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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Political scientists have, for the most part, ignored local millage elections. They have concentrated instead on partisan elections at the national and state levels and local nonpartisan elections. The last major study concerned with voting behavior in millage and bond elections was published in 1964 by Alvin Boskoff and Harmon Zeigler. There is, then, a void to be filled in the literature on voting behavior.

This research project examines the social characteristics of voters and nonvoters in school millage elections and of voters approving various millage proposals. A mail survey of voters in the Pennfield School District of Calhoun County has been utilized in an effort to answer two questions. First, who are the voters and who are the nonvoters in school millage elections? Second, who are the voters voting in favor of school millage and bond proposals and who are the voters voting against such proposals?

The current crises faced by school districts in financing education brings added emphasis to the importance of school

\[^{1}\text{Alvin Boskoff and Harmon Zeigler, } Voting Patterns in a Local Election (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1964).\]
millage and bond elections. Many school systems have been forced to reduce or eliminate programs in order to operate within the revenues they receive. Some schools have been forced to close completely for periods of several weeks. Since property taxes are a major revenue source for school districts, there is a need to know who is voting against millage proposals.

This study is concerned with three millage elections held during a ten-month period in the Pennfield School District. Two of these elections were bond issues. The first bond issue involved a $5.45 million school expansion and site improvement proposal, held November 10, 1975, and the proposal was soundly defeated (70 percent of those casting votes voted "no"). The turnout for this bond issue was the largest in the district's history. The second election, held between the two bond issues on June 14, 1976, was a general operating millage increase of one-half mill. It was held in conjunction with the annual school board elections. This millage increase passed by a margin which was less than the average for this type of election in the district. The turnout was the lowest for any school election in the preceding five years. The third election, which involved a second bond issue, was held September 13, 1976. The election involved a $1.5 million proposal for site improvements, mostly for elementary grade facilities, which were needed because of the structural inadequacies of the upper elementary
building and insufficient space in several other school buildings.
This proposal was also soundly defeated (61.6 percent voted "no")
but with a low turnout for this type of election.

Electoral History

In the twenty-two years since the 1955 bond issue which pro-
vided for the building of the first Pennfield High School, the Board
of Education has been quite successful at the polls. Thirteen
millage proposals and five bond issues have been presented to the
voters with only three defeats.

The three ballot proposals in this study differ from most
proposals voted on in the district in that of the three proposals
defeated at the polls in those twenty-two years, two are among
those being studied. The 1975 bond issue was the first to be
defeated in seventeen years. In the years between those two
defeats, nine millage proposals and two bond issues were passed,
with an average "yes" vote of 73.8 percent.

Not only have the voters of the Pennfield School District
supported most ballot proposals, they have supported the proposals
by wide margins. The average "yes" vote for ballot proposals
since 1955 has been 64.4 percent. If only those proposals which
passed are considered, the average "yes" vote rises to 70.6
percent. There has been a trend over the last seven years
(1971-1977, inclusive 1) for a slightly lower average of "yes" vote on millage proposals (64.9 percent) but this does not seem sufficient to cause any great alarm within the district concerning the prospect of millage proposals being defeated.

Analysis of the vote on the five bond issues voted on in the district since 1955 is more difficult. First, with the exception of the 1975 and 1976 bond issues, a span of five years separated each of the bond issues. Population changes over such a period of time make the identification of trends difficult. Second, the first three bond issues were held in more prosperous times when a healthy economy might have helped voters be more generous concerning their taxes. Third, the 1955, 1960, and 1965 bond issues were presented to the voters at times when the voters were not being asked for some type of millage increase or renewal each year. Prior to the 1975 bond issue, the voters had been presented with seven millage proposals in six years. Fourth, the substance of the bond issues may also have had an effect on the voters. The 1955 and 1960 bond issues proposed the building of new high school

1On June 13, 1977, a millage election calling for the renewal of a six mill levy was held in conjunction with the annual Board of Education elections. This millage request passed with a 62.5 percent "yes" vote. The results of this election are included in this section but are not part of the study as a whole as data collection had been completed and analysis begun before the election was held.
buildings. The 1965 and 1975 bond issues were similar in the types of renovation they proposed, but with vastly different sums of money involved ($750,000 in 1965 and $5.45 million in 1975).

While the average "yes" vote on the five bond issues held in the Pennfield School District has been 57.3 percent, the figure is deceiving. The 1955, 1960, and 1965 bond issues passed with an average "yes" vote of 72.7 percent, while the 1975 and 1976 bond issues were defeated with an average "yes" vote of only 34.4 percent. Why such differences exist is not within the scope of this paper, but the difficulties in analysis mentioned above could possibly provide a base for an examination of the differences.

No definitive statements can be made concerning the voter turnout in the district due to a lack of sufficient data on the number of registered voters, but some comments on trends may be made. Voter turnout has rarely been less than six hundred voters since 1960. Turnout in the seventies has not been as great numerically (and, judging from census reports of population increases between 1960 and 1970, probably proportionately) as in the sixties.

The turnout in the elections included in this study deviate from the general trends. First, the 1975 bond issue had not only the largest turnout for any election in the twenty-two years since the district voted on the original high school but the largest turnout by over eleven hundred votes. The previous high had been the 1960
bond issue. Second, the 1976 bond issue had the second highest turnout in the ten preceding years, behind only the 1975 bond issue. Third, the 1976 millage election, held between the 1975 and 1976 bond issues, had the lowest turnout of any election in five years. The reasons for such a low turnout could possibly be the proximity to the large, well publicized 1975 bond issue and the lack of publicity given the millage election itself. The latter reason probably also accounts for the low turnout for the 1976 bond issue (vis-a-vis the 1975 bond issue).

The elections included in this study were chosen to make comparisons between three different settings. There are differences between each of the elections. The millage election and bond issues differ greatly in substance. The millage election in June of 1976 called for a millage increase of one-half mill--a seemingly trivial amount. This millage increase was intended to provide money for the operation of the schools. The bond issues involved millions of dollars. The first sought funding for remodeling of each of the

1The recent 1977 millage election had the second highest turnout in the history of the district, surpassing the 1960 bond issue. While the Board of Education did little to publicize the millage proposal on the ballot, the election received a good deal of publicity from the candidates seeking election to the Board.

2This additional millage increased the annual property tax on a $20,000 home only $5.
district's six school buildings, for a new fine arts building, for new athletic facilities (including a swimming pool), and for the acquisition of land. The second sought remodeling funds for each of the four elementary buildings with only minor changes in the secondary buildings. The increase in the taxes would have been greater than with the millage increase, but the emotional impact of discussing millions of dollars undoubtedly affected many voters, possibly more than the potential increase in their own taxes.

There were also differences between the two bond issues. First, the first bond issue proposed many items not essential to the district (a new fine arts building, swimming pool, more tennis courts, expanded football stadium) while the second bond issue proposed only necessary remodeling and additions to the elementary buildings. Second, there was a difference of almost four million dollars—a great deal of money to most people. Third, the school administration waged a wide-spread publicity campaign encouraging voter approval of the first bond issue. They were matched by an equally wide-spread campaign against the proposal by a citizens' movement.

---

1 The estimated increase in the annual property tax on a $20,000 home would have been $15, according to school officials.

2 Although no official statement as such has been made, administration sources claim the Michigan Department of Education has threatened to close the upper elementary building if a proper ventilation system is not installed.
group. In contrast, very little was said about the second bond
issue. Outside of a newspaper article and a short pamphlet distrib-
uted throughout the district by the school administration, there was
little action in connection with this proposal--none of the dozens of
yard signs or several literature distributions which were part of
the first bond issue.

District Description

The Pennfield School District is comprised primarily of
Pennfield Township. Also included are portions of Bedford and
Convis Townships of Calhoun County and Assyria and Johnston
Townships of Barry County. The portion of Pennfield Township
which is not part of the Pennfield School District is part of the
Battle Creek Public Schools.

Pennfield Township is a mixed rural-suburban, unincorpo-
rated community bordering the City of Battle Creek on the township's
southwestern corner. The suburban areas of the township are those
closest to Battle Creek, spreading to the rural areas in the eastern
and northern parts of the township. The rural areas are spotted
with new, suburban-type housing developments, although such devel-
opments are currently not growing at the rapid pace of the late
sixties and early seventies. Those portions of the township which
are included in the Battle Creek Public Schools are suburban in
nature, while those portions of the school district from Bedford, Convis, Assyria, and Johnston Townships are rural.

The school district being studied cannot be considered typical of school districts in Michigan or the United States as a whole, either economically or demographically. Economically, the district is tied to the City of Battle Creek, as there is no business district within the community. What commercial establishments there are in the district are either small, privately owned businesses (drug store, gas stations, small grocery, etc.) or branches of larger firms based in Battle Creek (most often banks). There is no industrial tax base in either the township or school district. The absence of commercial or industrial establishments to bolster the tax base places the entire property tax burden on the individual property owner, i.e., the home owner.

Because the townships which comprise the Pennfield School District are not part of a Census Bureau standard metropolitan statistical area, no accurate data concerning the demographic make-up of the district can be obtained. However, since the majority of the school district is also part of Pennfield Township, the demographic data from the township can provide a general profile of the school district.

The population of Pennfield Township, according to 1970 census data, is 8,290. This represents a 25.1 percent increase
over the 1960 population. The voting age population in 1970 was 5,248. This corresponds with approximately forty-two hundred registered voters in the school district.¹ Persons over the age of sixty-five total 547, or 6.6 percent of the population. The population is fairly evenly divided by sex (48.8 percent male, 51.2 percent female). There are few minority persons in the township; only 1.2 percent of the population in 1970 was listed as non-white.

¹No accurate count as to the number of registered voters in the school district was obtainable from the school administration offices. The estimate of forty-two hundred registered voters is based on the size of the sample drawn for this study by the author in December 1976.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the area of voting behavior a great deal of attention has been given to national partisan elections. The studies which serve as a basis for most election studies are those which were done under the auspices of the Columbia Bureau of Social Research.¹ These studies, done in Erie County, Ohio, and Elmira, New York, in 1940 and 1948, respectively, found voter turnout to be related to the level of interest of the potential voter with those with the greatest interest more likely to participate in the election.² In nationwide surveys of the elections of 1948, 1952, and 1956 conducted by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan, voter turnout was also found to be similarly related to interest.³


²Lazarsfeld et al., The People's Choice, pp. 40–45; Berelson et al., Voting, pp. 25, 31–32.

Millage and bond elections have not received as much attention. One study dealing strictly with bond issues was done in DeKalb County, Georgia, by Alvin Boskoff and Harmon Zeigler. ¹ The effects of age, sex, length of residence, occupation, income, and perceived status on favorable vote on five bond issues were examined. Income and perceived status were found to be significantly to favorable vote with sex and age being "of some significance."²

A major problem in preparing hypotheses for research on local elections is the lack of literature. This problem is somewhat alleviated, however, by using national election findings to draw conclusions for local elections. Research has shown voting behavior in local nonpartisan elections to be highly correlated with voting behavior in national elections.³ We can, therefore, use the findings of major studies of national partisan elections in developing our

² Ibid., pp. 44-57.
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hypotheses for this study.

Nonpartisan and Local Issue Elections

While both local elections for public office and issue proposals are technically nonpartisan elections, the term "nonpartisan election" is usually used in reference to those elections held for public office. Much of the literature dealing with nonpartisan elections concerns itself with elected office rather than with ballot proposals. This imbalance in the literature leads us to referring to these elections collectively as nonpartisan in many instances in order to have a body of literature to rely upon in our discussion, and the reader must keep this in mind.

