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ABSTRACT

The basic assumptions of this study are that individual contributors to campaigns are motivated by a desire to enhance their self-esteem through access, acquired through giving, and that large givers exhibit behavior that indicates a greater desire for access. Large givers exhibit such behavior to a significantly greater extent than moderate or small givers, and seek "status" by giving for other than politically-explicit reasons.

It is hypothesized that:

I. All contributors have a greater sense of political efficacy and greater trust in government than the general public.

II. Individuals contribute as a result of conventional, acceptable motives, which are:

(1) Patriotism
(2) Ideology
(3) Efficacy
(4) Government Trust
(5) Party Identification/Partisanship
(6) Issue Orientation

There are statistically significant, positive relationships between the above conventional reasons for giving, and:

(a) The amount of contribution;
(b) The number of contributions;
(c) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.
III. There is a significant, positive relationship between a contributor's need to seek status (enhancement of self-esteem) and:

(1) The amount of contribution;
(2) The number of contributions;
(3) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.

IV. There is a significant, positive relationship between contributors who desire access and:

(1) The amount of contribution;
(2) The number of contributions;
(3) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.

A questionnaire containing 56 questions was mailed to a random sample of 2,700 contributors to the 1988 United States Senate races in nine states, representing the nine census regions of the country. By using five variables, a "representative" state was selected.

The data revealed that access is important to substantially all givers, but more important to large givers and those who contribute more frequently to more candidates, and certain attitudinal and behavioral indicators point to manifestations of the need for access to enhance the giver's self-esteem and status. Status is also important to the same group.
I.

INTRODUCTION

In the 1977-78 United States Senate races, winning candidates raised $43,000,000 to finance their campaigns. In 1987 and 1988, winning candidates raised $121,700,000 (Federal Election Commission Report 1989). In ten years, winning candidates for the United States Senate have increased the sum raised by that group over 355 percent. It is estimated that since January 1, 1989, 32 Senators who will run again in 1990 have raised cash at the rate of $145,000 per day (Kilpatrick 1989). It is further estimated that the "contributing elite" make up only 10 to 12 percent of the electorate (Campaign Practice Reports 1989).

Contributors use a variety of means or vehicles to part with their money, such as federal income tax checkoff, state income tax checkoff, giving to a candidate organization, giving to a party organization, giving to a political action committee, giving to a ballot issue committee, or giving to other groups supporting or opposing candidates (Campaign Practice Reports 1989). This group of "contributing elites" seems to own a bottomless well. They give and they give and they give and they give.--Why?

Money has always been a prerequisite to effective campaigning. No one argues credibly that money is not the prime prerequisite for an effective campaign. As Tip
O'Neill once said, "As it is now, there are four parts to any campaign. The candidate, the issues of the candidate, the campaign organization, and the money with which to run the campaign. Without money you can forget the other three" (Breslin 1975, 14). A candidate must have money to communicate to hundreds of thousands and even millions of people.

Two major traditions of belief, capitalism and democracy, have dominated the life of this nation. The two traditions of capitalism and democracy share many values, but there is, and has been, a continuing clash throughout our history between these two concepts. Contributing to candidates, although recognized as a participatory manifestation (Jacobson 1980), is an area that has not been explored in this traditional conflict. Contributing has been recognized as a rather aggressive participatory activity by Milbrath (1965) as being a part of the manifestation of participation for "gladiators", those participators who are not only involved in politics but literally become active in many ways: "Most contributions, however, come from gladiators themselves." (Milbrath 1965, 24).

Several questions may be posed: Why should there be a distinction between those who are financially able to contribute and those who are not financially able to contribute? Should participation in the democratic process
be less difficult for those with money than for those without money? Does, in fact, the ability to contribute dollars to candidates add emphasis to the reward system that capitalism stresses? Is contributing to candidates merely another function of the free market that capitalism holds is the most efficient and fairest mechanism for distributing goods and services? Herbert McCloskey and John Zaller in *The American Ethos* hold that the nation has violated almost every principle of its democratic tradition and concern themselves with what they call the "vital role played by opinion elites in articulating and promoting values of the ethos." (1984, 8).

Is the ability to contribute more money, or any money at all for that matter, to political candidates merely another description of those opinion elites who show a more intense and continuing concern for the affairs of the larger community and, therefore, exert a disproportional influence on the operation of the system? Is this ability to contribute and the results of contributing, which are discussed in this dissertation, another "unregulated market" or a "regulated market" that has become costly to the economy and has created an adverse effect on the general welfare of the country? Or is the whole mechanism of contributing to candidates another expression of freedom and the further manifestation on the part of political elites to guide American political policies and practices? It may be argued that there is no equality between political elites
[who are defined for the purposes of this dissertation as "the most influential actors with the greatest access to political resources..." (Dahl 1982, 37)]¹, or "contributing elites" as this group is referred to in this dissertation, and the majority of the electorate who either do not choose to participate in this fashion or are unable to participate in this fashion.

The effects of, and motives for giving should also be included in the study of participation, or decline thereof, in elections. Paul Abramson (1983) in his 1982 study concluded that the decline in presidential turnout is largely explained from the impact of two attitudinal trends, weakening of party identification and declining beliefs about government responsiveness. The research presented in this dissertation and prior survey studies lend weight to the proposition that those who give more trust government, and all contributors are efficacious.² In this context, one might ask, what's so bad about large political contributions? Could these larger contributions merely be another aspect of feelings of government trust and political efficacy, and merely another method of participatory activity that should not be frowned upon?

¹ A more extensive description or definition of "political elites" will be found in Milbrath's Political Participation, Second Edition (1977). Also, see Herson's The Politics of Ideas (1984, p. 245), wherein Herson discusses Thomas Dye who quotes Domhoff.
² In Section V of this dissertation, the reversal in the trend toward government trust, as shown by the National Election Study of 1988 is discussed.
Scholars have found that more education produces a bigger incentive to participate (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980). As this study and prior studies have shown, the contributing elites of this country are far better educated than the electorate as a whole. Is this why they contribute? An interesting result found in this study and prior studies, is the relatively high rate of turnout by these contributing elites. There is no decline in turnout among this group; no decline in participation.

Paul Sniderman (1975) asserts that the politically active and influential tend to have significantly higher self-esteem than does the average citizen. Carol Pateman (1970) concludes that low self-esteem tends to inhibit rather than encourage political involvement, yet low self-esteem does not preclude political involvement. Both of these authors concern themselves with the effect of self-esteem or lack thereof on participation. Milbrath and Goel also discuss "personality needs" and cite Maslow's theories of needs in relation to political participation, which includes self-esteem or ego-strength (1977, 83). Questions are raised in this study about the need for enhancement of self-esteem through giving. If, in fact, self-esteem is enhanced through giving, or at least a desire for increased self-esteem is manifested through giving, is giving clearly a participatory tool that should not, per se, be branded or

3 See Table 2-A.
labeled as "bad" or "good"? Just as participation by some may mean only a fulfillment of self-interest, e.g. an ability to obtain a political job, giving, although in some instances in self-interest only, is clearly a socially acceptable participatory vehicle.

What is the result of political giving, who participates in it, what do the participators expect from it, and how do they feel about it? These are issues that are central to this dissertation and will be investigated and discussed.

A great deal is known about where the money goes and how political action committees spend. The Federal Election Commission keeps accurate records about the income and expenditures of candidates for federal races. Watchdog organizations, such as Common Cause, review those numbers constantly. PACs proliferate. But the question that has escaped attention and investigation is, why do those individuals who contribute money, do so? What does "giving" really mean to those who give? Do contributors give to affect policy, as many political observers assume, or are there other reasons? Do contributors give out of patriotism, out of a feeling of loyalty to a candidate or party, because of an agreement with a candidate on a particular issue or issues, for access, for a combination of any of these, or for what may be termed politically nonexplicit reasons such as enhancing one's self-esteem? Is there a
significant difference in motivations for giving between large givers and small givers as defined herein? Do Republicans tend to contribute more than Democrats? How important is access to political contributors? Is access as important to small givers as to large givers? How do givers manifest their desire for access?

All of these questions will be investigated and discussed in various ways in this dissertation, and, as will be seen, there is a small body of existing literature which treats giving from other standpoints.
II.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Many scholars, including John M. Wright (1985), Michael J. Malbin (1984), Ruth S. Jones and Warren E. Miller (1985), and Marjorie Randon Hershey (1984), have investigated campaign giving, and, as a result, there is a small body of well-developed literature on the effects of contributions on particular campaigns, with an emphasis on PAC spending methods and on how PAC spending affects politics, politicians, and roll call voting. Significant contributions in this area have been made by such distinguished scholars as Malbin (1984), Jones and Miller (1985), Larry J. Sabato (1985), Benjamin Ginsberg (1984), Gary C. Jacobson (1980, 1984), James B. Kau and Paul H. Rubin (1982), and John Theilmann and Al Wilhite (1989).

These scholars, having specifically investigated campaign giving, are distinguished from those who have also made significant contributions to the understanding of the giving motivation or process. While not directly or specifically studying contributions, a group of scholars studied what may be broadly termed "the political personality." These authors include Kay Lehman Schlozman and John T. Tierney (1986), Herbert A. Simon (1985), Harold D. Lasswell (1948), Paul M. Sniderman (1975), Gordon W. Allport (1945 & 1950), Donn Byrne (1974), W. V. Silverberg (1952), and
Robert W. White (1961). The contributions of this latter group of scholars must be understood and reviewed in the context of the specific "contribution" studies of the other group.

Schlozman and Tierney understood organized interests, but they also understood that there are many reasons why individuals participate and showed an understanding of personal motives. As they put it, "It is axiomatic to our understanding of the political psychology of individuals that political men seek power, often for the other rewards on behalf of which it can be exercised, but sometimes for its own sake" (1986, 25). Simon added to this theory in explaining political behavior in the context of rational choice theory and the rational theory of cognitive psychology. Simon (1985) attempted to explain human behavior in political context and concluded that any analysis of the principal of rationality must be "accompanied by extensive empirical research to identify the correct auxiliary assumptions" (1985, 302), and unless that analysis is accompanied by that empirical research, it "has little power to make valid predictions about political phenomena" (p. 302). While not specifically studying campaign giving, Simon's conclusions point to a direction for future investigators which this dissertation follows. As Simon put it, "We need to understand not only how people reason about alternatives, but where the alternatives come from in the first place" (p. 302).
Among his conclusions, Simon pointed out, "Nothing is more fundamental in setting our research agenda and in forming our research methods than our view of the nature of the human beings whose behavior we are studying" (1985, 303).

The forerunner of this type of investigation was Harold Lasswell, who understood the motivations of those who enter politics. Lasswell understood the motivations of those who contribute money without specifically studying this group. Lasswell noted:

"Whatever the special form of political expression, the common trait of the political personality type is emphatic demand for deference. When such a motive is associated with skill and manipulation, and with timely circumstances, an effective politician is the result. The fully developed political type works out his destiny in the world of public objects in the name of public good. He displaces private motives on public objects in the name of collective advantage." (1951, 21)

In his work on the "political personality," Lasswell conceded that power can be wielded for worthy purposes by the strong and the good. Lasswell's conclusion forms a strong connecting link between all of the literature regarding psychological motivations of those who participate and the conclusions to be reached in this dissertation. As will be discussed, "the notion of a political type is that of a developmental type who passes through a distinctive career line in which the power opportunities of each
situation are selected in preference to other opportunities" (1948, 21). This description matches the profile of a special group of contributors to be described in this study. Lasswell's description of the political man was the forerunner of this special group, in that his political man: (1) accentuates power (gives more); (2) demands power for the self (access); (3) accentuates expectations concerning power (behavioral aspects); and (4) acquires at least a minimum proficiency in the skills of power (players).

Other contributions to the literature in this group of psychologically oriented writers, such as Allport, treated the effects of political participation on the self, or ego. Allport understood the enhancement of self-esteem in terms of participation. In an essay dealing with participation, he recognized that "The individual's desire for personal status is apparently insatiable" (Allport 1950, 147). Allport's essay focused upon problems of participation and "the task of obtaining from the common man participation in matters affecting his own destiny..." (p. 156).

Don Byrne (1974) put it simply by concluding that the aim of the ego is merely to obtain pleasure and to avoid pain. This is the "emphatic demand for deference" of which Harold Lasswell wrote (1951, 21). Wayne Guffey (1972) may well have described the "large giver" discussed in this dissertation when he noted that "self-esteem is the awareness of how close the individual is to the original
omnipotence" (p. 162). This concept of giving which was brought out by many of these writers, and so well put by Guffey, is the essence of the motivations for a large giver and predates Sniderman's views on self-esteem and the need for enhancement of self-esteem that is fulfilled by participation. Milbrath and Goel (1977) also understood this concept when they recognized that, "...political actives...usually have their impulse under control and clothe their motives with the garb of public interest." (p. 85).

The second group of scholars mentioned above took another step in the study of giving in general and, specifically, where the dollars go and why. Sabato (1985) discussed the recipients of PAC money and identified the obvious difference in the recipients of corporate PAC funds, labor PAC funds, and various trade PAC funds while analyzing the size of gifts by various PACs in the 1982 election cycle. His contribution is in the area of PAC motivation for giving to a particular candidate.

Malbin (1984) discussed campaign finance reform and the ever-popular subject of new or more limits on campaign spending, while pointing out the phenomenal rise and proliferation of Political Action Committees and the so-called Pac Phenomenon. Malbin, in a book of eight collected essays, characterized his book as follows: "This book is about how the extensive changes made in finance laws
during the 1970's have affected, and will affect, political campaigns in the United States" (1984, 1).

Central to the issues in this dissertation are Malbin's own remarks, both in his introduction to the book and his own essay, along with an excellent essay by Gary C. Jacobson (1984). Jacobson set forth some interesting statistics on the sources of campaign contributions to House and Senate general election candidates from 1974 to 1982 which dramatically point out the significant rise in those expenditures for those years. Parallel to those statistics are those compiled showing the correlation of increase of PAC contributions to congressional candidates for that same period. Throughout Jacobson's essay, and noted by Malbin, are references to increased money-raising ability of the Republican Party and the impact of that increased money-raising ability, a phenomenon supported by the current data.

Malbin, in his own essay, (1984) took aim at legislation, regulations, and Supreme Court decisions that affect and impact contribution limits, and makes strong recommendations for future finance "reform." Antecedent to his own essay, in the introduction to the book, Malbin points out what is noted in this dissertation: "As anybody who bought this book must know, it costs money to communicate ideas beyond one's immediate circle. Political campaigning in a representative democracy necessarily involves communication; candidates must persuade people to vote for them. Once, political communication could be done
face-to-face at little cost, but that option is not available in most places today" (1984, 1). In his own essay, he noted that, "Opponents of the current campaign finance system like to say that contributions do not buy votes, but do buy access—that is, they help a lobbyist gain entry into a member's office to present a case" (p. 265). Malbin expressed his skepticism of that conclusion and dwelt on the effect of campaign contributions and the environment of contributions (fund-raisers, etc.) but confined his observations to that circle of Washington lobbyists and their fund-raising events.

Further contributions to the literature have been made by others studying individual determinants or motives for campaign giving. John Thielmann and Al Wilhite (1989) used data obtained from the Federal Election Commission and explored differences between individual and institutional campaign contributions in attempting to evaluate the "determinants of absolute individual contributions and their influence on the proportion of total contributions made up of individual contributions..." (p. 327). They found that "individual contributions appear to be influenced by many of the same factors affecting total contributions," and that "these factors affect individual contributions and other types of contributions differently" (p. 327). Their thrust was a candidate's status in enabling a candidate to solicit funds from an individual. Their contribution to this "money" literature centers around the candidate. Thielmann
and Wilhite assumed that "individual funds are collected within the district" and that "while there are undoubtedly some out-of-district contributions, most of those are from organized political action committees" ("Note" p. 329). These assumptions are not supported by the data which is the source of this study, since all of the data in this study is individual data from FEC reports. All PAC contributions were omitted. There is significant evidence, therefore, that, candidates for the United States Senate receive substantial sums from individuals outside of their state.

Lynn Ragsdale and Timothy E. Cook (1987) also provided an interesting study on the ability of challengers and incumbents to raise money. The Ragsdale and Cook article is written from the perspective of the effects of the various incumbent activities on challenger expenditures and challenger PAC contributions.

Ragsdale and Cook's study centered around the possible linkage of strong challengers to resources of the incumbent and how incumbent resources in an election year are determined. The thrust of their study, however, did not involve the individuals' motives for giving to campaigns, but, rather, the ability of the incumbent and the challenger, within certain environments, to raise money.

James B. Kau and Paul H. Rubin (1982) also reviewed determinants of Congressional voting as a result of contributions from an economist's standpoint. They explored,
among other things, changes in campaign finance law between 1972 and 1978 in an attempt to determine the impact of those changes in campaign finance laws, concluding that the changes "have increased the ability of businesses and corporations to contribute to electoral campaigns" (p. 107). The focus of their study was also from a candidate's standpoint, and Kau and Rubin found that in 1982, "No relationship was apparent between the ideological voting of a representative and the amount of contributions he or she received from business; nor did any relationship exist between voting and contributions received" (p. 113). This is an interesting conclusion when viewed with our theory and data. Basically, Kau and Rubin studied variables that may explain Congressional voting.

Benjamin Ginsberg (1984) also studied some other aspects of changes in American electoral politics affected by public funding of presidential campaigns and a proliferation of PACs. Ginsberg brings out some interesting points about what he calls "the new political technology" and portrays the Republicans and the right as benefiting the most from the "new technology" because of what he calls the "traditional financial advantage of the right..." (p. 175). It should be noted once again that the current data under review support this theory.

Marjorie Randon Hershey (1984) also looked at campaign finance reform and the rapid growth of PACs and discussed
how reforms in campaign contribution law "institutionalized a means by which private money might play an increasing role in the financing of congressional races: the thousands of newly formed PACs" (p. 8). Her conclusion was that "The goal of PAC giving, after all, is to promote the groups' interests by gaining access to people and power, and there is no percentage in having good access to a likely loser" (p. 7). Once again, Hershey, as other writers discussed above, viewed campaign contributions from the perspective of their impact on the incumbent and the incumbent's response to that contribution and the "PAC Phenomena," but Hershey joins Malbin, Drew, and Jacobson (as will be discussed) in recognizing "access" as an important motivation.

Elizabeth Drew (1983) came a bit closer when she questioned: "Why is all this money floating about? What do the investors expect? At a minimum, they expect access, but access is simply the required entry ticket for getting something done. John Culver, the former Democratic Senator from Iowa, says: 'I think there is no question that money gives you real access. The members have to get their money some place, and they are grateful for the contributions’" (p. 77). Elizabeth Drew made the point, which is very important to an understanding of this feeding frenzy for funds, that "the acquisition of campaign funds has become an obsession on the part of nearly every candidate for federal office. The obsession leads the candidates who solicit and accept money from those most able to provide it to adjust
their behavior in office to the need for money—and the fear that a challenger might be able to obtain more" (p. 2). The race for money on Capitol Hill has turned into what one House Member has described as a "fever" that has taken over the institution.

Another recent study which addresses methods of giving is that of Ruth S. Jones and Warren E. Miller. They examined federal public funding through the income tax checkoff, PAC contributions, direct party givers, and candidate or candidate-organization donors. Particularly important, however, is that Jones and Miller recognized the complexity of campaign contributing. They recognized that the contributor is like an onion with many layers, and as each one is peeled, another layer is found to be different from the preceding layer. As Jones and Miller aptly expressed:

"All of this suggests that contributing, although a participatory activity, is also representative of psychological or socially motivated behavior that is more complex, and possibly less 'political' than the earlier literature on campaign financing has led us to believe" (1985, 207).

The work of Jones and Miller is an important background and preface to concepts to be introduced in this dissertation and follows Simon's earlier writings.

