For shame! The effect of community cooperative context on the probability of voting

Knack, Stephen and Kropf, Martha

World Bank

1998

For Shame!
The Effect of Community Cooperative Context on the Probability of Voting

by
Stephen Knack* and Martha E. Kropf**

American University
School of Public Affairs
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Submitted to *Political Psychology*, April 1998

*Assistant Professor, School of Public Affairs, American University, 4400 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington DC 20016 (knack@american.edu)

**Doctoral candidate, Department of Government, American University (mk7169@american.edu)

1. Introduction

The question of why some people vote in American national elections and others do not has been the focus of a vast literature in social science. Numerous empirical regularities have been established, such that we now know "who votes" and who doesn't, in the sense that various demographic characteristics -- most notably education -- are strongly correlated with turnout (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980; Teixeira 1987, 1992). A consensus on "why", in the form of theories and evidence on the motives of individuals, has been slower to emerge. This study builds on previous work emphasizing the political relevance of civic norms prescribing social cooperation. In this analysis, we use a county-level variable -- mail-in census response rates -- to measure the strength of civic norms in counties represented in the 1992 American National Election Study (NES), finding that the likelihood of one's voting increases with the county's census response rate, controlling for the usual set of factors associated with turnout. We explore one information source by which people may learn about community expectations, the newspaper.

2. Theory and Previous Literature

One approach to the question of why some people vote, and others don't, has been to interpret education, income and other correlates of voting as "resources" that facilitate political participation in general (Verba et al. 1995). However, the resources approach provides at best an incomplete account of motivation: why is voting an advantageous way of expending

resources?[1] Moreover, the primary "resource" necessary for voting is time, and it is debatable whether less-educated and lower-income citizens have less "free" time than others.[2]

Rational choice approaches to turnout provide a motivational framework, analyzing the "costs" and "benefits" of voting, and predicting that individuals will decide to vote when the expected net benefits are positive (Downs 1957). Numerous studies demonstrating how turnout declines when various costs to registering and voting are higher are consistent with this approach (e.g., see Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980; Teixeira, 1992). The rational choice literature on turnout is much less successful in identifying benefits sufficient to explain turnout. The most well-known product of this approach, in fact, is the so-called "paradox of turnout," the prediction -- clearly at odds with reality -- that rational, self-interested individuals will rarely vote (Mueller 1989). To improve its predictive power, it is necessary to relax at least one of the two basic assumptions of the rational choice approach, rationality and narrow self-interest.

Mueller (1989) explains why people vote by relaxing the rationality assumption, arguing that many people are psychologically conditioned to regard voting as a civic duty which they reflexively engage in each election, without regard to costs and benefits. Alternatively, one may relax the assumption that citizens are narrowly self-interested; this is the approach adopted here.

---

[1]See Uhlaner (1986) for a fuller development of this criticism.

[2]The unemployed arguably have the most free time, but few of the unemployed vote.

Following Coleman (1990), we expand the rational choice approach to incorporate the "costs" of violating cooperative norms, and the "benefits" of conforming to them. Actions such as voting are public goods. Because no one can be excluded from the benefits of voting[3] and any one vote has only the most minuscule impact, there may be an incentive to "free ride" and abstain when voting entails any costs in time or inconvenience. When only narrow self-interest is considered, voting thus represents a classic collective action problem: utility-maximizing behavior on the part of each individual leads to suboptimal outcomes for the group (Olson 1965). Yet, we observe upwards of one hundred million Americans vote in national elections. While this observation violates Olson's logic of collective action, it is consistent with normative expectations. Surveys indicate that the overwhelming majority of Americans recognize that voting in national elections is one's "civic duty" (Knack, 1992a, pp. 136-7).

We examine the hypothesis that voting is determined in part by the strength of civic norms that limit free riding in collective action settings (or, equivalently, "defections" in prisoner's dilemma settings). Norms are "expectations about action--one's own action, that of others, or both--which express what action is right or what action is wrong" (Coleman 1987: 135). We define "civic" norms more specifically as norms governing the choice to cooperate, when larger numbers of cooperators lead to more socially efficient outcomes.

