

Count

		DID R DONATE MONEY TO PARTY/CANDIDATE		Total
		DID NOT DONATE	DONATED	
YEAR	1952	1637	71	1708
OF	1956	1589	173	1762
STUDY	1960	978	128	1106
	1962	1166	120	1286
	1964	1289	154	1443
	1966	1169	107	1276
	1968	1201	119	1320
	1972	1963	228	2191
	1974	1425	145	1570
	1976	1586	316	1902
	1978	2002	290	2292
	1980	1291	113	1404
	1982	1278	128	1406
	1984	1785	151	1936
	1986	1947	211	2158
	1988	1618	155	1773
	1990	1841	133	1974
	1992	2087	165	2252
	1994	1660	126	1786
	1996	1396	136	1532
	1998	1179	101	1280
	2000	1410	145	1555
Total		33497	3415	36912

**MEMBER OF ORGANIZATION
OGMEMI AGE**

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * MEMBER OF POLITICAL ISSUE ORGANIZATION	2491	99.0%	26	1.0%	2517	100.0%

AGE GROUP * MEMBER OF POLITICAL ISSUE ORGANIZATION Crosstabulation

Count

		MEMBER OF POLITICAL ISSUE ORGANIZATION		Total
		NOT A MEMBER	MEMBER	
AGE GROUP	0-24	258	20	278
	25-44	1133	167	1300
	45-64	521	83	604
	65-100	282	27	309
Total		2194	297	2491

OGMEMI EDUCATION

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EDUCATION LEVEL * MEMBER OF POLITICAL ISSUE ORGANIZATION	2499	99.3%	18	.7%	2517	100.0%

EDUCATION LEVEL * MEMBER OF POLITICAL ISSUE ORGANIZATION Crosstabulation

Count

		MEMBER OF POLITICAL ISSUE ORGANIZATION		Total
		NOT A MEMBER	MEMBER	
EDUCATION LEVEL	GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	148	1	149
	HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	947	59	1006
	COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(s)	1107	237	1344
Total		2202	297	2499

PROTEST PT2YRS AGE

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * PAST 2 YEARS TAKEN PART IN A PROTEST	2509	99.7%	8	.3%	2517	100.0%

AGE GROUP * PAST 2 YEARS TAKEN PART IN A PROTEST Crosstabulation

Count

		PAST 2 YEARS TAKEN PART IN A PROTEST		Total
		NOT TAKEN PART	TAKEN PART	
AGE GROUP	0-24	229	50	279
	25-44	1137	174	1311
	45-64	549	59	608
	65-100	299	12	311
Total		2214	295	2509

PT2YRS EDUCATION

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EDUCATION LEVEL * PAST 2 YEARS TAKEN PART IN A PROTEST	2517	100.0%	0	.0%	2517	100.0%

EDUCATION LEVEL * PAST 2 YEARS TAKEN PART IN A PROTEST Crosstabulation

Count

		PAST 2 YEARS TAKEN PART IN A PROTEST		Total
		NOT TAKEN PART	TAKEN PART	
EDUCATION LEVEL	GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	147	2	149
	HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	943	67	1010
	COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(s)	1132	226	1358
Total		2222	295	2517

**POLITICAL MEETINGS
0718 AGE**

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS	36934	82.6%	7781	17.4%	44715	100.0%

**AGE GROUP * DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS
Crosstabulation**

Count

		DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS		Total
		DID NOT ATTEND MEETINGS	ATTENDED MEETINGS	
AGE GROUP	0-24	3492	240	3732
	25-44	14652	1224	15876
	45-64	10088	892	10980
	65-100	5947	399	6346
Total		34179	2755	36934

0718 EDUCATION

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EDUCATION LEVEL * DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS	36822	82.3%	7893	17.7%	44715	100.0%

EDUCATION LEVEL * DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS		Total
		DID NOT ATTEND MEETINGS	ATTENDED MEETINGS	
EDUCATION LEVEL	GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	5492	220	5712
	HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	16475	909	17384
	COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(S)	12105	1621	13726
Total		34072	2750	36822

0718 YEARS

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
YEAR OF STUDY * DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS	37199	83.2%	7516	16.8%	44715	100.0%

