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Abstract
Seventy-two undergraduates (ages 18-23) from The University of Richmond and Virginia Commonwealth University participated in this study to examine the potential predictors for student political participation. After methodological problems of past research - such as the confounding of activism and ideology and the specific focus on activism in the 1960's - were corrected, Dean's (1961) Alienation scale, Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control scale, and Olsen's (1969) Alienation scale were used to predict political activity levels, as measured by Kerpelman's (1972) Activity scale. A stepwise multiple regression procedure showed that futility (a subscale of Olsen's Alienation scale) was the only significant predictor of student political participation, contrary to past findings. The importance of this study in relation to past research and in motivating students to become politically active are discussed.
Alienation and Internal-External Locus of Control as Predictors of Student Political Participation

Past research on student political activism, defined as "actions through which ordinary members of a political system influence or attempt to influence outcomes" within that system (Nagel, 1987, p.1), suggests that participation is both a response to alienation as well as an indication of internal locus of control. Political activity has ranged from voting to signing a petition to running for political office, depending on researchers' definitions. A review of these studies, though, reveals methodological problems that inhibit external validity.

The feeling of alienation is one possible predictor of level of political participation. Alienation is characterized by a feeling of lack of coordination with social structures, reference groups, or the self. Research with regard to alienation and political participation has yielded contradictory results. Rosenberg (1951) found that:

politics is avoided because of feelings of psychological inadequacy or weakness... The great economic and power blocs, typified by giant corporations and unions, thrust the individual about, with pressures too great to resist. As a consequence, the individual is likely to feel overwhelmed and powerless. Given this feeling, the idea that his puny
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strength can match the giants is absurd, and he feels that a lonely individual can do nothing to change the way the world is run [p. 8-9].

On the other hand, Olsen (1969) looked at two categories of alienation and concluded that neither markedly correlated with political participation.

Contrary to these findings, Thompson and Horton (1960) found that "the alienated systematically express their alienation in political action, presumably as a negative attitude or protest vote" (p. 193). In addition, Oppenheimer (1968) hypothesized that students of the "new left" were using direct action in response to the alienation they felt from the political system. According to Watts, Lynch, and Whittaker (1969), active students are more likely to have active parents, and therefore feel less alienated from the system.

One reason for these contradictory results could be the lack of a uniform definition of alienation. Dean (1960) defined three types of alienation: powerlessness (the feeling that one does not have the power to change the political environment), normlessness (either a lack of clear norms or conflicting norms that prevent a person from taking action), and social isolation (the "perception of losing effective contact with significant and supporting groups" [p. 186]). He correlated each
type plus the combined score with four types of political apathy, and found the correlations to be too low to support the hypothesis that alienated persons are more politically apathetic.

Upon reviewing the literature on alienation, Seeman (1959) identified five distinct meanings: powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. Olsen (1969) has distinguished between two types of alienation: political incapability/futility and discontentment or cynicism with politics, and McDill and Ridley (1962) defined political alienation not only as a response to powerlessness, but also a distrust of political leaders in general. Like Thompson and Horton (1960), McDill and Ridley found that the politically alienated, when they go to the polls, express their alienation through a negative vote. In addition to alienation, correlations have been made between political participation and locus of control.

The traditional understanding of internal-external locus of control as it relates to political participation is that the stronger the belief that what one does will affect outcomes (internal) increases the likelihood that one will actively work to change his/her environment. Externals, on the other hand, believe that outcomes are
controlled by external forces such as luck or powerful others, and are not motivated to work actively to change their environment (Deutchman, 1985).

The majority of the research on locus of control and political activity is more conclusive. The relationship between political participation and internal control was supported by Deutchman (1985), Rosen and Salling (1971), and Abramowitz (1973). Strickland (1965) examined black activists and nonactivists, and found that the more internal the subject, the more likely he/she was to be active in civil-rights movements. In addition, Wolfsfeld (1985) determined that political efficacy (whether or not one feels like he/she can have an affect on the political system) should distinguish between internal and external locus of control.

Another body of locus of control research has focused on the factors of Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control scale (1966). Collins (1974) determined four components of Rotter's scale: (a) the world is difficult, (b) the world is unjust, (c) the world is governed by luck, and (d) the world is unresponsive. According to Collins:

From Rotter's theoretical perspective, the four types of externality are functionally equivalent. Any one of the beliefs... would inhibit coping and lower self-esteem. Each of
the four reasons would lead the respondent to conclude, 'There's no point in trying; it wouldn't make any difference if I did.' But these four sources of control are distinguishable and relatively uncorrelated [p. 387].