In this framework, voting can be viewed as simply a particular manifestation of socially-interested behavior. Evidence for this view is provided by Knack (1992b), who showed that voters are more likely than nonvoters to donate time or money to charitable causes, to

[3]At the level of a party or interest group, the public good is the election of one's favored candidate; at the level of the nation as a whole, it is often argued that higher turnout rates increase the legitimacy of democratic rule (e.g., Downs 1957).

willingly serve on juries, and to work on community problems. Political scientists naturally tend to view turnout decisions as political behavior motivated by political influences, such as the content and character of campaigns, and attitudes toward government and politicians. Interpreting turnout as a special case of socially cooperative behavior implies that sociological, psychological, and other explanations of turnout may be as or more productive than narrowly political approaches. Norms may be enforced internally (e.g., guilt) or externally by a person's social network (e.g., shame, ostracism, or approval). Individuals often internalize cooperative norms; even when they do not, behavior may still be influenced by norms, if others apply sanctions for conforming with (or violating) norms. The social enforcement of norms will be more effective in influencing one's behavior when one engages in repeated social interactions with those whose opinion one values, such as family, friends, neighbors and other community members (Coleman 1990). Informal social interaction is one way that information about prevailing norms is spread. One can also acquire knowledge about social expectations through more formal or organized mechanisms, such as local newspapers.

Following Coleman (1990), scholars have argued that social networks provide an enforcement mechanism to encourage participation. Knack (1992a) provides empirical evidence that interpersonal pressures enforcing norms of civic duty play a role in decisions about whether to vote. Rosenstone and Hansen (1993) argue that social networks are a key source of the costs and benefits of participation, as communities or social networks can bestow praise or esteem to those who cooperate, and shun or take note of those who do not. Neither of these two analyses employ contextual measures of the strength of cooperative norms in one's community, as we do in the current study.

More recently, the concept of "social capital" has been applied to the study of political participation (Putnam 1995a, 1995b). "Social capital" includes "features of social life --networks, norms, and trust -- that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives" (Putnam 1995a: 664-665; also see Putnam 1993). However, belonging to a group or social network does not necessarily increase one's likelihood of cooperating in social settings unrelated to the purposes of the group or social network itself. For example, the expectations of the social group could conceivably be that members should not vote or give to charity, etc. Accordingly, one's social context -- the beliefs, attitudes, and expectations of people who share one's social space-- should influence the likelihood of contributing to the resolution of collective action problems, for example voting in elections.

Coleman (1990) emphasizes the theoretical importance of context in arguing that norms are a macro-level construct, based on purposive actions at the micro level. Thus, understanding community-level normative behavior is a key to understanding individual behavior. In fact, several political scientists have argued that both individual and community factors affect political attitudes and participation of the individual (Beck et al. 1996; Huckfeldt and Sprague 1995; Kenny 1993; Leighley 1990; MacKuen and Brown 1987; Giles and Dantico 1982; Huckfeldt 1979; Putnam 1966). Huckfeldt (1979) used census tract level data to analyze how "status" (e.g., white collar vs. blue collar neighborhoods) affects the propensity to vote in Buffalo, New York. He argues that the activities which require the most interaction are the ones which are determined by context, such as campaign activities and cooperative activities (joining a group). Giles and Dantico (1982) merge NES data with census tract data on income, education and white collar employment, and verify, to some extent, Huckfeldt's results. None of these studies have

considered the level of civic cooperation in a community as determinants of the behavior of an individual, measured at either the census tract level or the county level. This study brings together the contextual methodology of that literature with social norms of cooperation and rational choice theory.

3. Data and Methodology

Individual-level data on voting participation and demographics are drawn from the 1992 NES. The 1992 election is chosen because it was the first presidential election that occurred following the 1990 decennial census, from which we obtained our indicator of the strength of cooperative norms at the community level: the mail-in census response rate, measured at the county level.[4] Households were asked to mail in their 1990 census forms by April 1, 1990. The Census Bureau calculated mail-in response rates by county as of April 28, 1990, shortly before field enumeration efforts began. Mail-in response rates were used by the Census Bureau "to measure the level of cooperation with the census" (Thompson, 1991). Mailing in the census form saves one's fellow taxpayers the costs of expensive enumeration efforts; the lower-than-anticipated mail-in response for the 1990 census necessitated the hiring of far more enumerators than originally planned by the Census Bureau. Mailing in the census form can thus be viewed as a public good for all Americans. Cooperating with the census can also be viewed as a "public good" at the level of states and local communities. A brochure accompanying the

[4]Census response rates are not available at more localized levels, such as census tracts, which would more closely approximate neighborhoods, which for some citizens may be the most relevant “community”. Any measurement error associated with an overly high level of aggregation will tend to make it more difficult to detect significant relationships between census

census form mailed to households noted that participation with the census would "help make sure your community gets its fair share of federal and state funding" and that census counts "are used to decide how many members of Congress your state sends" to Washington (Thompson 1991). In a national survey on "good citizenship" issues conducted by USA Today in 1990, 71.6% of respondents cited responding to the census as a characteristic of good citizenship.