Elections concerned with public office and ballot proposals are not completely independent of one another. There are common origins and elements. Nonpartisan elections and local issue elections were among many good government reforms initiated with the intention of taking political power away from political parties and bosses and giving the power "back to the people." There was a distrust of political parties and politicians. The belief was that

---


local government "ought to be free of politics;" that local issues were not controversial and therefore not political.¹ The idea that local issues are not controversial is, to say the least, naive. However, nonpartisanship does tend to highlight local issues rather than national or state issues.²

Nonpartisan and local issue elections are not without their effects on the politics of a community. According to Charles Adrian, nonpartisan elections for public office have tended to weaken party structure and influence, encourage the "avoidance of issues of policy in campaigns," and frustrate "protest voting."³ Willis Hawley proposes the idea that nonpartisanship has the tendency to depoliticize local issues, giving power to neither the people nor to elected officials but to the administrators who make the important decisions.⁴

The effects of local issue elections are not necessarily the same as the effects of elections for public office. The protest vote


²Lee, Politics of Nonpartisanship, pp. 28-29.


is probably made easier, as those wishing to protest those in power may not be effective in defeating incumbents and electing their own candidates but can defeat ballot proposals presented. Hawley's proposed effect does not apply to the ballot proposals being studied here, as the Michigan Constitution places a ceiling on the number of mills which may be levied by local governments without prior consent of the electorate.¹

Nonpartisan elections and local issue elections share two common characteristics: normal low turnout and high turnout in controversial elections. Numerous studies have shown local and nonpartisan elections to have turnouts less than elections for national and state offices in the same districts.² These findings are

¹Michigan Constitution, art. 9, sec. 6.

supported by data from the Pennfield School District. As stated in Chapter I, millage elections in the district normally draw approximately six to seven hundred voters. Using the estimated number of registered voters of forty-two hundred, this represents an average turnout of 14 to 17 percent. The June 1976 millage election and September 1976 bond issue had turnouts of approximately 11 and 18 percent, respectively. The November 1975 bond issue, which had the largest turnout in the district's history drew only about 50 percent of the registered voters. This compares with turnouts for the 1974 and 1976 general elections in Pennfield Township of approximately 60 and 70 percent, respectively.

Those elections which cause a great deal of controversy in a community attract more voters than do noncontroversial ones.\(^1\) There seems to be a small core of voters who vote in most local elections plus an additional electorate which goes to the polls only on special, controversial issues.\(^2\) The November 1975 bond issue, 

\(^1\)Baskoff and Zeigler, Voting Patterns, pp. 37, 93; Lester Milbrath, Political Participation (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965), p. 96.

\(^2\)Baskoff and Zeigler, Voting Patterns, pp. 20-21.
described earlier as being highly controversial, brought a turnout more than twice that of any other (numerically, at least) in the district's history. The less controversial September 1976 bond issue and the almost routine June 1976 millage election brought average turnouts.

There is a third characteristic of nonpartisan elections which applies especially to millage and bond elections—namely, the relationship between turnout and "no" vote on a proposal. Charles Adrian has listed the frustrating of protest voting as an effect of nonpartisanship on elections. However, there has often been found a direct relationship between the size of voter turnout and the proportion of "no" votes cast. It has been suggested that the reason for this is that voters alienated from the power center of a community use ballot proposals to stymie or at least protest the actions of those who do hold power in the community.

---


bond issue is a classic example of this relationship between turnout and "no" vote—the highest turnout ever, the highest "no" vote percentage ever, and the first defeat of a millage or bond proposal in seventeen years. The September 1976 bond issue does not serve as such a classic example, but it did have more voters than any of the eight previous millage elections.¹

In their analysis of local elections, Boskoff and Zeigler categorized local elections as being one of two types. First are those elections which cause little controversy, attracting only the most "dedicated local activists." Second are "those that excite the normally passive portions of the population to temporary activity."² Of the characteristics of nonpartisan elections discussed above, the low turnout election fits the first category while the high turnout, highly controversial election fits the second.

The three elections being studied here can be placed into Boskoff and Zeigler's classifications. The November 1975 bond issue, with its high turnout, undoubtedly drew to the polls "normally passive portions of the population." A turnout of over two thousand

¹The September 1976 bond issue was not a controversial election as was the November 1975 bond issue. While concerning itself with $1.5 million in improvements, the September 1976 bond issue did not have the great publicity and public debate which the November 1975 bond issue had. See Chapter I for a discussion of the differences between the two elections.

²Boskoff and Zeigler, Voting Patterns, pp. 20-21.
voters out of approximately forty-two hundred registered voters and with an average of about seven hundred indicates that people who had not voted for years, or maybe never before in a school election, must have come out to vote. The June 1976 millage election, with almost no controversy and a typically small turnout, fits into the first category. The September 1976 bond issue is a little more difficult to classify. The defeat of the proposal might lead one to believe that it was highly controversial with a high turnout. The turnout was actually low (slightly above the average for a millage election) and there was little controversy. While the issue being voted upon must seem to have been similar to the November 1975 bond issue, the fact is that there was little advance publicity on the issue. As discussed in Chapter I, there was not the great community debate on or involvement in publicity of this second bond issue. Therefore, this election would be placed in the first category--little controversy and low turnout.

Independent Variables

This study involves nine independent variables: education, income, occupation, sex, age, marital status, the presence of school-age children in the voter's family, home ownership, and public-regardingness. The first five independent variables are used in most studies on voting behavior while the last two are
normally used only in studies of local elections. Marital status and
the presence of school-age children in the family do not appear in
the literature but seem applicable in a study such as this. While
analyzed independently, the variables of education, income, and
occupation are grouped together under socioeconomic status for our
discussion of the literature.

Socioeconomic Status

The role of socioeconomic status (SES) in voting behavior has
received much attention. The researchers from the Columbia
Bureau of Social Research and the Survey Research Center have
found that voters from upper SES groups show more interest in
political affairs and vote more often than do members of lower SES
groups.¹ Thompson and Horton found voter turnout to be related to
political alienation, and political alienation to be inversely related
to SES.² These same conclusions have been reached in studies of
local elections as well.³ Support for local referenda has also been
found to be related to SES, with the upper SES voters approving such

¹Lazarsfeld et al., The People's Choice, p. 43; Berelson
et al., Voting, p. 25; Campbell et al., The American Voter,
pp. 56-57.


³Boskoff and Zeigler, Voting Patterns, p. 16.
proposals as bond issues. ¹

Nonpartisan elections involving controversy have higher turnouts than noncontroversial elections, and these additional voters tend to come from the lower SES groups.² And, since the proportion of "no" votes increases as turnout increases, it follows that the additional voters, the lower SES voters, tend to oppose referenda such as bond issues. As Boskoff and Zeigler have stated, "The high-turnout elections--meaning the controversial ones--have attracted more attention, and voting has generally been described as in conformity with class position."³

Socioeconomic status has been indexed in a variety of ways in voting behavior research. Lazarsfeld and his associates used an interviewer's rating; Campbell and his associates used respondent's perceived status; Berelson and his associates indexed SES by combining education, income, and occupation. Thompson and Horton, however, found "that the alienated (those most likely to be non-voters) are largely recruited from people of lower socioeconomic status, whether indexed by interview ratings, occupation, or

¹Ibid., pp. 19, 45, 57; Schmid, Social Trends, pp. 279-283; Thompson and Horton, "Political Alienation," pp. 190-192.

²Boskoff and Zeigler, Voting Patterns, pp. 16-17.

³Ibid., p. 17.
educational attainment."¹ In their study of the 1948 election, Campbell and his associates found participation to increase as the level of education, income, and occupational status increased.² When indices are constructed, income, education, and occupation are most generally used.

Of these three variables, education has received the most individual attention. In their studies of national elections, Berelson, Campbell, and Lazarsfeld found a relationship between education and voter turnout, with those having achieved higher levels of education more likely to vote.³ In their study of local voting patterns, Boskoff and Zeigler found income level to be positively related to support for bond proposals, but they found no consistent relationship between favorable vote and occupation.⁴ The inter-relationship between the socioeconomic variables of education, income, and occupation lead us to draw similar hypotheses for each of the variables and the dependent variables of turnout and "yes" vote.

The findings concerning the differences between controversial

²Campbell et al., The Voter Decides, pp. 70-73.
³Berelson et al., Voting, p. 25; Campbell et al., The American Voter, p. 252; Campbell et al., The Voter Decides, pp. 70-73; Lazarsfeld et al., The People's Choice, pp. 43-45.
⁴Boskoff and Zeigler, Voting Patterns, p. 45.
and noncontroversial elections make it necessary for us to consider
the three elections in this study separately when constructing
hypotheses for the three SES variables. The June 1976 millage
election was a noncontroversial election following the trend of
approval with low turnout. It can therefore be hypothesized that
voter turnout and "yes" vote in this election are both associated
with education, income, and occupation with the upper levels of
each of these variables showing higher turnout and approval rates.

The November 1975 bond issue follows the pattern of a highly
controversial election with high turnout and strong opposition. In
this instance, it is hypothesized that voter turnout will not be
associated with education, income, or occupation, i.e., no group
within any of these variables will show a turnout rate substantially
higher than any other group. Again, it is hypothesized that "yes"
vote will be associated with education, income, and occupation,
with the upper level within each of these variables showing higher
approval rates.

The September 1976 bond issue appears to be a paradox--
relatively low turnout with great opposition. This combination con-
tradicts the past findings on local elections. Since the turnout in
this election was low, it may have been influenced by SES. There-
fore, it is hypothesized that voter turnout is associated with educa-
tion, income, and occupation, as in the June 1976 millage election.
The strong opposition to this proposal, with the low turnout, leads to the belief that SES was not a major influence on the voters' decisions and that "yes" vote will not be associated with education, income, or occupation. In order for the proposal to be defeated by such a wide margin with a low turnout, hypothesized to be mostly voters from the upper levels of the SES variables, many voters from the upper SES groups would have to have voted against the proposal.

The hypotheses offered for the socioeconomic status variables of education, income, and occupation are as follows:

1. In the November 1975 bond issue, the SES variables will not be associated with turnout.
2. In the June 1976 millage election, the SES variables will be positively associated with turnout.
3. In the September 1976 bond issue, the SES variables will be positively associated with turnout.
4. In the November 1975 bond issue, the SES variables will be positively associated with "yes" vote.
5. In the June 1976 millage election, the SES variables will be positively associated with "yes" vote.
6. In the September 1976 bond issue, the SES variables will not be associated with "yes" vote.

Sex

The relationship between the dependent variables of voter turnout and voting decision and the independent variable of sex in
national elections seems to have undergone change during the past
three decades. Lazarsfeld and his associates found in 1940 that
men were more interested in elections and voted more.1 In 1948
Berelson and his associates found a lesser difference between men
and women.2 The researchers from the Survey Research Center
found differences similar to Berelson's in their nationwide surveys.
However, if you consider the national pattern excluding the South,
the difference was less than Berelson's.3 In analyzing data from
the 1972 election, Gerald Pomper found the difference in participa-
tion between the sexes to be almost zero, especially if the South is
excluded.4 From these studies a trend of equalization appears evi-
dent. Because of this, our hypothesis is that voter turnout will not
be associated with sex.