A non-scientific but nevertheless interesting study was done by Barry Werth (1988). As Werth put it "...then why do
they give? To examine the new imperatives of political fund-raising, New England Monthly decided to cut open the pie. We examined the Dukakis campaign's third quarter Federal Election Commission filing for 1987 and randomly selected the names of fifty $1,000 contributors--one from every 16th page--and set out to profile them. Who are they? Why Dukakis? What, finally, do they want?" (p. 38).

Werth interviewed, among others, a "wealthy former publisher" who, as Werth puts it, was "the mastermind of the Dukakis finance operation" (p. 38). This fund-raiser, according to Werth, is often asked why people give, and his answer may well constitute the central wisdom of the new fund-raising order. "Do people contribute because they believe in you? No. Because they share your political ideals? No. The main reason people give to political campaigns is because they don't want to say no to the person who asks them" (p. 38). Following that excerpt from Werth's interview with this fund-raiser, he then presented a series of interviews and/or profiles of various $1,000 contributors. These interviews show a variety of reasons for giving, not all of which are politically explicit. He makes some interesting observations which, while not necessarily scientific, come very close to the point of this entire study.

Werth, in his interviews with large givers to the Dukakis campaign, found a variety of reasons for making
contributions—from faith in the solicitor's judgment (see also Jacobson 1972, p. 69, who discusses this view), to the possible need for favors, to sharing the same political values, to politically nonexplicit reasons such as the same ethnic origin, "Potomac fever," and influence buying. Many of these reasons expressed for contributing are manifestations of the "political psychology" referred to by Schlozman and Tierney (1986, 25) and relate directly to the motives of the "self-imagers", a special group of contributors who are contributing elites in general but are more narrowly described and defined in this dissertation.

Perhaps the most significant study that directly relates to campaign giving is set forth in Jacobson's study about money in Congressional elections (1980). Jacobson theorized what this dissertation attempts to prove: "Individuals must, then, contribute to candidates for reasons other than simply to help them win office" (p. 62). Jacobson further recognized that there are politically nonexplicit reasons for giving when he concluded: "Individuals receive benefits from the act of contributing itself; these are, of necessity, psychological" (p. 69).

Jacobson's understanding of the gratification or enhancement-of-esteem motive for giving is further evidenced by his acknowledgment of the theory that personal "recognition and attention from the candidate or other high-status fund-raisers" (p. 69) is, in itself, a psychological reward
for giving. He also recognized that there are a variety of considerations which determine contributions from individuals, and that there may not be a tangible "quid pro quo" from a contribution. Obviously, Jacobson stressed the psychological reward for contributing but recognized other rewards for contributing, such as duty, influence-buying, and access.

Jacobson reviewed some of the works of Mancur Olson (1965), William P. Welch (1976), Larry L. Berg and Larry L. Eastland (1977), and pointed out that Olson has "demonstrated that, except in special circumstances, no rational, self- interested individual will voluntarily incur any of the cost of providing the public good" (Olson, p. 44, as quoted in Jacobson 1980, 57). Olson is an economist who studied group behavior. His various theories of group behavior are pertinent to this study if one views individual behavior as merely a microcosm of group behavior acting in the same interest as an individual, as Olson points out (Olson 1965, 1, as quoted in Jacobson 1980, 57). Jacobson’s point, based upon Olson’s views, was that there are differences in motivations for campaign giving between those who base their contribution on the "candidate’s party, ideology, general issue and policy orientation, good looks, ethnic affiliation, style, or any number of similar considerations" versus those who give for the "hope or promise of some personal payoff not automatically available to the whole group" (Jacobson 1980, 57).
Jacobson moves forward from that point of view when he discusses the psychological reward, and supports James E. Zinser and Paul A. Dawson's propositions that "giving is directly related to current satisfaction related to the act of participation, in other words, a consumption motive, that is, a motive which is driven by an expectation of expected returns which may be financial reward or other satisfactions" (Zinser and Dawson 1977, p. 7, as quoted in Jacobson 1980, 63).

Throughout Jacobson's study, he points out other factors which are central to this dissertation. For instance, Jacobson acknowledged that motives for giving range from "the most selfless to the most venal" (1980, 66). His conclusion is that "Individuals receive benefits from the act of contributing itself; these are, of necessity, psychological" (p. 68), and that an individual also receives a psychological reward merely from personal recognition and attention. Jacobson's work must be viewed as the most significant forerunner of this study.

All of the studies referred to above, including the psychologically-oriented studies of the group of scholars which include Lasswell, Allport, Silverberg, Schlozman and Tierney, Sniderman and others, and the group of studies which are more specifically oriented to effects of giving (Sabato, Jones and Miller, Kau and Rubin, Theilmann and Wilhite, and others), understood together, form the basis
for the concept of the "self-imagers"—that group of contributing elite who manifest their need for self-aggrandizement, self-esteem, and status by contributing money and through manifestations of psychologically or socially-motivated behavior. The profile of the "player", and specifically the larger giver, fits the description of the concept of the "self-imager" which is developed in this dissertation and made apparent through analysis of the data.

W. V. Silverberg (1952) recognized that man many times depends on external sources for his self-esteem. Silverberg recognized two sources of self-esteem, one an inner source, but also an external source. Campaign giving and the reward or benefits, which may be psychological only, that one receives from campaign giving, is an external source of self-esteem.

Sniderman, in his work on self-esteem, showed an understanding for the behavior of the "self-imagers" in his discussion of enhancement of self-esteem. Sniderman understood that a strong ego, "demanding deference" (Harold Lasswell's term), "substitutes a culturally acceptable aim for an impulse which might otherwise provoke disapproval." (1975, 68). The culturally acceptable aim that is substituted by some of those who emphatically demand deference is a large contribution to a political campaign. While Sniderman's work was basically a study in exploring "how the personality of citizens influences the extent to which they
embrace democratic politics" (p. 1), he, too, further
developed some of Lasswell's theories that the pursuit of
power is compensation against deprivation, and that politi­
cal man "...is impelled into political life to compensate
for low self-esteem, his politics offers an opportunity to
win power and prestige and so overcome feelings of personal
inadequacy" (p. 7). This attempt to overcome feelings of
inadequacy is, as this dissertation will develop, manifested
by large contributions to campaigns which may translate as
an attempt to be close to the "original omnipotence" (Guffey
1972, 162).

Essential to the understanding of the "self-imager" is
data revealed in this study in the area of government trust
and political efficacy. These self-imagers all clearly
trust government and all possess high degrees of political
efficacy. Already mentioned is a body of literature on
trust and efficacy and the major studies by Paul Abramson
and Arthur Miller. These studies of the general electorate
will be discussed and compared to the results of this
survey, past surveys, and the National Election Study of
1988, particularly in discussions of the profile of the
"self-imager."

The meaning of access in terms of enhancement of
self-esteem, as behavioral indicators reveal, is also
explored in this dissertation. The desire for access for
specific reasons which are not deemed as socially acceptable
are also investigated and discussed. Access is desired not just for personal economic gain, but, as the access behavioral indicators reveal, for ego-gratifying or esteem-enhancing reasons, such as easy access to the candidate or official through telephone communication, personal meetings, acceptance of invitations to personal events such as weddings and graduations, and an overall ability to attain access to the official through a variety of means. These manifestations of contributors' behavior are explored through the concept of "status," an independent variable tested in this dissertation.

In studying politically nonexplicit reasons for contributions as opposed to those reasons which are explicit and easier to discover, behavioral indicators must be used as well as attitudinal indicators. In this study, both attitudinal and behavioral measures of motivation are employed.

Throughout this paper, and certainly implied although not expressed, reference is made to the terms "ego", "self-esteem", and "ego gratification." Self-esteem is relatively modern as opposed to those terms such as ego or ego gratification which are Freudian in origin, but for the purposes of this study, "ego" is defined operationally, and is used virtually synonymously with ego gratification and enhancement of self-esteem, to refer to anything emotional, mental or physical that serves to make the donor feel
mentally and/or emotionally good or better (Loevinger 1969; Byrne 1974; White 1961; Yankelovich 1970; Doob 1975). Once again, Sniderman's study (1975) is relied upon as a basis for much of the assertions regarding enhancement of self-esteem.

The self-imagers, although not so labeled, are those about whom all of the above group of writers wrote. This study sets a typology of givers to explore the relationships of these self-imagers and other groups who give for various reasons, such as patriotism, ideology, personal, social, and politically explicit reasons, and compares those groups with the self-imagers who contribute for none or some of these reasons, but primarily for politically nonexplicit reasons which are linked with the studies described above and lead directly to the subject of this dissertation.
III.

METHODS, THEORY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

A. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES:

The research questions to be investigated in this study are that contributors to campaigns are motivated by a desire to enhance their self-esteem through access acquired through giving, and that large givers exhibit behavior that indicates a greater desire for access. This special group of large givers, that should exhibit such behavior to a significantly greater extent than moderate or small givers, seeks status and "good feelings" by giving for other than politically explicit reasons.

The various areas of inquiry are designed to determine specifically what it is about giving or the results of giving that makes people feel better. The "access" concept is investigated in a very direct manner merely by asking if access is important, and investigation into the immediate consequences or anticipated consequences of giving is probed more indirectly, such as the contributor's ability to telephone or see the candidate and the reasons for those contacts. Theoretically, the self-imagers are those who seek to gain some enhancement of self-esteem as a means of gaining prestige or perceived status that comes with the ability to socialize and/or make contact with an elected official because of or as a result of a contribution.
In addition, the theoretical position of this dissertation is that there are secondary sources of gratification into which categories most givers will fit. These categories are: access, power, patriotism, other selfish interests, ideological single issues, party identification, and ideology. The theoretical concepts of this dissertation are threefold (Beychok 1987):

(1) Enhancement of self-esteem and "status" is an important motive for contributing to a candidate;

(2) Every giver, and particularly a large giver, seeks enhancement of self-esteem and perceived "status";

(3) Enhancement of self-esteem or "status" may be achieved, using money as the vehicle, to:

(a) gain access to the candidate,
(b) acquire political power,
(c) satisfy other selfish interests,

Political giving, as theorized herein, meets certain basic human needs. The theoretical concepts of this dissertation recognize that the "emphatic demand for deference" (Lasswell 1951, p. 21) is a preexisting dynamic for political giving. "This simply means that human beings have a need that they believe will be fulfilled by the deference or attention paid to them by the recipient of the political contribution" (Beychok 1987, 16).
The hypotheses of this dissertation relate to the difference between large givers, moderate givers, and small givers, and the specific reasons for giving. Therefore, the hypotheses are as follows:

I. All contributors have a greater sense of political efficacy and greater trust in government than the general public.

II. Individuals contribute as a result of conventional, acceptable motives, which are:

(1) Patriotism
(2) Ideology
(3) Efficacy
(4) Government Trust
(5) Party Identification/Partisanship
(6) Issue Orientation

There are statistically significant, positive relationships between the above conventional reasons for giving, and:

(a) The amount of contribution;
(b) The number of contributions;
(c) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.

III. There is a significant, positive relationship between a contributor's need to seek status (enhancement of self-esteem) and:

(1) The amount of contribution;
(2) The number of contributions;
(3) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.
IV. There is a significant, positive relationship between contributors who desire access and:

(1) The amount of contribution;
(2) The number of contributions;
(3) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.

B. SAMPLE AND DATA SOURCE:

To investigate the validity of these hypotheses, a survey was used. Other than the surveys referred to below, this investigative technique has not been used before to determine the motives of campaign givers. National surveys are expensive and time-consuming, but these constraints were deemed minimal when considering the knowledge to be gained from the accumulation of such data. This survey is the third and most ambitious of a series of three surveys. The first two served as pilot studies for this national survey.

The first survey was conducted in 1986 in connection with author's master's thesis. The sample for this first survey was taken from contributors to the United States Senate race between then Congressmen John Breaux and Henson Moore in their race for the open seat from Louisiana. The group surveyed were 300 contributors listed on Federal Election Commission reports taken from a random sample of all contributors to those two campaigns. A mail
questionnaire was used along with a limited number of personal interviews.

The second survey was conducted in 1988 in connection with a paper this author delivered to the Western Political Science Association, using a random sample of contributors to the five major candidates for Governor of Louisiana, taken from reports filed by candidates for Governor with the appropriate Louisiana State authorities. A similar mail questionnaire was used.

For this dissertation, a mail questionnaire, similar to the two noted above, was used. It is recognized that there are certain accepted disadvantages and limitations to a mail questionnaire, such as the absence of the opportunity to probe, a lack of control over the respondent's environment, and a low response rate. However, because of the geographical dispersal of the respondents, no other practical method is available. Questionnaires used in the earlier research are attached for comparison to the questionnaire used in this research (see Appendix III).

The group surveyed is a sample of contributors to the 1988 United States Senate races (General Election) in the states shown on the following table. States shown are deemed to be representative of the regions shown in the column paralleling the list of the states and the candidates for the Senate Seat in each of those states is shown on the third column in Table 1.
Table 1

Representative States and Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>Lautenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>East-North-Central</td>
<td>Riegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>West-North-Central</td>
<td>Kerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>South-Atlantic</td>
<td>Robb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>East-South-Central</td>
<td>Dowdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>West-South-Central</td>
<td>Bensten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>DeConcini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>McCarthy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above states were selected by taking a mean or median, whichever lent itself better to the particular variable of five variables: age, race, education, per capita income, and political party identification. The divisions of regions were obtained from the 1980 U.S. Census Data. All of the variables did not lend themselves to scoring by a mean or median, and, therefore, arbitrary, subjective decisions were made as to what states were more representative. In addition, those states in which there was no competitive race in 1988 were discarded, and, in at least two cases, the representative state used is perhaps the second best for purposes of representation, but is used because a competitive race occurred in that state and did not occur in the first choice state. Appendix I reflects the five variables used to determine the representative state from each region.
As pointed out above, not all of the variables lent themselves to scoring by a mean or median, either because of the classificatory nature of the variable (e.g.: there is no practical mean for race) or because accurate information simply was not available. The variable of age is listed by median distribution in those tables. Race is shown as a percentage of the actual population. Education is reduced to the mean within five coding categories. Income is represented in current U.S. dollars, per capita. Political party identification is shown with percentage scores attributed to the categories of democrat, independent, republican, and "don't know" responses. The mean of each regional score and its representative state are included in the last column of the table. The table entitled "Political Party Identification" lists the states and corresponding regions used in formulating the above tables for the nine region coding.

A random sample of approximately 2,700 names was drawn from original Federal Election Commission reports filed by the candidates in the races examined, averaging 150 names for each candidate in each race (300 names per state). The raw data came from copies of the actual reports filed by each candidate during 1988.

Approximately 300 of the original mailings were returned for a variety of reasons, such as wrong address or no forwarding address, deceased, etc., leaving a total of
2400 names in the sample. 1500 postcards were mailed to those in the sample who had not responded to the first questionnaire mailing (see Appendix IV). Seven hundred eighty-nine (789) properly executed questionnaires were returned.

Contributors have been categorized in three groups as follows:

$ 1 to $299 = Small Contributor
$300 to $599 = Moderate Contributor
$600 or More = Large Contributor

Although Federal Election Commission rules do not mandate reporting receipts under $200, the candidates in the 1988 Senate races examined did, in fact, report those receipts. Therefore, all contributions have been included. The classification of givers is arbitrary. One might certainly argue, with some merit, that large givers should be only those who contribute $1,000, or, in fact, those whose spouses contribute an additional $1,000. One might very well argue that anyone who contributes $200 is not a "small" giver. In an effort, however, to (1) continue to use the means of comparison consistent with the two earlier studies, and (2) to support the hypothesis that there are differences in motives for giving in these classifications which is supported by the previous studies, classifications were made arbitrarily.
It is important to note that there are other categories or groups of contributors who should be examined but are not included in this study. In particular, no distinction has been made between "soft money" and "hard money." "Soft money" is simply those funds that are not directly contributed to federal elections, such as union dues, corporate treasury funds, or individual contributions beyond the legal limits which are contributed and used for certain party activities. These funds go to state parties for "party building activities" (Drew 1983, 14) and to national parties.

Another group of contributors that is not identified specifically but are certainly among the respondents, are those contributors who are known as "fund-raisers", that is, those individuals who are well-known to the national political community who are called upon, wooed, and seduced by candidates because of their reputation as fund-raisers. These individuals deserve separate investigation because it is suspected that their motives for raising large amounts of money from other contributors resembles, if not mirrors, the motives for those large givers identified in this study. From a review of raw data from the Federal Election Commission reports, however, it is impossible to single out these individuals. The Werth article (1988) referred to hereinabove pays particular attention to those "fund-raisers" with outstanding reputations for their ability to raise money.
C. THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

The questionnaire contains 56 questions. The first set of questions (1 through 21) are designed to determine respondents' views concerning "trust in government" and "political efficacy", and specifically to determine whether or not contributors have a high or low feeling of efficacy and trust. In earlier studies, trust in government among contributors was significantly and substantially higher than trust in government for the general population (Abramson 1983).

Questions 22 and 23 are designed to determine respondents' attitudes as their attitudes may be related to their personal feelings about themselves. Questions 25 through 27 are designed to determine whether or not respondents are "players", that is, those who contribute more than once to campaigns. Questions 32 through 36 are designed for purposes other than the central theme of this dissertation and have been inserted in the questionnaire merely for further investigative purposes at a later date.

Questions 37 through 40 are specifically designed to determine the importance of access to the respondents. Question 41 seeks an attitudinal response which is followed by behavioral indicators in questions 42, 43, 44 and 46, and followed again by an access question, number 47. Questions 48 through 56 are demographic.
IV.

DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

The data will be described in the following manner: First, the general demographics will be examined. Second, respondents will be profiled and compared to the general population. Comparisons will be made, reviewing the responses to such questions in the survey that reflect governmental trust, political efficacy, their contributions in general, and the number of times and campaigns to which respondents contributed. Their access attitudes will also be described in detail. Actual access or behavioral access will be discussed in another section. Much of the focus of this investigation will be to determine whether or not there is support for the hypothesis that the contributing elites are different from the general public.

Before discussion of the various topics of this chapter, which include demographics, party affiliation, government trust, and political efficacy, the following tables were prepared to show comparisons between the profile of these respondents and respondents to the American National Election Study of 1988 (Miller, 1989/90).
### Table 2-A

**Comparison of Survey Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Study</th>
<th>National Election Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>'88 PRES. VOTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dukakis</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>Dukakis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTY I.D.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDEOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade or Less</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8th Grade or Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Some High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. S. Graduate</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>H. S. Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12 Yrs. +/-No Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Yr. College</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Junior College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Yr. College Grad.</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>B.A. Level Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELIGION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Level Mgr.</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>Executive/Administrative/Managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level Mgr.</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Manager</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Prof. Specialty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNION/NON-UNION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Union</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>Non-Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $19,999</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Under $19,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-29,999</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>$20,000-29,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-39,999</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>$30,000-39,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-49,999</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>$40,000-49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-100,000</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>$50,000-89,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $100,000</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>Over $90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2-B

#### Comparison of Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Study</th>
<th>National Election Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. There is no way people like me can have an influence on the federal government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>AGREE STRONGLY 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>AGREE SOMEWHAT 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE SOMEWHAT 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. People like me have a fair say in getting the federal government to do things we care about.</td>
<td></td>
<td>DISAGREE STRONGLY 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td>National Election Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you think people in government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste most of it, or don’t waste very much of it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A LOT</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>A LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT MUCH</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>NOT MUCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST ABOUT ALWAYS</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>JUST ABOUT ALWAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST OF THE TIME</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>MOST OF THE TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME OF THE TIME</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>SOME OF THE TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE OF THE TIME</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>NONE OF THE TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Who really runs the federal government?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE BIG CORPORATIONS</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>FOR BIG INTERESTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A FEW VERY INFLUENTIAL PEOPLE</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTH OF THE ABOVE</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTED OFFICIALS WHO REPRESENT THE PEOPLE</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. DEMOGRAPHICS:

A total of 789 responses were received. Of the 789 responses, 97.2% of the respondents voted in the 1988 presidential race between George Bush and Michael Dukakis. Only 0.5% of the respondents were in the age group 18 to 24; 4.6% were in the age group of 25 to 34; 27.9% were in the age group of 35 to 49; 36.6% were in the age group of 50 to 64; and, 29.5% were in 65 and older age group.  