The Survey of Census Participation, a nationwide survey conducted for the Census Bureau by the National Opinion Research Center, provides additional support for using census response as a proxy for the strength of cooperative norms. Overwhelming majorities agreed that:

> "Census information is used to help all of the people of the United States" (81.6%);
> "The Census is very important to the country" (95.4%);
> "Filling out the census form is a patriotic thing to do" (90.0%);
> "It's in everyone's best interest to cooperate with the census" (95.0%); and
> "The Census helps people in my community" (86.8%).[5]

---

response and other variables of interest.

[5]These figures were graciously provided by Mick Couper. For further discussion and evidence on census response as a reflection of a sense of civic obligation, see Couper et al. (1998).

If county-level census response is a valid measure of cooperative norms in communities, we would expect residents of counties with high census response rates to believe that one's fellow citizens tend to act cooperatively. In Table 1, we investigate this issue. Equations 1 and 2 present results from two logit regressions, in which the dependent variables are alternative measures of interpersonal trust. In equation 1, the dependent variable assigns respondents to one of two categories, those who believe that "most of the time people try to be helpful" (coded 1) and those who believe people are "mostly just looking out for themselves" (coded 0). Similarly, equation 2 analyzes the tendency to agree with the statement that "most people can be trusted" (coded 1) as opposed to believing that "you can't be too careful in dealing with people" (coded 0). In examining the influence of county-level census response, we control for other important influences on trust such as education, age, and income.[6]

[6]See Knack and Keefer (1997) for a country-level analysis showing that education and income are positively correlated to trust.

Results show that respondents residing in counties with higher mail-in census response rates are significantly more likely to believe that their fellow citizens tend to act cooperatively rather than selfishly. The logit coefficients for census response indicates that a one percentage-point rise in the likelihood of trusting others is produced by an increase of about 3 or 4 percentage points in census response rates, on average.[7] These are sizeable effects. A one standard deviation increase in county-level census response -- 8.6 percentage points[8] -- increases the likelihood of trusting by about 2 or 3 percentage points on average, compared to an impact of about 3 percentage points on average for each additional year of education. In addition to education's effects, increases in age and income are associated with higher trust. Longer residence in a community is associated with lower trust[9], while regular church attendance has no effect.

In addition to influencing attitudes about the cooperative dispositions of one's fellow citizens, community census response rates could affect cooperative behaviors. If others in the

---

[7]In logit models, the impact of any independent variable on the dependent variable depends on the value of the other independent variables. A mean impact over the NES sample for a 1-unit increase in an independent variable can be calculated as the sample mean of the expression:

$$[P - P^*]_i = 1/[1 + \exp(-BX_i)] - 1/[1 + \exp(-BX_i^*)]$$

where P and P* are predicted probabilities of trusting others, and BX_i and BX_i^* equal the sum of the actual values of the independent variables for each respondent multiplied by the respective coefficient estimates, with the independent variable of interest (e.g. census response) set equal to a value 1 unit greater in calculating P than in calculating P*.

[8]Census response is distributed fairly uniformly within our sample between values of 47.7% and 83.1%. Only one county, at 24.5%, with 9 NES respondents, lies outside this range.

[9]This result does not necessarily imply that newer residents would trust their neighbors more, but they may trust strangers ("most people") more if long-term residence in a community gives one a more parochial view.

community are doing the right thing, as exhibited by high census response rates, one may feel a strengthened sense of civic obligation oneself, and act on it. Accordingly, we created an index of "social altruism," representing the number of socially cooperative activities one engages in, from a list of four, including volunteer work, charitable giving, working on a community problem, and willingness to serve on a jury. This scale is the dependent variable in equation 3 of Table 1. Census response is positively, but not significantly, related to the social altruism index.[10]

4. The Effects of Context on Voting

Table 2 presents the results of logit regressions analyzing the relationship between county-level census response and (self-reported) turnout, controlling for other factors standard in the turnout literature, such as education, income, age, and election law and election calendar variables (survey questions and codings of variables used can be found in the Appendix). Equation 1 shows that county-level census response rate has a statistically significant effect on the probability of voting. Each increase of 5 percentage points in census response corresponds to an increase in the likelihood of voting of about 1 percentage point, on average. Each standard deviation increase in census response (8.6 percentage points) increases the probability of voting by nearly two percentage points.