YEAR OF STUDY * DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS
Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R ATTEND POLITICAL MEETINGS		Total
		DID NOT ATTEND MEETINGS	ATTENDED MEETINGS	
YEAR OF STUDY	1952	1584	120	1704
	1956	1638	123	1761
	1960	1011	94	1105
	1962	1184	103	1287
	1964	1319	126	1445
	1968	1223	123	1346
	1970	1365	140	1505
	1972	1996	194	2190
	1974	1478	97	1575
	1976	1781	122	1903
	1978	2075	217	2292
	1980	1301	106	1407
	1982	1274	130	1404
	1984	1790	152	1942
	1986	2031	144	2175
	1988	1645	127	1772
	1990	1857	120	1977
	1992	2071	182	2253
	1994	1677	111	1788
	1996	1442	91	1533
1998	1209	71	1280	
2000	1470	85	1555	
Total		34421	2778	37199

INTREST IN POLITICS
READNAT AGE

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * ATTENTN TO NAT'L POLITCS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS	2392	95.0%	125	5.0%	2517	100.0%

AGE GROUP * ATTENTN TO NAT'L POLITCS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS Crosstabulation

Count

		ATTENTN TO NAT'L POLITCS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS				Total
		NO ATTENTION	VERY LITTLE ATTENTION	SOME ATTENTION	A GREAT DEAL	
AGE GROUP	0-24	18	62	138	53	271
	25-44	37	176	605	438	1256
	45-64	17	66	249	247	579
	65-100	7	44	99	136	286
Total		79	348	1091	874	2392

READNAT EDUCATION

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EDUCATION LEVEL * ATTENTN TO NAT'L POLITCS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS	2397	95.2%	120	4.8%	2517	100.0%

EDUCATION LEVEL * ATTENTN TO NAT'L POLITCS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS Crosstabulation

Count

		ATTENTN TO NAT'L POLITCS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS				Total
		NO ATTENTION	VERY LITTLE ATTENTION	SOME ATTENTION	A GREAT DEAL	
EDUCATION LEVEL	GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	12	42	36	20	110
	HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	58	194	468	237	957
	COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(s)	9	113	590	618	1330
Total		79	349	1094	875	2397

WORKED FOR CAMPAIGN/CANDIDATE CW88 AGE

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * WORKED FOR CAMPAIGN	2508	99.6%	9	.4%	2517	100.0%

AGE GROUP * WORKED FOR CAMPAIGN Crosstabulation

Count

		WORKED FOR CAMPAIGN		Total
		DID NOT WORK	WORKED	
AGE GROUP	0-24	246	32	278
	25-44	1102	209	1311
	45-64	481	127	608
	65-100	260	51	311
Total		2089	419	2508

CW88 EDUCATION

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EDUCATION LEVEL * WORKED FOR CAMPAIGN	2516	100.0%	1	.0%	2517	100.0%

EDUCATION LEVEL * WORKED FOR CAMPAIGN Crosstabulation

Count

		WORKED FOR CAMPAIGN		Total
		DID NOT WORK	WORKED	
EDUCATION LEVEL	GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	142	7	149
	HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	919	91	1010
	COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(s)	1035	322	1357
Total		2096	420	2516

0719 YEARS

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
YEAR OF STUDY * DID R WORK FOR PARTY OR CANDIDATE	37175	83.1%	7540	16.9%	44715	100.0%

**YEAR OF STUDY * DID R WORK FOR PARTY OR
CANDIDATE Crosstabulation**

Count

		DID R WORK FOR PARTY OR CANDIDATE		Total
		DID NOT WORK	WORKED	
YEAR OF STUDY	1952	1654	54	1708
	1956	1701	57	1758
	1960	1043	63	1106
	1962	1236	50	1286
	1964	1369	75	1444
	1968	1261	77	1338
	1970	1398	107	1505
	1972	2078	110	2188
	1974	1499	75	1574
	1976	1817	88	1905
	1978	2163	129	2292
	1980	1355	50	1405
	1982	1323	80	1403
	1984	1859	79	1938
	1986	2099	73	2172
	1988	1712	58	1770
	1990	1926	51	1977
	1992	2175	77	2252
	1994	1729	57	1786
	1996	1491	42	1533
1998	1255	25	1280	
2000	1512	43	1555	
Total		35655	1520	37175