Employment distribution was substantially skewed toward the high-level professional, accounting for 38.4% of the respondents, while middle-level professional accounted for 10.2% of the respondents; executive manager respondents accounted for 17.4%; therefore, high-level professional, middle-level professional and executive manager accounted for 66% of those in the sample who responded.  

The smallest percentage of respondents was semiskilled and unskilled labor at 0.3%. Eighty-one and one-tenth (81.1) percent of the respondents were from nonunion households. The National Election Survey Respondents fell

4 Results of the National Election Survey for 1988 could not be compared with this survey in this category because of a totally different method of classification.
5 In the National Election Study for 1988, when its categories of "Executive, Administrative and Managerial" and "Professional Specialty Occupations" were compared with this survey's "High Level Manager", "Middle Level Professional", and "Executive Manager", expected, dramatic variations were shown. Sixty-two and four-tenths (62.4%) percent of the respondents in the current survey fell into those three categories, while only 26% of the respondents in the National Election Study fell into comparable categories.
into those categories in almost exactly the same percentages.

Ideologically, liberals accounted for 15.5% of the respondents, while those who considered themselves to be moderate accounted for 37.5% of the respondents; and 43.4% considered themselves to be conservative. The National Election Study respondents considered themselves to be 27% liberal, 17% moderate, and 55% conservative. In the current study, education was also skewed toward the higher end, with 48.6% having completed postgraduate education and 26% identifying themselves as 4-year college graduate; however, National Election Study respondents are not nearly so educated, with only 6% having "Advanced Degrees", and only 14% identifying themselves as possessing a "B.A. Level Degree".

Religious preferences basically followed normal census. Fifty-seven and eight-tenths (57.8) percent of the respondents are Protestant; 18.2% of the respondents are Catholic; and 9.3% of the respondents are Jewish. National Election Study respondents, however, were 71% Protestant, 26% Catholic, and only 2% Jewish.

B. PARTY AFFILIATION

Party identification or partisanship is an independent variable which is included in a list of independent
variables to be tested with certain dependent variables in another section. Specifically, party identification or partisanship was probed with the use of the following question:

55. Regardless of how you may vote, do you consider yourself to be a Democrat, Republican, or Independent?

Twenty-nine and six-tenths (29.6) percent of the respondents consider themselves to be Democrats; 49.9% consider themselves to be Republicans; and 18.6% consider themselves to be Independent. National Election Study respondents identified themselves as Democrat, 33.5%; Republican, 26.3%; and Independent, 30%. Obviously, respondents in the current study are more likely to be Republicans than Democrats, whereas in the N.E.S. survey a greater percentage of respondents were Democrat than Republican.

The mean for the states included in this study, where party registration figures are available (see Appendix II), is: Democrats 42.6; Republicans 33.8. This is almost a reversal of the aggregate data for the survey, but is closer to the N.E.S. data. In addition, and once again contradictory to the manner in which respondents identify themselves, is the data revealing the results of the 1988 Senate races in each of these nine states. In seven of the states, Democrats won the Senate seat, and in only two of the states did the Republicans win the Senate seat. Republicans won in California, with 53% of the vote, even
though Republican registration was 39%, and in Mississippi where there is no party registration, Republicans won with 54% of the vote. On the other hand, in Arizona, where Republican registration is 46% and Democratic registration only 43%, Democrats won reelection with 57% of the vote (Barone 1989).

The income level of respondents was, as may be expected, extremely high, with 58.6% of the respondents indicating income of over $100,000 per year and 21.5% indicating income of $50,000 - $100,000. From that point there was a significant drop to 5.9% whose income was below $50,000. As indicated in the tables above, income level of the N.E.S. respondents, percentage wise, appears in almost the reverse order of the income of respondents in this survey. Sixty-six (66%) percent of respondents in the N.E.S. survey earned under $19,999 per year, while 58.6% of the respondents in the current survey earn over $100,000 per year. Obviously, respondents in the current survey are much more affluent.

C. GOVERNMENT TRUST:

The following attitudinal questions were asked to reflect trust in government:

1. Do you think people in government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?
A lot
Some
Not Very Much

2. Do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right?
   Just About Always
   Most of the Time
   Some of the Time
   None of the Time

3. Do you think you can trust your state government to do what is right?
   Just About Always
   Most of the Time
   Some of the Time
   None of the Time

4. Who really runs the federal government?
   The Big Corporations
   A Few Very Influential People
   Both of the Above
   Elected Officials Who Really Represent the People

DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Agree/Disagree

5. Our government officials usually tell the truth

6. Most of the things government leaders say can't be believed.

Paul R. Abramson, in his study on political attitudes in America (1983), states that a "...major trend has been a decline of popular trust in government" (p. 11). He cites what he calls the most frequently asked question by the University of Michigan Research Center: "How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right--just about always, most of the time, or
only some of the time?" (p. 194). According to Abramson, by 1980, only one in four Americans trusted the government to do what is right. On the other hand, current results and National Election Study results, which are very similar, do not reflect those results, as will be indicated and discussed. Responses from this 1990 survey closely resemble the responses in the 1988 Louisiana Governor's Race survey, and in the 1986 Louisiana Senate Race Survey. The National Election Study of 1988 reflects the results of this current survey, indicating a substantial reversal of the trend in the area of government trust. Tables above clearly show that the results of the American National Election Study are virtually the same as the results of this survey.

Arthur Miller (1974) presented the first major analysis of the decline of political trust. Miller made certain claims about the decline of political trust and the political alienation of efficacy. Our study does not compare with the intensity and close scrutiny of Miller's study, whose central theme was the study of political trust and efficacy. But the questions asked which closely respond to the one cited by Abramson and used by Miller, were current survey Questions 2 and 3 set out above.

The Michigan Survey Research Center indicated a decline from 73% of the Electorate who trusted government in 1958 to only 25% in 1980. On the other hand, current survey results indicate that 37.4% of our respondents think that they "can
trust the government in Washington to do what is right most of the time," 58.1% trust the government in Washington "some of the time; 37.5% trust state government most of the time; and 56.2% trust state government some of the time. No claim is made that this survey, with a minimum number of questions focused on government trust, contradicts Arthur Miller's claims, but it is suggested that those who contribute to campaigns and those with the extremely high income level of our respondents, do have a greater sense of trust in government (1988 NES results show similar results for the general electorate) and certainly have a greater feeling of political efficacy. For instance, 52.6% of the respondents agree with the statement: "People like me have a fair say in getting the federal government to do the things we care about"; and 74.8% disagree with the statement: "There is no way people like me can have an influence on the federal government." In state terms, 62.3% believe that "People like me have a fair say in getting the state government to do the things we care about"; and 76.8% disagree with the statement that "There is no way people like me can have an influence on the state government."

Closely connected to the questions concerning trust is the question which asks respondents, "Who really runs the federal government?" (see page 45). The results from this question may be viewed as a bit contradictory to the high feelings of trust and efficacy that are found in this survey and in past surveys. For instance, 38.3% of the respondents
believe that "The Big Corporations" and "A Few Very Influential People" really run the federal government, while only 29.6% believe "Elected officials who really represent the people really run the government." It is difficult to reconcile the fact that only 29.6% of the respondents believe elected officials represent the people, but over 93% believe they could trust government at least some of the time. The National Election Study results closely mirror the results of this current survey in the area of trust (See Table 2-C). A "trust" index has been constructed for the purposes of further statistical analysis and is discussed in the following section entitled "Findings." Government trust has been tested with certain dependent variables in the sections on bivariate analysis and on multivariate analysis.

D. POLITICAL EFFICACY:

Although we have discussed to some extent the results to efficacy questions which are interconnected with "trust" questions, the following is a further discussion of those indicators of political efficacy of the respondents. Those questions are:

**Agree/Disagree**

7. The way our system of government operates, almost every group has a say in running things

---


8. This country is really run by a small number of persons at the top who only speak for a few special groups

9. Although our country may be facing difficult times, I still feel that it is a worthwhile place and I really belong here

10. The way this country is going, I often feel that I really don't belong here

11. I am proud of many things about our federal system of government

12. I can't find much in our federal system of government to be proud of

13. People like me have a fair say in getting the federal government to do the things we care about

14. There is no way people like me can have an influence on the federal government

15. This state is really run by a small number of persons at the top who only speak for a few special groups

16. Although our state may be facing difficult times, I still feel that it is a worthwhile place and I really belong here

17. The way this state is going, I often feel that I really don't belong here

18. I am proud of many things about our state system of government
19. I can't find much in our state system of government to be proud of ______ ______

20. People like me have a fair say in getting the state government to do the things we care about ______ ______

21. There is no way people like me can have an influence on the state government ______ ______

The responses to these questions support the view by McCloskey that most Americans still believe in the American dream (McCloskey and Zaller 1984). Fifty and five-tenths (50.5) percent agree that "...almost every group has a say in running things"; and 52.6% believe that they have "a fair say in getting the federal government to do the things that we care about." Supporting those answers is 74.8% of respondents who disagree with the statement that "there is no way people like me can have an influence on the federal government."

How do the results of this survey compare with the National Election Study of 1988? The comparison is difficult to make, as Table 2-B above indicates. The N.E.S. question was: "People like me don't have any say about what the government does." Forty-one (41%) percent of the respondents agreed "somewhat" or "strongly". The question on the current survey was: "There is no way people like me can have an influence on the federal government." Only 21.5% agreed, and 74.8% disagreed with that statement. A
comparison of those two questions showed that respondents to the current survey are much more efficacious than respondents to the National Election Study. However, another question was asked in this current study which is closely related to the National Election Study question: "People like me have a fair say in getting the federal government to do the things we care about." Fifty-two and six-tenths percent (52.6%) agreed, and 45% disagreed, showing a much closer relationship to the results of the National Election Study question.

Once again, it must be noted that our sample reflects the high income levels of our particular respondents as distinguished from the general sample of the American population. An "efficacy" index has been constructed for the purposes of further statistical analysis and is discussed in the following section entitled "Findings."

E. STATUS

Status seekers are those respondents who affirmatively answered certain status indicators by checking certain listed responses. In another section, a status index is described and that index is tested with three dependent variables. For the purposes of this section, however, status seekers are those who checked responses such as, "It gives me additional status" or "It satisfies my friends and associates", when being questioned about the respondent's
feelings when making or considering a campaign contribution. Thirteen (13%) percent of respondents checked, "It gives me additional status"; and 37.9% of respondents checked, "The donation was expected from a person in my position." The question of status and its relationship to other variables will be analyzed in another section.

F. ACCESS ATTITUDES:

On the all important question of access, another interesting observation must be made. The following questions are access indicators:

37. a. Is it important for you to have easy access to a public official?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b. If you answer to the above is "YES", how important is easy access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fairly Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

38. Do you believe that contributors have more access to an elected official than those who do not contribute?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sixty-four and six-tenths (64.6) percent of all respondents agree that it is important to have easy access to a public official, and when asked how important easy access is to
that respondent, almost 65% expressed importance from "fairly important" to "extremely important." Seventy-two and five-tenths (72.5) percent of respondents believe that contributors have more access to an elected official than those who do not contribute.

Two questions asked in this survey which were not asked in prior surveys concerning access indicators are:

39. When you contribute money to a candidate, do you express your desire to have access to that candidate?

   YES  
   NO  
   SOMETIMES

40. Is it important for you when you make a contribution that the candidate acknowledge his availability and access to you?

   YES  
   NO  
   NO DIFFERENCE

In what may be viewed as contradictory to Questions 37 and 38, only 6.9% expressed a desire to have access to the candidate when contributing, and only 8.9% expressed that desire "sometimes", while 81.9% flatly answered "no". They do not express a desire to have access to that particular candidate. While clearly showing their belief in the importance of access, 63.7% of respondents stated that it was not important for a candidate to acknowledge his availability and access when making a contribution, and 14.8% said it made "no difference." It is suggested that
Questions 39 and 40 above are behavioral in style rather than attitudinal, and although respondents know, accept and acknowledge the importance of access, respondents are simply not willing to openly admit their desire for access as an acceptable motive when faced with a candidate to whom one is about to contribute. To express a desire for access openly to the recipient of the contribution may be considered a reason for giving that respondents feel is not socially acceptable or simply does not "sound good."

Respondents were also asked to check each of 18 listed reasons for contributing to campaigns. The question asked was:

41. Here is a sample of some reasons people contribute to campaigns. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:

   ___a. I believe it is a patriotic duty.
   ___b. I like to know the candidate better, and contributing gives me a better opportunity to know him.
   ___c. I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate.
   ___d. It strengthens my particular ideology of government by contributing to a particular candidate or candidates.
   ___e. I do it because of the party.
   ___f. I do it to acquire political clout.
   ___g. I like to be around elected officials.
   ___h. I like to help good people win.
   ___i. It is good for my business.
____j. I like to have some influence in appointments to boards and commissions and other public offices.

____k. It is nice to be able to call a public official whenever I wish.

____l. I like to have informal contacts with officials, such as luncheons, dinners, and other social contacts.

____m. I like to work in campaigns and contributing is part of working in a campaign.

____n. I like to feel that I have access to an official to alert him to the effects of certain legislation.

____o. I have my own personal interests involved.

____p. It is easier to contribute money than to work in a campaign in other ways.

____q. It satisfies my friends and associates.

Reasons b, f, i, j, k, l, n, and o, are deemed to be access indicators. Their intercorrelations are discussed in the next chapter. The percentage of respondents checking or responding to those indicators is shown on Table 3.

The access indicators listed above have been used to construct an "access attitudinal index" which will be described in the next section entitled "Findings."
### Table 3

**Frequency of Response to Attitudinal Access Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Frequency of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Would like to know the candidate better and feel that contributing gives them a better opportunity to know the candidate.</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Contribute to acquire political clout.</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Contribute because it is good for their business.</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Contribute in order to have some influence in appointments to boards, commissions and other public offices.</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Contribute in order to be able to call a public official whenever they wish.</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Contribute because they like to have informal contacts with officials, such as luncheons, dinners, and other social contacts.</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Contribute in order to have access to an official to alert him to the effects of certain legislation.</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Contribute because of their own personal interests.</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequencies shown above in Table 3 are in marked contrast to frequencies of response to behavioral indicators which are discussed in another section. The responses, however, compare well with responses in both prior surveys, as indicated in Table 4.


Table 4

Access Attitude Indicators

Comparison of Previous Surveys with Current Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Would like to know the candidate better and feel that contributing</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives a better opportunity to know the candidate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Contribute to acquire political clout.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Contribute because it is good for their business.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Contribute in order to have some influence in appointments to boards,</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commissions and other public offices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Contribute in order to be able to call a public official whenever they</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Contribute because they like to have informal contacts with officials,</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as luncheons, dinners, and other social contacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Contribute in order to have access to an official to alert him to the</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects of certain legislation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Contribute because of their own personal interests.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not asked in 1986 Survey.

Table 5 indicates frequencies of response to all of the listed reasons for giving.
Table 5
All Reasons for Giving
Comparison of Previous Surveys with Current Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I believe it is a patriotic duty.</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I like to know the candidate better, and contributing gives me a better opportunity to know him.</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate.</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. It strengthens my particular ideology of government by contributing to a particular candidate or candidates.</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I do it because of the party.</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I do it to acquire political clout</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. I like to be around elected officials.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I like to help good people win.</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. It is good for my business.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. I like to have some influence in appointments to boards and commissions and other public offices.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. It is nice to be able to call a public official whenever I wish.</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. I like to have informal contacts with officials, such as luncheons, dinners, and other social contacts.</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. I like to work in campaigns and contributing is part of working in a campaign.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. I like to feel that I have access to an official to alert him to the effects of certain legislation.</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. I have my own personal interests involved.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. It is easier to contribute money than to work in a campaign in other ways.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. It satisfies my friends and associates.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not asked in 1986 Survey.
A review of the frequency responses in Table 5 shows some obvious variations for various questions which will also be discussed in another section, but it is important to note that the most popular reasons for contributing to campaigns, as shown by responses to the list of reasons in Table 5, were:

c: 60.7% contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate.

d: 41.8% believe it strengthens their particular ideology of government by contributing to a particular candidate or candidates.

h: 73.5% contribute because they like to help good people win.

Once again, variations are found in responses in the current survey as compared with responses in the 1986 and 1988 surveys. Nevertheless, patriotism, ideology, issues, and the "sound good - feel good" reason--"I like to help good people win"--were uniformly strong responses in prior surveys.

G. ACTUAL ACCESS (BEHAVIORAL INDICATORS):

The following questions are deemed to be behavioral indicators:

42. Since making your contribution to a candidate for office, have you met with the candidate or candidates to whom you contributed?
43. Have you called him/her on the telephone since your contribution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>A Few Times</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

44. Have you written him/her?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>A Few Times</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

46. Have you invited the candidate(s) to any social event sponsored by you or to any event of personal significance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 6 below shows a comparison of previous surveys with current survey results for behavioral access indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Available
Fifty-three and two-tenths (53.2) percent of respondents have met with the candidate or candidates to whom they contributed either "a few times" (40.5%) or "often" (12.7%). Thirty-seven and eight-tenths (37.8) percent have called the candidate on the telephone since making contribution "a few times" (24.9%) to "often" (2.9%). Thirty-five and six-tenths (35.6) percent of the respondents have written the candidate "a few times" (30.9%) to "often" (4.7%). Perhaps an even stronger indication of a desire for access is answers to Question 46: 30.3% of the respondents admitted that they have invited the candidate to a social event sponsored by the contributor or to an event of personal significance. A more detailed analysis is contained in another section of this dissertation, when the differences between small, moderate and large givers and their responses to the behavioral access index is compared and discussed.

Response to whether or not the respondent has called the candidate since the contribution also varies somewhat from the 1990 response (37.8%) to the 1988 response (40.9%) and, more strikingly, to the 1986 response (50.6%). It is intriguing that the response rate in the 1990 survey in a Senate race is only 3.1% less than the response in the 1988 Governor's race survey, but significantly lower (12.8%) than a similar race, a Senate race, in 1986. It must be assumed, for lack of any further investigation or empirical evidence, that this is a phenomenon which is a function of other
issues which are not under investigation in this study and is unexplained by the current data.

Another important category is the response to whether or not the contributor had issued an invitation to an event of personal significance to the candidate. In the 1986 Senate race, those respondents responded, saying that 39.3% had issued such an invitation; in the 1988 Governor's race, 46.5% of the respondents so indicated; but in this current survey only 30.3% so indicated. For further analysis, and for purposes of bivariate and multivariate analysis, a behavioral access index has been constructed and is discussed in the next section entitled "Findings."

H. CONTRIBUTORS AND THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS:

In another section the relationship of three important dependent variables with the eleven independent variables listed above is analyzed and discussed in detail. The responses to three questions, two of which are discussed in this section, compose those three important dependent variables. The questions are:

26. Within the last five years, how many times have you contributed?

   Less than Twice
   2 Times to 5 Times
   More than 5 Times
27. To how many candidates have you contributed?

Only one
More than One but Less than 5
More than 5

28. How much is your usual contribution to a candidate for federal office (Congress, Senate, President)?

$1 - $299
$300 - $599
$600 - $1,000

Contributors who make multiple contributions to one campaign or more have been labeled "players." A large proportion of the respondents in this survey, as in past surveys, are "players" within that definition.