The relationship between turnout and other independent variables is consistent with the findings of other researchers. Education, age, income, and longer-term residence are positively

[10]Results are similar using multinomial logit. If income is omitted as a control variable in equation 3, the relationship becomes borderline significant (p=.05); if education is also omitted, the relationship becomes highly significant.

and significantly correlated with voting. Respondents who care more about the outcome of the presidential election, or who read newspapers more often, or who live in election-day registration states, vote at higher rates. Other variables (Senate or gubernatorial contests on the state's ballot, motor voter, expectation of a close presidential contest, church attendance) all exhibit the expected positive signs but are not significant at conventional levels.

Equation 2 explores the possibility that our contextual measure of cooperation influences turnout through its effects on individuals' sense of civic obligation or interpersonal trust. The social altruism index is included as an independent variable, as is a simple additive index of the two interpersonal trust items described above.

Both of these indexes are strongly related to voting, as shown in Knack (1992b). Each one-point rise in the altruism index is associated with an increase in the likelihood of voting of about 4 percentage points on average, larger than the effect of an additional year of education. Table 1 showed that county-level census response is positively related to trust and (more weakly) social altruism. As trust and altruism are in turn related to voting, one could argue that county-level census response increases turnout at least in part through increasing individuals' sense of civic obligation.

This argument would imply, however, that any independent effects of census response, controlling for trust and altruism, should be smaller than in equation 1. With the addition of these individual-level measures in equation 2, the coefficient on county-level census response is no longer significant at the .05 level for a two-tailed test ($p = .054$). However, the magnitude of the coefficient drops only slightly. While it is possible that a more complete and less

crudely-measured set of trust and altruism indicators could "explain away" more of the impact of census response, we must acknowledge that we have little direct indication that county-level census response influences turnout through affecting attitudes about cooperation.

If responding to the census and voting are both viewed as forms of political participation, one might think that county-level census response is not only acting as a proxy for the strength of civic norms but is also capturing the effects of *any* omitted variables related to political participation. However, the costs of voting and the costs of responding to the census have little in common. Location-specific variables omitted from our models that likely would help explain turnout include distance from the polls, election-day weather, other local differences in the convenience of registering and of voting, and variation in the excitement and importance of state and local contests. These variables as well as individual-level influences such as attitudes toward government and politicians, and interest in politics and public affairs, are unlikely to be correlated with county-level census response. Census response in turn has its own idiosyncratic determinants, such as concerns about confidentiality, mail-handling habits, and mail-delivery problems (Couper et al., 1998). Even trust-in-government influences cannot account for the census response-voting correlation, as cynicism about politicians and government does not predict census response (Couper et al., 1998), and is not strongly or consistently related to turnout (Knack, 1992a). What census response and turnout do have in common is that a major benefit of each is avoiding the guilt, shame, or social sanctions accompanying noncompliance; this relation is precisely our rationale for employing county-level census response as a measure of the strength of cooperative norms to which citizens are subject.

The omitted-variables argument for the census response-turnout relationship also fails to

account for a result we present in the next section. There we show that census response influences turnout more for respondents with more information on community expectations.

5. How Might Community Expectations Be Communicated?

The previous section provides some evidence that community context matters when one is making the decision to vote. An interesting issue is that of how people come to understand community expectations: how does one learn about how cooperative others are, and others' expectations regarding one's cooperative behavior? One possible link is that newspapers may communicate civic norms of cooperation. Indeed, political behavior scholars have found that newspaper reading is correlated with voting (Teixeira 1992), but they lack a theoretical explanation of how newspaper reading might cause people to vote.

A look at even just a few newspapers the day before election day provides casual support for this contention. On the day before the November 4, 1996 election, an *Asheville (NC) Citizen-Times* editorial declared: "The right to select our leaders makes all the other privileges we enjoy possible. It is a right we ought to cherish above all, and just as important, to use it responsibly. Taking the few minutes it will require Tuesday to go to our precinct polling places and vote is without question one of the most important things we will do over the next four years." In Indianapolis, the local paper's editorial had a similar theme: "The only way that democracy can prevail...is for the citizenry to be involved in the electoral process. Going to the voting booth and casting a ballot is the most fundamental way to express that involvement." "For shame!" another editorial admonished citizens not registered to vote in the town of Neptune, NJ.