0720 AGE

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER	35331	79.0%	9384	21.0%	44715	100.0%

AGE GROUP * DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER
Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER		Total
		DID NOT DISPLAY	DISPLAYED	
AGE GROUP	0-24	3282	350	3632
	25-44	13420	1693	15113
	45-64	9385	1070	10455
	65-100	5715	416	6131
Total		31802	3529	35331

0720 EDUCATION

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EDUCATION LEVEL * DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER	35201	78.7%	9514	21.3%	44715	100.0%

EDUCATION LEVEL * DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER
Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER		Total
		DID NOT DISPLAY	DISPLAYED	
EDUCATION LEVEL	GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	4705	343	5048
	HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	15109	1557	16666
	COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(S)	11865	1622	13487
Total		31679	3522	35201

0720 YEARS

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
YEAR OF STUDY * DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER	35475	79.3%	9240	20.7%	44715	100.0%

YEAR OF STUDY * DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R DISPLAY CANDIDATE BUTTON/STICKER		Total
		DID NOT DISPLAY	DISPLAYED	
YEAR OF STUDY	1956	1486	273	1759
	1960	876	231	1107
	1962	1160	124	1284
	1964	1206	238	1444
	1968	1137	198	1335
	1970	1364	139	1503
	1972	1881	307	2188
	1974	1487	87	1574
	1976	1755	148	1903
	1978	2090	201	2291
	1980	1313	94	1407
	1982	1294	109	1403
	1984	1764	178	1942
	1986	2015	160	2175
	1988	1621	154	1775
	1990	1845	132	1977
	1992	2000	253	2253
	1994	1658	129	1787
	1996	1377	156	1533
	1998	1202	79	1281
	2000	1398	156	1554
Total		31929	3546	35475

VOTING VTREG AGE

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * R CURRENTLY REGISTERED TO VOTE	2507	99.6%	10	.4%	2517	100.0%

AGE GROUP * R CURRENTLY REGISTERED TO VOTE Crosstabulation

Count

		R CURRENTLY REGISTERED TO VOTE		Total
		NOT REGISTERED	YES	
AGE	0-24	106	173	279
GROUP	25-44	292	1018	1310
	45-64	72	536	608
	65-100	29	281	310
Total		499	2008	2507

VTREG EDUCATION

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EDUCATION LEVEL * R CURRENTLY REGISTERED TO VOTE	2515	99.9%	2	.1%	2517	100.0%

EDUCATION LEVEL * R CURRENTLY REGISTERED TO VOTE Crosstabulation

Count

		R CURRENTLY REGISTERED TO VOTE		Total
		NOT REGISTERED	YES	
EDUCATION LEVEL	GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	63	86	149
	HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	262	747	1009
	COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(s)	177	1180	1357
Total		502	2013	2515

VTPRES AGE

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * VOTED IN ALL PRES ELECTION SINCE OLD ENOUGH	2506	99.6%	11	.4%	2517	100.0%

AGE GROUP * VOTED IN ALL PRES ELECTION SINCE OLD ENOUGH Crosstabulation

Count

		VOTED IN ALL PRES ELECTION SINCE OLD ENOUGH							Total
		NEVER VOTED	RARELY VOTED	VOTED IN SOME	VOTED IN MOST	VOTED IN ALL	NOT OLD ENOUGH	NEVER ELIGIBLE	
AGE GROUP	0-24	88	10	13	19	93	37	19	279
	25-44	179	65	166	249	590		59	1308
	45-64	33	16	55	140	351		13	608
	65-100	12	8	24	66	198		3	311
Total		312	99	258	474	1232	37	94	2506

VTPRES EDUCATION

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EDUCATION LEVEL * VOTED IN ALL PRES ELECTION SINCE OLD ENOUGH	2514	99.9%	3	.1%	2517	100.0%

EDUCATION LEVEL * VOTED IN ALL PRES ELECTION SINCE OLD ENOUGH Crosstabulation

Count

		VOTED IN ALL PRES ELECTION SINCE OLD ENOUGH							Total
		NEVER VOTED	RARELY VOTED	VOTED IN SOME	VOTED IN MOST	VOTED IN ALL	NOT OLD ENOUGH	NEVER ELIGIBLE	
EDUCATION LEVEL	GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	35	6	22	25	40		21	149
	HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	197	63	134	195	359	29	31	1008
	COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(s)	82	30	102	256	836	8	43	1357
Total		314	99	258	476	1235	37	95	2514