Seventy-five and four-tenths (75.4) percent of the respondents have contributed more than five times within the last five years, and 60.3% have contributed to more than five candidates. It is evident, therefore, that these respondents are contributors or "players" in the broadest sense of the word. It should be noted that the 75.4% of the contributors who contributed more than five times in the past five years include those who only contribute in the "small" category of $1 to 299. Therefore, the inescapable conclusion is that virtually all of the contributing elite are "players." Both of these variables (Question 26 and Question 27) are tested with eleven variables to determine a relationship, if any, between these variables and the eleven, all of which are discussed in the "Findings" section. For purposes of bivariate and multivariate
analysis, respondents who checked "More than five times" to question 26 are labeled "Frequencies," and those who checked "More than five" to question 27 have been labeled "Concentration," as will be shown in following sections.

I. FURTHER OBSERVATIONS:

Some interesting findings have resulted from this investigation which are not necessarily related to the central hypotheses of this dissertation. Although in the 1988 Presidential election 54% voted for George Bush and 46% voted for Michael Dukakis, aggregate statistics indicate that 66.3% of the respondents say they voted for George Bush, and 30.9% say they voted for Michael Dukakis. The results of this survey indicate that respondents apparently identify much more with the Republican Party than the Democratic Party, and are less willing even to admit that they are Democrats. The following two questions are germane to this point:

24. Generally speaking, are you more inclined to contribute to a candidate who is a Democrat or Republican?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Difference</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. Regardless of how you may vote, do you consider yourself to be a Democrat, Republican or Independent?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Not Sure</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-nine and one-tenth (29.1) percent of the respondents said they are more inclined to contribute to a Democrat, while 53.3% said they are more inclined to contribute to a Republican. Twenty-nine and six-tenths (29.6) percent consider themselves to be Democrats, while 49.9% consider themselves to be Republicans, and 18.6% consider themselves to be Independent. All of these responses are somewhat contrasting with the National Election Study responses, as discussed above.

Other observations as a result of statistical questions asked help form a total profile of a contributor or contributing elite which is in line with previous surveys. For instance, the age breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>00.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>04.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 49</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 64</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 +</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the respondents (or 66%) are either high level professionals, middle-level professionals, or executive managers. An overwhelming 81.1% of respondents reside in a nonunion household, have completed at least four years of college (26.0%), and 48.6% have completed postgraduate courses. One of the most striking facts revealed by this survey is that 58.6% of the respondents have a family income in 1988 of over $100,000. So the profile of our contributors conforms to most descriptions of
"political elites", both in their socioeconomic characteristics and in their attitudes toward government. The general profile of our respondents is one of elites who are highly educated, moderate to conservative, with high personal income. The profile in this survey, however, differs somewhat from earlier surveys in that the respondents are not evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans, but are obviously heavy with Republicans or at least behavioral Republicans.

An interesting contrast, however, is shown in Jones' study of political contributors (1989), which does not correspond to the profile of the contributing elite that has been developed as a result of this survey and in two prior surveys. The source of Table 7 is from Jones' study and shows a comparison with his data versus current data, allowing for differences in category labels.


### Table 7

**Profile of Political Contributors**

*Comparison Between Jones' Results and Current Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jones</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 35 25%</td>
<td>Under 35 5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>35 - 54 46%</td>
<td>35 - 49 27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 &amp; Over 29%</td>
<td>50 - 64 36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 &amp; Over 29.5%</td>
<td>65 &amp; Over 29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>Grade School 2%</td>
<td>8th Gr. &amp; Less 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School 13%</td>
<td>Some H.S. &amp; H.S. Grad. 6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College 86%</td>
<td>College to Coll. Grad. 43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Graduate 48.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>&lt; $15,000 8%</td>
<td>&lt; $19,999 2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000-$35,000 24%</td>
<td>$20,000-$29,999 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; $35,000 68%</td>
<td>$30,000-$39,999 4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000-$49,999 5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000-$100,000 21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; $100,000 58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION</td>
<td>Yes 22%</td>
<td>Yes 18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 78%</td>
<td>No 81.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTISANSHIP</td>
<td>Democrat 46%</td>
<td>Democrat 29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent 2%</td>
<td>Independent 18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republican 62%</td>
<td>Republican 49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEOLOGY</td>
<td>Liberal 27%</td>
<td>Liberal 15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate 27%</td>
<td>Moderate 37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservative 41%</td>
<td>Conservative 43.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### J. SUMMARY

Who are the contributing elite investigated in this study? From the demographic data described in the above section, it is evident that these respondents are: rich...better employed...educated...conservative—leaning to
Republican, i.e., most voted for Bush rather than Dukakis, and they would rather contribute to a Republican than a Democrat..."players," i.e., more of them have contributed at least five times and more of them have contributed to at least five different candidates...they desire access and they understand the importance of access...they trust government about the same as the general electorate...they are all efficacious...

Below is a pictorial model of the profile of these contributing elite.
Why does he contribute? Is it because he is any of the above? Some of the above? All of the above? None of the above? The data reveal the answers to these questions.

Is there a special group within the larger universe of contributing elites that contributes for "special reasons"? To answer these questions, relationships of some of these variables to other variables were tested. To further understand the frequencies described in this section, bivariate and multivariate analysis techniques were used and are described in the following section.
V. FINDINGS

As set out earlier on page 28, but imperative for an understanding of the findings, are the hypotheses of this dissertation which relate to the difference between large givers, moderate givers, and small givers, and the specific reasons for giving. The hypotheses are:

I. All contributors have a greater sense of political efficacy and greater trust in government than the general public.

II. Individuals contribute as a result of conventional, acceptable motives, which are:

(1) Patriotism
(2) Ideology
(3) Efficacy
(4) Government Trust
(5) Party Identification/Partisanship
(6) Issue Orientation

There are statistically significant, positive relationships between the above conventional reasons for giving, and:

(a) The amount of contribution;
(b) The number of contributions;
(c) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.
III. There is a significant, positive relationship between a contributor's need to seek status (enhancement of self-esteem) and:

(1) The amount of contribution;
(2) The number of contributions;
(3) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.

IV. There is a significant, positive relationship between contributors who desire access and:

(1) The amount of contribution;
(2) The number of contributions;
(3) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.

Findings in relation to these hypotheses are discussed below in two sections: (1) bivariate analysis; and (2) multivariate analysis.

A. BIVARIATE ANALYSIS

The objective of this analysis is to investigate the theory that a "special" group of contributors are those who seek to gain enhancement of self-esteem as a means of gaining prestige that comes with the ability to socialize (behavioral access) and/or make contact with elected officials because of, or as a result of, a contribution or contributions (frequency and concentration). This special group has been labeled the "self-imagers", and throughout
this study, reference is made to this group who, it is theorized, contribute for reasons which are not necessarily politically explicit.

Therefore, the focus of this analysis is based upon an investigation of three dependent variables and their relationship to eleven independent variables that reflect the special nature of this group of contributing elite. The three important dependent variables are as follows:

Dependent Variables

(1) Categories of Giving;
(2) Frequency of Giving;
(3) Concentration of Giving.

The category of each individual contribution has been determined from the results of respondents' answers to question 28 of the questionnaire which allowed respondents to place themselves in one of three categories of giving (see Appendix III for questionnaire).

"Frequency of giving," or, as we will label these respondents, "players," was determined from responses to question 26 of the questionnaire, which asked respondents the number of times they had contributed to candidates within the last five years and asked them to place themselves within one of three categories. Those respondents who contributed more than five times within the last five years have been labeled "players".
The third dependent variable, dealing with "concentration of giving," relates to question 27 of the questionnaire, which seeks responses relative to the number of candidates to whom the respondent has contributed rather than the number of times (the response sought by question 26). Respondents to question 27 who have contributed to five or more candidates have also been deemed "players," but, for purposes of labeling the various tables shown below, "players" who have contributed five or more times will be shown under columns entitled "Frequency of Giving," and players who have contributed to more than five candidates will be shown under columns labeled "Concentration of Giving".

The above dependent variables have been tested by eleven independent variables, which are as follows:

**Independent Variables**

(1) Trust;
(2) Efficacy;
(3) Patriotism;
(4) Ideology;
(5) Party I.D./Partisanship;
(6) Status;
(7) Attitudinal Access;
(8) Behavioral Access;
(9) Issue Orientation;
(10) Religion;
(11) Party Motivation.

As has been discussed in the preceding section, the data have already shown the manner or manners in which these respondents differ from the general electorate or generally conceived patterns of behavior. This analysis seeks to show
the relationship, if any, between these various pairs of variables to support the theory of this dissertation that large givers are those givers who give more, to more candidates, and more times, for access rather than for other conventional, explicit reasons, such as patriotism, ideology, and party, and that it is access which promotes these givers' self-esteem and sets this group apart into a special and unique group labeled the "self-imagers." Other studies have shown the special nature of the "contributing elite," and this data supports the general profile of those "elite."

To investigate the relationships between these various pairs of variables, indexes were constructed for "trust", "efficacy", "status", "attitudinal access", and "behavioral access".

Generally, expectations were that a strong positive relationship would be found between the dependent variables (size of giving, frequency of giving, and concentration of giving) and the eleven independent variables listed above.

1. **Categories of Giving:**

**Categories of Giving By Trust Index**

A trust index was constructed by using an additive scale, assigning values to positive answers and, in some cases, combining responses as follows:
Table 8

Questions Used to Construct
Trust Index

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right?

- Just About Always
- Most of the Time
- Some of the Time
- None of the Time

3. Do you think you can trust your state government to do what is right?

- Just About Always
- Most of the Time
- Some of the Time
- None of the Time

DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Our government officials usually tell the truth.  
   
6. Most of the things government leaders say can't be believed.

Responses to the two statements regarding trust in the federal government and trust in the state government were combined, and a positive answer was considered if respondents checked "Just about always" or "Most of the time". Agreement with the statement "Our government officials usually tell the truth" and disagreement with the statement that "Most of the things government leaders say can't be believed", were considered positive responses. Values were then assigned for positive responses and for negative responses.
A trust index was then constructed after reviewing frequencies of responses which indicated the percentage of those respondents who were labeled "low trust", "moderate trust" and "high trust". Those respondents who answered none of the questions indicating trust, and those who answered only one of the questions indicating trust, were collapsed into one category labeled "low trust"; those who answered two of the questions indicating trust, were labeled "moderate trust"; and those who answered three or four of the questions indicating trust, were labeled "high trust", as those categories were combined. 6

Table 9 below shows the results of testing the relationship, if any, between categories of giving and the trust index. Testing indicated a statistical significance between variables which may be described as of moderate strength in a positive direction.

6 Indicators used showed a moderate intercorrelation. Two indicators were omitted (Question 1, "Do you think people in government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don’t waste very much of it?"; and Question 4, "Who really runs the federal government?"). These were not intercorrelated and, therefore, were omitted from the index.
Table 9

Categories of Giving By Trust Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF GIVER</th>
<th>TRUST INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{TauC} = 0.07 \quad \text{Sig.} < 0.05 \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.12\]

Table 9 shows a significant statistical relationship at .05 level between small givers and large givers and their trust index scores. Fifty-six (56%) percent of those with low trust are small givers, and only 42% of those with high trust are small givers. Therefore, the relationship conforms to expectations.

Categories of Giving By Efficacy Index

An efficacy index was constructed using an additive efficacy scale, constructed in the same fashion as the trust scale, using the questions of the questionnaire shown below. It was expected that large givers would be more efficacious than moderate and small givers.
Table 10

Questions Used to Construct Efficacy Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. People like me have a fair say in getting the federal government to do the things we care about.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There is no way people like me can have an influence on the federal government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the above questions for the efficacy index, appropriate responses of agree or disagree are obvious, and an appropriate response was given a value larger than an inappropriate response. The intercorrelation was high. A scale was then constructed, labelling those who scored "0" (21.4%), low efficacy; those who scored "1" (24.6%), moderate efficacy; and those who scored "2" (50.7%), high efficacy.

Table 11 below shows category of giving by the efficacy index. The table reveals that the relationship is not statistically significant. Substantially all respondents are politically efficacious, as discussed in a prior section.
### Table 11

#### Categories of Giving By Efficacy Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF GIVER</th>
<th>EFFICACY INDEX</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Efficacy</td>
<td>Moderate Efficacy</td>
<td>High Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{TauC} = 0.01 \quad \text{Not Sig.} \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.03$

### Categories of Giving By Status Index

The results to be expected by constructing a status index and analyzing that index by the size of contribution, were that large givers are more likely to be status seekers than moderate and small givers.

A status index was constructed by using the following questions and particular responses to those questions.
Table 12

Questions Used to Construct Status Index

22. Here is a sample of some ways in which people feel about themselves when they make or consider a campaign contribution. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination.

___a. The donation was expected from a person in my position.
___b. There was nothing else I could do since I was asked by a good friend.
___c. My family has long been involved in party politics.
___g. I am inclined to contribute so that those who ask me won't think badly of me.
___h. I don't want the person who asks for the contribution to think I am unable to afford it.
___i. I like to do what my friends and associates do.
___j. It gives me additional status.

41. Here is a sample of some reasons people contribute to campaigns. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:

___q. It satisfies my friends and associates.

The above obviously questions the way respondents feel about themselves when they make or consider a campaign contribution. The responses used are deemed to be status indicators, however, intercorrelations were low, attributable to the fact that the highest response frequency was to "a." above, at 37.9%, and most were below 10%.
To qualify to be a status seeker on the index which was constructed, it was determined that that term would apply to any respondent who indicated the direct response that "It gives me additional status," or any two of the other indicators, including, "It satisfies my friends and associates." The index was constructed by assigning one point to each of the indicators used above. Therefore, a respondent could score a possible nine points if that respondent checked each of the indicators. Only one respondent checked nine, and one respondent checked eight. Categories were determined by: those who scored none were labeled "non status seekers"; those who scored only one were labeled "low status seekers"; those who checked two of the indicators were labeled "medium status seekers"; and those who checked three or more were labeled "high status seekers."

The number of respondents who checked more than three was only 53, therefore, all of those categories were collapsed into three and above. A statistically significant relationship was discovered between those found to be status seekers with categories of giving as indicated by Table 13 below. Of the non status respondents, 57.5% were small givers, and of the high status respondents, only 41.7% were small givers. On the other hand, of the non status respondents, 19.7% were large givers, and of the high status respondents, 37.8% were large givers.
Table 13

Categories of Giving By Status Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF GIVER</th>
<th>STATUS INDEX</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Status</td>
<td>Low Status</td>
<td>Medium Status</td>
<td>High Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{TauC} = 0.13, \text{Sig.} < 0.01, \text{Gamma} = 0.19\]

Categories of Giving By Attitudinal Access Index

It was expected that those respondents who were classified as high access respondents, according to the index constructed, would be more likely to contribute large sums. An attitudinal access index was constructed by determining "no access" respondents (NAR), "low access" respondents (LAR), "medium access" respondents (MAR), and "high access" respondents (HAR). About 45.2% of respondents were labeled "NAR"; 19.0% "LAR"; 13.2% "MAR"; and 22.6% HAR.

An index was constructed by assigning a value of "0" to those who checked none of the attitudinal access indicators; a value of "1" to those who checked one; a value of "2" to those who checked two, to a possible high total of "8", ...
giving one point for each attitudinal access indicator checked. Only two respondents checked all eight, and only seven respondents checked seven. If three or more access attitudinal indicators were checked, a label of "high access respondent" was assigned. Access attitude indicators are shown in the table below. The relationships are moderate and positive but are not statistically significant.

Table 14

Questions Used to Construct Attitudinal Access Index

41. Here is a sample of some reasons people contribute to campaigns. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:

___b. I like to know the candidate better, and contributing gives me a better opportunity to know him.
___f. I do it to acquire political clout.
___i. It is good for my business.
___j. I like to have some influence in appointments to boards and commissions and other public offices.
___k. It is nice to be able to call a public official whenever I wish.
___l. I like to have informal contacts with officials, such as luncheons, dinners, and other social contacts.
___n. I like to feel that I have access to an official to alert him to the effects of certain legislation.
___o. I have my own personal interests involved.

Table 15 below shows the results of the attitudinal access index by size of giving.
Table 15

Categories of Giving By Attitudinal Access Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF GIVER</th>
<th>ATTITUDINAL ACCESS INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N A R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tau C = 0.08 | Not Sig. | Gamma = 0.12 |

There is not a strong relationship between these variables. On the other hand, these variables are attitudinal rather than behavioral. There is a striking difference between the analysis of these attitudinal variables and behavioral variables which will be discussed below.

Categories of Giving By Behavioral Access Index

A behavioral access index was constructed. Questions 42, 43, 44, and 46, shown below, were the indicators used for this behavioral access index.
Table 16
Questions Used to Construct
Behavioral Access Index

42. Since making your contribution to a candidate for office, have you met with the candidate or candidates to whom you contributed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Few Times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Have you called him/her on the telephone since your contribution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Few Times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Have you written him/her?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Few Times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. Have you invited the candidate(s) to any social event sponsored by you or to any event of personal significance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To construct the scale, one point was awarded to those respondents who answered "a few times" or "often" to 42, 43 and 44, and, conversely, no points were awarded to those respondents checking "not at all" or "rarely". Three points were awarded to a respondent who answered "yes" to 46, and no points to a respondent answering "no" to this question. Possible maximum point total, therefore, was "6". Those
scoring none or 1 point were considered "no behavioral access respondents"; those scoring 2 points were considered to be "low behavioral access respondents"; those scoring 3 points, indicating they either answered all three of the less weighted questions positively or answered "yes" to Question 46, were labeled "medium behavioral access respondents"; and those scoring 4 or more points were labeled "high behavioral access respondents." Therefore, three categories were combined—those scoring 4, 5, and 6 points. Table 17 reflects the results of this analysis. The frequencies were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Behavioral Access Respondents</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Behavioral Access Respondents</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Behavioral Access Respondents</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Behavioral Access Respondents</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

Categories of Giving By Behavioral Access Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF GIVER</th>
<th>BEHAVIORAL ACCESS INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TauC = 0.11  Sig. <0.01  Gamma = 0.16
The differences are apparent. Of those respondents labeled "NBAR" (no behavioral access respondent), 51% were small givers, yet of those labeled "HBAR" (high behavioral access respondent), only 38% were small givers. On the other hand, of those labeled "NBAR", 23.5% were large givers, and of those labeled "HBAR", 41.5% were large givers, showing a dramatic difference between the categories of giving. The conclusion is that high behavioral access respondents are more likely to be large givers.

Categories of Giving By Issue Orientation

After a determination that one indicator was the proper indicator for issue orientation, it was expected that those respondents who were classified as "issue oriented" by their response to the indicator contained in Question 41, as shown below, would be more likely to contribute large sums. The relationship between issue orientation and categories of giving proved to be statistically significant at the 0.05 level, but the relationship was a negative one. It is apparent, therefore, that the more issue oriented a

---

7 Indicators of issue orientation were first considered as, "I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate"; "It strengthens my particular ideology of government by contributing to a particular candidate or candidates"; and "He/She thinks as I do on issues which are important to me." No intercorrelation was found between these suggested indicators. A decision was made to use, "I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate" because of the straightforward nature of the choice and the fact that over 60% of respondents checked that reason as a reason for "contributing to a campaign."
respondent, the smaller the gift. This result is supported in the multivariate analysis which follows.

41. Here is a sample of some reasons people contribute to campaigns. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:

___ c. I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate

---

**Table 18**

**Categories of Giving By Issue Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF GIVER</th>
<th>ISSUE ORIENTATION</th>
<th>Not Issue Oriented</th>
<th>Issue Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{TauC} = -0.10 \quad \text{Sig.} < 0.05 \quad \text{Gamma} = -0.16$

---

**Categories of Giving By Religious Preference**

Question 54 of the survey asked, "What is your religious preference?" The choices and the frequency of responses are shown below:
Protestant 57.8%
Catholic 18.2%
Jewish 9.3%
Other 4.7%
None 8.7%

It was expected that religion would not impact upon categories of giving, and the results support this expectation. The following table shows the results.