For many, the newspaper is an important source of political information (Mondak 1995);

it may also be a source of information concerning social expectations and norms. These social expectations may go beyond the marriage column and the gossip columns, and extend to one's role as a "good citizen." As the violation of norms of "society" may be enforced through gossip that people read in local papers, norms may be enforced through gossip, for example, about young people today being too lazy to do their duties as citizens and vote.

Through reading articles about crime, civic activities, voting rates, tax compliance, driving behavior, and even census response rates, readers can learn about levels of social cooperation in their communities, and adjust their views of their own appropriate contributions toward the civic welfare accordingly. For people with relatively little information about others' levels of cooperation or expectations, behavior should be less sensitive to the behavior and expectations of others. This argument suggests that in our model the impact of county-level census response on an individual's likelihood of voting should vary positively with the frequency of his or her newspaper reading.

To test this hypothesis, equation 3 of Table 2 adds an interactive term equal to the product of newspaper reading (number of days per week) and county-level census response. The slope of this interaction term is positive and significant, indicating that the relationship between census response and voting is significantly greater among respondents who read newspapers more often.

From equation 1, we calculated the effect of a one standard deviation increase in census response (about 8.6 percentage points) on the probability of voting, averaged over the full sample, at about 1.8 percentage points. For respondents who do not read daily newspapers at all, this average effect drops to less than one-tenth of a percentage point. For those reading newspapers seven

days a week, the impact rises to 3.4 percentage points.[11]

These results suggest that newspaper reading may be more important in the voting decision than simply as a measure of "political connectedness" (Teixeira 1992) or as an indicator of political participation in and of itself (Abramson et al. 1990). Newspaper reading may also transmit community expectations to individuals regarding appropriate levels of social cooperation. We investigated several other possible sources of information regarding community expectations, with less success. The impact of county-level census response did not vary significantly with the number of days per week that respondents watched TV news, the years a person has lived in a community, a home ownership dummy, or with the degree of interaction with neighbors.

6. Conclusion

While other studies have shown that context matters in voting behavior, this study is the first study that we know of to show that the social context of a community -- as proxied by county-level census response -- influences whether an individual will choose to vote. This study also shows that the incidence of one's cooperative behavior in other arenas -- such as giving to charities, or willingly serving on juries -- is also correlated with the probability of voting, providing further support for the importance of cooperative norms in explaining political participation, consistent with the arguments and findings of Knack (1992a, 1992b).

Norms are only one form of social capital, according to Coleman (1990: 304): "social

[11] In the NES sample, 910 claimed to read newspapers seven days a week, 566 more did not read a paper at all, while 836 more cited anywhere between one and six days per week.

organization constitutes social capital, facilitating the achievement of goals that could not be achieved in its absence or could not be achieved only at a higher cost". The resources inherent in social capital lie in the relationships between and among individuals, and the ability of individuals to monitor each others' behavior. Social capital is made up of three components: obligations and expectations (norms), information potential (ability to obtain information from others about current events and/or community expectations), and social organization (including, but not limited to group membership). Coleman (1990) notes that an especially important form of social capital is the prescriptive norms which dictates that individuals should forego their self interest to act in the interests of society. If social relations do not include expectations about collective action, social capital may do little to solve collective action problems. However, norms depend on other forms of social capital for communication.

In this case, the evidence is suggestive that newspapers are one form of information for the communication of social expectations. In addition to providing information about issues and candidates, newspapers also provide information about how "good citizens" act, and about the extent to which other community residents are in fact behaving as good citizens, with consequences for turnout and other socially cooperative behaviors.

Finally, this research provides further support for the inclusion of "community norms" in rational choice theory. While methodological individualism provides important deductive theory to a point, it fails to account for empirically observed behaviors, such as contributing to public broadcasting or voting in elections. It is clear that the individual will consider more than individual factors in any cost-benefit calculus. He or she will also consider expectations of others, and those expectations become an integral part of the individual's analysis of the costs and

benefits of participation.

APPENDIX
Coding of Variables (variable number from 1992 NES in parentheses)

Vote: (#5601) Voted in November 1992 election: coded 1=yes; 0=no.

Census Response Rates (by county): Percentage of census forms returned by mail by April 28, 1990, by county of residence (source: Census Bureau).

