DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 584 SO 004 989

AUTHOR Shaw, Paul C.
TITLE The Urban University Student: A Political Profile. University-Urban Interface Program.
INSTITUTION Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. University Urban Interface Program.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-8-0725
PUB DATE 13 May 72
GRANT OEG-29-480725-1027
NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Activism; *Educational Research; Elections; Higher Education; Political Affiliation; *Political Attitudes; *Political Influences; *Political Socialization; Social Influences; Student Attitudes; *Student Participation; Surveys; Voting

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the dimensions of student political participation during the period of the 1970 election, determines the relationship between participation and certain sociological variables, assesses the impact of a schedules recess from Pittsburgh University for participation, and makes some speculations about the potential political impact of the enfranchisement of 18-20 year olds. Fall 1970 pre-election and February 1971 post-election questionnaires provided the random sample survey data base. Major findings indicate that students identify with the Democratic Party; there is a close congruence between father and student party affiliation, and between the students' party preference and that of the local area; students tend to be active and engaged in higher order political activities; students' age is unrelated to political participation; statistically, there is no difference in level of political activity engaged in by males and females; social class has no influence on level of political activity; one-half of the students under the legal voting age in 1970 expressed no party preference; the election recess was not successful in promoting student political participation; and the enfranchisement of 18-year olds will not greatly change present political patterns. (Author/SJM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 069584

THE URBAN UNIVERSITY STUDENT:

A POLITICAL PROFILE

SP 004 989

Paul C. Shaw
University-Urban Interface Program
University of Pittsburgh

Prepared for presentation at
The Annual Meeting of
The District of Columbia Sociological Society
Howard University
May 13, 1972

The research reported herein was supported in part by an Office of Education Grant, Contract No. OEG-29-480725-1027, Project No. 80725. I appreciate the helpful criticisms of Martha K. Baum and Barbara B. Jameson. Christina M. Jarema was responsible for the processing of the data.

THE URBAN UNIVERSITY STUDENT: A POLITICAL PROFILE

During the late 1960's, much of the social and political turmoil that troubled our cities also infected our colleges and universities. The triple social problems of poverty, racism, and the burgeoning and predominant military-industrial complex which are so repugnant to many of the nation's idealistic young soon served to provoke them into dramatic and often violent attempts at "changing the system." As a result, the student activist became the object of much journalistic reporting and academic analysis. As a consequence, there emerged, we believe, an exaggerated picture of universities both as havens for the politically radical student and as purveyors of deviant and sometimes dangerous opinion.

Our interest in student political participation is provoked in part because of what we see as a distorted depiction of the college student. But equally important to our research motivation is that Pitt was one of a handful of colleges and universities that officially scheduled and sanctioned an election recess. Also, in addition to recessing work as usual, Pitt established a Citizenship Information Center which made available information on candidates and issues. The scheduling of the recess and the establishment of CIC are policy decisions which hold the promise of some reform of the University's traditional educational and political role. Pitt, therefore, was a convenient laboratory for examining the political involvement and activity of a cross-section of its students. And unless student activism has peaked, as some observers suggest, the combination of recess and information center might be expected to stimulate a significant level of student political activity--activity or behavior "within the system."

There are, of course, other developments which make the analysis of a university recess and student political activity relevant and timely.

The recent passage of the 25th Amendment to the Constitution enfranchising approximately eleven million 18- to 21-year olds has generated considerable comment and speculation on the potential political import of the addition of this segment of American youth to the electorate. On the one hand, political analysts such as Richard Scammon (1970) contend there is no reason to think that the newly-enfranchised youth will vote dramatically different or in greater proportions than their elders. Typically, those who accept this argument point out that young voters traditionally (a) reflect the party preferences of their parents, and (b) tend to turn out to vote in proportionally lower numbers than do older population cohorts; and therefore, the potential political impact of youth is and will be minimal. On the other hand, the conventional view is increasingly seen as inadequate and the data which underpins this perspective is spurious. Professor Louis M. Seagull (1970), for example, has argued that youth today differ from earlier generations in that they are more politicized and better educated--twin factors which should produce a group of new voters less committed to previous political patterns. He points to education, in particular, as a factor which should result in higher rates of voting participation as well as a decline in the salience of party identification among the young. Seagull foresees

the ultimate impact of the youth vote as effecting an attenuation of the salience of party labels and therefore causing the parties to become more issue-oriented.