Table 19

Categories of Giving by Religious Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF GIVER</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lambda = 0.00 Not Sig.

An interesting result is, however, that of the Jewish respondents, who comprise only 9.3% of the total respondents, 47.9% are large givers; and, they are, therefore, the only religious group who gives in larger proportion to their number.
Categories of Giving By Other Indicators

Categories of giving were also tested with patriotism, ideology, party motivation, and party identification or partisanship, but no statistically significant relationship was found between these variables.

Summary (Categories of Giving)

In the above section categories of giving or size of contributions were tested by eleven variables, including a trust index, an efficacy index, a status index, an attitudinal access index, a behavioral access index, party orientation, issue orientation, ideology, patriotism, and religion. A statistically significant relationship was found between categories of giving and government trust. Those givers who are in the large contribution category were more likely to be trustful, or trust government, than small givers.

The relationship, however, between efficacy and categories of giving was not significant. The results show that basically every respondent has a high level of efficacy, whether a large giver, moderate giver, or small giver.

A significant statistical relationship was found between categories of giving and status, as shown by a
status index. Results indicate that larger givers are more likely to be status seekers than moderate or small givers.

In testing the same variable (categories of giving) by the attitudinal access index, results indicate that there was only a weak statistical relationship between those variables. On the other hand, however, in testing categories of giving by a behavioral access index, the differences between categories of givers was apparent. The conclusion is obvious that large givers are more likely to be high behavioral access respondents, that is, desire access more than small and moderate givers.

2. Frequency of Giving:

Players

As discussed above, two of the key dependent variables in this data are respondents who contributed five times or more in the last five years, and respondents who have contributed to at least five candidates. These respondents have been labeled "players". Respondents who have contributed more than five times within the last five years are indicated in response to the questions shown below. For purposes of this bivariate analysis, these respondents are identified by "frequency of giving" and are referred to in further discussion as "players". Those respondents who have
contributed to more than five candidates, as indicated by response to the questions shown below, are labeled, for purposes of this bivariate analysis, as "concentration of giving" and are also considered "players" as defined supra. A strong positive relationship was expected between concentration of giving, frequency of giving, and the listed variables.

26. Within the last five years, how many times have you contributed?

   Less than Twice  _____
   2 Times to 5 Times  _____
   More than 5 Times  _____

27. To how many candidates have you contributed?

   Only one  _____
   More than One but Less than 5  _____
   More than 5  _____

The above questions were tested with the same independent variables listed supra. First, we will discuss "frequency of giving" with the independent variables listed above.

**Frequency of Giving By Attitudinal Access Index**

Table 20 shows the results of frequency of giving by the attitudinal access index.
The results of the above table are statistically significant, showing a positive direction but only a fair relationship, but the statistics shown in Table 20 indicate that although substantially all of the respondents are "players", 86.5% of high access respondents give more than five times, and of no access respondents (NAR), 71.7% fall into that same category.

**Frequency of Giving By Status Index**

The same question was tested with the status index variable, and the results are shown in Table 21 below.

### Table 20

**Frequency of Giving By Attitudinal Access Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF TIMES CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>ATTITUdINAL ACCESS INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N A R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{TauC} = 0.08 \quad \text{Sig.} <0.01 \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.22 \]
Table 21

Frequency of Giving By Status Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF TIMES CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>N S R</th>
<th>L S R</th>
<th>M S R</th>
<th>H S R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TauC = 0.11  Sig. <0.01  Gamma = 0.30

Table 21 clearly indicates that high status respondents (HSR) are more likely to give more times than low status respondents (LSR). The results are shown to be statistically significant at the level of .01, and the relationship is a positive one with fair strength.

Frequency of Giving by Issue Orientation

As previously discussed in the prior section, only one indicator was used for this purpose. That indicator was:

41. Here is a sample of some reasons people contribute to campaigns. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:

   c. I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate
This indicator was then used to test frequency of giving with issue orientation. The results were not statistically significant. "Players" are not issue oriented.

**Frequency of Giving By Patriotism**

The following question was used to determine whether or not respondents contributed for patriotic reasons:

41. Here is a sample of some reasons people contribute to campaigns. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:

   a. I believe it is a patriotic duty.

Table 22 below shows the results of frequency of giving by patriotism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF TIMES CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>PATRIOTISM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TauC = 0.16  Sig. <0.01  Gamma = 0.48
The results shown in the above table clearly indicate that people who give often are more likely to be patriotic than those who give fewer times. There is a direct positive relationship between patriotism and number of contributions, which is statistically significant, and indications are that the relationship is strong. It is noted, however, that there are few respondents in the small category.

**Frequency of Giving by Party Motivation**

Those who contribute because they are motivated by their feelings for party were determined by one indicator, as follows:

41. Here is a sample of some reasons people contribute to campaigns. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:

   ___e. *I do it because of the party.*

Those, of course, who checked: "I do it because of the party," are for these purposes, considered to be motivated by party, and those who do not check this response are not so identified. Table 23 below shows the results of testing the relationship between frequency of giving and those who identified with a party.
Table 23

Frequency of Giving By Party Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF TIMES CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>PARTY MOTIVATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Party Motivated</td>
<td>Party Motivated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{TauC} = 0.13 \quad \text{Sig.} < 0.01 \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.55 \]

The results of the above indicate clearly that people who indicate party as a reason for contributing are more likely to give more times. In other words, party is the reason why these respondents contribute to campaigns. The relationship is statistically significant at the 0.01 level, and the relationship is strong, as indicated by the results of gamma.

Frequency of Giving By Trust Index

The relationship of frequency of giving with those who trust, using the trust index described above, was also tested. It was found that there was no statistical relationship between the number of times respondents gave and their political trust.
Frequency of Giving By Behavioral Access Index

Frequency of giving was also tested with the behavioral access index described above. The following table shows those results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF TIMES CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>BEHAVIORAL ACCESS INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{TauC} = 0.19 \quad \text{Sig. <0.01} \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.46 \]

The results shown in Table 24 above indicate clearly that those labeled "HBAR" (high behavioral access respondents) are more likely to be "players" by a very large margin. Put another way, those who exhibit a higher desire for access contribute more times. The relationship is statistically significant at the 0.01 level, and gamma indicates a very strong relationship between variables. This is the heart of our major hypothesis and will be discussed further.
Frequency of Giving By Efficacy Index

Frequency of giving was tested with the efficacy index we have previously constructed and described above, and although the results were statistically significant, there is little difference in categories. The conclusion is that basically all of these respondents have high levels of efficacy.

Frequency of Giving By Religious Preference

As indicated in the previous section, one indicator was used for religious preference, "What is your religious preference?" Respondents could choose one of the responses listed below. Frequency of responses has been indicated.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF TIMES CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>PROTESTANT</th>
<th>CATHOLIC</th>
<th>JEWISH</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \Lambda = 0.00 \) Not Sig.
Table 25 above shows the results of frequency of giving by religion. The relationship between the two variables is not statistically significant. Lambda was used in this table as a more appropriate statistic than TauC or Gamma. The only conclusion to be reached from the above table is that Jews are more likely to be large givers than Protestants or Catholics.

Frequency of Giving by Party I.D./Partisanship

The relationship, if any, between these variables was examined, and it was found that there is no significant statistical relationship between those who are partisan to party and frequency of giving.

Frequency of Giving by Ideology

Respondents were questioned as to whether or not they were liberal, moderate or conservative. The following was the question used:

52. Do you consider yourself liberal, moderate, or conservative?

Liberal
Moderate
Conservative
Not Sure

Moderates were omitted from the investigation as to a relationship between frequency of giving and ideology, and
only those who considered themselves liberal or conservative were used. The following table indicates those results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF TIMES CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>IDEOLOGY</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{TauC} = 0.07 \quad \text{Sig.} < 0.05 \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.18 \]

The relationship between frequency of giving and ideology is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Although it is not a particularly strong relationship, it is, however, positive. The data does reveal, however, that conservatives are more likely to contribute more times than liberals.

**Summary (Frequency of Giving)**

In the above section, "frequency of giving" (players) was tested by the eleven independent variables described
above, including a trust index, an efficacy index, a status index, an attitudinal access index, a behavioral access index, party identification/partisanship, party as a motive, issue orientation, religious preference, ideology and patriotism. A statistically significant relationship was found between frequency of giving and attitudinal access, indicating that respondents who contribute more than five times (frequency of giving) are more likely to express a desire for access than moderate givers or small givers.

The results also show that those who are labeled high status respondents are more likely to give more times than low status respondents. There is a positive, statistically significant relationship between frequency of giving and high status respondents. Similarly, those who contribute more times are more likely to be ideologues, patriots, and identify with party.

Most important to the hypotheses and conclusions reached by this study is the result of frequency of giving by the behavioral access index, showing that those who give more times are much more likely to be labeled "high access respondents" than those who do not give as many times, by a very large margin. The relationship between these variables will be discussed in further detail in the following sections.
3. Concentration of Giving:

We have previously discussed the relationship between those respondents who, because of the frequency of their giving, are considered "players" and the eleven independent variables. Now we will consider those respondents who have concentrated their giving, that is, have given to more than five candidates, and the relationship of those respondents (also players) and the eleven independent variables.

The expected results were that those respondents who have contributed to more than five candidates would contribute larger amounts of money.

Concentration of Giving By Attitudinal Access Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF CAND. TO WHOM CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>ATTITUINAL ACCESS INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N A R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TauC = 0.14  Sig. <0.01  Gamma = 0.26
The relationship between those labeled players as a result of the above responses and access, is statistically significant, and the relationship, therefore, conforms to expectations. High access respondents (HAR) are more likely to contribute to more candidates than no access respondents (NAR), low access respondents (LAR), or medium access respondents (MAR), by an impressive margin.

Concentration of Giving By Issue Orientation

Also investigated was a potential relationship between concentration of giving and issue orientation. It was expected that those who contribute because a particular candidate supports an issue the respondent wishes to support ("I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate.") would contribute more times than those who were not issue oriented. The results did not support that expectation. There is no statistically significant relationship between concentration of giving and issue orientation.

Concentration of Giving By Trust Index

The relationship, if any, between concentration of giving and the trust index was tested, with expectations that those who contributed to more candidates would exhibit greater levels of trust. It was found, however, that there
is no statistically significant relationship between these two variables.

Concentration of Giving By Efficacy Index

The relationship, if any, between concentration of giving and efficacy was tested with the expectations that those who contributed to more candidates would exhibit higher levels of efficacy. The results of this test supported the expectations. The relationship is statistically significant at the 0.01 level, and is a moderately positive one. Table 28 below shows those results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF CAND. TO WHOM CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>EFFICACY INDEX</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Efficacy</td>
<td>Moderate Efficacy</td>
<td>High Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{TauC} = 0.07 \quad \text{Sig.} < 0.01 \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.16\]
Concentration of Giving By Patriotism

The relationship, if any, between concentration of giving and patriotism was tested in the same manner as above. Table 29 below shows those results, which support the expectations that there would be a strong, positive, statistically significant relationship between those who contribute to more candidates and patriotism.

Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF CAND. TO WHOM CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>PATRIOTISM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{TauC} = 0.17 \quad \text{Sig.} < 0.01 \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.42 \]

Concentration of Giving By Party Motivation

The relationship, if any, between concentration of giving and "party motivation" as a reason for giving was tested in the same manner as above. Table 30 below shows
those results, which support the expectations that there would be a strong, positive, statistically significant relationship between those who give to more candidates and party motivation.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF CAND. TO WHOM CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>PARTY MOTIVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Party Motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{TauC} = 0.11 \quad \text{Sig.} < 0.01 \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.32 \)

The results show a statistical significance at the level of .01 and a strong gamma relationship. Therefore, it may be concluded that those who are party motivated are more likely to contribute to more than five candidates than those who are not party motivated, by a substantial margin.

Concentration of Giving by Party I.D./Partisanship

The indicator for partisanship is the following question:
55. Regardless of how you may vote, do you consider yourself to be a Democrat, Republican or Independent?

Democrat ____
Republican ____
Independent ____
Other/Not Sure ____

Independents and "Other/Not Sure" respondents were omitted, and only those respondents who checked "Democrat" or "Republican" were deemed to be partisan. The results of the testing of that relationship are shown below in Table 31.

---

Table 31

Concentration of Giving By Party I.D./Partisanship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF CAND. TO WHOM CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>PARTY IDENTIFICATION/PARTISANSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Partisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{TauC} = 0.02 \quad \text{Not Sig.} \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.05$

The results of the above indicate that the relationship between partisanship and concentration of giving is of not statistically significant.
Concentration of Giving By Status Index

The same question was tested with the status index variable. The expectations were that those who are labeled players are greater status seekers than those who are labeled non-players. The results of the testing of that relationship are shown below in Table 32.

Table 32

Concentration of Giving By Status Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF CAND. TO WHOM CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>STATUS INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TauC = 0.18 Sig. &lt;0.01 Gamma = 0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 above clearly indicates that high status respondents (HSR) are more likely to contribute to more than five candidates than non status respondents (NSR), low status respondents (LSR), and medium status respondents (MSR).
Concentration of Giving By Behavioral Access Index

Concentration of giving was also tested with the behavioral access index described above. It was expected that players are more likely to be higher behavioral access respondents than those who are not players. The following table shows the results.

Table 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF CAND. TO WHOM CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>BEHAVIORAL ACCESS INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NBAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{TauC} = 0.22 \quad \text{Sig. < 0.01} \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.40\]

The results shown in the above table indicate clearly that high behavioral access respondents (HBAR) are more likely to contribute to more than five candidates than no behavioral access respondents (NBAR), low behavioral access respondents (LBAR), and medium behavioral access respondents (MBAR). The relationship is statistically significant at the 0.01
level, and the gamma indicates a very strong relationship between these variables. Once again, this is an important relationship for purposes of this study.

**Concentration of Giving by Religious Preference**

Concentration of giving was tested by religious preference, and the table below shows those results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF CAND. TO WHOM CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lambda = 0.00  Sig. <0.01*

The relationship between these two variables is statistically significant at a 0.01 level. However, the relationship is a weakly negative one.
Concentration of Giving by Ideology

The relationship between concentration of giving and ideology is statistically significant at the 0.05 level, and is a positive one but moderate in strength. This data compares very well with the data shown earlier for frequency of giving by ideology, indicating that conservative "players" contribute to more candidates than do liberal "players."

Table 35
Concentration of Giving By Ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF CAND. TO WHOM CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>IDEOLOGY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{TauC} = 0.07 \quad \text{Sig. < 0.05} \quad \text{Gamma} = 0.19 \]

Summary (Concentration of Giving)

Statistically significant, positive relationships of varying strength were found between frequency of giving and all of the variables with the exception of trust. The same results were true of concentration of giving.
4. **Summary (Bivariate Analysis)**

Table 36 on page 115 is a summary of the statistical significance of the dependent variables [(1) categories of giving; (2) frequency of giving; (3) concentration of giving] and the eleven tested independent variables [(1) trust; (2) efficacy; (3) patriotism; (4) ideology; (5) party identification/partisanship; (6) status; (7) attitudinal access; (8) behavioral access; (9) issue orientation; (10) religion; (11) party motivation].

The summary clearly indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship between categories of giving and status seekers, a relationship between those who contribute more times and the desire for status, and a relationship between those who contribute to more candidates and a desire for status. The results also show that while ideology, patriotism, and party have little or no relationship to size of giving, the relationship between those three variables and Players I and Players II are all significant and vary in strength from moderate to strong. There is a statistically significant, moderately strong relationship between trust and categories of giving, but basically all of the respondents have high levels of efficacy, and there does not appear to be then any significant difference in relationships between the respondents, all of whom are efficacious, and the categories
of giving of "concentration of giving" and "frequency of giving" (players).

Attention, however, is directed to the attitudinal access and behavioral access variables from which indices were constructed. Although the attitudinal access indicator, when tested by categories of giving, Players I and Players II, does not reveal a great deal, the opposite is true of the behavioral access index and the three variables tested. In each case, the relationship is statistically significant and ranges from moderate to strong. In fact, other than the relationship between patriotism and Players I or party and Players I, the strongest relationship between these variables is between the behavioral access index and Players I and II, clearly indicating that those respondents who contribute more times and contribute to more candidates are much more likely to desire access than other respondents. Likewise, there is a statistically significant relationship at the .01 level between behavior indicators and categories of giving. This bivariate analysis shows that there is a moderate relationship between the behavioral index and categories of giving, and that large givers are more likely to be high behavioral access respondents.
Table 36
Summary of Statistical Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Categories of Givers</th>
<th>Frequency of Givers</th>
<th>Concentration of Givers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>TauC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party I.D./Partisanship</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Access</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Access</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Orientation</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>--------*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Motivation</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lambda (0.00), rather than TauC or Gamma, was used as a more appropriate statistic.
B. MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Multivariate regression was used to assess the simultaneous effect of the eleven independent variables (less the access attitude variable) on the three dependent variables under study. The attitude access indicators were discarded since it is evident, from the univariate and bivariate analyses, that attitude access indicators are not as reliable as indicators as behavioral access indicators. $R^2$, the multiple correlation coefficient, was used to measure the amount of variance in each of the dependent variables explained by the independent variables employed.

Tables 39 through 41, shown below, indicate each dependent variable with the seven independent variables, as measured. $R^2$ and statistical significance, as well as beta coefficient, are also indicated.

| Table 37 |
| Categories of Giving |
| $R^2 = 0.06$ | Sig. <0.01 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Access</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Access</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Orientation</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1. **Categories of Giving**

   A review of Table 37 reveals that trust, status, and issue orientation are significant determinants of categories
of giving, and as trust, status, and issue orientation increase, the size of the contribution increases. Trust, status, and issue orientation are both significant at the 0.01 level, and the relationship is a positive one. The beta coefficients of all three of these variables indicates that each is relatively the same in importance, although it was expected that trust and status would be significant determinants of categories of giving, it was not expected that issue orientation would be determinative.

2. Frequency:

The relationships of the independent variables to the dependent variables are all positive, with the exception of issue orientation, and the results of this analysis indicates that frequent givers are motivated by efficacy, behavioral access, patriotism and party. The behavioral access variable is significant at the 0.01 level, the patriotism variable is significant at the 0.01 level, and the party variable is significant at the 0.01 level. When the beta coefficients are reviewed, however, it is evident that behavioral access contributes more to frequency of giving than the other variables. While issue orientation was statistically significant at the 0.05 level, when tested with categories of giving, it is interesting that it is not statistically significant with frequency.
3. **Concentration:**

Table 39 above reveals that those who contribute to more candidates are motivated by behavioral access, patriotism, and ideology. The relationship of behavioral access is statistically significant at the level of 0.01, as is shown patriotism. However, ideology is significant at the level of 0.05. Once again, the results of the beta coefficients clearly indicate that behavioral access contributes substantially more to frequency than do any of the other variables.

4. **Summary (Multivariate Analysis)**

Using multiple regression techniques, the data reveal that there is a statistically positive relationship between the size of the gift (categories of giving) and trust, status, and behavioral access. The relationship between issue orientation and categories of giving is, however, a negative one. These data further reveal that there is a statistically significant relationship between frequency of the gift and efficacy, behavioral access, patriotism and party, all of which are statistically significant at the 0.01 level. The data further reveal that there is a statistically significant, positive relationship between concentration of giving and behavioral access, patriotism and ideology.
Important to this entire study is the fact that the behavioral access variable is the only variable that is statistically significant in each of the three tables above. This is a new dimension added to reasons or motives for giving. In addition, status, as an independent variable, has a statistically significant, positive relationship with categories of giving. It was unexpected that there is not a statistically significant relationship between status and frequency and concentration. Status, however, is another new dimension added to reasons for giving other than the conventionally acceptable reasons and supports the assertion that larger givers give to enhance self-esteem through status, which they perceive to be an achievement of status by giving larger amounts of money.