Voter Turnout (by county): Turnout as a percentage of the voting age population (source: Election Research Service).

Others Helpful: (#6140) "Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?" Coded: 1=try to be helpful; 0=just looking out for themselves.

Trust in People: (#6139) :"Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?" Coded: 1=most people can be trusted; 0=can't be too careful.

Community Problem: (#6144) "In the last twelve months, have you worked with others or joined an organization in your community to do something about some community problem?" Coded: 1=yes; 0=no.

Charity: (#6145) "How about you, were you able to contribute any money to church or charity in the last twelve months?" Coded: 1=yes; 0=no.

Jury: (#6143) "If you were selected to serve on a jury, would you be happy to do it or would you rather not serve?" Coded: 1=happy; 0=rather not serve.

Volunteer: (#6138) "Many people say they have less time these days to do volunteer work. What about you, were you able to devote any time to volunteer work in the last 12 months?" Coded: 1=yes; 0=no.

(An additive index of "social altruism" was constructed from the immediately preceding four dichotomous variables.)

Newspaper: (#3203) "How many days in the past week did you read a daily newspaper?" Coded 0-7 days.

New resident: (#4130) "How long have your lived in your present (city/town/township/county)? Coded 1=less than one year; 0=otherwise.

Family income: (#4104) The log of the midpoint of each interval is computed.

Age: (#3903) Log of age in years**.**

Years of education: (#3905)

Close: (#3103) "Do you think the Presidential race will be close, or will one candidate win by quite a bit?" Coded 1=yes; 0=no.

Care: (#3106) "Generally speaking, would you say that you personally care a good deal who wins the presidential election this fall, or that you don't care very much who wins?" Coded 1=care a good deal; 0=don't care very much.

Attend church: (#3826) "...do you ever attend religious services, apart from occasional weddings, baptisms or funerals?" Coded 1=yes; 0=no.

Senate Race: Coded 1 if the state in which the respondent resided had a Senate race in 1992; 0 otherwise

Governor's Race: Coded 1 if the state in which the respondent resided had a Governor's race in 1992; 0 otherwise

Motor Voter Registration: Coded 1 if the state in which the respondent resided had a "motor voter" program in 1992 similar to that later required by the NVRA; 0 otherwise.

Election Day Registration: Coded 1 if the state in which the respondent resided had election day registration in 1992; 0 otherwise.

References

Abramson, P. R., J. H. Aldrich and D. W. Rohde (1990). *Change and Continuity in the 1988 Elections*. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press.

"An Exercise in Democracy." *The Indianapolis News*. November 4, 1996: A6.

Beck, P. A., R. J. Dalton, R. Huckfeldt and S. Nichols (1996). Political Intermediation in Neighborhood Contexts. Paper presented at the 1996 Midwest Political Science Meetings, April 18-20, 1996, Chicago, IL.

Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1987). Norms as Social Capital. In G. Radnitzky and P. Bernholz, eds. *Economic Imperialism: The Economic Method Applied Outside the Field of Economics*. New York: Paragon House Publishers.

Downs, A. (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.

Giles, M. and M. K. Dantico (1982). Political Participation and Neighborhood Social Context Revisited. *American Journal of Political Science* 26: 144-150.

"High Turnout for Elections Carries Benefits." *Asheville Citizen-Times*. November 4, 1996: A6.

Huckfeldt, R. (1979). Political Participation in the Neighborhood Social Context. *American Journal of Political Science*." 23: 579-592.

Huckfeldt, R. and J. R. Sprague (1995). *Citizens, Politics and Social Communication: Information and Influence in an Election Campaign*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kenney, C. (1993). The Microenvironment of Political Participation. *American Politics Quarterly* 21: 223-238.

Knack, S. (1992a). Civic Norms, Social Sanction and Voter Turnout. *Rationality and Society* 4: 133-156.

Knack, S. (1992b). Social Altruism and Voter Turnout: Evidence From the 1991 NES Pilot Study. National Election Studies Working Paper.

Knack, S. And P. Keefer (1997). Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-National Investigation. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 112: 1251-88.

Leighley, J. E. (1990). Social Interaction and Contextual Influences on Political Participation. *American Politics Quarterly* 18: 459-475.

MacKuen, M. and C. Brown (1987). Political Context and Attitude Change. *American Political Science Review* 81: 471-490.