Mirels (1970) has also taken a multidimensional view of Rotter's scale. He found two distinct factors in the scale: that luck and ability determine personally relevant outcomes, and the acceptance or rejection of the idea that a citizen can exert some control over political and world affairs (much like Collins' fourth component).

Scaturo and Smalley (1980) correlated Collins' factors and Kerpelman's Activity scale (1972) and found that, when tested separately, only Factor IV (belief in a politically unresponsive world) was related to political activity. The combination of all four factors did correlate with political activity, but Factor IV accounted for almost all of the scale's ability to predict political participation.

Regardless of the number of studies conducted to determine the characteristics of student political activists, much confusion remains concerning the personal and environmental determinants of activism. Some of this confusion can be attributed to the methodological problems of traditional political participation studies.

Characteristic of these studies is a confounding of
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activism and ideology (Kerpelman, 1972). Because most of these studies (Oppenheimer, 1968; Watts, et al., 1969; Trent & Craise, 1967; Strickland, 1965; and Katz, 1967) examine exclusively liberal, or "new left" activists, it is difficult to generalize to the entire population of activists. According to Block, Haan, and Smith (1968):

Although there has been a tendency to equate social involvement and political activism with liberal politics, we have been impressed by the existence of an active protest group with a conservative political philosophy. The continuing presence of such individuals requires that activism be defined independently of political ideology if we are to extricate the correlates of activism per se from those of liberalism per se [p. 208].

Kerpelman (1969) also compared activists and nonactivists and determined the necessity of separating ideology from activism.

In addition, studies on political participation tend to focus on activism in the 1960's, especially on a single, politically charged college campus (Oppenheimer, 1968; Watts, et al., 1969; and Trent & Craise, 1967). Again, such a narrow focus decreases the external validity of traditional political participation studies.

The present study attempts to eliminate these methodological problems in two ways: (a) both conservative and liberal student activists were examined, and (b) the subjects were drawn from two universities.
Political activity was determined by Kerpelman's Activity scale (1972), and ideology was assessed through a self-rating scale. Because of the aforementioned difficulties in defining alienation, two alienation scales were administered. Dean (1961) distinguished between three types of alienation in his scale (powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation), and Olsen (1969) defined alienation as a combination of both political incapability/futility and discontentment or cynicism with politics. In addition to the ideology scale, Dean's (1961) and Olsen's (1969) alienation scales, as well as Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control scale (1966) was used to determine the differences, if any, between student political activists and nonactivists.

Method

Subjects and Procedure

Three hundred undergraduates (ages 18-23) at the University of Richmond and Virginia Commonwealth University selected from student directories were mailed packets containing the questionnaires in this order: (a) the purpose of the study and instructions (b) a biographical data sheet (including the self-rated ideology scale), (c) Dean's (1961) Alienation scale, (d) Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control scale, (e) Olsen's (1969)
Alienation scale, and (f) Kerpelman's (1972) Activity scale (see Appendixes A-F). The subjects were also informed that the surveys would be kept strictly confidential.

Ninety-seven surveys were returned (a 32% return rate), 72 of which were used in the multiple regression. The remaining 25 surveys were either incomplete, or were filled out by students over the age of 23. Of the 72 usable surveys, 28 were males and 44 were females. Regarding ideology, two students considered themselves radically conservative; 36 were conservative; 33 were liberal; and one student considered him/herself radically liberal. Forty-one of the participating students attended The University of Richmond, and 31 attended Virginia Commonwealth University.

Apparatus

Political activity was measured by Kerpelman's Activity scale (1972). Actual political participation was assessed by 12 Likert-type items measuring the degree of political involvement over the past three years. In addition, the same 12 items were used to measure the students' desired amount of participation had they been free of all other commitments. Kerpelman (1972) has determined that a combination of these sub-scales is an
accurate predictor of level of political activity.

Dean's Alienation scale (1961) consists of 24 Likert-type items that assess the student's feelings of powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. Measures of validity of Dean's scale have been quite low, yet correlations between the scale and other tests that measure alienation are in the range of .26 to .30. The split half reliability of the scale was .78.

Olsen's (1969) Political Alienation scale was used to determine both political incapability/futility and discontentment with politics through eight Likert-type items. While validity was not absolutely calculated, Olsen examined voting preferences according to scores on both of the scales. He learned that over 80% of those high on incapability and low on discontentment voted Democratic.

Locus of control was measured by Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control scale, which consists of 29 Likert-type items, six of which are fillers. Evidence of the scale's validity comes from a number of researchers, including Rotter (1966) and Joe (1971).

In addition, ideology was measured on a scale from 1-4. The ratings are as follows: 1 = "radically liberal," 2 = "liberal," 3 = "conservative," and 4 = "radically
conservative."