Other relationships are also shown which relate to variables that are secondary and variables we have termed conventionally acceptable and already established. These relationships have not been empirically investigated before this study, although conventional wisdom has proclaimed that these are the conventionally acceptable reasons for giving.

The new dimension added to the reasons or motives for giving is the relationship between a desire for status (enhancement of self-esteem) and that relationship with the dependent variables, and a desire for access and that relationship with the dependent variables. Those relationships are now shown to be moderately strong and positive.
VI. CONCLUSION

Money has taken on a growing importance in the politics of our country and in all aspects of the political process. Contributors respond to that demand for more money for a variety of reasons, not all of which are unacceptable or prejudicial to democracy. To understand the motives for giving to campaigns is no different than to understand why humans do anything. Albeit there are many practical uses to which this type of knowledge may be put, to understand any process in the overall political picture of our society is to put us one level ahead of where we were yesterday.

The main thrust of this dissertation and investigation has been to determine why it is that people contribute to political campaigns and to suggest that differences exist in the various motivations for giving among different types of givers. A comparison has been made of the respondents to this survey and respondents to the National Election Study of 1988 to determine whether or not there are differences in the profiles of these respondents and the general electorate. A review of the profile of these contributing elite, the reasons why they give, and the relationship of those reasons with other variables, will reveal some of the reasons that people contribute to a political campaign.
Direct responses to survey questions also give insight into what these givers say about themselves and their reasons for giving. Other survey responses, when studied carefully, indicate reasons for giving that are not necessarily akin to the direct responses. Three dependent variables were used to test eleven independent variables to determine whether or not a relationship, and what type of relationship, exists among those variables. The results of those tests indicate why some people contribute and what differences may exist in the various motivations for giving among these different types of givers, but particularly among the givers that we have labeled the "self-imagers."

Who are these givers? These contributing elite tend to be:

(1) educated;
(2) conservative;
(3) Republican;
(4) professional or high level managers;
(5) efficacious;
(6) status seekers;
(7) trusting;
(8) rich;
(9) desirous of access.

How different is this group from the general electorate? According to the National Election Study of 1988, these respondents are more Republican, more moderate to conservative, much more educated, less Protestant and Catholic and a bit more Jewish, occupy many more high level jobs, and make a great deal more money than respondents to the National Election Study of 1988.
These contributors are all efficacious, but there is not a substantial difference between the level of efficacy of these respondents and the National Election Study respondents, although a comparison of results may be deemed "mixed." Not surprisingly, respondents to the current survey tend to trust government. Government trust, at a very low level in the early 1980's, has made a steady comeback, and the results of this study compare favorably with the National Election Study, showing that most of both sets of respondents trust government.

What do these contributors say about themselves, and what do they think when making a political contribution?

A review of basic frequency distribution of responses reveals a great deal about these contributing elite. From earlier studies, it is obvious that when presented with a list of reasons for contributions, respondents generally indicate more socially acceptable reasons for contributing and generally tend to avoid those reasons which would imply a desire for access or a desire to gratify ego or enhance self-esteem. A list of "Some Reasons Some People Contribute to Campaigns" has been described in another section. The favored response of respondents to conventionally acceptable reasons to contribute is: "I like to help good people win." Responses in all three surveys are virtually the same. In all three surveys (1986, 1988, and current survey), almost three-fourths of those who responded checked that reason as
a reason for contributing. Contributing to support ideology of government is also a popular, conventionally acceptable reason for contributing, as is the closely related reason, "I contribute to support a particular issue." But what do these responses really mean?

It has been shown that respondents, when given an opportunity, will indicate those reasons that are conventionally acceptable and are reluctant to reveal other reasons for giving that may not "sound" so conventionally acceptable. When the dependent variables, however, are tested with other independent variables, more interesting results or motivations are revealed. For instance, when the attitudinal access index was tested with the dependent variable, "categories of giving," no statistically significant relationship was found. On the other hand, when "frequency of giving" (players) was tested with the same attitudinal access index, and when "concentration of giving" (players) was tested with the attitudinal access index, a statistically significant relationship between those two variables, respectively, was found. The relationship was not as strong as expected, but when the all important behavioral access index was tested with the same dependent variables, results lived up to expectations.

Relationships between the dependent variable "behavioral access" and the three independent variables, "categories of giving", "concentration of giving", and
"frequency of giving", were all statistically significant and show a moderately strong, positive relationship. The differences between behavioral indicators and attitudinal indicators, when tested with the same independent variables, were strikingly different. Almost two times as many high behavioral access respondents were found in the "large givers" category than those labeled "no behavioral access", "low behavioral access" or "medium behavioral access."

Respondents' actual behavior reveals that they do not always know or tell the truth about their motives. Conventionally acceptable reasons are merely "cover" to clothe the desire for access in prettier garb. The indicators designated as behavioral access indicators were: "meeting with the candidate, calling the candidate, writing the candidate, and inviting the candidate to a social event of personal significance." The intercorrelation of these variables was high.

A dramatic difference between large givers and other categories of giving is shown by Table 17 which measures categories of giving by a behavioral access index. Other interesting data, however, include some of the univariate responses to the behavioral indicators. Almost one-third of all respondents have invited a candidate to a social event sponsored by the respondent which is of personal significance. Although two-thirds of the respondents did not indicate that they had manifested their behavior in this
fashion, the respondents' somewhat conflicting responses to attitudinal access indicators suggests that not all respondents actually told the truth about their behavioral manifestations. In the discussion in the previous section of the construction of the behavioral access index, it was noted that extra weight was given to an affirmative response to that question. That question and responses are also closely related to the question of a desire for status through giving. These data further reveal that when that question alone (Question 46) was tested with categories of giving, almost twice as many large givers as small givers answered in the affirmative.

Similar results were found for the status seekers, who seek status, seek enhancement of self-esteem, and behave in the manner described above. When the status index was tested with each of the dependent variables, a statistically significant relationship was found at the 0.01 level. The relationship was positive and moderately strong. The data reveal that large givers desire status in substantially greater percentages than do smaller givers, status seekers are more likely to contribute more times, and status seekers are more likely to contribute to more candidates than are respondents who are considered no status seekers or low status seekers. So, put another way, these groups of contributors, the high behavioral access respondents and the high status seekers feel the social pressure, feel the social effects, and enhance their status and self-esteem by
contributing in greater numbers and with larger amounts than small and moderate givers. For instance, over one-half of the large givers contribute because "the donation was expected," while only one-third of moderate givers and small givers contribute for that reason. The data also reveal that larger givers feel that contributing gives them additional status in substantially greater numbers than do small givers.

What are some of the other relationships revealed by the data? Most of the respondents exhibit high levels of trust. Larger givers show a higher level, but not substantially. The relationship, however, between the categories of giving and trust index is significant at the 0.05 level, but it is a relatively weak relationship. Although basically all of our respondents are efficacious, there is no statistically significant relationship between categories of giving and efficacy or frequency of giving. On the other hand, a relationship between efficacy and concentration of giving is statistically significant at the 0.01 level, although the relationship is not strong. Respondents who contribute to more candidates manifest their high efficacy level by becoming involved in more campaigns.

The data reveal that contributing elite are not issue oriented. Although the relationship between categories of giving and issue orientation was significant at the 0.05 level, the relationship was a negative one. Apparently the
more issue oriented a respondent, the smaller the gift. There was no statistically significant relationship between issue orientation and frequency of giving or concentration of giving. Contrast these results with the most frequently described reasons for giving: "I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate"; "It strengthens my particular ideology of government by contributing to a particular candidate or candidates"; "I contribute because I like to help good people win" (p. 58, supra). On the other hand, their behavior does not support those results. This is another example of respondents' desire to "clothe behavior in prettier garb."

Is there a significant difference between Protestants, Catholics and Jews and their giving habits? There is no statistically significant relationship between categories of giving or frequency of giving and religious preference. There is, however, a statistically significant relationship at the level of 0.01 between those givers who give more times and religious preference. In all cases, however, the only interesting conclusion to be reached is that Jews contribute more times, in larger amounts, and to more categories than other religions, according to their ratio to the population.

Is there a relationship between patriotism and these dependent variables? There is no relationship between
patriotism and categories of giving, but there is a moderately significant relationship between patriotism and frequency of giving and patriotism and concentration of giving. In other words, the "players" tend to be patriotic.

What is the relationship, if any, between ideology (liberal or conservative) and these dependent variables? There is no relationship between ideology and categories of giving. There is a relationship, but not particularly strong, between frequency of giving and ideology. The relationship is statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The same may be said about the relationship between ideology and concentration of giving. Players may be ideologues, but they do not represent the poles of ideology.

In seeking to determine motives for giving, respondents were given a list of questions to respond to to determine their direct responses to "motives for giving." Among these is "giving for party" or what has been labeled in this dissertation "party motivation." There is no statistically significant relationship between party motivation and categories of giving, but, once again, players are motivated by "party." There is a statistically significant relationship at the level of 0.01 between frequency of giving and party motivation and concentration of giving and party motivation. A moderately strong gamma of 0.55 for frequency of giving when tested by party motivation, indicates a positive correlation between "party motivation"
and those who give more frequently. Players are motivated by their feelings for party.

"Party identification or partisanship" is a separate independent variable. Although it may very well be related to "party motivation," it is set out in a totally different context in the questionnaire. "Party identification/partisanship" merely signifies whether or not one identifies with a party or not. No statistical significance was found and, therefore, there is no relationship between any of the dependent variables and "party identification/partisanship."

In *Power and Money*, Thomas Byrne Edsall points out what these data reveal: "The growing importance of money in elections works inherently to the advantage of Republicans: donors fall overwhelmingly in the top 20% of the income distribution and it is there that allegiance of the Republican party is strongest" (1988, p. 219). Although this statement may be supported by the data in the current survey (see p. 38, supra), there is no statistically significant relationship between party identification and categories of giving among these contributors. That does not, however, contradict the statement that there is a greater percentage of those who identify as Republicans contained within this group of contributing elite than Democrats.

The favorite response of respondents, as pointed out, is a conventionally acceptable reason to contribute: "I like to help good people win," but the results discussed
above indicate that respondents don’t always mean what they say or, if they do mean what they say, they are simply not "telling all." The strength of the desire for access and the difference between small, moderate, and large givers tends to support the hypothesis that there is a significant positive relationship between contributors who desire access and, as the tables have shown, the amount of contribution, the number of times contributions are made, and the number of candidates to whom contributions are made.

A review of all of the hypotheses of this dissertation is in order. The hypotheses are:

I. All contributors have a greater sense of political efficacy and greater trust in government than the general public.

II. Contributors contribute as a result of conventional, acceptable motives, which are:

(1) Patriotism
(2) Ideology
(3) Efficacy
(4) Government Trust
(5) Party Identification/Partisanship
(6) Issue Orientation

There are statistically significant, positive relationships between the above conventional reasons for giving, and:

(a) The amount of contribution;
(b) The number of contributions;
(c) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.
III. There is a significant, positive relation­ship between a contributor's need to seek status (enhancement of self-esteem) and:

(1) The amount of contribution;
(2) The number of times he contributes;
(3) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.

IV. There is a significant, positive relation­ship between contributors who desire access and:

(1) The amount of contribution;
(2) The number of times he contributes;
(3) The number of candidates to whom contributions are made.

It is important to note that considerable thought and attention was given to the use of behavioral access as a dependent variable or an independent variable. The basic definition of these two types of variables is the basis for some consternation over whether behavioral access should be labeled one or the other. Obviously, the dependent variable is the variable that the researcher wishes to explain, and the independent variable is the variable expected to explain a change in the dependent variable, and is, therefore, the "presumed cause" of changes in the values of the dependent variable. As the Nachmiases explain it:

"It should be stressed that the distinction between dependent and independent variables is analytic and relates only to the research purpose." (1981, p. 58).
As has been shown in this dissertation, the phenomena investigated called for the assessment of the effects of eleven independent variables on three dependent variables, and behavioral access might easily have been used as a dependent variable rather than an independent variable with the same objective of attempting to determine an expected change in behavioral access through the use of the ten remaining independent variables. The author confesses that there is no clear, distinctive dividing line between the use of behavioral access as a dependent or independent variable. For purposes of this study, however, it was determined that a relationship, if any, between behavioral access and other variables could best be investigated and explained by using behavioral access as an independent variable rather than a dependent variable.

Do contributors have a greater sense of political efficacy and greater trust in government than the general public? In 1980, the Michigan Survey Research Center indicated that only one-fourth of the electorate trusted government. In 1988, however, the National Election Study indicated that there is a reversal of government trust feelings in this country, and in 1988, most of those respondents trusted government in "Washington to do what is right" most of the time to some of the time. Respondents in the current survey responded in approximately the same percentages. Therefore, the results of our survey indicate
that the general public trusts government just as much as the contributing elite, and hypothesis "I" is not supported.

Similar results are found for efficacy. Simple univariate statistics show that most of these respondents disagree with the statement that "There is no way people like me can have an influence on the federal government." About one-half of respondents agree that "almost every group has a say in running things," and about the same number believe that they "have a fair say in getting the federal government to do the things that we care about" (see p. 50, supra). Virtually every respondent has a high level of efficacy. When an efficacy index was constructed and compared with categories of giving, the results showed that virtually the same number of small givers and large givers were considered to have high efficacy (see p. 79, supra). All givers display high levels of efficacy. The National Election Study results are very similar to the univariate statistics above, and, therefore, the hypothesis that "All contributors have a greater sense of efficacy... than the general public," is invalid.

Do contributors contribute as a result of conventional acceptable motives, which are patriotism, issue orientation, ideology, efficacy, government trust, and party? The statistical analysis, described in the section entitled "Findings", demonstrates that there is a significant
positive relationship between those respondents who are considered "high trust respondents" and levels of giving.

Do these contributors give because of other conventional, acceptable motives, such as patriotism, ideology and party, as set out in hypothesis "II"? As indicated earlier, respondents do indicate that these are reasons or motives for giving. Although respondents say they contribute because of patriotism, issues, ideology and party, reference to bivariate and multivariate analyses referred to earlier does not show a statistically significant relationship between these variables. There are, therefore, mixed results as to hypothesis "II".

The most important independent variables, in terms of importance to this dissertation, are status and access, two variables that have been introduced in this study for the first time in the literature in an empirical fashion. These two variables and the relationship between these two and the independent variables form the basis for the self-imagers that desire access and status and give for other than politically explicit reasons.

Therefore, the hypothesis that "There is a significant, positive relationship between the contributors's need to seek status (enhancement of self-esteem) and: (1) the amount of the contribution; (2) the number of times he contributes; and (3) the number of candidates to whom contributions are made" is central to the entire theory of this dissertation
and should be taken together and discussed together with the hypothesis that "There is a significant, positive relationship between contributors who desire access" and the same dependent variables.

The concept of "status" should be examined first. A review of the univariate data shows some of the feelings the contributors have about themselves when they make or consider a campaign contribution, and some of the reasons why they contribute as indicated by these various indicators. For instance, about one-third of respondents feel that a donation is expected "from a person in my position", and a smaller group of respondents feel that it gives them "additional status". It is recognized that only a small portion use this reason as a reason for giving; however, consideration must be given to other status indicators and the all of the indicators used to construct the status index for statistical purposes (see Table 12, p. 80).

Bivariate analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between those found to be status seekers and categories of giving. These relationships are also very revealing and interesting (see Table 13, p. 82). Using multivariate regression to assess the simultaneous effect of eleven independent variables on the three dependent variables under study, it was revealed that there is a statistically significant relationship at the .01 level between status and categories of giving.
Similarly, status was revealed to have a statistically significant relationship at the .01 level with the frequency of giving with a positive, fairly strong relationship. Virtually identical results were revealed when investigating the relationship between status and concentration of giving. There are indications, therefore, that there is a statistically significant relationship between categories of giving and status seekers, and a relationship between those who contribute more times and the desire for status and a relationship between those who contribute to more candidates and a desire for status. Although the multiple regression analysis reveals multiple correlation coefficients, which may be termed "weak", there is a consistent relationship between the independent variable status and all three dependent variables. The data and analysis, therefore, reveal that status seekers do tend to give more, more times, and to more candidates.

Similar results were found when access was investigated for its relationships, if any, with the same dependent variable. In terms of the univariate frequency distribution support for these relationships and analysis, it should also be pointed out that a majority of the respondents answered in the affirmative when asked the importance of easy access to a public official, and a larger majority believe that "contributors have more access to an elected official than those who do not contribute" (see pp. 52 and 53, supra). Access indicators have been referred to in another section,
but it is interesting to note that some respondents contribute to "acquire political clout"; some contribute because they like "to be able to call a public official" whenever they wish; some contribute because they "like to have informal contacts with official"; some contribute because they "like to feel that they have access to an official to alert him to the effects of certain legislation"; and some merely contribute because it makes them "feel good" (see Table 3, p. 56).

Behaviorally speaking, the results of the survey are more revealing. Over one-half of the respondents "met with the candidate or candidates" to whom they contributed, "a few times" to "often"; and almost one-third "invited the candidate to a social event" sponsored by the respondent or to an "event of personal significance" (see Table 6, p. 60). These are the respondents, including the self-imagers, but not necessarily excluding others, whose socially acceptable reasons for giving may be the social garb which masks their true desire for access. Noteworthy is the fact that large givers show higher levels of manifesting their behavior in this manner than do small and moderate givers.

When a behavioral index was constructed and bivariate analysis techniques were used to determine if a relationship existed between the behavioral access index and categories of giving, the differences became apparent. Of the high behavioral access respondents, 88.2% contributed more than
five times, yet of the no behavioral access respondents, only 60.2% contributed more than five times. Once again, it should be pointed out that, while the multiple regression coefficients do not indicate strong relationships, the relationships are statistically significant and are consistent in that behavioral access, as an independent variable, shows a consistently significant relationship with all three dependent variables and with greater strength than any other independent variable. It may be concluded, therefore, that high behavioral access respondents tend to be large givers.

As a whole, the data, reveal that large givers feel the social pressure or, put another way, feel the social effects and, therefore, enhance their status by contributing in greater numbers than do small and moderate givers and seek access in the same fashion.

STATUS and ACCESS are the two most important words in this dissertation. As the data have revealed, access is equated with virtually all of the motives used for giving. The use to which access may be put, which may include such less socially acceptable motives as "influence", may be a common result of the acquisition of access, but this use to which access may be put is not the subject or the focus of this dissertation. This dissertation points out that access is a motive, in and of itself, for a certain group of givers and is important to virtually all givers. "As Gordon
Allport might put it, contributing to many campaigns in large amounts makes one a 'machtmensch', enhances self-esteem and gratifies the ego. Access does all of this. Access makes one a machtmensch" (Beychok 1987, p. 62).

To fully understand this driving motivation for status, acceptance, identity—all leading to enhancement of self-esteem by making large contributions—one may look to scholars in other disciplines who have given clarity to these theories.

William Glasser, an educator, pointed out that the single basic need "that people have is a requirement for an identity: the belief that we are someone in distinction to others, and that the someone is important and worthwhile" (1959, 5,12-17). Charles Horton Cooley described the "looking glass self" in writing about one's conception of oneself, which involves what one believes others see and "as a result, self-feelings in some form of either pride or abnegation" (1922, 183-185).

The following insight is perhaps closer to the mark than anything written so far. Tmotsu Shibutani (1962) said:

"Men struggle for social status, to be assured of being treated with reasonable respect in their communities; they struggle for personal status, to keep up their reputation for integrity; they also struggle for self-respect...Man's deepest gratifications come from living well according to his own standards, which in most cases are the standards of the society in which he lives" (pp. 230-234).
One scholar elaborated on both Shibutani's words and Charles Horton Cooley's "looking glass self" when he said:

"Self-esteem is a feeling, not a definition, a thought, or a role that one plays, it is not a game. Self-esteem perceives any evaluation man makes of himself in formulating various self-concepts. The mirror image is an alienated self-concept, one that needs external props to maintain it" (Guffey 1972, 179-180).