Thus, there are a number of reasons for studying the electoral activity of Pitt students: most of the earlier student politics studies have focused on a relatively small number of activists; by scheduling the recess, the University attempted to facilitate within-the-system student political activity; with the establishment of the recess and the Citizenship Information Center, Pitt was, in fact, moving toward a reform of its educational and political role; and some believe the increased student interest in orthodox political activities may lead to a reform of the party system.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to describe the dimensions of student political participation during the period of the 1970 election, to determine the relationship between participation and certain sociological variables, and to assess the impact of the recess on participation. In addition, the research should permit us to make some speculations about the potential political impact of the enfranchisement of 18-20 year olds.

The Study: Design and Context

Just prior to the Fall, 1970 election, we conducted a mailed questionnaire survey of University students--the random sample design generated responses from undergraduate and graduate students, full and part-time. The questionnaire was designed to provide data on the impact of social class and student status on student political participation. We received a 40% response to the pre-election mailing. We subsequently conducted a

second or post-election survey in February, 1971 of those who had responded to the Fall survey; The February response rate was 69%. The Panel N (those responding at both Time I and II) = 180. As a rule of thumb, Oppenheim (1966) reports that a response rate to mailed questionnaires of between 40-80% is considered acceptable.

Normally, we would have drawn a stratified quota sample, but, unfortunately, the administrative record-keeping of aggregate student data was in the process of being revised, thus we had to be content with a random sample. With respect to several selective characteristics, Table 1 presents the distribution for our sample and the student population. In general, this comparison shows the compatability of the two groups. There is, of course, some disparity. For example, part-time, graduate, and female students are slightly overrepresented. In terms of social class, however, the groups are identical. Statistically, we find no significant difference between sample and population on the graduate-undergraduate dimension. There is a significant difference between the two groups in terms of both the part-time and full-time variable and sex. We are, however, inclined to view these differences as a blessing because both females and part-time students tend to be underrepresented (or neglected) in many student studies. Thus what appears to be a skewed sample may, in fact, be a fortuitous circumstance and may add to the interpretive character of the data.

Pitt, like many other universities, is an institution undergoing change. While the pressures for change and the change process itself are in many respects similar to the experiences of other large and urban

universities, Pitt may be unique in that it has not experienced a major student disturbance, and even minor disruptions are uncommon. In 1968, the "seasonal spring panty raid" took on a slightly different character when the dormitory air conditioning failed and students took to the streets causing the police to be called to break up the gathering. Then in 1969, the Student Black Action Society staged a brief sit-in at the Computer Center without damage to the equipment (Jameson and Hessler). These two events constitute the high points of student unrest at Pitt.

But there is yet another characteristic or set of characteristics that may further distinguish Pitt from other universities of comparable size, program, and urban location. In terms of the composition of its student body, Pitt has always been something of a "street-car" or commuter university; although it began to lose this reputation in the late 1950's as it vigorously sought to expand its graduate programs and improve, generally, the quality of its educational program. However, Pitt's quest for academic excellence proved to be very costly, and in 1967 Pitt exchanged its private status for state-relatedness. The character of the student body is, subsequently, undergoing change. As a private institution, approximately one-quarter of all Pitt freshmen came from out-of-state; now this is true of only 10% or less of the freshman class. Before becoming state-related, about 30% of the undergraduate student body came from blue-collar families; now about 50% of the undergraduates have a parent engaged in a blue-collar occupation; the national average for college freshmen is 27%. In terms of family income, three-fourths of Pitt undergraduates had family incomes of under $15,000; the 1970 median family income for Pitt

students is $10,674; nationally the median parental income for parents of college freshmen is $13,587. In terms of parental education, almost 70% of Pitt undergraduates were first generation college-going (Palmer). And finally, about 65% of Pitt undergraduates commute to class. Thus, Pitt undergraduate students tend to be working class, commuting, and first generation college attending.