0702 AGE

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * DID R VOTE IN ELECTION	40509	90.6%	4206	9.4%	44715	100.0%

AGE GROUP * DID R VOTE IN ELECTION Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R VOTE IN ELECTION		Total
		DID NOT VOTE	VOTED	
AGE GROUP	0-24	2358	1616	3974
	25-44	6278	11172	17450
	45-64	3053	9156	12209
	65-100	1959	4917	6876
Total		13648	26861	40509

0702 EDUCATION

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EDUCATION LEVEL * DID R VOTE IN ELECTION	40392	90.3%	4323	9.7%	44715	100.0%

EDUCATION LEVEL * DID R VOTE IN ELECTION Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R VOTE IN ELECTION		Total
		DID NOT VOTE	VOTED	
EDUCATION LEVEL	GRADE SCHOOL OR LESS (0-8yrs)	3046	3770	6816
	HIGH SCHOOL (9-12yrs)	7346	11745	19091
	COLLEGE/ADVANCE DEGREE(S)	3205	11280	14485
Total		13597	26795	40392

0702 YEARS

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
YEAR OF STUDY * DID R VOTE IN ELECTION	40794	91.2%	3921	8.8%	44715	100.0%

YEAR OF STUDY * DID R VOTE IN ELECTION Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R VOTE IN ELECTION		Total
		DID NOT VOTE	VOTED	
YEAR OF STUDY	1948	238	422	660
	1952	463	1251	1714
	1956	477	1285	1762
	1958	556	882	1438
	1960	197	912	1109
	1962	512	781	1293
	1964	324	1126	1450
	1966	486	802	1288
	1968	336	1055	1391
	1970	606	887	1493
	1972	621	1662	2283
	1974	646	924	1570
	1976	517	1392	1909
	1978	1042	1250	2292
	1980	403	1004	1407
	1982	557	849	1406
	1984	525	1464	1989
	1986	1032	1142	2174
	1988	538	1235	1773
	1990	1056	923	1979
	1992	554	1700	2254
	1994	741	1053	1794
	1996	359	1175	1534
	1998	591	687	1278
	2000	372	1182	1554
Total		13749	27045	40794

INFLUENCE 0717 AGE

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
AGE GROUP * DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHERS VOTE	39634	88.6%	5081	11.4%	44715	100.0%

AGE GROUP * DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHERS VOTE

Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHERS VOTE		Total
		DID NOT TRY TO INFLUENCE	TRIED TO INFLUENCE	
AGE GROUP	0-24	2904	1000	3904
	25-44	12048	5007	17055
	45-64	8559	3359	11918
	65-100	5386	1371	6757
Total		28897	10737	39634

0717 YEARS

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
YEAR OF STUDY * DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHERS VOTE	39910	89.3%	4805	10.7%	44715	100.0%

YEAR OF STUDY * DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHERS VOTE
Crosstabulation

Count

		DID R TRY TO INFLUENCE OTHERS VOTE		Total
		DID NOT TRY TO INFLUENCE	TRIED TO INFLUENCE	
YEAR OF STUDY	1952	1239	469	1708
	1956	1264	498	1762
	1958	1182	241	1423
	1960	726	382	1108
	1962	1050	237	1287
	1964	992	455	1447
	1966	999	287	1286
	1968	903	443	1346
	1970	1105	400	1505
	1972	1497	692	2189
	1974	1329	246	1575
	1976	1199	708	1907
	1978	1799	492	2291
	1980	898	508	1406
	1982	1086	316	1402
	1984	1310	629	1939
	1986	1721	451	2172
	1988	1261	513	1774
	1990	1634	342	1976
	1992	1405	847	2252
1994	1376	411	1787	
1996	1090	443	1533	
1998	1024	256	1280	
2000	1009	546	1555	
Total		29098	10812	39910