Results

A stepwise multiple regression determined the ability of Dean's (1961) Alienation scale, Rotter's (1966) Locus of Control scale, and Olsen's (1969) two-part (futility and cynicism) alienation scale to predict political activity. Only futility was found to be a significant predictor of political participation ($B = -.49, p > .01$). The adjusted $R$ for futility was .23, which was consistent with the zero-order correlation.

Another stepwise multiple regression determined whether or not the three factors of Dean's (1961) Alienation scale (social isolation, powerlessness, and normlessness) and Mirels' (1970) two factors of Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control scale were significant predictors of political participation. None of these factors were predictive.

Discussion

These results both support and contradict previous findings. First, this study supports the findings of Dean (1960) that neither powerlessness, normlessness, social isolation, nor a combination or all three forms of alienation correlate with political participation as measured by the Kerpenman scale. Level of alienation
did not significantly affect political participation, contrary to the findings of Rosenberg (1951) that there is an inverse relationship between alienation and political participation, and those of Thompson and Horton (1960) and Oppenheimer (1968), that high levels of alienation correlate with political participation.

Unlike Olsen (1969), these results demonstrate that there is a correlation between futility and political participation, with level of futility being the only significant predictor of political activity. One of the reasons for this contradiction may be in the differences in age of the subjects between the present study and Olsen's study. While Olsen looked at subjects predominantly over the age of 29, the present study focused on a much younger population. For young adults, who generally believe that they can change the world, high levels of futility have a marked effect on political participation levels.

These findings are not consistent with previous research regarding locus of control (Deutchman, 1985; Rosen & Salling, 1971; Abramowitz, 1973; Strickland, 1965; and Wolfsfeld, 1985); Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control scale did not correlate with political participation as measured by Kerpelman's
(1972) Activity scale.

It was also found that neither of Mirels' (1970) factors of Rotter's (1966) scale (that luck and ability determine personally relevant outcomes; and the acceptance or rejection that a citizen can exert some control over political and world affairs) correlated with political activity. While no other study has correlated Mirels' factors with political activity, Scaturo and Smalley (1980) correlated Collins' (1974) factors with Kerpelman's (1972) Activity scale and found that, when tested separately, only Factor IV (belief in a politically unresponsive world) significantly correlated with political participation.

These findings are important because they are based on data obtained from both liberal and conservative students attending two distinct universities. While previous studies are limited by the homogeneity of their subjects, the present study is more generalizable. A few cautions should be noted here. The small n (72) of this study does limit the scope of the findings. In addition, the relatively low political activity level mean (51.23 on a scale from 24 to 120) and the lack of variance between activity scores may show that the students surveyed are not sufficiently politically active to show differences on the other tests.
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One of the reasons for the fact that futility was the only significant predictor of student political activity may be that futility was highly correlated with Dean's (1960) Alienation scale ($r = .37$, $p > .01$), Olsen's (1969) cynicism subscale ($r = .37$, $p > .01$), and Rotter's (1966) Internal-External Locus of Control scale ($r = -.50$, $p > .001$). When futility was put into the regression equation, it took with it all of the strength of the other three scales. Thus, because futility had the highest correlation with activity, it was the only predictor of political participation.

Another explanation for the fact that futility was the only predictor of political activity may be in the nature of political participation itself. Generally, political activity (i.e. voting, signing a petition) is not an extrinsically rewarding activity. In the absence of external positive reinforcers, it would be easier for students to get discouraged and to believe that participating in the political process is futile.

In summary, it was found that the only significant predictor of student political activism was level of futility. In general, students who feel incapable of acting or that their actions are futile, are less likely to be politically active. On the other hand, students
who believe that they can make a difference are more likely to participate. Therefore, according to this study, in order to get young adults to participate in the political process, an effort must be made to show them that their actions can and do make a difference. In addition, an emphasis on the positive intrinsic rewards of being politically active may counter some of the negative effects of the lack of external rewards on student political participation.
Political Participation
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Appendix A

Cover Letter

My name is Joanne Miller, and I am a senior at the University of Richmond. I am conducting a survey on student political activism to fulfill a psychology honors requirement. Students from the University of Richmond and Virginia Commonwealth University were randomly chosen to participate in this study. Enclosed are a number of questionnaires that will take approximately 45 minutes to complete. I understand the time constraints of college students, but it would be greatly appreciated if you would complete the surveys (independently) and return them to me by February 15 in the enclosed envelope. Please also note that there is a front and back to all of the questionnaires. All of the surveys will be kept strictly confidential. If you have any questions, feel free to call me at (804) 281-1803.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Joanne Miller
Appendix B