Clearly, contributions to campaigns— with consistency, in large amounts— to obtain access through various manifestations of behavior described throughout this dissertation, are those external props that this particular group of "self-imagers" tend to use to maintain and enhance self-esteem and ego gratification. There would be little argument over the assertion that, in response to a direct mail solicitation for a contribution to a candidate whose principal single issue is to save the whales, that this was a contribution given for politically nonexplicit reasons that has little or nothing to do with enhancement of self-esteem or gratification of ego. So, too, would there be little or no argument for a $20 contribution for a "right to life" or "pro-choice" proponent. The very existence of those givers who give more money, give more frequently, trust government, possess high levels of efficacy, like the feeling of increased status that giving seems to give that special group, demand access for its own sake through various behavioral manifestations, such as writing, calling,
contacting, and inviting the candidate to social events, gives rise to all of the questions to which these data may give answers.

Perhaps redundant, but important, is to emphasize the fact that most respondents clearly indicate that access is an important motivation for giving, regardless of the category of giver. Survey results certainly give some indication of what access really means to each individual contributor, although it is still not clearly defined. The listed reasons of definitions of access in the survey are only revealing to a limited extent. No measure has been devised to determine whether or not there is an immediate "fix" in giving a large contribution. No body thermometer or other electronic device attached to the body of a contributor has yet been invented to determine fluctuations in blood pressure and other physical manifestations when access is achieved through meeting with, contacting, or socializing with a candidate, but this data and this research clearly indicates that such indications are there. How strong are these indications? How important is it that the end results of these behavioral manifestations actually gratify and enhance? These are questions that are not yet answered.

What is clear, however, is that a group of contributors who give more money, more times, and to more people, are the "self- imagers" of this contributing elite. These are the
contributors who give for politically nonexplicit reasons, as well as those reasons which may be politically explicit. They don't give to harm, nor do they give for altogether altruistic reasons. On the other hand, they do not harm democracy; they do not harm the republic. On the contrary, it has been shown that contributing is a method of participation in the process, and the impact of giving may very well be internal. This reasoning, does not, however, exclude reasons for giving which may be less than altruistic and only for the personal gain of the contributor. Other, future means of investigations may well analyze this aspect of giving. Whether or not an ability to contribute larger sums on more occasions and to more candidates, to seek access and status, is violative of the American ethos of equality is a proper intellectual exercise for those who wish to further investigate equality in all its forms.

In this study, comparisons have been made with earlier studies of a more narrow sample. Comparisons have also been made between regions of the country, and data have been presented to point out not only the differences among the various categories of givers, but also the similarities, particularly in the area of access as a motivation for giving. An attempt has been made to review the underlying basis for the theory of this dissertation through the views of those scholars who have theorized and studied the psychological basis for the effects of participation on
individuals who elect to participate in the political processes of the United States, as well as a review of those scholars who have done significant work in the specific area of political contributions and their impact.

"Political giving has generally been viewed as being motivated by selfish desires to 'control' or 'influence' or by purely ideological or patriotic feelings. Society's obsession with disclosure, limits on campaign contributions, continuous public debate and 'sensational' media reports about who gave how much to whom, support the obsession of the media and perhaps the public with the negative connotations of political giving" (Beychok and Parent 1989, p. 21). Yet this study, as do earlier studies, indicates that more personal reasons for giving also exist in some givers. Are those personal reasons "bad" for democracy? In the 1986 study, one of the interviewees, a former Governor of Louisiana, said:

"I mean, many people, especially people who are nouveau rich, people who historically have been on the outside looking in at high society, if they suddenly become wealthy, then they will frequently use political campaigns as a means, in their own estimation, it may not elevate them in the eyes of anybody else, but in their own eyes, as a means of becoming somebody important" (p. 22).

Reviewing conclusions reached by scholars who are psychologically oriented and scholars who are more specifically interested in the impact of giving, we may conclude
that there are many reasons why individuals contribute to political campaigns. Schlozman and Tierney (1986) understood that there are many reasons why individuals participate; Simon (1985) explained human behavior in a political context and stressed the need for a knowledge of the nature of human beings in any political study and in forming research methods; Lasswell (1948) described a "political personality"; Allport (1950) focused upon problems of participation for the individual; and Sniderman (1975) pointed out the effect of self-esteem on participation and/or the effect of participation on self-esteem.

Various authors reviewed the so-called "Pac Phenomenon" and its impact on participation in the political processes. Among those were Sabato (1985), Malbin (1984), Jacobson (1980, 1984), Thielmann and Wilhite (1989), Ragsdale and Cook (1987), Kau and Rubin (1982), Ginsberg (1984), Hershey (1984), and Drew (1983). Jacobson's seminal study fully recognized that access is a motive for campaign giving and pointed out that which has been empirically approached in this dissertation: that there are politically nonexplicit reasons for giving and that "individuals receive benefits from the act of contributing itself" (Jacobson 1980, 68), which are psychological in nature.

These questions were asked in the 1986 study (Beychok, 1987): "Is giving for the purposes outlined by the former
Governor in the above interview quotation 'bad' for democracy? Does such motivation cause harm? Isn't the behavior described above a motivation for campaign giving which cannot be explained in explicitly political terms but must be and is explained by an innocent desire to enhance one's self-esteem?" (p. 22).

Has this study revealed the psychological demon within one's inner being that answers the questions scholars have asked for decades? What is it about participation, and specifically through participation in the process by contributing, that rewards the contributor with something other than tangible material good? Does this study contradict Olson's (1965) view that "no rational, self-interested individual will voluntarily incur any of the cost of providing the public good" (p. 44, as quoted in Jacobson 1980, 57)? Is there now less doubt that there are certain rewards in giving which are not necessarily explicit or tangible? Certainly general concerns about the impact of giving are not answered in the absolute, but the data does reveal that some of our concerns may be alleviated.

Some questions have, in fact, been answered for the first time. A desire for status and a desire for access may very well be interchangeable and may be analogous to the classical conundrum: "Which came first," a desire for status motivating behavior leading to access, or a desire for access motivating behavior leading to status? It
matters not, however, which comes first. It does matter that these two factors are taken together to fully understand the "self-imagers" of this study. It is also important to understand that these motivations for giving...status and access...are not necessarily politically explicit, nor should either or both be labeled in the negative.

Scholars and lay people alike are quick to recognize the need to identify with those perceived to be in positions of power or influence. Why should we not adopt the proposition that campaign giving is merely one of many methods of so doing? There are, of course, those who choose irrational standards to assure themselves that they possess a high level of self-esteem, but there is no debate that if one achieves what one perceives to be an enhancement of self-esteem through political giving, there is no harm to society as a whole or to our processes. Certainly there is an impact on society and our processes, but our society demands that type of participation and sanctions it. It must, therefore, be recognized that the imprimatur of society, affixed to the campaign contributor, merely parallels or ices the cake of the individual seeking additional status.

This study has not filled all of the gaps in our knowledge of the motive of an individual for giving to a campaign. Indeed, this study has revealed some further gaps
and even some contradictions, but it is hoped that pointing out these gaps, some cumulation of knowledge, and some contradictions, will lead to further study of the most fascinating subject on earth: The motives of man.

What do the data reveal for the future and for practical benefit in the political arena? Certainly the data reveal certain techniques of solicitation. Since these self-imagers and most of the contributing elite trust government and have high feelings of efficacy, any solicitation of this group should be made with that in mind. Those who give money, "like" government and feel they have some input or influence on government. The identity of the solicitor has proved to be important, as a substantial number of respondents would rather contribute to friends and associates or are substantially influenced by friends and associates in their giving. The fact that access is important to the majority of givers, whether large or small, is also a factor that must be considered in any solicitation campaign. The subtle effects of perceived changes in status and ego gratification resulting from a chance to rub elbows with the candidate or official may very well be one of the most important techniques of solicitation.

On a broader spectrum, information has been revealed which supports conventional wisdom and other studies (Ginsberg 1984) that the contributing elite would rather give to Republicans than Democrats. Obviously the
Democratic Party would benefit from knowledge revealed in this study in an effort to bring a larger portion of those contributing elite to their table.

Perhaps charitable givers also possess a need to participate for input, for status and for certain associations. The "self-imagers" of this study may very well be found in charitable giving. We might theorize that these same "self-imagers" will be found, although with some different stripes, in the names of those whose plaques are affixed to hospital walls, church and synagogue buildings, featured prominently in solicitations to foundations engaged in research in the many physical diseases of our society, or on the board of United Givers, local symphonies and other philanthropic endeavors.

William Glasser's words mean all of that and perhaps more:

"Thus we say that the single basic need that people have is requirement for an identity: the belief that we are someone in distinction to others, and that the someone is important and worthwhile" (1959, 5, 12-17).

"The mirror image that needs external props to maintain it," as Cooley pointed out, and may very well be obtained by methods which are not harmful to one's self or to the public, are not injurious to democracy, do not exhibit or manifest a need to control or influence, but may very well be harmless attempts on the part of human beings to carry
out that "...requirement for an identity: the belief that we are someone in distinction to others..." (1922, 183-185).

Perhaps future research will focus on this small group of "self-imagers" who give for these reasons. Obviously, a more intense study of this small group and a group not studied here, the "fund-raisers", through interviews, psychological evaluations, and other tools, should provide an even greater insight into the motives for their campaign giving and support the findings of this dissertation.
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# Appendix I

## Table A

Median Age Distribution -- 1980 U.S. Census  
*(Persons Age 25 and Older)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-North-Central</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-North-Central</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Atlantic</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-South-Central</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-South-Central</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-North-Central</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-North-Central</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Atlantic</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-South-Central</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-South-Central</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table B

### Distribution of Race by Percentage—1980 U.S. Census Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region &amp; Rep. State</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-North-Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-North-Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-South-Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-South-Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table C

**Mean Education Level — 1980 U.S. Census Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region &amp; Rep. State</th>
<th>8 Yrs or Less</th>
<th>1 - 3 Years H.S.</th>
<th>4 Years H.S.</th>
<th>1-3 Years Univ.</th>
<th>4+ Years Univ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-North-Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-North-Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-South-Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-South-Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D

**Mean Per Capita Income in Dollars — 1980 U.S. Census Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Mean Income</th>
<th>Representative State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>$10,105</td>
<td>$10,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>10,127</td>
<td>10,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-North-Central</td>
<td>9,779</td>
<td>9,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-North-Central</td>
<td>9,338</td>
<td>9,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Atlantic</td>
<td>8,762</td>
<td>8,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-South-Central</td>
<td>7,436</td>
<td>7,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-South-Central</td>
<td>9,079</td>
<td>9,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>8,994</td>
<td>8,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>10,720</td>
<td>10,938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table E

**Political Party Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-N.-Cent.</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.-Atlantic</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-S.Cent.</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-S.-Cent.</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPENDIX II

**TABLE: ACTUAL REGISTRATION (1988)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>162</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## APPENDIX II

### Actual Registration (1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Democrat Registration</th>
<th>Republican Registration</th>
<th>Other Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Require No Party Registration
APPENDIX III

1989 QUESTIONNAIRE CODE

1989 QUESTIONNAIRE

1988 QUESTIONNAIRE

1986 QUESTIONNAIRE
CODE

1989

DISSERTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Numbering Code: Sample "15-0001"
or "72.5-0452"

(Questionnaire #1 was sent to a contributor to a
Massachusetts campaign, and the contribution was $500)

(Questionnaire #452 was sent to a contributor to a
Texas Campaign, and the contribution was $250)

first number: 1 = Massachusetts (Northeast)
2 = New Jersey (Mid-Atlantic)
3 = Michigan (East-North-Central)
4 = Nebraska (West-North-Central)
5 = Virginia (South-Atlantic)
6 = Mississippi (East-South-Central)
7 = Texas (West-South-Central)
8 = Mountain (Arizona)
9 = California (Pacific)

second number: Category of Giver, as Follows:

0 = Less than $100
1 = $100 1.1 = $110 1.5 = $150, etc.
2 = $200
3 = $300
4 = $400
5 = $500
6 = $600
7 = $700
8 = $800
9 = $900
10 = $1000
11 = $1100 11.5 = $1150, and on and on

Last four numbers: Questionnaire number

0001 = Questionnaire # 1
2700 = Questionnaire # 2700
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think people in government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think you can trust the government in Washington do what is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just About Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think you can trust your state government to do what is right?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just About Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who really runs the federal government?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Corporations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Few Very Influential People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both of the Above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Officials Who Really Represent the People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree or disagree with the following statements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our government officials usually tell the truth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host of the things government leaders say can't be believed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way our system of government operates, almost every group has a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say in running things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This country is really run by a small number of persons at the top</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who only speak for a few special groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although our country may be facing difficult times, I still feel that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is a worthwhile place and I really belong here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way this country is going, I often feel that I really don't belong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of many things about our federal system of government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can't find much in our federal system of government to be proud of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People like me have a fair say in getting the federal government to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the things we care about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no way people like me can have an influence on the federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. This state is really run by a small number of persons at the top who only speak for a few special groups

Agree  Disagree

16. Although our state may be facing difficult times, I still feel that it is a worthwhile place and I really belong here

Agree  Disagree

17. The way this state is going, I often feel that I really don’t belong here

Agree  Disagree

18. I am proud of many things about our state system of government

Agree  Disagree

19. I can’t find much in our state system of government to be proud of

Agree  Disagree

20. People like me have a fair say in getting the state government to do the things we care about

Agree  Disagree

21. There is no way people like me can have an influence on the state government

Agree  Disagree

22. Here is a sample of some ways in which people feel about themselves when they make or consider a campaign contribution. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination.

   a. The donation was expected from a person in my position.
   b. There was nothing else I could do since I was asked by a good friend.
   c. My family has long been involved in party politics.
   d. I don’t know what happened, I just felt I ought to give the money.
   e. It makes me feel good to know I am part of the process.
   f. I feel some guilt if I don’t participate.
   g. I am inclined to contribute so that those who ask me won’t think badly of me.
   h. I don’t want the person who asks for the contribution to think I am unable to afford it.
   i. I like to do what my friends and associates do.
   j. It gives me additional status.

23. Here is a sample of some ways in which people feel about a candidate when they make or consider a campaign contribution. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination.

   a. I could never get done in a day what the candidate does.
   b. I always knew he/she would win, and I didn’t want to lose my vote.
   c. He/she remembered my name at a fund-raiser.
   d. He/she is the right person at the right time.
   e. He/she just sees the big picture.
   f. I don’t know why, he/she just always says things that I wish I had said.
   g. He just gets me excited when he speaks. He is a great orator.
   h. All politicians are crooks, but he/she will get something done.
   i. I was afraid to support him/her.
   j. There is never a dull moment when he is in office.
   k. He/she will get done exactly what needs to be done and would do what I would do if I were in office.
   l. I always knew he/she would win, and I didn’t want to lose my vote.
   m. He/she will be good for business.
   n. He/she thinks as I do on issues which are important to me.

24. Generally speaking, are you more inclined to contribute to a candidate who is a Democrat or Republican?

   Democrat  Republican  No Difference

25. Have you ever contributed money to a candidate for public office?

   YES  NO
26. Within the last five years, how many times have you contributed?
   Less than Twice  ______
   2 Times to 5 Times  ______
   More than 5 Times  ______

27. To how many candidates have you contributed?
   Only one  ______
   More than One but Less than 5  ______
   More than 5  ______

20. How much is your usual contribution to a candidate for federal office (Congress, Senate, President)?
   $1 - $299  ______
   $300 - $599  ______
   $600 - $1,000  ______

29. How much is your usual contribution to a candidate for state office (House, Senate, Governor, Other Elected Official)?
   $1 - $299  ______
   $300 - $599  ______
   $600 - $1,000  ______

30. Have you ever loaned money to a campaign?
   YES  ______
   NO  ______

31. If your answer to the previous question is "YES", in what category would your loan(s) fit?
   $1 - $299  ______
   $300 - $599  ______
   $600 - $1,000  ______

32. Do you prefer to give your contribution to a campaign, as follows:
   To the Candidate  ______
   To His Supporter Who Raises Funds for Him  ______
   Through the Mail  ______
   To Someone You Know Socially  ______
   To Someone With Whom You Do Business  ______

33. Does it bother you to know that the amount of money you will contribute will be disclosed in a Finance Report which may find its way into the media?
   YES  ______
   NO  ______
   OTHER  ______

34. Do you find it easier to give to a candidate when you are solicited by a friend other than a representative of the candidate whom you do not know?
   YES  ______
   NO  ______
   OTHER  ______

35. When solicited, would you like to be asked for a specific amount rather than a general request for a contribution?
   YES  ______
   NO  ______
   OTHER  ______
36. Would you prefer that your contribution take the form of a purchase of a ticket to a specific function or event?

YES
NO
NO DIFFERENCE
OTHER

37. a. Is it important for you to have easy access to a public official?

YES
NO

b. If you answer to the above is "YES", how important is easy access?

Fairly Important
Moderately Important
Very Important
Extremely Important

38. Do you believe that contributors have more access to an elected official than those who do not contribute?

YES
NO
NO OPINION

39. When you contribute money to a candidate, do you express your desire to have access to that candidate?

YES
NO
SOMETIMES

40. Is it important for you when you make a contribution that the candidate acknowledge his availability and access to you?

YES
NO
NO DIFFERENCE

41. Here is a sample of some reasons people contribute to campaigns. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:

a. I believe it is a patriotic duty.
b. I like to know the candidate better, and contributing gives me a better opportunity to know him.
c. I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate.
d. It strengthens my particular ideology of government by contributing to a particular candidate or candidates.
e. I do it because of the party.
f. I do it to acquire political clout.
g. I like to be around elected officials.
h. I like to help good people win.
i. It is good for my business.
j. I like to have some influence in appointments to boards and commissions and other public offices.
k. It is nice to be able to call a public official whenever I wish.
l. I like to have informal contacts with officials, such as luncheons, dinners, and other social contacts.
m. I like to work in campaigns and contributing is part of working in a campaign.
n. I like to feel that I have access to an official to alert him to the effects of certain legislation.
o. I have my own personal interests involved.
p. It is easier to contribute money than to work in a campaign in other ways.
q. It satisfies my friends and associates.
r. It makes me feel good.
42. Since making your contribution to a candidate for office, have you met with the candidate or candidates to whom you contributed?

Not at All
Rarely
A Few Times
Often

43. Have you called him/her on the telephone since your contribution?

Not at All
Rarely
A Few Times
Often

44. Have you written him/her?

Not at All
Rarely
A Few Times
Often

45. Have the meetings, phone calls, or letters been to express yourself on issues or have you sought assistance for yourself or others in some particular matter?

Issues
Assistance
Other

46. Have you invited the candidate(s) to any social event sponsored by you or to any event of personal significance?

YES
NO

47. Here are some definitions of "access". Please put a check by the definition that most closely resembles your definition. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:

- a. An ability to reach the official on the phone.
- b. An ability to see the official rather than the aide in his Washington office.
- c. An ability to see the official rather than an aide in his district or state office.
- d. Some influence over his voting on questions that are important to me.
- e. Some influence over his recommendations for appointments for jobs, commissions, or judgeships.
- f. Having the official to a social occasion at my house.
- g. Going on a social visit, such as hunting, fishing, or vacationing with the official and/or his family.
- h. Interaction between the official's family and my family.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY:

48. In 1988, did you vote for George Bush or Michael Dukakis?

Bush
Dukakis
Did Not Vote

49. In what age group are you?

18 - 24
25 - 34
35 - 44
50 - 64
65 +
50. Please classify your job or profession in one of these categories.