Boskoff and Zeigler found a difference in the votes of men
and women. The women were somewhat more favorable to the bond
issues than were the men. The greatest difference was on the issue

1Lazarsfeld et al., The People's Choice, pp. 45, 48.
2Berelson et al., Voting, p. 25.
3Campbell et al., The American Voter, pp. 255-257. The
studies of Lazarsfeld and Berelson were done in northern commu-
nities.
4Gerald M. Pomper, Voters' Choice (New York: Dodd, Mead,
of civic buildings, including educational facilities. However, Campbell and Pomper found that women's voting varies little from men's. Campbell and his associates also found that often women with little interest in politics will accept and follow the advice of their husbands. James March found this to be the case in national elections on candidates and on issues at the national level but found the opposite to be true for local elections and issues. The findings of Pomper, Campbell, and March lead us to hypothesize that "yes" vote will not be associated with sex.

Our hypotheses for the independent variable of sex will be as follows:

1. Sex will not be associated with voter turnout.
2. Sex will not be associated with "yes" vote.

Age

The independent variable of age has been found to be related to turnout in national elections. Lazarsfeld and his associates

1 Boskoff and Zeigler, Voting Patterns, p. 44.

2 Campbell et al., The American Voter, p. 261; Campbell et al., The Voter Decides, pp. 205-206; Pomper, Voters' Choice, p. 85.

3 Campbell et al., The American Voter, p. 260; Campbell et al., The Voter Decides, p. 205.

found in 1940 that those they identified as "older people" (i.e., over forty-five) were more interested in elections and therefore voted more.\(^1\) A similar conclusion was reached by Campbell and his associates.\(^2\) Neither of these studies included eighteen to twenty year olds since this group was not part of the electorate in most states at the times of their studies. This age group was included in the data used by Pomper, who reached the same conclusion concerning age and turnout which Lazarsfeld and Campbell reached.\(^3\)

A minor exception to this conclusion was found by Berelson and his associates in 1948. While a similar pattern concerning age and turnout was found, the authors considered the differences to be minor.\(^4\) Applying these findings from national election studies to local elections, we hypothesize that voter turnout will be positively associated with age, i.e., older age groups will show higher turnout rates.

In their study of DeKalb County, Boskoff and Zeigler found that age was related to favorable vote on the bond issues. Voters in the forty to sixty year old age group gave the issues the greatest

\(^1\) Lazarsfeld et al., *The People's Choice*, p. 44.


\(^3\) Pomper, *Voters' Choice*, pp. 97-98.

\(^4\) Berelson et al., *Voting*, pp. 73, 91-92.
support.\(^1\) Thompson and Horton found that the "young" and "old" were the most alienated voters and that alienated voters were more likely to be in opposition to local referenda.\(^2\) Therefore, it is hypothesized that "yes" vote will be associated with age with middle-aged groups (thirty to sixty) being more favorable to the millage and bond proposals.

Our hypotheses for the independent variable of age will be as follows:

1. Age and voter turnout will be positively associated with older age groups showing higher rates of turnout.

2. Age and "yes" vote will be associated with middle-age groups being more favorable to the proposals.

Marital Status and the Presence of School-age Children in the Voter's Family

The independent variables of marital status and the presence of school-age children in the voter's family have not, to the best of the author's knowledge, been tested for significant relationships with voter turnout or "yes" vote on millage proposals. We must

\(^1\)Boskoff and Zeigler, *Voting Patterns*, p. 44.

\(^2\)Thompson and Horton, "Political Alienation," pp. 192, 195. A problem here is that Thompson and Horton did not identify which ages were included in their classifications of "mature," "middle-age," "elderly," and "old." Only for "youth" did they give who was included (those being the twenty-one to thirty year olds).
therefore speculate as to what relationships, if any, will be found.

It seems likely that both of the variables would be related to voter turnout. Those voters with children in their families would be expected to have a greater interest in school affairs and thus be more likely to vote. Being primarily a residential community, it would seem that those married persons who settle in the school district would have an attachment to the community which would be absent in those single persons living in the district. Also, it is highly probable that marital status and the presence of school-age children in the family are related. Therefore, we hypothesize that marital status and the presence of children in the family will be associated with voter turnout, with married voters and voters with children in their families showing higher turnout rates than those not married and without children.

Marital status and the presence of children in the voter's family are not expected to influence the direction of the individual's voting decision. Instead, it is expected that voters in each nominal category within these variables will be influenced in their voting decision by other factors, most likely socioeconomic status.

The hypotheses for marital status and the presence of school-age children in the voter's family, therefore, will be as follows:

1. Marital status will be associated with voter turnout, with married voters showing higher turnout rates than unmarried voters.
2. The presence of school-age children in the voter's family will be associated with voter turnout, with those voters with children in their families showing higher turnout rates than those without children.

3. Marital status will not be associated with "yes" vote.

4. The presence of school-age children in the voter's family will not be associated with "yes" vote.

Home Ownership

In his study of Seattle, Washington, Calvin Schmid found home ownership to be a factor in a referendum for a limit on the total number of mills levied on personal property, with home owners supporting the proposal.\(^1\) Horton and Thompson found no difference between home owners and non-home owners in either turnout or "no" vote on referenda.\(^2\) While not contradictory, these two studies do not present a clear indication of the relationship between home ownership and voter turnout.

It is our belief that home ownership and voter turnout will be positively associated, i.e., home owners will vote more than non-home owners. Home owners are the ones most directly affected by property taxes and would therefore be expected to have an interest

\(^1\)Schmid, Social Trends, p. 283.

\(^2\)Horton and Thompson, "Powerlessness and Political Activism," p. 492.
in tax elections. Also, those who have purchased their homes have made a commitment to the community and are likely to have developed an attachment to the community. It is hypothesized that home ownership and voter turnout will be positively associated, with home owners showing higher turnout rates than non-home owners.

As with marital status and the presence of children in the family, home ownership is not expected to be associated with "yes" vote but that the voters will be influenced by other factors in their decisions on the proposals themselves.

The hypotheses for home ownership will be as follows:

1. Home ownership will be positively associated with voter turnout with home owners showing higher turnout rates than non-home owners.
2. Home ownership will not be associated with "yes" vote.

Public-regardingness

In a series of writings, Edward C. Banfield and James Q. Wilson have developed the concepts of "public- and private-regardingness." These concepts have been used to describe voting

behavior in millage elections. The basic hypothesis is that

... some classes of voters are more disposed than others to rest their choices on some conception of the "public interest" or the "welfare of the community." To say the same thing another way, the voting behavior of some classes tends to be more public-regarding and less private- (self- or family-) regarding than that of others.¹

The public-regarding voter, then, is one who favors public expenditures which he or she perceives to be of benefit to the community as a whole, while the private-regarding voter approves public expenditures not on the basis of benefit to the community but to himself or herself.²

For our purposes here, the concepts of public- and private-regardingness provide perhaps an additional variable for explaining voting behavior in school millage elections.

Banfield and Wilson found non-home owners, higher income, and higher educated voters to be public-regarding.³ These voters


²In their 1971 article the authors developed the concepts of "unitarist" and "individualist," substituting them for the concepts of public-regarding and private-regarding, respectively. For the purposes of this paper, the original terms will be employed.

also tend to have, either by inheritance or adoption, the Anglo-Saxon Protestant ethos or culture discussed by Banfield and Wilson in City Politics. This ethos emphasizes citizen participation in government and favors such "good government" reforms as non-partisan and at-large elections and primaries for nominating candidates in lieu of party caucuses or conventions.

While Banfield and Wilson indicate that the political ethos (i.e., Anglo-Saxon Protestant or its opposite, the immigrant ethos) is the primary factor in determining public-regardingness, socio-economic status seems to be applicable also. Banfield and Wilson, in fact, refer to the Anglo-Saxon Protestant ethos as the middle-class culture. In addition, higher income and educated voters would generally be considered upper SES voters. It would seem, then, that the middle and upper SES voters would also be the public-regarding voters.

It is hypothesized that public-regarding voters will show higher turnout rates than private-regarding voters. The public-regarding voters are expected to be more interested in public affairs. Also, concerning the voters favoring or opposing the ballot proposals, it is hypothesized that public-regarding voters will favor

---


2Ibid.
the proposals, while the private regarding voters will oppose them.

The former will behave in a manner which will demonstrate their interest in the community, while the latter will behave in such a way that will best benefit themselves.

Our hypotheses for public-regardingness will be as follows:

1. Public-regardingness will be positively associated with voter turnout with public-regarding voters showing higher turnout rates.

2. Public-regardingness will be positively associated with "yes" vote with public-regarding voters approving the proposals.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The study is based on a survey of voters of the Pennfield School District. A systematic random sample was drawn from the voter registration rolls of that district. Beginning from a position selected from a random numbers table, every tenth name was selected for the sample. This procedure produced a total sample of 418 subjects, or about 10 percent of the total number of registered voters in the district.

Data Collection

The data collection procedure for this study was a mailed questionnaire containing questions concerning the three millage proposals being studied. Each subject was asked to identify himself or herself as a voter or nonvoter in each election. Those respondents identifying themselves as voters were also asked whether they voted for or against each proposal. This information provided the dependent variables.

As a validity check, each subject's voting record (i.e., whether or not they had voted in an election) was obtained from school administration records, and the questionnaire each subject received was color-coded to match his or her voting record.
Turnout for the statistical tests in this study was then determined on the basis of the color-coded questionnaires, rather than the subject's responses as to whether or not they had voted. There was a great discrepancy between those saying they had voted and those who actually did. In measuring the direction of the individuals' votes, only those identified as actual voters by the color-coded questionnaires were included. When comparisons between the actual voters claiming to have voted "yes" on the various proposals and the actual "yes" vote percentages for the proposals were made, significant differences were found for the June 1976 millage election and the September 1976 bond issue. Therefore, no analysis of voter support of the proposals in those two elections could be made.

The questionnaire included eight personal information items

1 Differences between claimed and actual turnout:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election</th>
<th>Claimed to have voted</th>
<th>Actually voted</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1975</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1976</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1976</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Single sample Z-tests for the three elections yielded the following scores. Z = 1.96 for two tailed tests at the .05 level. The null hypothesis tested was that the sample vote equals the actual vote.

(1) November 1975: Z = 1.222, fail to reject the null hypothesis.
(2) June 1976: Z = 2.919, reject the null hypothesis.
(3) September 1976: Z = 2.979, reject the null hypothesis.
which were used for the independent variables. Sex, age, marital status, education, income, occupation, home ownership, and the presence of school-age children in the voter’s family were measured by the answers marked on the questionnaire for each item by the respondents. Occupation was the only open ended item on the questionnaire. All other items contained a limited number of possible answers supplied by the researcher. In addition to the eight personal information items, those acknowledging the presence of school-age children in their families were asked to identify the school system(s) their children attended.\(^1\)

The questionnaires were distributed and collected by mail. McDonagh and Rosenblum found mailed questionnaires to be acceptable for the collection of data in a survey with little difference between respondents and nonrespondents.\(^2\) Others have found that subjects with higher education and subjects with great interest in the topic involved respond faster but that there are generally few

\(^1\)No statistical tests were run in this study using the school the voter’s children attend because of the high number whose children attend Pennfield Schools (95.5 percent of those with school-age children). No discrimination could be made between those with children attending Pennfield Schools and any of the other eight schools in the Battle Creek area.

differences between early respondents and respondents in follow-up collection waves.\(^1\) It should be noted that these conclusions were drawn from studies involving rather lengthy questionnaires rather than a relatively short one as used in this study.