Biographical Data

Social Security Number __________ (used solely for coding)

Year fr so jr sr gr

Gender M F Age ____

Nationality:

___ Native American or Alaskan Native
___ Black or African American
___ Mexican American or Chicano
___ Asian or Pacific American
___ Puerto Rican
___ Other Hispanic or Latin American
___ White (non-Hispanic)
___ Other ________________

Religion:

___ Catholic
___ Protestant
___ Jewish
___ Other ________________

Ideology:

Please choose the category that best describes your ideology:

1 radically conservative 3 liberal
2 conservative 4 radically liberal

Please list all organizations you have belonged to and positions held while attending college:
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Appendix C

Dean's Alienation Scale (Questionnaire #1)

Directions

Below are some statements regarding public issues, with which some people agree and others disagree. Please give us your own opinion about these items, i.e., whether you agree or disagree with the items as they stand.

Please fill in the appropriate blank, as follows:

A (Strongly Agree)
B (Agree)
C (Uncertain)
D (Disagree)
E (Strongly Disagree)

___ 1. Sometimes I feel all alone in the world.
___ 2. I worry about the future facing today's children.
___ 3. I don't get invited out by friends as often as I'd really like.
___ 4. The end often justifies the means.
___ 5. Most people today seldom feel lonely.
___ 6. Sometimes I have the feeling that other people are using me.
___ 7. People's ideas change so much that I wonder if we'll ever have anything to depend on.
___ 8. Real friends are as easy as ever to find.
___ 9. It is frightening to be responsible for the development of a little child.
___ 10. Everything is relative, and there just aren't any definite rules to live by.
___ 11. One can always find friends if he/she is friendly.
Appendix C (cont'd)

___ 12. I often wonder what the meaning of life really is.

___ 13. There is little or nothing I can do towards preventing a major "shooting" war.

___ 14. The world in which we live is basically a friendly place.

___ 15. There are so many decisions that have to be made today that sometimes I could just "blow up."

___ 16. The only thing one can be sure of today is that he/she can be sure of nothing.

___ 17. There are few dependable ties between people anymore.

___ 18. There is little chance for promotion on the job unless a person gets a break.

___ 19. With so many religions abroad, one doesn't really know which to believe.

___ 20. We're so regimented today that there's not much room for choice even in personal matters.

___ 21. We are just so many cogs in the machinery of life.

___ 22. People are just naturally friendly and helpful.

___ 23. The future looks very dismal.

___ 24. I don't get to visit friends as often as I'd really like.
Appendix D

Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Questionnaire #2)

Directions

The questions in this section are formed in pairs of statements. Please circle the letter of the one you agree with more.

25. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
    b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

26. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
    b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

27. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
    b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

28. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
    b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized, no matter how hard he/she tries.

29. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
    b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

30. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
    b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
Political Participation

Appendix D (cont'd)

31. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
   b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

32. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

33. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

34. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
   b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

35. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
   b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

36. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
   b. This world is run by the few in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

37. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
   b. It is not always to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

38. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
   b. There is some good in everyone.

39. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
   b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
Appendix D (cont'd)

40. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
   b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

41. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
   b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

42. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
   b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

43. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
   b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

44. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
   b. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.

45. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
   b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

46. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
   b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

47. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
   b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

48. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
   b. A good leader makes it clear to people what their jobs are.
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49. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
    b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

50. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
    b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

51. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
    b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

52. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
    b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

53. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
    b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.
Appendix E

Olsen's Alienation Scale (Questionnaire #3)

Directions

Fill in A if you agree with the statement, and B if you disagree with the statement.

___ 54. I believe public officials don't care much what people like me think.

___ 55. There is no way other than voting that people like me can influence actions of the government.

___ 56. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that I can't really understand what's going on.

___ 57. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.

___ 58. These days the government is trying to do too many things, including some activities that I don't think it has the right to do.

___ 59. For the most part, the government serves the interests of a few organized groups, such as business and labor, and isn't very concerned about the needs of people like myself.

___ 60. It seems to me that the government often fails to take necessary actions on important matters, even when most people favor such actions.

___ 61. As the government is now organized and operated, I think it is hopelessly incapable of dealing with all the crucial problems facing the country today.
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Kerpelman's Activity Scale (Questionnaire #4)

Directions

This survey is for research purposes only, and as such, there are no right or wrong answers. We are seeking to measure students' experiences and expectations concerning certain general issues. Please read each question and fill in the letter that corresponds to the answer according to the response that comes most closely to your actual state of affairs.