- High-Level Professional
- Middle-Level Professional
- Executive Manager
- Sales, Proprietor
- White Collar Civil Service
- Skilled Labor
- Semi- & Unskilled Labor
- Housewife
- Other

51. Are you or is any member of your household a member of a labor union?

- Labor Member
- Labor Household
- Non-Union Household

52. Do you consider yourself liberal, moderate, or conservative?

- Liberal
- Moderate
- Conservative
- Not Sure

53. What is the last grade of school you have completed?

- 8th Grade or Less
- Some High School
- High School Graduate
- Some College
- 2-Year College Graduate
- 4-Year College Graduate
- Post-Graduate

54. What is your religious preference?

- Protestant
- Catholic
- Jewish
- Other (Specify)
- None

55. Regardless of how you may vote, do you consider yourself to be a Democrat, Republican or Independent?

- Democrat
- Republican
- Independent
- Other/Not Sure

56. For statistical purposes only, we need to know your total family income for 1988. Please check one of the following:

- Under $19,999
- $20,000 - $29,999
- $30,000 - $39,999
- $40,000 - $49,999
- $50,000 - $100,000
- $100,000 +
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you think people in government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?

   A lot
   Some
   Not Very Much

2. Do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right?

   Just About Always
   Most of the Time
   Some of the Time
   None of the Time

3. Do you think you can trust the government in Baton Rouge to do what is right?

   Just About Always
   Most of the Time
   Some of the Time
   None of the Time

4. Who really runs government?

   The Big Corporations
   A Few Very Influential People
   Both of the Above
   Elected Officials Who Really Represent the People

DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

   AGREE  DISAGREE

5. Our government officials usually tell the truth

6. Most of the things government leaders say can't be believed

7. The way our system of government operates, almost every group has a say in running things

8. This country is really run by a small number of persons at the top who only speak for a few special groups
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9. | Although our country may be facing difficult times, I still feel that it is a worthwhile place and I really belong here |   |   |   |
| 10. | The way this country is going, I often feel that I really don't belong here |   |   |
| 11. | I am proud of many things about our federal system of government |   |   |
| 12. | I can't find much in our federal system of government to be proud of |   |   |
| 13. | People like me have a fair say in getting the federal government to do the things we care about |   |   |
| 14. | There is no way people like me can have an influence on the federal government |   |   |
| 15. | This state is really run by a small number of persons at the top who only speak for a few special groups |   |   |
| 16. | Although our state may be facing difficult times, I still feel that it is a worthwhile place and I really belong here |   |   |
| 17. | The way this state is going, I often feel that I really don't belong here |   |   |
| 18. | I am proud of many things about our state system of government |   |   |
| 19. | I can't find much in our state system of government to be proud of |   |   |
| 20. | People like me have a fair say in getting the state government to do the things we care about |   |   |
| 21. | There is no way people like me can have an influence on the state government |   |   |
22. Please check the statement below which you believe fits you best.

   ___ a. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
   ___ b. At times I think I am no good at all.
   ___ c. I sometimes feel that others don’t take my opinions seriously.

23. Here is a sample of some ways in which people feel about themselves when they make or consider a campaign contribution. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination.

   ___ a. The donation was expected from a person in my position.
   ___ b. There was nothing else I could do since I was asked by a good friend.
   ___ c. My family has long been involved in party politics.
   ___ d. I don’t know what happened, I just felt I ought to give the money.
   ___ e. It makes me feel good to know I am part of the process.
   ___ f. I feel some guilt if I don’t participate.
   ___ g. I am inclined to contribute so that those who ask me won’t think badly of me.
   ___ h. I don’t want the person who asks for the contribution to think I am unable to afford it.

24. Here is a sample of some ways in which people feel about a candidate when they make or consider a campaign contribution. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination.

   ___ a. I could never get done in a day what the candidate does.
   ___ b. I always knew he/she would win, and I didn’t want to lose my vote.
   ___ c. He/she remembered my name at a fund-raiser.
   ___ d. He/she is the right person at the right time.
   ___ e. He/she just sees the big picture.
   ___ f. I don’t know why, he/she just always says things that I wish I had said.
   ___ g. He just gets me excited when he speaks. He is a great orator.
   ___ h. All politicians are crooks, but he/she will get something done.
   ___ i. I was afraid not to support him/her.
   ___ j. There is never a dull moment when he is in office.
   ___ k. He/she will get done exactly what needs to be done and would do what I would do if I were in office.
   ___ l. I always knew he/she would win, and I didn’t want to lose my vote.
25. Generally speaking, are you more inclined to contribute to a candidate who is a Democrat or Republican?

Democrat ____
Republican ____
No Difference ____

26. From time to time, specific issues will become popular in our State and/or Country. Do you respond to these issues by:

Contributing to an Organization ____
Contributing to a Candidate or Official ____
Whose Position You Favor ____
None of the Above ____
Other ________________________

27. Have you ever contributed money to a candidate for public office?

YES ____
NO ____

28. If your answer to the above is "no", will you explain "why"?

____________________________________________________________________

29. Within the last five years, how many times have you contributed?

Less than Twice ____
2 Times to 5 Times ____
More than 5 Times ____

30. To how many candidates have you contributed?

Only One ____
More than One but Less than 5 ____
More than 5 ____

31. How much is your usual contribution to a candidate for federal office (Congress, Senate, President)?

$ 1.00 - $ 499.00 ____
$ 500.00 - $ 999.00 ____
$ 1,000.00 - $ 2,499.00 ____
$ 2,500.00 - $ 9,999.00 ____
Over $10,000.00 ____
32. How much is your usual contribution to a candidate for state office (House, Senate, Governor, Other Elected Official)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 1.00 - $ 499.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 500.00 - $ 999.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,000.00 - $ 2,499.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 2,500.00 - $ 9,999.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Have you ever loaned money to a campaign in any way whatsoever?

YES ______

NO ______

34. If your answer to Question 31 is "YES", in what category would your loan(s) fit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 1.00 - $ 499.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 500.00 - $ 999.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,000.00 - $ 2,499.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 2,500.00 - $ 9,999.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Do you contribute more, less, or the same to Federal, State, and local candidates?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. If you contribute more or less to Federal, State, or Local candidates, please give your reasons.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

37. Do you prefer to give your contribution to a campaign, as follows:

To the Candidate ______
To His Supporter Who Raises Funds for Him ______
Through the Mail ______

38. Does it bother you to know that the amount of money you will contribute will be disclosed in a Finance Report which may find its way into the media?
39. Do you find it easier to give to a candidate when you are solicited by a friend other than a representative of the candidate whom you do not know?

YES

NO

OTHER _________________________________________

40. When solicited, would you like to be asked for a specific amount rather than a general request for a contribution?

YES

NO

OTHER _________________________________________

41. Would you prefer that your contribution took the form of a purchase of a ticket to a specific function or event?

YES

NO

NO DIFFERENCE

OTHER _________________________________________

42. Is it important to have easy access to a public official?

YES

NO

OTHER _________________________________________

43. Do you believe that contributors have more access to an elected official than those who do not contribute?

YES

NO

NO OPINION

44. When you contribute money to a candidate, do you express your desire to have access to that candidate?

YES

NO

SOMETIMES
45. Is it important for you when you make a contribution that the candidate acknowledge his availability and access to you?

YES
NO
NO DIFFERENCE

46. Here is a sample of some reasons people contribute to campaigns. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:

_a._ I believe it is a patriotic duty.
_b._ I like to know the candidate better, and contributing gives me a better opportunity to know him.
_c._ I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate.
_d._ It strengthens my particular ideology of government by contributing to a particular candidate or candidates.
_e._ I do it because of the party.
_f._ I do it to acquire political clout.
_g._ I like to be around elected officials.
_h._ I like to help good people win.
_i._ It is good for my business.
_j._ I like to have some influence in appointments to boards and commissions and other public offices.
_k._ It is nice to be able to call a public official whenever I wish.
_l._ I like to have informal contacts with officials, such as luncheons, dinners, and other social contacts.
_m._ I like to work in campaigns and contributing is part of working in a campaign.
_n._ I like to feel that I have access to an official to alert him to the effects of certain legislation.
_o._ I have my own personal interests involved.
_p._ It is easier to contribute money than to work in a campaign in other ways.
_q._ It satisfies my friends and associates.
_r._ It makes me feel good.

47. Since making your contribution to a candidate for office, have you met with the candidate or candidates to whom you contributed?

Not at All
Rarely
A Few Times
Often

48. Have you called him/her on the telephone since your contribution?

Not at All
Rarely
A Few Times
Often
49. **Have you written him/her?**

   Not at All ____
   Rarely ____
   A Few Times ____
   Often ____

50. **Have the meetings, phone calls, or letters been to express yourself on issues or have you sought assistance for yourself or others in some particular matter?**

   Issues ______
   Assistance ______
   Other _______________________________ ■ ________________________________

51. **Has the candidate(s) accepted an invitation to any social event sponsored by you or to any event of personal significance?**

   YES ______
   NO ______

52. **Do you like to attend functions or events for candidates where the purpose is fund-raising, or would you prefer just to make the contribution and not attend a function or event?**

   Prefer to Attend ______
   Prefer Not to Attend ______

53. **Generally speaking, which of the following words or phrases best describe your relationship with the candidates to whom you have contributed? Rate the top three reasons (1-3), using "1" for the best description.**

   Personal ______
   Friendly ______
   Social ______
   Business ______
   Political ______
   Casual ______

**NOW, I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY:**

54. **In 1988, do you plan to vote for George Bush or Michael Dukakis?**

   Bush ______
   Dukakis ______
   Don't Know ______
   Won't Vote ______
53. In what age group are you?

18 - 24
25 - 34
35 - 49
50 - 64
65 +

56. What type of work do you do? What is the job called? (If unemployed or retired, give usual occupation and write job description in space below.)

High-level Professional
Middle-level Professional
Executive Manager
Sales, Proprietor
White Collar Civil Service
Skilled Labor
Semi- & Unskilled Labor
Housewife
Other

JOB DESCRIPTION ___________________________________

57. Are you or is any member of your household a member of a labor union?

Labor Member
Labor Household
Non-Union Household

58. Do you consider yourself liberal, moderate, or conservative?

Liberal
Moderate
Conservative
Not Sure

59. What is the last grade of school you have completed?

8th Grade or Less
Some High School
High School Graduate
Some College
2-Yr. College Graduate
4-Yr. College Graduate
Post-Graduate

60. What is your religious preference?

Protestant
Catholic
Jewish
Other (specify)
None
61. Regardless of how you may vote, do you consider yourself to be a Democrat, Republican or Independent?

Democrat
Republican
Independent
Other/Not Sure

62. For statistical purposes only, we need to know your total family income for 1987. Will you please look at this list and check that which better represents total income before taxes.

Under $19,999 $40,000 - $49,999
$20,000 - $29,999 $50,000 - $100,000
$30,000 - $39,999 Over $100,000
1. Have you ever read anything in a newspaper or magazine or watched anything on television that discussed the amount of money spent on political campaigns?
   YES
   NO

2. Do you agree or disagree that greater limits on campaign contributions are needed?
   AGREE
   DISAGREE
   OTHER

3. If your answer to the above is "other", please explain:

4. Do you think people in government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?
   A Lot
   Some
   Not Very Much

5. Do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right?
   Just About Always
   Most of the Time
   Some of the Time
   None of the Time

6. Who really runs government?
   The Big Corporations
   A Few Very Influential People
   Both of the Above
   Elected Officials Who Really Represent the People

DO YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

7. Our government officials usually tell the truth.
   AGREE
   DISAGREE

8. Most of the things government leaders say can't be believed.
   AGREE
   DISAGREE
9. The way our system of government operates, almost every group has a say in running things.

10. This country is really run by a small number of men at the top who only speak for a few special groups.

11. Although our country may be facing difficult times, I still feel that it is a worthwhile place and I really belong here.

12. The way this country is going, I often feel that I really don't belong here.

13. I am proud of many things about our system of government.

14. I can't find much in our system of government to be proud of.

15. People like me have a fair say in getting the government to do the things we care about.

16. There is no way people like me can have an influence on the government.

17. Please check the statement below which you believe fits you the best.
   a. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
   b. At times I think I am no good at all.
   c. I sometimes feel that others don't take my opinions seriously.

18. Generally speaking, are you more inclined to contribute to a candidate who is a Democrat or Republican?
   Democrat
   Republican
   No Difference

19. From time to time specific issues will become popular in our State and/or Country. Do you respond to these issues by:
   Contributing to an Organization
   Contributing to a Candidate or Official Whose Position You Favor
   None of the Above
   Other

20. Have you ever contributed money to a candidate for public office?
   YES
   NO

21. If your answer to the above is "no", will you explain "why"?
22. Within the last five years, how many times have you contributed?
   Less than Twice _____
   2 Times to 5 Times _____
   More than 5 Times _____

23. To how many candidates have you contributed?
   Only One
   More than One but Less than 5 _____
   More than 5

24. How much is your usual contribution to a candidate for federal office (Congress, Senate, President)?
   $100 - $249 _____
   $250 - $749 _____
   $750 - $1000 _____

25. Do you contribute more, less, or the same to Federal, State, and Local candidates?
   Federal  State  Local
   More _____  _____  _____
   Less _____  _____  _____
   Same _____  _____  _____

26. If you contribute more or less to Federal, State, or Local candidates, please give your reasons.

27. Is it important to have easy access to a public official?
   YES _____
   NO  _____
   OTHER  ____________________________________________

28. Do you believe that contributors have more access to an elected official than those who do not contribute.
   YES _____
   NO  _____
   NO OPINION  _____

29. Here is a sample of some reasons people contribute to federal campaigns. Please put a check by each reason that applies to you. You may check one, none, all, or any combination:
   _____ a. I believe it is a patriotic duty.
   _____ b. I like to know the candidate better, and contributing gives me a better opportunity to know him.
   _____ c. I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate.
   _____ d. It strengthens my particular ideology of government by contributing to a particular candidate or candidates.
e. I do it because of the party.
f. I do it to acquire political clout.
g. I like to be around elected officials.
h. I like to help good people win.
i. It is good for my business.
j. I like to have some influence in appointments to boards and commissions and other public offices.
k. It is nice to be able to call a public official whenever I wish.
l. I like to have informal contacts with officials, such as luncheons, dinners, and other social contacts.
m. I like to work in campaigns and contributing is part of working in a campaign.
n. I like to feel that I have access to an official to alert him to the effects of certain legislation.
o. I have my own personal interests involved.
p. It is easier to contribute money than to work in a campaign in other ways.
q. It satisfies my friends and associates.
r. It makes me feel good.

30. The following is a restating of all of the above. Please indicate the importance to you of the items that you checked above by using a scale of 1, 2, 3, etc.

- a. I believe it is a patriotic duty.
- b. I like to know the candidate better, and contributing gives me a better opportunity to know him.
- c. I contribute to support a particular issue that may be supported by a particular candidate.
- d. It strengthens my particular ideology of government by contributing to a particular candidate or candidates.
- e. I do it because of the party.
- f. I do it to acquire political clout.
- g. I like to be around elected officials.
- h. I like to help good people win.
- i. It is good for my business.
- j. I like to have some influence in appointments to boards and commissions and other public offices.
- k. It is nice to be able to call a public official whenever I wish.
- l. I like to have informal contacts with officials, such as luncheons, dinners, and other social contacts.
- m. I like to work in campaigns and contributing is part of working in a campaign.
- n. I like to feel that I have access to an official to alert him to the effects of certain legislation.
- o. I have my own personal interests involved.
- p. It is easier to contribute money than to work in a campaign in other ways.
- q. It satisfies my friends and associates.
- r. It makes me feel good.

31. Since making your contribution to a candidate for federal office, have you met with the candidate or candidates to whom you contributed?

Not At All ______
Rarely ______
A Few Times ______
Often ______

32. Have you called him/her on the telephone since your contribution?

Not at All ______
Rarely ______
A Few Times ______
Often ______
33. Have you written him/her?
- Not at All
- Rarely
- A Few Times
- Often

34. Have the meetings, phone calls, or letters been to express yourself on issues or have you sought assistance for yourself or others in some particular matter?
- Issues
- Assistance
- Other

35. Has the candidate(s) accepted an invitation to any social event sponsored by you or to any event of personal significance?
- YES
- NO

36. Generally speaking, which of the following words or phrases best describe your relationship with the candidates to whom you have contributed? Rate the top three reasons (1-3), using "1" for the best description.
- Personal
- Friendly
- Social
- Business
- Political
- Casual

37. In your own words, describe your relationship with any or all of the federal candidates to whom you have contributed.

38. In your own words, describe your feelings about contributing to candidates.

NOW I AM GOING TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY:

39. In 1984, did you vote in the election for President between Walter Mondale, the Democrat, and Ronald Reagan, the Republican?
- YES
- NO
40. In what age group are you?
18-24
25-34
35-49
50-64
65+

41. What type of work do you do? What is the job called? (If unemployed or retired, give usual occupation and write job description in space below.)

- High-level Professional
- Middle-level Professional
- Executive Manager
- Sales, Proprietor
- White Collar Civil Service
- Skilled Labor
- Semi- & Unskilled Labor
- Housewife
- Other

JOB DESCRIPTION

42. Are you or is any member of your household a member of a labor union?
- Labor Member
- Labor Household
- Non-Union Household

43. Do you consider yourself liberal, moderate, or conservative?
- Liberal
- Moderate
- Conservative
- Not Sure

44. What is the last grade of school you have completed?
- 8th Grade or Less
- Some High School
- High School Graduate
- Some College
- 2-Year College Graduate
- 4-Year College Graduate
- Post-Graduate

45. What is your religious preference?
- Protestant
- Catholic
- Jewish
- Other (specify)
- None

46. Regardless of how you may vote, do you consider yourself to be a Democrat, Republican or Independent?
- Democrat
- Republican
- Independent
- Other/Not Sure

47. For statistical purposes only, we need to know your total family income for 1985. Will you please look at this list and check that which better represents total income before taxes.
- Under $19,999
- $20,000 - $29,999
- $30,000 - $39,999
- $40,000 - $49,999
- $50,000 - $100,000
- Over $100,000
APPENDIX IV

1989 QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

1989 FOLLOW-UP POST CARD
Dear Friend:

I am supervising a graduate student's research project in connection with his doctoral dissertation in the Department of Political Science, Louisiana State University, that requires a survey. Our purpose is to learn more about why people contribute to campaigns and how certain feelings about government and politics are related to the amount of money people give. You have been selected from the Candidate's Report filed with the Federal Elections Commission to participate in this survey, and thus your opinions will represent the opinions of thousands of people much like yourself.

Enclosed find a copy of the questionnaire. While it is a bit lengthy, we hope you will take the time to complete and return the questionnaire to us in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

We promise you total confidentiality under the Academic Ethics Standards of the American Political Science Association. We will not know or reveal your identity nor will anyone outside of the project staff have any knowledge of your identity.

Please note the number in the upper right-hand corner of the questionnaire. This number allows us to temporarily identify you. By referring to this number, we will know that you responded to the questionnaire and will not send you the follow-up mailing we will have to send to those who do not respond.

We appreciate your willingness to help us in our research effort. If you would like a copy of our completed study, either include a note with the returned questionnaire, or, to ensure anonymity/confidentiality, let us know under separate cover, and we will make certain that you receive a copy of our results. We believe that you will find the questionnaire interesting and provocative and that you will enjoy completing it. We look forward to receiving your reply. Your reply is essential for the completion of this graduate student's research.

Very truly yours,

T. Wayne Parent, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

TWP/ses

Enc.
POSTCARD

REMINDER

PLEASE TAKE A FEW MINUTES TO COMPLETE AND RETURN
THE QUESTIONNAIRE WHICH WE RECENTLY SENT TO YOU.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP.

T. Wayne Parent, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
240 Stubbs Hall
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803-5433
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