Findings - Discussion

Party Identification: In the two or so decades since the birth of the current crop of college students, the Democrats have maintained a consistent national majority, although they have not always controlled the Presidency. Philip Converse (1966), for example, estimates the "normal" Democratic vote in Presidential elections at about 54%. As we know, the Democratic strength has, in particular, rested in the larger urban industrial centers, especially those with high ethnic concentrations. Pittsburgh and the surrounding Allegheny County have, accordingly, consistently registered and voted Democratic, and 1970 was no exception; in that year, local Democrats held a registration margin over the Republicans of about 64% to 36%.

But what about the party identification of students? Recent Gallup Opinion data suggest that the 21-30 age group tends to be Democratic in their party identification, with a disproportionately large number considering themselves as Independents (1970). But regardless of age, Republican party allegiance has reached a seven-year low (The Pittsburgh Press). A recent New York Times (1970) report of an American Council on Education survey of college freshmen shows that they increasingly consider themselves to be leftist or liberal in political orientation. In their

review of 40 years of research, Feldman and Newcomb (1970) suggest that college experience has a generally liberalizing effect on student attitudes toward political issues.

Thus, one might expect that Pitt students would tend to identify with the Democratic Party and perhaps the Independents. We found a surprisingly large number of our respondents registered to vote--about 80%. And of those registered, we found a strong student affinity for the Democratic Party--a division of party support comparable to that for Allegheny County. The Allegheny County registration for November, 1970 divided roughly 64% Democratic, 36% Republican, and 1½% "other" (including Independents). The party registration of our student respondents is: 53.8% Democrat, 35.2% Republican, and 8.9% Independent (Table 2). This suggests, we believe, that the local political culture, including parental political influence, may be more significant to the political conditioning of Pitt students than is the national collegiate culture or student counter-culture influences. This interpretation is consistent with Scammon's (1970:16) earlier prediction and with the conclusions of the voting studies of the 1950's and 1940's (Campbell, et. al., 1960).* Table 3 suggests a moderately strong congruence between student and parental party identification--although the relationship is much stronger for Democratic than for Republican party registrants. The data suggest also that the general liberalizing influence of college may exert a disproportionate effect on Republican Party fortunes, especially in a predominantly Democratic

*A recent Gallup poll (1970) shows about 52% of college students consider themselves "Independents." However, we would suggest that the Gallup "Independent" category may be inflated by the inclusion of "no preference" and "undecided" students who are not of voting age.

political culture (Feldman and Newcomb, 1970). For example, a disproportionate number of students from Republican families "switched" to the Democratic Party.

Political Participation: Lester Milbrath (1965) reminds us that there are approximately a dozen different political activities that one might engage in, and that participation in these acts is usually cumulative or hierarchical. That is, persons who engage in one type of political activity often engage in others, and these activities can be analytically cumulated or ranked so that those who engage in the top-most activities also tend to perform those of lower rank as well. Further, Milbrath suggests that the hierarchy of political activities can be clustered along an active-inactive dimension. What results are four or, perhaps, five role-activity groupings: (1) Apathetics or non-participants; (2) Spectators or those who may vote but are generally passive observers of the campaign; (3) Transitionals or those who are marginally active, e.g., write letters and contribute money to a party; and (4) Gladiators or those who are active participants in the party and campaign.

A fifth role may also be listed, but one outside the traditional apathetic to gladiator hierarchy: this is the protests and demonstrations category; an activity traditionally engaged in by deprived minorities and common to the 1960's student scene (Milbrath, 1965:18-27).

Table 4 displays the data on political participation by both discrete activity and activity level or category. It is clear that political activity is, in fact, hierarchical or progressive. Most of the respondents engaged in only spectator activities (51.7%), a much smaller number performed transitional (18.9%) and gladiatorial (9.4%) activities. What is