Three collection waves were employed. In the first wave, each subject was sent a questionnaire and a cover letter explaining the nature and purpose of the study and a guarantee of anonymity. Included with the questionnaire was a stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the questionnaire and a postcard to be returned under separate cover on which was printed the subject's name. The postcard allowed the researcher to determine respondents and nonrespondents for subsequent mailings. This technique has been found effective in stimulating response while guaranteeing anonymity for subjects.\(^2\) Another technique employed to increase response was the use of first-class postage on the return


envelopes. 1 Cover letters were printed on university letterhead stationery to help provide validity for the study in the subjects' minds. 2

Approximately one month after the initial mailing, those who had not yet responded were sent a second letter requesting that they complete and return the questionnaire. This was followed by a third mailing of a cover letter, questionnaire, and return envelope to nonrespondents, sent approximately one month after the second mailing.

Of the 418 questionnaires mailed out, 218 were returned.

Three questionnaires were returned blank, leaving a responding sample of 215 (51.4 percent of the total sample). In terms of the number of elections voted in, the highest response came from those who actually voted in all three elections (76.7 percent); the second highest response came from those who had voted in two of the three

1Wayne E. Hensley, "Increasing Response Rate by Choice of Postage Stamps," Public Opinion Quarterly 38 (Summer 1974): 280-283. Hensley found best response came from a combination of meter-stamped postage and commemorative first-class postage, using the meter-stamp for mailings sent to the subjects and first-class commemoratives on the return envelopes. This combination was used in this study.

elections (71.2 percent); the third highest response came from those who had voted in only one of the elections (61.7 percent); the lowest response came from those who did not vote in any of the elections (34.7 percent).

Among the social characteristics of the subjects, sex was the only variable for which information could be obtained prior to data collection. Table 1 illustrates the total and responding samples by sex.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Responding Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Z-tests were run comparing the two samples with one another and comparing the two samples with the population, no

---

1It is interesting to note that for subjects voting in the November 1975 bond issue and the June 1976 millage election but not the September 1976 bond issue the response rate was 100 percent.
significant differences were found.\footnote{Test results (using proportions of females):}

In addition to composing a majority of both the total and responding samples, females also showed a higher response rate than males. Questionnaires were returned by 54.3 percent of the women in the total sample, compared to 48.2 percent of the males in the total sample.

No other variables offer themselves for similar analysis, as the voter registration records of the Pennfield School District do not carry the necessary information. While date of birth is normally included in registration data, it was not available for all voters.

Index Construction

Two ordinal indices were constructed to serve as dependent variables in the study: the Index of Voter Turnout and the Index of Voter Support. The first index was constructed for use in our consideration of voter turnout in general, as opposed to consideration of turnout in the individual elections. The Index of Voter Turnout was made ordinal by categorizing each subject by the number of

\footnote{1}{Test results (using proportions of females):}
(1) Two sample $Z$-test between total sample and responding sample: $Z = -.75$.
(2) Single sample $Z$-test between total sample and population: $Z = .875$.
(3) Single sample $Z$-test between responding sample and population: $Z = 1.50$. 
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elections he or she voted in. Thus, rather than being listed as "voted" or "did not vote," turnout for each respondent was ranked on a zero-to-three scale. This will permit us to identify those voters who are most likely to vote regardless of the nature of or circumstances surrounding a school millage election.

For our consideration of voting decision, our dependent variable will be an ordinal variable based on the proportion of favorable votes cast on the three proposals out of the total number voted upon. Those who did not vote in any of the three elections in the study will not be included for this analysis. Chart 1 indicates how this variable was operationalized.

CHART 1

Operationalization of Dependent Variable: Index of Voter Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voter Support</th>
<th>Number of &quot;Yes&quot; Votes Cast (proportion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0 of 1; 0 of 2; 0 of 3 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>1 of 3; 1 of 2; 2 of 3 (.33-.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1 of 1; 2 of 2; 3 of 3 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dependent variable was operationalized in this manner to counteract any weighting in favor of turnout.

On the questionnaire were ten attitudinal items which were
intended to help identify each respondent as public- or private-regarding, in terms of the Banfield and Wilson concepts (see Chapter II). Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with statements concerning education. Of the ten items, two were omitted from the public-regardingness index because of direct references to the school district being studied. It was believed that the responses to these items were responses to the present situation in the Pennfield School District and were not reflections of the respondent's general attitude towards education. Four other items were omitted as being nondiscriminatory. The public-regarding position (either agreeing or disagreeing with the statement) was determined for each of the four remaining items. Respondents were then rated on a zero-to-four scale based on their number of agreements with the public-regarding positions with four being the highest public-regarding rating and zero being the lowest public-regarding (and therefore highest private-regarding) rating.

1 For the working of the statements, see the sample questionnaire in Appendix A.

2 The consensus on these four items ranged from 82.8 percent to 92.1 percent.

3 The four items used for the public-regardingness index were numbers one, three, four, and nine from the questionnaire. The public-regarding position for each item: one--disagree; three--agree; four--disagree; nine--agree.
CHAPTER IV

VOTER TURNOUT

The act of voting requires the citizen to make not a single choice but two. He must choose between rival parties and candidates. He must also decide whether to vote at all.¹

This observation was made in a study of voting behavior in presidential elections, but is no less appropriate here. When a voter is making a decision as to whether to support or disapprove a millage or bond proposal, just as in elections among candidates, there is also the decision to be made as to whether or not to vote at all. The decision to vote or not to vote is as crucial to the election process frequently as the decision concerning the direction one votes. As we shall see in Chapter V, certain groups are more favorable to millage and bond proposals. If only those groups which are favorable to a proposal were to go to the polls, the proposal would have little difficulty winning approval.

For our analysis of voter turnout in the three elections in the Pennfield School District we will first examine the relationships between voter turnout and the independent variables described in Chapter II one at a time. Second, all independent variables included in the study will be tested together with the dependent variable in a

¹Campbell et al., The American Voter, p. 49.
regression analysis to determine which independent variables explain the greatest variance in voter turnout.

Independent Variables

Age

In Chapter II we hypothesized that voter turnout would be positively associated with age, i.e., older age groups would show higher turnout rates. As can be seen in Tables 2, 3, and 4, this hypothesis was borne out in our study. Not only was age significantly associated with voter turnout in each of the three elections but it was also significantly associated with the Index of Voter Turnout described in Chapter III. In the analysis of each individual election, age yielded the highest measures of degree of association of all the independent variables considered and yielded the highest measure of degree of association with the Index of Voter Turnout.

In each election and on the Index of Voter Turnout the voters who were the least likely to vote were in the eighteen to twenty-nine age group. Also, with but one exception, in the November 1975 bond issue those voters sixty years old or older were most likely of all age groups to vote. It is interesting to note that the greatest split

1The tables in this and the following chapters will be structured so as to conform to the hypotheses presented. The dependent variable will be reordered when necessary.
### TABLE 2

**Voter Turnout and Age, November 1975 Bond Issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[p \text{ less than } .001 \quad \text{Theta} = +.49\]

### TABLE 3

**Voter Turnout and Age, June 1976 Millage Election**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[p \text{ less than } .01 \quad \text{Theta} = +.27\]

### TABLE 4

**Voter Turnout and Age, September 1976 Bond Issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[p \text{ less than } .01 \quad \text{Theta} = +.27\]
between voters and non-voters in the November 1975 bond issue is between the eighteen to twenty-nine year olds and those voters over thirty, while in the June 1976 millage election and the September 1976 bond issue the greatest split is between those under sixty and those sixty years old or older. There was a significant difference between those in the thirty to fifty-nine age group and those sixty or older in the September 1976 bond issue, with the latter group the most likely to vote (see Table 5).

**TABLE 5**

Voter Turnout and Age, September 1976 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>30-59</th>
<th>60 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .01  Phi = +.22

When comparing age and the Index of Voter Turnout we found that the young voters (eighteen to twenty-nine) were the ones most

1Those in the 18-29 age group were not included here as the difference between those and the other age groups was made evident in Table 4. Our interest here is only in the difference between the 30-59 year olds and those over sixty. A similar test was made with the variables for the June 1976 millage election. The difference between age and turnout was not statistically significant, with the following test results:  

\[ X^2 = 3.831; \ X^2 \] at the .05 level equals 3.841.
likely to have not voted at all, the older voters were the ones voting most often, and the middle-age voters (thirty to fifty-nine) were the ones most likely to have voted only once. This probably resulted from the unusually high turnout in the highly controversial November 1975 bond issue, where voters who normally do not participate in school elections did. The impression is that voters in the middle-age group are the ones drawn to the polls in special circumstances but who normally do not participate in school elections. This probably also explains why the greatest split between voters and non-voters was between those under thirty and thirty and over in the November 1975 bond issue but between those under sixty and those sixty and older in the other two elections.

Our findings concerning age and voter turnout are similar to those from the national election studies of Lazarsfeld, Campbell, Berelson, and Pomper. In those studies, as in ours, voter turnout was found to be positively associated with age.

**TABLE 6**

Voter Turnout and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted once</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted twice</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted thrice</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .001  Tau B = +.33
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Home Ownership

The only independent variable other than age found to be significantly associated with voter turnout in each of the three elections was home ownership. We hypothesized that a positive association would exist between home ownership and voter turnout and this is what was found. From Tables 7, 8, and 9 we can see that in the November 1975 bond issue a majority of home owners went to the polls while a majority of the non-home owners did not. In neither of the other two elections studied was this pattern found. Although a positive association was found between home ownership and turnout, home owners did not show a majority voting. Given the lower turnouts in the latter two elections, this is not surprising. It is interesting to note that in the September 1976 bond issue not one non-home owner in our sample voted.

With non-home owners showing low turnout rates in the three individual elections, it is not surprising that home owners were found to vote more often when home ownership was tested against the Index of Voter Turnout. Since only home owners voted in the September 1976 bond issue it would be impossible to have any non-home owners voting thrice. However, only one non-home owner—a pastor—voted in two of the elections while 77.4 percent of these potential voters did not vote in any of the three elections. This contrasted with over a third of the home owners voting in at least two elections and less than
### TABLE 7

Voter Turnout and Home Ownership, November 1975 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Owner</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .001  Phi = +.41

### TABLE 8

Voter Turnout and Home Ownership, June 1976 Millage Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Owner</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .05  Phi = +.16

### TABLE 9

Voter Turnout and Home Ownership, September 1976 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Owner</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .01  Phi = +.23
a quarter not voting at all.

**TABLE 10**

Voter Turnout and Home Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Owner</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted once</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted twice</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted thrice</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .001  Theta = +.22

While our hypothesized positive association between home ownership and voter turnout was borne out, our findings differ from those of Horton and Thompson. In Chapter II we stated that these researchers had found no relationship between home ownership and turnout. As discussed earlier, however, home owners were expected to vote more often than non-home owners; they are more likely to have developed an attachment to the community and are most directly affected by the property tax increases these proposals would raise.