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burkhart, James, et al. Strategies for Political Participation. Massachusetts: Winthrop, 1972.
- Carter, Gregg Lee. The Gun Control Movement. New York: Twayne, 1997.
- Carter, Janelle. "Protest Mark Roe vs. Wade Anniversary." ABC. 22 Jan. 2000. 31 Oct. 2001.
<http://more.abcnews.go.com/sections/US/DailyNews/abortion000122.html>.
- Chappell, David L. Inside Agitators: White Southerners in Civil Rights Movement. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Chatfield, Charles. "The Antiwar Movement and America." in Charles DeBenedetti. An American Ordeal: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1990.
- Dawson, Richard E. and Kenneth Prewitt. Political Socialization. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.
- Ford, Linda G. Iron-Jawed Angels: The Suffrage Militancy of the National Woman's Party 1912-1920. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1991.
- Gurganian, Vaughn. "A Clash of Symbols." Newsweek. 24 Jan. 2000: 3.
- Hall, Mitchell K. The Vietnam War. New York: Pearson Education Limited, 2000.
- Hoffer, Peter Charles, ed. Early American History: A Nation in the Womb of Time. New York: Garland, 1988.
- Kasher, Steven. The Civil Rights Movement: A Photographic History 1954-68. New York: Abbeville Press, 1996.
- Lomax, Louis E. The Negro Revolt. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962.
- Lumsden, Linda J. Rampant Women: Suffragists and the Right of Assembly. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997.

- Mabee, Carleton. Black Freedom: The Nonviolent Abolitionists from 1830 Through the Civil War. Toronto: Macmillian, 1970.
- “‘Million Mom March’ Puts Gun Control Back in Legislative Firing Line.” CNN. 15 May 2000. 31 Oct. 2001. <http://www9.cnn.com/2000/US/05/15/million.moms/index.html>.
- Muse, Benjamin. The American Negro Revolution: From Nonviolence to Black Power 1993-1967. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968.
- Pateman, Carole. Participation and Democratic Theory. New York: Cambridge University, 1970.
- Raphael, Ray. A People’s History of the American Revolution: How Common People Shaped the Fight for Independence. New York: New York Press, 2001.
- “Rally to Remove Flag.” ABC. 17 Jan. 2000. 31 Oct. 2001. <http://abcnews.go.com/sections/US/DailyNews/flag000117.html>.
- Riches, William T. Martin. The Civil Rights Movement: Struggle and Resistance. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997.
- Sapiro, Virginia, Steven J. Rosenstone, and the National Election Studies. 1948-2000 Cumulative Data File [dataset]. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, Center for Political Studies [producer and distributor], 2001.
- “South Carolina Takes Confederate Flag Down from Capitol Dome.” CNN. 1 July 2000. 31 Oct. 2001. <http://www10.cnn.com/2000/US/07/01/scflag.01/>.
- Small, Melvin. Covering Dissent: The Movement and the Anti-Vietnam War Movement. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1994.
- Smith, W. Thomas Jr. “The Segregationist Who ‘Saw the Light’.” U.S. News & World Report. 6 Dec. 1999: 34.

- Sorin, Gerald. Abolitionism: A New Perspective. New York: Praeger, 1972.
- Tatalovich, Raymond and Byron W. Daynes. The Politics of Abortion: A Study of Community Conflict in Public Policy Making. New York: Praeger, 1981.
- “Thousands March Against Confederate Flag in South Carolina.” CNN. 17 Jan. 2000. 29 Oct. 2001. <http://www9.cnn.com/2000/ALLPOLITICS/stories/01/17/sc.flag>.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, Henry E. Brady, and Norman Nie. AMERICAN CITIZEN PARTICIPATION STUDY, 1990 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, National Opinion Research Center (NORC) [producer], 1995. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1995.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman and Henry E. Brady. Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Verba, Sidney and Norman H. Nie. Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Vizzard, William J. Shots in the Dark: The Policy, Politics, and Symbolism of Gun Control. New York: Rowman Littlefield, 2000.
- Wagner, Salley Roesch. A Time of Protest: Suffragists Challenge the Republic 1870-1887. Carmichael, California: Skycarrier Press, 1988.
- Wells, Tom. The War Within: America's Battle of Vietnam. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994.
- Zaroulis, Nancy and Gerald Sullivan. Who Spoke Up? American Protest Against the War in Vietnam 1963-1975. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1984.