especially interesting, however, is that the students are already exhibiting political behavioral characteristics associated with the higher educated segment of society. This suggests, also, support for the assumption that education is a key determinant of political activity. In reviewing the literature on political participation, Milbrath (1965:19) found that within the American adult population, only "about four or five per cent are active in a party, campaign, or attend meetings;" whereas, almost 10% of our student sample attended political meetings and/or campaigned. Nationally, about 10% make monetary contributions, an equal proportion of our respondents contributed money to a party or candidate. Nationally, about 13% contact public officials and about 15% display a button or sticker; with our student sample, the respective figures are 22% and 18%. Within the adult population, about 30% try to persuade or influence others to vote for a particular candidate or party, 55% of our respondents initiated political discussion in an attempt to persuade. Nationally, approximately "40 to 70 per cent of all adults perceive political messages and vote in any given election," (Milbrath, 1965:19) whereas slightly more than 60% of the students voted and almost 80% perceived themselves as having been exposed to political stimuli. If the voting age population is divided by the categories of the typology, we find about 30% that can be classified as apathetic, about 60% fall into the spectator category, and only two to seven per cent function as gladiators (Milbrath, 1965:21). Our student respondents, however, are considerably more active and at higher levels: less than six per cent are apathetic, about 52% are spectators, and almost 10% are gladiators.

Party Affiliation and Political Participation: Statistically, party affiliation has no effect on the level of participation. There is, however, a tendency for Republicans to be relatively underrepresented in the protests category and overrepresented in gladiator activities (Table 5).

Age and Political Participation: There are a number of demographic variables associated with political participation. An individual's position within the life cycle and that position's association with political participation has been documented often by researchers (Lipset, 1969; Lazarsfeld, et. al., 1944). They have found, in general, that participation rises with age, until it peaks in the fifties. Our data also show that the older students are significantly more active than the younger respondents. Age, we believe, may partially explain why our student sample is generally more active than what one might expect (Table 6). Age, it is usually explained, is positively related to political behavior because as one grows older he typically develops more identification with or integration in his community. Students usually don't have this identification because they don't have the necessary family and occupational commitments or responsibilities. Although we don't have the necessary data to confirm our respondents' family obligations, the fact that almost one-third are over age 30 suggests that they are of the necessary age for a life style that is concomitant with community integration. One might assume also that part-time student status would be an indicator of the appropriate life style necessary for stimulating political activity. However, statistically there is no difference between

full and part-time students and their level of political activity. Marriage is another variable related to age and community integration, but with our respondents it seems to have an adverse influence on political activity (Table 7). Thus, we might speculate that, perhaps, married students have less available time and resources to devote to politics and/or they may be more vocationally-oriented and more devoted to their studies.

Education: This variable is perhaps the best single indicator of political activity (Berelson, 1954; Campbell, 1954; Almond and Verba, 1963), and is, probably, the most important determinant of our respondents' higher than normal activity. The greater the level of education the greater the interest in the politics, the more political information one receives and accumulates, and the more effective one feels. Our data seems to suggest that the completion of a college education is not an essential prerequisite to political activity, and we would speculate further that the college intellectual atmosphere and culture may serve as a stimulus to political behavior, therefore reducing the necessity that one complete a college degree; suggesting instead that one only need spend some significant period of his life within the college environment. Thus, post secondary school education and the college culture may combine to stimulate or produce high order political behavior.

Sex and Politics: Milbrath (1965:135) points out that "the finding that men are more likely to participate in politics than women is one of the most thoroughly substantiated in social science." However, with the advent of the women's lib movement and mass college education for both sexes one might detect some erosion of the sex-related differential in

political participation. With our sample there is no statistically significant difference between males and females and their participation in political activities. There are, however, some discernable tendencies: true to the sex stereotype almost twice as many women respondents are non-participants; but, then slightly more women fall into the transitional category and, surprisingly, more than twice as many females engage in gladiatorial activities (Table 8). We would speculate that once women decide to become involved they will be increasingly dissatisfied with menial political assignments and accordingly might become a more potent and visible political force. This should be especially true of women in our sample; the authors of The American Voter discovered more than a decade ago that increments of higher education have a larger effect on women (Campbell, et. al., 1960:256).

Social Class: Social class or position and its relation to political behavior has been researched perhaps more than any other aspect of political activity (Milbrath, 1965; Lane, 1959). In general, researchers have found a positive correlation between degree or rate of political activity and socio-economic status. Studies of student activists have also shown a clear association between student political activity and SES. In a recent paper Braungart (1970) suggests that social class characteristics and social status concerns, to a considerable extent, are determinants of political extremism. He has found, for example, that radical left students "come primarily from the middle and upper-middle classes in society," (Braungart, 1970) whereas the reactionary or right-wing students "come from lower-middle and respectable working-class backgrounds." (Braungart, 1970)

In our study, we defined social class by the Hollingshead Index of Social Position which combines scores on education and occupational scales. For purposes of analysis, we followed the convention and defined: working class as the collapsed Hollingshead IV and V classes; class III as lower-middle class, and classes I and II, collapsed, as upper-middle class.