**Socioeconomic Status**

Because education, income, and occupation \(^1\) are all indicators of

\(^1\)Occupation used was that of the higher status occupation of either the respondent or the respondent's spouse (for those married). It is believed that this provides a better measure of occupational...
socioeconomic status and because these variables tend to be related to voter turnout in the same way, the three variables were considered together in Chapter II. However, because the literature indicates differing effects of SES on voter turnout depending on the type of election, we offered specific and separate hypotheses concerning SES and voter turnout for each election considered in this research:

1. In the November 1975 bond issue, the SES variables will not be associated with turnout.

2. In the June 1976 millage election, the SES variables will be positively associated with turnout.

3. In the September 1976 bond issue, the SES variables will be positively associated with turnout.

Our first hypothesis, concerning the November 1975 bond issue, was borne out. No group within any of the SES variables showed higher turnout rate than any other. Also borne out was our second hypothesis. The SES variables of education, income, and occupation were significantly related to and positively associated with voter turnout in the June 1976 millage election. In each instance the upper level group within the variable--i.e., college educated, high income, and professional-technical occupations--showed higher turnout rates.

status. Thus, a housewife whose husband is employed as an office manager was listed in the managerial-proprietor classification rather than as unemployed or non-working. Those who listed only their place of employment without giving their occupation were listed as "other" and dropped from the computations in order to preserve the ordinal nature of the variable.
### TABLE 11

**Voter Turnout and Education, November 1975 Bond Issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance

### TABLE 12

**Voter Turnout and Income, November 1975 Bond Issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>$0-9,900</th>
<th>$10,000-14,900</th>
<th>$15,000-19,900</th>
<th>$20,000-24,900</th>
<th>$25,000- &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance

### TABLE 13

**Voter Turnout and Occupation, November 1975 Bond Issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Managerial Professional</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Foreman</th>
<th>Lab-</th>
<th>Non-</th>
<th>Nonworking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance
TABLE 14
Voter Turnout and Education, June 1976 Millage Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .01      Theta = +.25

TABLE 15
Voter Turnout and Income, June 1976 Millage Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>$0-$9,900</th>
<th>$10,000-$14,900</th>
<th>$15,000-$19,900</th>
<th>$20,000-$24,900</th>
<th>$25,000 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .05      Theta = +.22

TABLE 16
Voter Turnout and Occupation, June 1976 Millage Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Foreman</th>
<th>Laborer</th>
<th>Non-Working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Proprietor</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>Non-Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .05      Theta = +.24
than did the lower level groups. Each variable produced a low measure of degree of association, but the low range of the measures for these variables (+.25, +.22, and +.24 for education, income, and occupation, respectively) indicates that none was more influential than the other two.

The only major exception to the ordinal natures of the independent variables of education, income, and occupation is with the non-working classification on the occupational scale. A possible explanation for a higher turnout rate being shown for that classification than for some of the higher status occupations is that the non-working classification includes not only those who are unemployed but also those who are housewives, students, and retired. It is quite likely that within this classification there are voters currently not working (for voluntary reasons) whose decision to vote was influenced by a spouse's or parent's occupation or, in the case of the retired voter, by his or her former occupational status.

The major surprise was that no association was found between any of the SES variables and voter turnout in the September 1976 bond issue. With this election being a low turnout election similar to the June 1976 millage election, it was expected that positive associations would again be found. A possible explanation is that while the June 1976 and September 1976 elections were both low turnout elections (for their types), the fact that the former was a millage election and the latter
### TABLE 17

**Voter Turnout and Education, September 1976 Bond Issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance

### TABLE 18

**Voter Turnout and Income, September 1976 Bond Issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>$0-$9,900</th>
<th>$10,000-$14,900</th>
<th>$15,000-$19,900</th>
<th>$20,000-$24,900</th>
<th>$25,000-$&amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance

### TABLE 19

**Voter Turnout and Occupation, September 1976 Bond Issue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Foreman</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Craftsman</th>
<th>Non-working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Proprietor</td>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance
was a bond issue was the important factor. The voters going to the polls in the September 1976 bond issue who did not vote in the June 1976 millage election must have been drawn from the lower SES groups, just as were many of the voters in the November 1976 bond issue. This would indicate either a difference between the voters in millage and bond elections or an error in our earlier classification of the September 1976 bond issue as "non-controversial." Given the lack of publicity surrounding this second bond issue and its seemingly low turnout (vis-a-vis the first bond issue), our classification of "non-controversial" would seem justified. Therefore, we might infer that the difference in the degree of association found between SES and voter turnout in the two elections lies in the type of election. Bond issues appear to attract voters from all socioeconomic status levels while millage elections attract mainly the middle and upper level SES voters.

Income was the only SES variable to be significantly related to the Index of Voter Turnout. It was expected that each of the SES variables of education, income, and occupation would show a significant, positive association as socioeconomic status has usually been found to be positively associated with turnout. As can be seen in Table 17, voter turnout and income are positively associated, but with a low measure of degree of association.

While not statistically significant, there is a basic pattern
### TABLE 20

**Voter Turnout and Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>$0-$9,900</th>
<th>$10,000-$14,900</th>
<th>$15,000-$19,900</th>
<th>$20,000-$24,900</th>
<th>$25,000 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted once</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted twice</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted thrice</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total %</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cases</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p$ less than .05  
  
* Tau $B = +.11$

### TABLE 21

**Voter Turnout and Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted once</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted twice</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted thrice</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total %</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cases</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No significance

### TABLE 22

**Voter Turnout and Occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Managerial</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Foreman</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Craftsman</th>
<th>Laborer</th>
<th>Non-Working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted once</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted twice</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted thrice</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total %</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cases</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No significance
between turnout and education with those having attained higher levels of education voting more often than those at lower educational levels (Table 18). No discernible pattern is evident between turnout and occupation (Table 19).

The results of our tests regarding voter turnout and the SES variables of education, income, and occupation for the November 1975 bond issue and the June 1976 millage election conform to the findings from previous research in voting behavior in national and local elections. In the former the large turnout negated the influence of the socioeconomic status variables while in the latter these variables were significantly associated with voter turnout. The relationship between income and the Index of Voter Turnout also conforms to the literature on SES and voting behavior.

Marital Status

Although not previously tested, we hypothesized that marital status would be positively associated with voter turnout, with married persons yielding higher turnout rates. This hypothesis was born out in the November 1975 bond issue but not in the other two elections.

When marital status was compared with voter turnout in the first bond issue, it was found that married voters came to the polls in greater numbers than did the unmarried voters. Also, in this

1 Marital status was dichotomized with the unmarried classification including those single, divorced, and widowed.
### TABLE 23
Voter Turnout and Marital Status, November 1975 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Unmarried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p \text{ less than } .01 \quad \text{Phi} = +.21 \]

### TABLE 24
Voter Turnout and Marital Status, June 1976 Millage Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Unmarried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance

### TABLE 25
Voter Turnout and Marital Status, September 1976 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Unmarried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance
### TABLE 26

Voter Turnout and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Unmarried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted thrice</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted twice</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted once</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not vote</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .001  
Theta = +.11

Dichotomy, as with home ownership in this election, not only was there a significant difference but each nominal classification within the independent variable showed a different majority vis-a-vis the dependent variable. A majority of married persons voted while a majority of those not married did not.

A significant relationship, but with a low measure of degree of association, was found between marital status and the Index of Voter Turnout. More than one-half of the unmarried voters did not go to the polls in any of the elections studied while, similar to home ownership, more than one-third of the married voters voted at least twice and more than two-thirds voted at least once.

Other Independent Variables

Two independent variables were hypothesized to be positively
associated with voter turnout but were found not to be. First was the presence of school-age children in the voter's family. This hypothesized relationship was not borne out in any of the statistical tests between turnout in the individual elections nor with the Index of Voter Turnout.

The second hypothesized association not borne out was that between turnout and the Public-regardingness Index (described in Chapter III). It was hypothesized that those high on the public-regardingness scale would vote more often than those low on the scale. That this relationship did not materialize is not surprising, for public-regarding voters are generally those having attained higher educational, income, and occupational levels and these socioeconomic indicators were not associated with turnout in two of the elections and only income was associated with the Index of Voter Turnout.¹

No significant association was hypothesized or found between sex and voter turnout in any of the statistical tests.

Regression Analysis

As a final stage of our analysis of voter turnout a stepwise regression was run to determine which variables explain the greatest variance in voter turnout when considered together in a single analysis.

¹The relationships between public-regardingness and the other independent variables is discussed in Appendix D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient of Multiple Regression</th>
<th>Coefficient of Determination</th>
<th>Increase in Coefficient of Determination</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.3891</td>
<td>.1514</td>
<td>.1514</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership</td>
<td>.4449</td>
<td>.2024</td>
<td>.0509</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.4726</td>
<td>.2233</td>
<td>.0209</td>
<td>.0181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-regardingness</td>
<td>.4780</td>
<td>.2285</td>
<td>.0052</td>
<td>.2371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of children</td>
<td>.4791</td>
<td>.2295</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.5909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.4800</td>
<td>.2304</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.6278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.4809</td>
<td>.2313</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.6306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>.4813</td>
<td>.2316</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.7431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>.4817</td>
<td>.2320</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.7528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the nine independent variables were considered collectively, only three—age, home ownership, and education—were found to be significant.

The greatest variance—15.1 percent—was explained by age. This was almost thrice the variance explained by any other variable. This was not surprising after age and turnout were significantly related and yielded the highest measure of degree of association in each of the individual elections studied and with the Index of Voter Turnout. This leads us to the conclusion that age is the single most important factor in determining whether or not an individual voter will go to the polls in a school millage election.

Although not as strong as age, the independent variable of home ownership was significant, explaining an additional 5.1 percent of the variance in turnout. This was the only variable besides age to show a significant relationship to turnout in each of our other analyses. That education was within the critical region for significance on the regression analysis was somewhat of a surprise, for education was found to be significantly associated to turnout only in the June 1976 millage election. Education apparently was a strong factor in each of the three elections, but not strong enough to show significance. Each of the other independent variables failed to explain more than one-half of one percent of the variance in voter turnout.
Summary

Without question, age has been found to be the most significant factor in determining the likelihood of an individual voting in a school millage election. Only home ownership also proved to be significantly associated with voter turnout in all tests, but never had a higher measure of degree of association than age and could explain only one-third the variance in the regression analysis. The older the voter, the more likely he or she is to vote. It is the middle-age and older voters, particularly the latter, who are most likely to determine the fate of a millage or bond proposal.
CHAPTER V

THE VOTER'S DECISION, YES OR NO

We began Chapter IV by saying that the voter had two decisions to make concerning his or her participation in an election. First, he or she must decide whether or not to vote. Once at the polls, he or she must decide in a school millage election whether to vote for or against the proposal(s) being presented. In Chapter IV we found that, generally, it is the older voters (i.e., over thirty), home owners, and, in some instances, those of higher socioeconomic status who go to the polls. Now we must determine what their decisions will be once they enter the voting booth.

We will consider the November 1975 bond issue first and then turn our attention to voter decision in general: The Index of Voter Support. Analysis of voting decision in the June 1976 millage and September 1976 bond issue cannot be made because of significant differences between the actual vote and our sample.

November 1975 Bond Issue

It was hypothesized that age, socioeconomic status, and public-regardingness would be associated with a favorable ("yes") vote on the various proposals being studied. The other variables were hypothesized to show no relationship to the dependent variable.
Each of the SES variables of education, income, and occupation were found to be significantly related to "yes" vote in this election. In each instance, those of the higher levels within the independent variable--college educated, high income, and professional-technical occupations--yielded higher rates of approval on the proposal. For education and income, only those in the highest step within the ordinal scale showed a majority voting for the proposal. The two highest occupational levels--professional-technical and managerial-proprietor--showed majorities voting "yes." As can be seen in Tables 28, 29, and 30 education and occupation produced the highest measures of degree of association.