Mondak, J. J. (1995). *Nothing to Read: Newspapers and Elections in a Social Experiment*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Mueller, D. C. (1989). *Public Choice II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1995a). Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28: 664-683.

Putnam, R. D. (1995b). Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6: 65-78.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1966). Political Attitudes and the Local Community. *American Political Science Review* 60: 640-654.

Rosenstone, S. J. and J. M. Hansen (1993). *Mobilization, Participation and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan.

Teixeira, R. A. (1992). *The Disappearing American Voter*. Washington: Brookings.

Teixeira, R. A. (1987). *Why Americans Don't Vote: Turnout Decline in the United States, 1960-1984.* Westport CT: Greenwood Press.

Thompson, J. H. (1991). Definition and Clarification of Mail Return Rates for the 1990 Decennial Census." Census Bureau memorandum, July 2 1991.

Uhlaner, C. J. (1986). Political Participation, Rational Actors and Rationality: A New Approach. *Political Psychology* 7: 551-573.

USA Counties (1994). CD-ROM. Washington, DC: Census Bureau.

Verba, S., K. L. Schlozman, and H. E. Brady (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in*

American Politics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
"Why People Don't Vote and Why Their Reasons Don't Stand Scrutiny." *Asbury Park Press* (Neptune, NJ). November 4, 1996: A18.

Wolfinger, R. E. and S. J. Rosenstone (1980). *Who Votes?* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Table 1: Regression Analyses, 1992 NES Data

	coefficient (standard error)		
equation	1	2	3
dependent variable	most people are helpful	most people can be trusted	social altruism index
method	logit	logit	OLS
intercept	-8.344 (0.765)	-9.044 (0.787)	-13.847 (1.091)
years of education	0.140** (0.020)	0.178**(0.021)	0.258**(0.029)
log of age	0.916** (0.128)	0.840**(0.129)	1.162**(0.176)
log of household income	0.289** (0.056)	0.279**(0.058)	0.418**(0.071)
log of years in current city/town	-0.088* (0.039)	0.077* (0.039)	0.124* (0.052)
attend church regularly	0.019 (0.099)	-0.042 (0.098)	0.242 (0.130)
county-level census response rate	1.256* (0.536)	1.244* (0.536)	1.929* (0.793)
likelihood ratio index/R^2	0.068	0.077	0.188
N	2120	2134	2121
mean, dependent variable	0.592	0.456	1.94
proportion of cases correctly predicted/ standard error	0.658	0.623	---

* indicates $p < .05$, 2-tailed test; ** indicates $p < .01$

Table 2: Logit Regression Analysis, 1992 NES Data
Dependent variable: Voted (self-reported)

	logit coefficient (standard error)		
equation	1	2	3
intercept	-13.559 (1.079)	-12.472 (1.119)	-13.847 (1.091)
years of education	0.256** (0.029)	0.213**(0.030)	0.258**(0.029)
log of age	1.159** (0.176)	1.043**(0.180)	1.162**(0.176)
log of household income	0.416** (0.071)	0.357**(0.073)	0.418**(0.071)
log of years in current city/town	0.124* (0.052)	0.121* (0.053)	0.124* (0.052)
attend church regularly	0.241 (0.130)	0.115 (0.135)	0.242 (0.130)
care about presidential outcome	1.359** (0.136)	1.287**(0.139)	1.369**(0.137)
expect close presidential race	0.217 (0.157)	0.188 (0.159)	0.227 (0.157)
Senate race on state ballot	0.117 (0.140)	0.104 (0.142)	0.133 (0.140)
Governor's race on state ballot	0.091 (0.241)	0.082 (0.245)	0.086 (0.242)
motor voter registration	0.198 (0.176)	0.223 (0.178)	0.207 (0.177)
election-day registration	0.898* (0.432)	0.794 (0.437)	0.887* (0.433)
number days in week read newspaper	0.076** (0.023)	0.066**(0.023)	0.081**(0.023)
county-level census response rate	1.640* (0.791)	1.565 (0.812)	1.929* (0.793)
census response*newspaper reading			0.493* (0.245)
trust index		0.159 (0.082)	
social altruism index		0.325 (0.065)	
likelihood ratio	0.232	0.249	0.234

index (pseudo-R^2)			
N	1922	1891	1922
mean, dependent variable	0.768	0.767	0.768
proportion of cases correctly predicted	0.810	0.816	0.809

* indicates $p < .05$, 2-tailed test; ** indicates $p < .01$