When Hollingshead Index scores were calculated for the respondents' fathers, we found that: 52.2% were working class, 27.2% were lower-middle class, and 20.6% upper-middle class.

Thus with our sample of predominantly blue-collar students we might expect low levels of political activity. However, as we noted above, our respondents are more active and engaged in higher order activities that their predominantly working class background would suggest. But, in examining the relationship between social class and political activities we find no significant difference between social class position and political activity (Table 9).

There are, however, some interesting tendencies. For example, in comparing the three social class groupings, we find that the upper-middle class contributes: the largest proportion of non-participants, the lowest proportion of gladiators, and--in support of the findings of Braungart and others (Westby and Braungart, 1966:690-692; Flacks, 1967:52-75)--the largest proportion of protestors-demonstrators. As expected, the working class students tend to comprise a disproportionate number of spectators.

Again, we believe, our data suggest that student engagement in orthodox, within-the-system types of political participation may be a result of a combination of three factors: the local political culture (including parental influence), the college culture, and the respondent's level of education.

The 18-Year Old Vote: Some Speculations

Students age 20 and under constitute a disproportionately small number of respondents to our questionnaire--less than 16% of the respondents are under age 21. Frankly, we do not know why this age group is underrepresented. It is possible that their low response rate can be accounted for by their age and related status and life-cycle position. We are suggesting the possibility that the response rate to a questionnaire tapping political preferences and related questions might be interpreted as "not applicable" to those who are not yet permitted to vote. This interpretation may be especially plausible when considering the Pitt student's reputation for apathy and orthodoxy--"counterculture politization" may not be a viable force at Pitt. This is, of course, only one tentative explanation; we acknowledge the possibility of many other equally plausible explanations.

It is, nevertheless, appealing to make the analogy between the response rate to a "political" questionnaire and age and political behavior and age. For example, Table 10 displays the party affiliation-registration rates for two age groupings. The party preferences of the 20 and under group varies greatly from that of their age 21 and over counterparts. However, of those who were 21 at the time of the Fall 1970 election a relatively large number had not registered. Yet, of those who did register their party preference tends to be in the direction of the older students and the residents of the Pittsburgh area. Our data do not, however, reveal whether the younger student's deviance from the local party identification norm is attributable to a new found political independence, or whether it may be explained by the findings of the earlier voting studies and interpreted as the apolitical interests of youth. We tend to accept the latter explanation for Pitt students.

We are suggesting, therefore, that on the basis of our observations at Pitt the enfranchisement of 18-year olds will probably not lead to or bring about a radical change in the party system. If we may generalize from Pitt students, and speculate beyond our data, we would expect Pitt students to follow pretty closely the political preferences of their parents and those of their local political culture--these preferences, if modified, would be influenced no more or less than we would typically expect higher education to influence one's political inclinations. This is, of course, an open question.

Summary - Conclusions

The major substantive findings that have been presented in this report are:

1. The students exhibit strong identity and affiliation with the Democratic Party.

2. There is a close congruence, especially in Democratic families, between father and child's party affiliation-identification.

3a. There is a close congruence between the students' party preference and that of the local metropolitan area.

3b. There is considerable discrepancy between the proportion of Pitt Independents and national student identity with Independent political status.

4. Compared with earlier surveys of the adult population, the Pitt students sampled tend to be more active and engaged in higher order political activities.

5. Student age is unrelated to political participation.

6. Unmarried students tend to engage in higher order political activities than do married students.

7. Statistically, there is no difference in level of political activity engaged in by males and females. There is, however, a tendency for females to be overrepresented in the gladiatorial category.