Public-regardingness was also found to be significantly associated with "yes" vote. Table 31 illustrates the relationship between these two variables. The higher a voter was on the public-regardingness scale, the more likely he or she was to vote in favor of the bond proposal. As with education and income, only those in the highest public-regarding position showed a majority casting favorable votes on the proposal.¹

Surprisingly, home ownership was found to be significantly associated with "yes" vote. While neither home owners nor non-home owners showed a majority voting for the bond proposal, the

¹See Appendix D for the discussion of the public-regardingness variable.
TABLE 28

Voter Support and Education, November 1975 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted against</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted for</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .05     Theta = +.35

TABLE 29

Voter Support and Income, November 1975 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>$0- $9,900</th>
<th>$10,000- $14,900</th>
<th>$15,000- $19,900</th>
<th>$20,000- $24,900</th>
<th>$25,000 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted against</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted for</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .05     Theta = +.24

TABLE 30

Voter Support and Occupation, November 1975 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Managerial Person</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Foreman</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Craftsman</th>
<th>Labor- Non- Working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted against</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted for</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .01     Theta = +.34

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
TABLE 31

Voter Support and Public-regardingness, November 1975 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public-regardingness Index</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted against</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted for</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .001  Theta = +.31

TABLE 32

Voter Support and Home Ownership, November 1975 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Owner</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted for</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted against</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .01  Phi = +.24

home owners were more likely to vote for the proposal. This is contrary to Schmid's findings in his study of Seattle, where home owners voted to limit the number of mills levied against their property.

The expected association between "yes" vote and age failed to develop. As is illustrated in Table 33, no age group produced a majority voting in favor of the proposal and there is no discernible pattern. Our original hypothesis stated that the middle-age voters
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(thirty to fifty-nine) would vote in favor of the proposal. If we combine
the three middle categories in Table 33 we find that the middle-age
voters did favor the proposal more often than did the younger voters
but not as often as did the older voters. This is somewhat of a sur­
prise for the older voters--those likely to be on fixed incomes and
without children in the schools--were expected to disapprove of the
proposal. Other factors--presumably socioeconomic status or public­
regardingness--were more important than age.

TABLE 33
Voter Decision and Age, November 1975 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted for</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted against</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance

TABLE 34
Voter Decision and Age (Modified), November 1975 Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-59</th>
<th>60 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted for</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted against</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significance
As hypothesized, no association was found between the independent variables of marital status, sex, and the presence of school-age children in the voter's family and the dependent variable of favorable vote.

Whereas age was found in Chapter IV to be the most important factor in turnout in this election, here the socioeconomic status variables of education, income, and occupation and public-regardingness were found to be significantly related to the voter's decision for the bond proposal. These findings support those of previous research regarding these variables. The socioeconomic status variables have consistently been found to be associated with favorable vote on millage and bond proposals. Public-regardingness, by definition, produces expectation of favorable vote on such proposals.

Index of Voter Support

The dependent variable for our analysis of voter support for the ballot proposals in general is the Index of Voter Support, described in Chapter III. The ordinal variable is intended to indicate which voters are most likely to support a school finance ballot proposal, regardless of whether it is a millage or bond proposal.

Education, income, occupation, and public-regardingness were hypothesized and found to be significantly associated with the Index of Voter Support. Also, the hypothesized association between age and the dependent variable again failed to materialize.
Public-regardingness yielded the highest measure of degree of association with the Index of Voter Support. As can be seen in Table 35, the higher an individual voter rates on the Index of Voter Support, the higher he rates on the public-regardingness index. Whatever the source of an individual's public- or private-regarding ideals or opinions may be, there is no doubt that his or her vote is influenced by this variable.

TABLE 35

Voter Support of Proposals and Public-regardingness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public-regardingness Index</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No support</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional support</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full support</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .001  

Of the socioeconomic variables, education and occupation produced moderate measures of degree of association, with the association between voter support and income being somewhat weaker. In each instance it is the highest position on the ordinal independent variable which shows the greatest favorability to the proposals.

There is a distinct difference between college graduates and the other classifications within the education variable. While the variable
### TABLE 36
Voter Support of Proposals and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No support</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional support</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full support</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .001  Tau B = +.32

### TABLE 37
Voter Support of Proposals and Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>$0-9,900</th>
<th>$10,000-$14,900</th>
<th>$15,000-$19,900</th>
<th>$20,000-$24,900</th>
<th>$25,000 &amp; Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No support</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional support</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Support</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .05  Tau B = +.20

### TABLE 38
Voter Support of Proposals and Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Non-working</th>
<th>Laborer</th>
<th>Foreman</th>
<th>Forestman</th>
<th>Craftsman</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Manager Proprietor</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No support</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional support</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full support</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .001  Tau B = +.37
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maintains its ordinal nature, those with college degrees are much more likely to favor millage proposals. The difference between the other classifications is less pronounced.

The only major exception to the ordinal nature of occupation is that the non-working voters are more favorable to millage proposals than those in the two occupational classifications immediately above them. This is probably explained by the makeup of the non-working classification, as discussed in Chapter IV. There is also a sharp difference between the laborers and foremen-craftsmen classifications and those of the upper status occupations.

Although not having the strict ordinal nature which education and occupation possess, income nevertheless is related to voter support with those of the lower income groups less likely than those of higher income groups to favor the millage proposals. The irregularity of this variable leads to the conclusion that income is independent of education and occupation. It may be remembered that in Chapter IV we found income to be significantly associated with the Index of Voter Turnout but that education and occupation were not. When Pearson R correlations were run between these three socioeconomic status variables, education and occupation were moderately correlated while income produced a much lower coefficient when tested against education and occupation. Chart 2 shows these correlations.
CHART 2

Pearson R Correlation of the Socioeconomic Status Variables of Education, Occupation and Income

Education and Occupation: \( r = +.53 \) \( p \) less than .001
Income and Occupation: \( r = +.33 \) \( p \) less than .001
Income and Education: \( r = +.21 \) \( p \) less than .01

It might normally be assumed that those of the higher educational levels and occupational status would be the ones earning the most money. From the above chart we can deduce that those of the higher educational levels are the ones with the higher status occupations. Two factors possibly account for income not being highly correlated with education and occupation. First, our measure of income was family income rather than the income of the respondent. If both the respondent and spouse are employed, family income may be high without either possessing a high level of education or a high status occupation. Thus, a husband and wife who are laborers in a factory are likely to have a combined income higher than a college-educated office manager whose wife does not work. Second, some lower status occupations pay more than upper status occupations. A teacher, identified as a professional, is very likely to have an income less than a factory worker.

Only our hypothesis concerning age and voter support was not borne out and is the only instance of our research not reaching conclusions similar to previous election studies, concerning the Index of
Voter Support. The socioeconomic variables and public-regardingness were associated with the dependent variable as the literature indicated they would.

Regression Analysis

As with the Index of Voter Turnout, a step-wise regression analysis was run using the Index of Voter Support as the dependent variable. Of our nine independent variables, only two--public-regardingness and occupation--were found to be significant. The results of this test are found in Table 39.

In our consideration of the independent variables individually we found public-regardingness to have the highest measure of degree of association with the Index of Voter Support. Here public-regardingness not only explains the most variance but explains more of the variance in voter support than the other eight independent variables combined. Of the forty-two percent of the total variance explained, public-regardingness explains 26.6 percent. The other significant variable--occupation--explains an additional 10.7 percent. The other seven variables explain less than 5 percent of the variance and do not approach the critical region for significance.

Summary

Of the independent variables considered, public-regardingness is most important in determining how an individual will vote on a
### TABLE 39

**Voter Support: Regression Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient of Multiple Regression</th>
<th>Coefficient of Determination</th>
<th>Increase in Coefficient of Determination</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public-regardingness</td>
<td>.5159</td>
<td>.2662</td>
<td>.2662</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>.6105</td>
<td>.3727</td>
<td>.1065</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.6245</td>
<td>.3900</td>
<td>.0173</td>
<td>.0929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.6364</td>
<td>.4050</td>
<td>.0150</td>
<td>.1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of children</td>
<td>.6467</td>
<td>.4183</td>
<td>.0133</td>
<td>.1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.6475</td>
<td>.4192</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.6878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.6477</td>
<td>.4195</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.8487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership</td>
<td>.6477</td>
<td>.4195</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.9453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.6477</td>
<td>.4195</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.9949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
millage or bond proposal. Public-regardingness was found to be significantly associated with "yes" vote in the November 1975 bond issue, to have the highest measure of degree of association when tested against the Index of Voter Support, and to be by far the most significant variable in the regression analysis. It is this concept of the public good that most influences a voter in these types of elections.
In this paper we have examined the social characteristics of the voters and non-voters in school millage elections and of those voters who vote in favor of millage and bond proposals. Our findings in general support the findings of other researchers with respect to turnout and voter support in local referenda. The data from the Pennfield School District on the district's electoral history also supports the past research on nonpartisan elections.

In Chapter II we presented the findings of other studies which found local referenda to have lower turnout rates than partisan elections. Ballot proposals such as school millage and bond proposals were also found to have a greater possibility of defeat if there was a large turnout. The past history of the Pennfield School District, often held in conjunction with nonpartisan board of education elections, have low turnouts when compared to primary and general elections in Pennfield Township. Of the two bond issues in this study which were defeated the first, the November 1975 bond issue, produced the highest turnout in the district's history--twice that of any other (in terms of number of voters). The second, the September 1976 bond issue, had a higher turnout than was common for the district. The operating millage election of June 1976 had the lowest turnout in the district in
five years and passed with no difficulty.

We hypothesized that of our nine independent variables, only sex would not be significantly associated with voter turnout. As expected, older voters voted more often than younger voters, home owners voted more often than non-home owners, married persons voted more often than non-married persons, and there was no relationship between sex and turnout.

We had hypothesized that each of the socioeconomic status variables—education, income, and occupation—would be associated with turnout with the upper level groups within each variable—college educated, high income, and high status occupations—being most likely to vote, except in the November 1975 bond issue. Our tests showed only income to be associated with the Index of Voter Turnout and none of the SES variables was significantly associated with turnout in the September 1976 bond issue. Some qualification must be considered, however, regarding the Index of Voter Turnout and the SES variables. While not associated with the Index of Voter Turnout, education and occupation were associated with turnout in the June 1976 millage election with measures of degree of association slightly higher than income and, again, we hypothesized that these SES variables would not be associated with turnout in the November 1975 bond issue. Also, when all nine independent variables were included in the regression analysis education was within the critical region for significance.
Two anticipated relationships did not develop. First, public-regarding voters were expected to vote more often than private-regarding voters. No such relationship was found in any of the individual elections nor with the Index of Voter Turnout. More surprising, the presence of school-age children in the voter's family had no effect on turnout. It was expected that those voters with children would have more of an interest in the schools and therefore vote more often. This was not the case. If voters with children were more interested in school affairs it was not reflected at the polls.

Of the nine independent variables, age was the most important in influencing voter turnout. The older voters went to the polls while the younger voters did not. Age not only produced the highest measure of degree of association in each of the individual tests but was also by far the most significant variable in our regression analysis. The second most important independent variable in relationship to voter turnout was home ownership. This was not surprising for it is the home owners and not the non-home owners who are affected most directly by property taxes.

Our findings concerning turnout and age and sex support the findings of studies correlating local election results with those from national, partisan election studies. As stated in Chapter II, research in partisan elections have found age to be related to turnout and no relationship to exist between turnout and sex. Socioeconomic
status in general, and education in particular, have also been found in partisan election studies to be related to turnout but these variables were not related to turnout in this study.

When presenting our hypotheses, we hypothesized that the three socioeconomic variables, public-regardingness, and age would be associated with voter support of the ballot proposals. With but two exceptions, our hypotheses were borne out.

Public-regardingness tested the highest measure of degree of association of any significant variable in the November 1975 bond issue and with the Index of Voter Support. Those voters identified as public-regarding were those most likely to vote "yes" on the ballot proposals. Also significantly related to the Index of Voter Support (in order of their measures of degree of association) were occupation, education, and income. Each of these found independent variables was also significantly associated with 'yes' votes in the November 1975 bond issue (the only individual election for which such tests were made). When the regression analysis was run for the Index of Voter Support public-regardingness was the most significant variable with education the only other independent variable within the critical region for significance. When public-regardingness was dropped from the analysis education was the only significant variable but with much less of the variance explained.