In the following questions the word "issues" refers solely to broad political and social issues on or off campus. Campus issues that have little or no broad political or social implications (such as support or protest of food service, grading practices, teaching practices) are not to be considered issues for the purposes of this inventory. Campus issues that would have broad political or social implications (such as support or protest of controversial speakers or films, controversial books in the library) are to be considered issues for the purposes of this inventory. Off-campus issues that have no broad political or social implications (such as support or protest of city or town tax policy, local school board appointments, etc.) are not to be considered issues for the purposes of this inventory. Off-campus issues that would have broad political or social implications (such as support or protest of U.S. foreign policy, major election campaigns, etc.) are to be considered issues for the purposes of this inventory.

___ 62. How many times in the past three years have you organized a group to support or protest a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times

___ 63. How many times in the past three years have you led, or directly assisted in leading, an already organized group supporting or protesting a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times
Appendix F (cont'd)

64. How many times in the past three years have you participated in a group supporting or protesting a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times

65. How many times in the past three years have you engaged in an extended argument with anyone over a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times

66. How many times in the past three years have you addressed a formal audience (i.e., been a scheduled speaker) concerning a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times

67. Approximately how much time during the average day do you spend trying to convince others to support or protest political or social issues?
   a) less than 15 min.  b) 15-30 min.  c) 30 min-1 hr.  d) 1-2 hr.  e) more than 2 hr.

68. Approximately how much time during the average day do you spend discussing political or social issues?
   a) less than 15 min.  b) 15-30 min.  c) 30 min-1 hr.  d) 1-2 hr.  e) more than 2 hr.

69. How many times in the past three years have you written something (pamphlet, handout, etc.) designed specifically to either inform or convince other people concerning a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times

70. How many books during the average month do you read on political or social issues?
   a) 0  b) 1-2  c) 3-4  d) 5-6  e) 7 or more
Appendix F (cont'd)

71. How much time during the average day do you spend reading material, the bulk of which includes news, comment, or factual information on political or social issues?
   a) less than 15 min. b) 15-30 min. c) 30 min-1 hr. d) 1-2 hr. e) more than 2 hr.

72. How many times during the average month do you attend meetings which have as their focus political or social issues?
   a) 0 times b) 1-2 times c) 3-4 times d) 5-6 times e) 7 or more times

73. How many times in an average month do you go to hear scheduled speakers talking about political or social issues?
   a) 0 times b) 1-2 times c) 3-4 times d) 5-6 times e) 7 or more times

Imagine yourself as having been free from all financial, social, academic, etc., responsibilities or any other commitments on your time during the past three years. Answer the following questions in terms of what you would have liked to have done if that were the case.

74. How many times in the last three years would you have liked to have organized a group to support or protest a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times b) 1-2 times c) 3-4 times d) 5-6 times e) 7 or more times

75. How many times in the last three years would you have liked to have led, or directly assisted in leading, an already organized group supporting or protesting a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times b) 1-2 times c) 3-4 times d) 5-6 times e) 7 or more times

76. How many times in the last three years would you have liked to have participated in a group supporting or protesting a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times b) 1-2 times c) 3-4 times d) 5-6 times e) 7 or more times
Appendix F (cont'd)

77. How many times in the last three years would you have liked to have engaged in an extended argument with anyone over a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times

78. How many times in the last three years would you have liked to have addressed a formal audience (i.e., been a scheduled speaker) concerning a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times

79. Approximately how much time during the average day would you like to spend convincing others to support or protest political or social issues?
   a) less than 15 min.  b) 15-30 min.  c) 30 min-1 hr.  d) 1-2 hr.  e) more than 2 hr.

80. Approximately how much time during the average day would you like to spend discussing political or social issues?
   a) less than 15 min.  b) 15-30 min.  c) 30 min-1 hr.  d) 1-2 hr.  e) more than 2 hr.

81. How many times during the past three years would you have liked to have written something (pamphlet, handout, etc.) designed specifically to either inform or convince other people concerning a political or social issue?
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times

82. How many books during the average month would you have liked to have read on political or social issues?
   a) 0  b) 1-2  c) 3-4  d) 5-6  e) 7 or more

83. How much time during the average day would you like to spend reading material, the bulk of which includes news, comment, or factual information on political or social issues?
   a) less than 15 min.  b) 15-30 min.  c) 30 min-1 hr.  d) 1-2 hr.  e) more than 2 hr.
Appendix F (cont'd)

84. How many times during the average month would you like to attend meetings which have as their focus political or social issues?  
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times

85. How many times in the average month would you like to go to hear a scheduled speaker talking about political or social issues?  
   a) 0 times  b) 1-2 times  c) 3-4 times  d) 5-6 times  e) 7 or more times