8. Student social class has no influence on level of political activity.

9. One-half of the students under the legal voting age in 1970 expressed no party preference.

10. The party preference of 21-year olds is in the direction of the preferences of older students and the local area.

11. Full or part-time student status has no effect on political participation.

In general, we believe that the election recess was not successful in promoting student political participation. Although more than 60% of our respondents voted, voting ranks quite low on the hierarchy of political activities. Further, we believe that those students who engaged in transitional and gladiatorial activities--about one-fourth of our respondents--would probably have done so even had the recess not been held. We say that because transitional and gladiatorial activities require a relatively high level of political interest and involvement. Moreover, 40% of our respondents devoted the recess period to studying; 24% used it for working and other job-employment related activities; and 7% spent the recess engaged in recreational activities. Finally, in a CIC-sponsored referendum, 55% of the students voted against scheduling future election recesses. However, the CIC does continue to receive University funding, but University administrators have announced that future recesses for political participation probably will not be scheduled.

There is little in our data to suggest that the enfranchisement of 18-year olds will greatly change present political patterns. As our respondents reach voting age they tend to select a party and to actively participate within the party structure; thus, political parties appear to have higher saliency for our sample. We would suggest that studies reporting student affinity for Independent status may be misleading in that they include large numbers of students not yet pushed to party commitment because they are ineligible to vote. Although many students may be concerned with effecting programmatic change, they seem willing to accept traditional party labels.

We suggest also that with the spread of affirmative action and open admissions programs the character of other urban universities may come to resemble more closely the working class, first-generation college attending character of Pitt. Expanding the egalitarian mass education concept would therefore increase the number of upwardly mobile students enrolled in college and should result in activating its graduates along traditional and orthodox lines in support of the established party system.

Finally, what was seen as widespread student disillusionment with orthodox political activity following the 1968 McCarthy campaign does not seem to have had a negative impact on the political participation of Pitt students. Clearly, Pitt students have not turned to radical political activity; in contrast, their level of political participation exceeds what is normally expected from the adult, voting age population.

Table 1

Selective Comparison of Sample and Population

	Sample	Population	
Undergraduate	57.0%	63.8%	$x^2 = 1.28$, NS
Graduate	40.6	36.1	
Full-time	47.1	60.2	$x^2 = 4.98$, sig. at .05 level
Part-time	49.0	39.8	
Male	53.4	71.0	$x^2 = 15.04$, sig. at .001 level
Female	46.6	29.0	
Social Class:			
Blue collar	52.2	53.2	

Table 2

Party Registration

	Pitt Student Survey (November 1970)	Allegheny County - all registered adults (November 1970)
Democrat	53.8%	64%
Republican	35.2	36
Independent	8.9	1½

Table 3

Congruence of Student and Parental Party Affiliation*

	Father's Party	
Student's Party	Democrat	Republican
Democrat	74.2%	32.0%
Republican	15.2	56.0
Independent	10.6	12.0

$x^2 = 23.59$, sig. beyond .001

*Responses for only those students who are registered to vote; four students reported fathers who were either Independent or Other in affiliation--however, the four students were not registered and thus their responses do not appear above.

Table 4

Student Political Participation: A Typology

N = 180

	November 3, 1970	
	N	%
Apathetic/Non-Participation	[10]	[5.6]
Spectator	[93]	[51.7]
Exposure to political stimuli. (Listening to speeches, reading about politics, etc.)	142	78.9
Voting	110	61.1
Initiated a personal discussion of politics. (Tried to persuade someone to support your own position; face-to-face.)	99	55.0
Wearing a button or putting a sticker on the car. (Button or sticker indicates a partisan position.)	33	18.3
Transitional	[34]	[18.9]
Petitioning political leaders and public officials. (Writing letters, etc.)	40	22.2
Making a monetary contribution to a political party or candidate.	17	9.5
Attending a political meeting (e.g., strategy meeting for a candidate or party.)	17	9.5
Gladiatorial	[17]	[9.4]
Campaigning (e.g., canvassing, stuffing envelopes, etc.)	17	9.5
Active party membership (e.g., strong identification with a party; activity in party affairs.)	8	4.4
Soliciting political funds (e.g., door-to-door, telephoning, etc.)	1	0.6
Office seeking and holding	0	0.0
Protests and Demonstrations	[13]	[7.2]
No Response	[13]	[7.2]

Table 5

Party Affiliation and Political Participation*

	Party		
	Democrat	Republican	Independent
Non-Participant	5.6%	2.5%	6.7%
Spectator	52.8	62.5	33.3
Transitional	23.6	17.5	26.7
Gladiator	9.7	15.0	13.3
Protests and Demonstrations	6.9	2.5	13.3
No Response	1.4	0.0	6.7

$x^2 = 8.89$ N.S.