As expected, no associations were found between sex, marital
status, or the presence of school-age children in the voter's family and support of the proposals. Home ownership was not significantly associated with the Index of Voter Support but was significantly associated with the "yes" vote in the November 1975 bond issue.

The other hypothesis not borne out was that age and voter support would be associated with middle-age voters (thirty to fifty-nine) favoring the ballot proposals. Instead, no relationship at all was found. When the data for the November 1975 bond issue was analyzed, age categories were combined so to have three ordinal categories: young (eighteen to twenty-nine), middle-age (thirty to fifty-nine), and old (sixty and over). Each of these three categories showed almost identical percentages favoring the bond issue when this was done.

In bringing the findings concerning voter turnout and voter support together, it is the older voters (thirty and over) and the home owners who are most likely to go to the polls in a school millage election. At the polls, it is the voters with public-regarding attitudes and of the higher educational, occupational, and income levels who are most likely to vote "yes" on the proposals presented.

When considering the results of this study two questions come to mind. First, of what value are the findings of this study to those doing research in the area of voting behavior in school millage elections? Second, of what value are these findings to school administrators who must contend with the electorate in the financing and operation
of their schools?

For the researcher, these findings help provide a footing from which to conduct further research in this area. Just as the research conducted for this paper was based on the past research of others, this study adds to the base from which others begin. With the exception of the major studies conducted by the Columbia Bureau of Social Research and the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan in the 1940's and 1950's, no research project in voting behavior using the individual voter as the unit of analysis was begun from scratch and even those pioneering studies were based on aggregate election data and previous sociological research. Each researcher must look at what has been done before and build his or her project from the research previously conducted.

There are several points which the researcher wishing to use this study as a base must consider. First, and probably foremost, is that the low amount of variance explained by the independent variables employed here in the regression analyses leads to the conclusion that factors other than the social characteristics of the voter are most important in determining whether or not an individual will exercise his or her right to vote and how he or she will cast that vote. In the consideration of the Index of Voter Support public-regardingness, an attitudinal concept, was by far the most significant independent variable, given its high measure of degree of association and strength in
the regression analysis. That this variable tested higher than the other independent variables in these analyses leads to the conclusion that future research should consider the importance of other attitudinal variables. Independent variables which might be included and tested could be alienation, apathy, and efficacy. It is possible, in light of some other research in the area of local referenda, that one or more of these variables might do better in explaining why some people vote in school millage elections and why some do not, or why some vote for and some against ballot proposals such as bond issues. Alienation might explain why elections with large turnouts usually result in the defeat of the proposals presented. Alienation, apathy, and efficacy each might individually explain the normal low turnout in these elections or one might prove applicable to one segment of the electorate while another is applicable to a different segment. Apathy might be the determining factor in a young person's decision not to vote while a lower socioeconomic status individual might have become alienated from the system or believe that his or her vote has no effect on what those in power do.

Public-regardingness should be included in future research of voting behavior in school millage elections along with such attitudinal variables as those discussed above, but a better index should be developed. While the index developed for this study has served our purposes, improvement and refinement are needed to strengthen the
variable.

Future research in this area should also include attitudinal factors in addition to the concepts discussed above, which are common to studies of voting behavior. The voters' opinions on such matters as property taxes and school administration should be explored. It is possible that a voter is basically public-regarding, is not alienated or apathetic, and believes he can influence school policy but simply cannot bear any additional property tax burden. Or a voter may believe in providing, equipping, and maintaining modern educational facilities but will not vote for any ballot proposal until the teachers and/or administrators he believes to be incompetent are dismissed. These attitudes might not be adequately measured by an index of alienation, apathy, efficacy, or public-regardingness but could most definitely have an affect on how the voters behave at the polls.

The presentation of these points is not meant to advocate the exclusion of social characteristic variables from future research in the area of voting behavior in school millage elections. These social variables might provide important links between the voters and the concepts discussed above. The researcher cannot expect, however, to explain electorate behavior by examining social characteristics alone. Attitudinal factors must be considered.

For the school administrator, the value of this study is much
less evident. In presenting ballot proposals, the school officials must
design proposals which will be favorable to those of the lower socio-
economic status groups for it is these voters who our research shows
to disapprove millage and bond proposals. In the instance of the
Pennfield School District, it is possible that the differences between
the various socioeconomic status groups was not taken into account in
the preparation of the November 1975 bond issue.

The Board of Education contracted an engineering firm,
Kingscott Associates, Inc., to conduct a study of the school district's
facilities. The results of this study were then used by a citizens
advisory committee in developing a comprehensive plan for expansion
and renovation of the school's facilities. The bond issue was then
developed to finance the operationalization of the committee's plan.
The prevailing belief was that the bond issue would have little trouble
passing since it was based on a citizens' project report. What the
board apparently did not consider was the make-up of the citizens
advisory committee. Those who are likely to become involved in such
a project are those of the middle and upper socioeconomic status
groups. What was not taken into account, apparently, was the reac-
tion of those not represented on the committee. Recruitment of

---

1 This belief was expressed to the author in a private conversa-
tion with a member of the citizens advisory committee who has since
been elected to the Board of Education.
members of the lower socioeconomic status group to serve on such committees is undoubtedly difficult. But their opinions and attitudes cannot be overlooked, for they can bring a ballot proposal to defeat. As discussed in Chapter II, it has been theorized that the large turnout in certain local elections results from the increased number of lower socioeconomic status voters going to the polls and that these voters are more likely to vote "no."

While not dealt with in any detail in this paper, school administrators should analyze voting trends before attempting to win approval for a millage or bond proposal. By looking at the results of their own district, school administrators can determine if a trend towards disapproval has been developing in the district. For example, an administration which has had continued success at the polls with the proposals they have presented might overlook a trend of increasing turnout and decreasing "yes" votes. Officials within such a school administration might be quite surprised to find their proposals defeated but shouldn't be. This is not to say that the officials within the Pennfield school administration did not analyze and properly interpret past election results. The district's turnout and percentage of "yes" vote in these types of elections had been quite stable for some time.

The pitfall which the Pennfield school officials might have fallen into is one into which many may fall. The continued success
of millage proposals does not automatically mean that bond issues will also be successful. Despite efforts of the school administration to inform the public to the contrary, it is possible that voters fear a bond proposal intent on issuing millions of dollars worth of bonds more than an operating millage proposal for a small number of mills—a term they are familiar with and can conceptualize—believing their taxes will increase substantially more than they actually will.

Another caution is that administrators cannot look at the voting results of another district and believe those results automatically apply to their own district. Different social and economic compositions and/or different past experiences between the board of education and the citizens can establish different environments for elections.

The officials within the Pennfield School District erred if they accepted the approval of a bond issue similar to the November 1975 bond issue in the neighboring Harper Creek School District as an indicator of the opinions of the voters in Pennfield.

While the proposals included in this study which were defeated were bond issues, operating millages are being defeated in many school districts. The officials in these districts are faced with greater problems. Examination of the findings of studies similar to this would provide them with little useful information. They cannot restrict who votes, allowing only those expected to be favorable to
millage proposals to enter the voting booth. In any event, if the voters within a district have been defeating proposals regularly the results of a study where a routine proposal was successful would be of little benefit. Also, even in districts where millage proposals are usually approved while bond issues are defeated there are capital investments for renovations which eventually will need to be made.

Three options are available to school administrators in situations similar to those described above. First, administrators in districts where millage but not bond proposals are usually approved may provide for the establishment of a building fund which would be used for necessary renovations. Such a fund would have to be established at a time when the district's facilities were not in need of immediate renovation. Any facility such as a school is in need of continual maintenance but minor projects might be financed through operating millage revenues while a special building fund could be used for major projects. It is possible that the voters would approve of a small millage proposal for the establishment of such a fund where they might not approve of a bond issue to raise the needed revenues immediately. This option is, of course, of no value to those whose voters continually vote down all millage proposals.

A second option would be for the school board to campaign for the passage of a proposal in a manner similar to those campaigns staged for candidates for office. While the board could not fail to
publicly announce that the election was being held, after making the official announcement the board could concentrate its efforts in getting the middle and upper socioeconomic status groups to the polls (since they are most likely to vote "yes") through literature distributions and personal contacts and at the same time ignore those groups likely to oppose the proposal(s), thus not stimulating their interest.

Two problems are present with such a strategy, however. First, there might be some question of the legalities of such behavior by school officials (i.e., public officials) and there would undoubtedly be questions of ethics. Second, there might be a backlash reaction by citizens which might not only defeat the proposal(s) but result in school officials losing their jobs, whether those officials are appointed administrators or elected members of the board of education.

The third, and most feasible, option is to tap the various governmental agencies, both state and federal but particularly federal, for the financial resources needed. Many federal agencies have programs which make available to local governmental units funds for new construction and renovation projects. This source of financial aid is one which should receive priority attention from school administrators but often seems neglected.¹

¹This is the strategy which has been adopted by the Pennfield school administration in light of the defeats of the November 1975 and September 1976 bond issues.
Our above discussion of sources of financial aid for school districts may seem extraneous to this paper. Our research was concerned with voting behavior in school millage elections, not where schools get their monies. However, political scientists studying voting behavior are not researching their topic in a sterile laboratory environment but in a political environment where actions today affect events of the future. Electorate behavior in a partisan election and the behavior of public officials between elections affect the next election. Similarly, the behavior of the electorate in past millage and bond elections and the administration's behavior undoubtedly affects the electorate's behavior in future school finance elections. Voters' attitudes and opinions can change as a result of what happens in elections and the efforts of school officials to finance school operations with monies not collected through taxation but granted by governmental agencies on the basis of good planning. If we are to study voting behavior in millage and bond elections we must consider what the administrators are doing and how these actions affect the electorate, just as a researcher studying presidential elections must consider the events and performances of officials in the national and international political environments.
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APPENDIX A

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Several of the questions below refer to millage and bond proposal elections held in the Pennfield School District. Here is a short review of the proposals recently voted upon:

November 10, 1975: $5.45 million expansion and site improvement bond proposal; included were expanded football stadium, swimming pool, new music building, remodeling and additions to each of the six school buildings.

June 14, 1976: general operating millage increase of one half mill (.5 mills).

September 13, 1976: $1.5 million bond proposal for improvements in the elementary school buildings, particularly Central Elementary (the current fifth and sixth grade buildings).

Please answer YES or NO to the following questions:
(please circle your answer)

1. Did you vote in the November 10, 1975, bond proposal election?
   YES   NO   DON'T KNOW
   If YES did you vote yes or no?
     YES   NO   DON'T KNOW

2. Did you vote in the June 14, 1976, operating millage election?
   YES   NO   DON'T KNOW
   If YES did you vote yes or no?
     YES   NO   DON'T KNOW

3. Did you vote in the September 13, 1976 bond proposal election?
   YES   NO   DON'T KNOW
   If YES did you vote yes or no?
     YES   NO   DON'T KNOW
Please AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statements:

(please circle your answer: A=agree, DA=disagree, Dk=don't know)

A  DA  DK  1. The school should teach only the basic subjects such as reading, writing, and arithmetic and forget about the other subjects being taught today.

A  DA  DK  2. The schools in the district do not have enough classroom space and the buildings are not in very good condition.

A  DA  DK  3. In order to grow the schools must provide additional recreation and athletic facilities.

A  DA  DK  4. School improvements are fine if they don't raise taxes.

A  DA  DK  5. A school system should have plenty of classroom space and the buildings should be in good structural condition.

A  DA  DK  6. The purpose of a school is to provide the basic skills needed to get a job and nothing else.

A  DA  DK  7. A community must provide and maintain good schools.

A  DA  DK  8. The main problem we face in this school district is high taxes.

A  DA  DK  9. Operating millage proposals should usually be approved in order to keep the schools running smoothly.

A  DA  DK  10. A school should provide students with a general education to help them become productive members of the community.

Please mark the appropriate answer:

1. Sex:       male  female

2. Age:       18-29  30-39  40-49
              50-59  60-69  70 & over
3. Marital Status: ___ single ___ married ___ divorced
    ___ widow

4. Education:
   ___ some high school
   ___ high school graduate
   ___ at least one year of college
   ___ college graduate (B.A. or B.S. degree)
   ___ graduate degree (M.A., M.S., or above)

5. Family Income:
   ___ $0-4,900   ___ $5,000-9,900
   ___ $10,000-14,900 ___ $15,000-19,900
   ___ $20,000-24,900 ___ $25,000-49,900
   ___ $50,000-99,900 ___ $100,000 or more

6. Respondent's Occupation
   Spouse's Occupation

7. Do you own your home?  ___ yes  ___ no

8. Do you have school-age children in your family?  ___ yes  ___ no

   If YES, which school (or schools) do they attend?  (Check as many as necessary)
   ___ Pennfield Schools    ___ Battle Creek Academy
   ___ Battle Creek Christian ___ Battle Creek Public Schools
   ___ Bellevue Schools      ___ Harper Creek Schools
   ___ Lakeview Schools      ___ St. Philip Catholic
   ___ Springfield Schools
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Did you vote in the November 10, 1975 bond proposal election?
Yes = 159
No = 46
Don't know = 10

If YES, did you vote yes or no?
Yes = 55
No = 99
Don't know = 10
No response = 51

Did you vote in the June 14, 1976 operating millage election?
Yes = 122
No = 77
Don't know = 16

If YES, did you vote yes or no?
Yes = 87
No = 34
Don't know = 8
No response = 86

Did you vote in the September 13, 1976 bond proposal election?
Yes = 135
No = 72
Don't know = 8

If YES, did you vote yes or no?
Yes = 61
No = 69
Don't know = 9
No response = 77

(For items 1-10 responses are coded as follows:
A = agree
DA = disagree
DK = don't know)

1. The school should teach only the basic subjects such as reading, writing, and arithmetic and forget about the other subjects being taught today.
A = 38
DA = 162
DK = 15

2. The schools in the district do not have enough classroom space and the buildings are not in very good condition.
A = 48
DA = 113
DK = 54

3. In order to grow the schools must provide additional recreation and athletic facilities.
A = 63
DA = 127
DK = 25

4. School improvements are fine if they don't raise taxes.
A = 84
DA = 109
DK = 22
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5. A school system should have plenty of classroom space and the buildings should be in good structural condition.
   $A = 197$ 
   $DA = 6$ 
   $DK = 12$

6. The purpose of a school is to provide the basic skills needed to get a job and nothing else.
   $A = 25$ 
   $DA = 178$ 
   $DK = 12$

7. A community must provide and maintain good schools.
   $A = 198$ 
   $DA = 9$ 
   $DK = 8$

8. The main problem we face in this school district is high taxes.
   $A = 69$ 
   $DA = 100$ 
   $DK = 46$

9. Operating millage proposals should usually be approved in order to keep the schools running smoothly.
   $A = 115$ 
   $DA = 69$ 
   $DK = 31$

10. A school should provide students with a general education to help them become productive members of the community.
    $A = 198$ 
    $DA = 10$ 
    $DK = 7$

Sex: 
- Male = 94
- Female = 121

Age: 
- 18-29 = 44
- 30-39 = 45
- 40-49 = 57
- 50-59 = 38
- 60-69 = 21
- 70 and over = 10

Marital Status: 
- Single = 17
- Married = 186
- Divorced = 2
- Widowed = 10

Education: 
- Some High School = 25
- High School Graduate = 83
- One Year of College = 59
- College Graduate = 26
- Graduate Degree = 16
- No Response = 6
### Income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 4,900</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 9,900</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 14,900</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 - 19,900</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 24,900</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 49,900</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 99,900</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 &amp; over</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Family Occupation:

- Professional = 28
- Technical = 17
- Managerial = 37
- Clerical = 24
- Sales = 11
- Foreman = 4
- Craftsman = 14
- Laborer = 27
- Housewife = 6
- Student = 6
- Retired = 14
- Other = 11
- Unemployed = 3
- No response = 13

### Do you own your home?

- Yes = 180
- No = 31
- No response = 4

### Do you have school-age children in your family?

- Yes = 111
- No = 104

### If YES, which school (or schools) do they attend?

- Pennfield Schools = 104
- All others = 7
# Appendix C

## Summary of Measures of Association

**Education and Voter Turnout:**
- Index of Voter Turnout  
  - November 1975: NS  
  - June 1976: $p < .01$, $\theta = .25$  
  - September 1976: NS

**Income and Voter Turnout:**
- Index of Voter Turnout  
  - November 1975: $p < .05$, $\tau_B = .11$  
  - June 1976: $p < .05$, $\theta = .22$  
  - September 1976: NS

**Occupation and Voter Turnout:**
- Index of Voter Turnout  
  - November 1975: NS  
  - June 1976: $p < .05$, $\theta = .24$  
  - September 1976: NS

**Sex and Voter Turnout:**
- Index of Voter Turnout  
  - November 1975: NS  
  - June 1976: NS  
  - September 1976: NS

**Age and Voter Turnout:**
- Index of Voter Turnout  
  - November 1975: $p < .001$, $\tau_B = .33$  
  - June 1976: $p < .001$, $\theta = .49$  
  - September 1976: $p < .01$, $\theta = .27$

**Marital Status and Voter Turnout:**
- Index of Voter Turnout  
  - November 1975: $p < .01$, $\theta = .11$  
  - June 1976: NS  
  - September 1976: NS

**Presence of Children and Voter Turnout:**
- Index of Voter Turnout  
  - November 1975: NS  
  - NS
### June 1976
- **Home Ownership and Voter Turnout:**
  - Index of Voter Turnout
    - November 1975: $p < .001$  \(\Theta = .22\)
    - June 1976: $p < .05$  \(\Phi = .16\)
    - September 1976: $p < .01$  \(\Phi = .23\)

### September 1976
- **Public-regardingness and Voter Turnout:**
  - Index of Voter Turnout
    - November 1975: NS
    - June 1976: NS
    - September 1976: NS

### Education and Voter Support:
- Index of Voter Support
  - November 1975: $p < .001$  \(\tau_B = .32\)
  - November 1975: $p < .05$  \(\Theta = .35\)

### Income and Voter Support
- Index of Voter Support
  - November 1975: $p < .05$  \(\tau_B = .20\)
  - November 1975: $p < .05$  \(\Theta = .24\)

### Occupation and Voter Support:
- Index of Voter Support
  - November 1975: $p < .001$  \(\tau_B = .37\)
  - November 1975: $p < .01$  \(\Theta = .34\)

### Sex and Voter Support:
- Index of Voter Support
  - November 1975: NS

### Age and Voter Support:
- Index of Voter Support
  - November 1975: NS

### Marital Status and Voter Support:
- Index of Voter Support
  - November 1975: NS

### Presence of Children and Voter Support:
- Index of Voter Support
  - November 1975: NS
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Home Ownership and Voter Support:
Index of Voter Support
November 1975

Public-regardingness and Voter Support:
Index of Voter Support
November 1975

NS

$\Phi = +.24$

$p < .01$

$p < .001$

$p < .001$

$\tau_b = +.44$

$\theta = +.31$
APPENDIX D

PUBLIC-REGARDINGNESS

In our discussion of public-regardingness in Chapter II we reported that Banfield and Wilson had found non-home owners and higher income and educated voters to be public-regarding. When our ordinal public-regardingness variable was tested against the social characteristic variables of subjects the three socioeconomic status variables of education, income, and occupation were found to be significantly associated with the dependent variable.

The expected trend of those voters having the higher public-regardingness ratings being those of the upper levels within the SES variables was found. It is interesting to note that for each SES variable the group showing the highest percentage in the highest public-regardingness classification (the four rating) was not the highest group on the SES ordinal scale but the second highest while the highest positions on the SES ordinal scales showed their highest percentages in the second highest public-regardingness classification (the three rating). This indicates that the relationship lacks a strict linear nature.

Education showed the highest measure of association when tested against public-regardingness, followed by occupation and

---

1 See Chapter II, Footnote 3, p. 32.
### TABLE 40

Public-regardingness and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public-regardingness Index</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>One Year College</th>
<th>College Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .01  
Tau B = .19

### TABLE 41

Public-regardingness and Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public-regardingness Index</th>
<th>$0-9,900</th>
<th>$10,000-14,900</th>
<th>$15,000-19,900</th>
<th>$20,000-24,900</th>
<th>$25,000 &amp; over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .05  
Tau B = .13
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TABLE 42

Public-regardingness and Family Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public-regardingness Index</th>
<th>Non-Working</th>
<th>Laborer</th>
<th>Craftsman</th>
<th>Clerical Sales</th>
<th>Managerial Proprietor</th>
<th>Professional Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p less than .01 Tau B = +.17

income. The low range of the three measures of association would lead to the impression that none of the three variables was more important or significant than the others. Home ownership was expected to show a negative association to public-regardingness, but no association of any type was found. Sex, age, marital status, and the presence of school-age children in the voter's family were not expected to be related to public-regardingness and none were.

When a step-wise regression analysis using public-regardingness as the dependent variable was run education was the only variable significant in explaining the variance of the dependent variable. Education explained 4.5 percent of the variance while no other independent
variable was significant in adding to the explanation of the variance. However, all eight independent variables tested were able to explain less than nine percent of the variance. This indicates that these independent variables are actually of little value in determining which voters are public-regarding and which are private-regarding. Banfield and Wilson's position that political ethos (i.e., Anglo-Saxon Protestant or immigrant) is the important determinant of public- and private-regardingness is apparently substantiated here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient of Multiple Regression</th>
<th>Coefficient of Determination</th>
<th>Increase in Coefficient of Determination</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.2111</td>
<td>.0446</td>
<td>.0446</td>
<td>.0019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.2469</td>
<td>.0609</td>
<td>.0164</td>
<td>.0558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.2707</td>
<td>.0733</td>
<td>.0123</td>
<td>.0955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>.2845</td>
<td>.0810</td>
<td>.0077</td>
<td>.1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.2918</td>
<td>.0852</td>
<td>.0042</td>
<td>.3276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Children</td>
<td>.2957</td>
<td>.0875</td>
<td>.0023</td>
<td>.4719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership</td>
<td>.2973</td>
<td>.0884</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>.6504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.2980</td>
<td>.0889</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>.7447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

PENNFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT ELECTORAL HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election Date</th>
<th>Type of Proposal</th>
<th>Turnout</th>
<th>&quot;Yes&quot; Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 1955</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1957</td>
<td>Millage increase</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1958*</td>
<td>Millage increase</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1960</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1965 (1)</td>
<td>Millage increase</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Millage increase</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1970 (1)</td>
<td>Millage renewal</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Millage increase</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1971</td>
<td>Millage increase</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1972</td>
<td>Millage renewal</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1973</td>
<td>Millage increase</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1974</td>
<td>Millage increase</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1975</td>
<td>Millage renewal</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1975*</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1976</td>
<td>Millage increase</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1976</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1977</td>
<td>Millage renewal</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*proposals defeated