*Responses reported for only students who are registered to vote.

Table 6

Age and Political Participation: Percentage Distributions

Political Activities	Age 16-21	22-30	31+
Non-Participation	0.0%	5.3%	10.3%
Spectator	50.0%	57.9%	44.8%
Transitional	6.5%	15.8%	32.8%
Gladiatorial	8.7%	9.2%	10.3%
Protest and Demonstrations	13.0%	7.9%	7.7%
No Response	21.7%	3.9%	0.0%

$x^2 = 39.55$, sig. at .001

Gamma = 0.147

Table 7

Marital Status and Political Participation

	Married	
	Yes	No
Non-Participation	10.2%	0.0%
Spectator	50.0	55.0
Transitional	22.4	13.8
Gladiatorial	5.1	13.8
Protests and Demonstrations	7.1	7.5
No Response	7.3%	

$x^2 = 15.29$ sig. at .05

Table 8

Student's Sex and Political Participation

	Male	Female
Non-Participation	3.8%	7.9%
Spectator	60.6	39.5
Transitional	18.3	19.7
Gladiatorial	5.8	14.5
Protests and Demonstrations	6.7	7.9
No Response	4.8	10.5

$x^2 = 10.72$ NS

Table 9

Social Class and Political Participation: Percentage Distribution

	Social Class		
	I & II Upper Middle	III Lower Middle	IV & V Working
Non-Participation	13.5%	2.0%	4.3%
Spectator	35.1	53.1	57.4
Transitional	21.6	16.3	19.1
Gladiatorial	5.4	14.3	8.5
Protests and Demonstrations	16.2	8.2	3.2
No Response	8.1	6.1	7.4

$x^2 = 16.88$ NS

Gamma = -0.11

Table 10

A Comparison of the Party Preferences of Two Age Groupings:

The 21 Year Old and The 20 and Under

	Age 20 and under	Age 21
No preference/ Not registered	50.0%	28.5%
Democrat	28.5	42.8
Republican	10.7	21.4
Independent	10.7	7.0

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almond, Gabriel, and Sidney Verba. The Civic Culture. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1963.

Berelson, Bernard, et. al. Voting. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1954.

Braungart, Richard G. "Status Politics and Student Politics: An Analysis of Left and Right Wing Student Activists." District of Columbia Sociological Society Meetings, College Park, Maryland. May 9, 1970.

Campbell, Angus, et. al. The American Voter. New York: John Wiley. 1960.

Campbell, Angus, et. al. The Voter Decides. Evanston: Row Peterson. 1954.

Converse, Philip E. "The Concept of a Normal Vote." Chapter 2 of Angus Campbell, et. al. Elections and the Political Order. New York: John Wiley. 1966.

Feldman, Kenneth A., and Theodore M. Newcomb. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1970.

Flacks, Richard E. "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest." Journal of Social Issues. Volume 23. 1967.

The Gallup Opinion Index, No. 60. June, 1970.

Jameson, John, and Richard M. Hessler. "The Natives are Restless: The Ethos and Mythos of Student Power." Human Organization. Summer, 1970.

Lane, Robert E. Political Life. Glencoe: Free Press. 1959.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., et. al. The People's Choice. New York: Duell, Sloane. 1944.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. Political Man. New York: Doubleday. 1969.

Milbrath, Lester W. Political Participation. Chicago: Rand McNally. 1965.

_____. The New York Times. December 20, 1970.

Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire Design and Measurement. New York: Basic Books. 1966.

Palmer, Diane H. "Report on Student Socio-Economic Status, Fall 1970 Undergraduate Students." Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, Office of Institutional Research. July, 1971.

_____. The Pittsburgh Press. October 10, 1971.

Scammon, Richard. Interviewed in The New York Times. December 22, 1970.

Seagull, Louis M. "The Youth Vote and Change in American Politics." Delivered at the 1971 American Political Science Association Meetings, Chicago, Illinois.

Westby, David, and Richard Braungart. "Class and Politics in the Family Backgrounds of Student Political Activists." American Sociological Review. Volume 31. October, 1966.