

**KANGAROOS VOTE, JOEYS DON'T: THE EFFECT OF PEER  
INFLUENCE ON COLLEGE-AGED VOTER TURNOUT FOR LOCAL  
ELECTIONS**

An Undergraduate Research Scholars Thesis

by

KATRINA LESLIE,<sup>1</sup> JESSICA DUTY<sup>2</sup>

Submitted to the LAUNCH: Undergraduate Research office at  
Texas A&M University  
in partial fulfillment of requirements for the designation as an

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH SCHOLAR

Approved by  
Faculty Research Advisors:

Dr. Kristy Pathakis  
Dr. Sarah Fulton

May 2022

Majors:

Political Science<sup>1,2</sup>

Copyright © 2022. Katrina Leslie,<sup>1</sup> Jessica Duty.<sup>2</sup>

## **RESEARCH COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION**

Research activities involving the use of human subjects, vertebrate animals, and/or biohazards must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate Texas A&M University regulatory research committee (i.e., IRB, IACUC, IBC) before the activity can commence. This requirement applies to activities conducted at Texas A&M and to activities conducted at non-Texas A&M facilities or institutions. In both cases, students are responsible for working with the relevant Texas A&M research compliance program to ensure and document that all Texas A&M compliance obligations are met before the study begins.

We, Katrina Leslie<sup>1</sup> and Jessica Duty<sup>2</sup>, certify that all research compliance requirements related to this Undergraduate Research Scholars thesis have been addressed with my Research Faculty Advisors prior to the collection of any data used in this final thesis submission.

This project required approval from the Texas A&M University Research Compliance & Biosafety office.

TAMU IRB #: 2021-1108M Approval Date: 03/01/2022 Expiration Date: 11/02/2024

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	1
DEDICATION.....	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	4
INTRODUCTION.....	5
SECTIONS	
1. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
1.1 College-aged Voters.....	6
1.2 Local Elections.....	8
2. THEORY.....	9
2.1 Peer Influence.....	9
2.2 Friend Group Influence.....	10
2.3 Family Influence.....	11
2.4 Prior Personal Political Interest.....	11
2.5 Influence of Community Involvement.....	12
2.6 Location of Voter Registration.....	13
3. METHODOLOGY.....	15
4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION.....	17
CONCLUSION.....	25
4.1 Limitations.....	25
4.2 Future Research.....	26
REFERENCES.....	28
APPENDIX A: PRE-ELECTION SURVEY.....	31
APPENDIX B: POST-ELECTION SURVEY.....	41

## **ABSTRACT**

Kangaroos Vote, Joeys Don't: The Effect of Peer Influence on College-Aged Voter Turnout for Local Elections

Katrina Leslie,<sup>1</sup> Jessica Duty<sup>2</sup>  
Department of Political Science  
Texas A&M University

Research Faculty Advisor: Dr. Kristy Pathakis  
Department of Political Science  
Texas A&M University

Research Faculty Advisor: Dr. Sarah Fulton  
Department of Political Science  
Texas A&M University

In recent decades, young voter turnout on average has shown national declines in the United States. Many reasons for this are tied to a lack of understanding of the voting process, feelings of being uninformed, and political disinterest. The field of political science has been greatly interested in the voting behaviors of college-aged students due to this infrequent participation, however, most studies focus their scope upon national or state elections. Our research focuses on local elections to see how peers can influence traditionally less publicized and attended elections. We discussed with around 50% of one professor's students at a large Texas public institution the specific ballot items on the local election ballot using an in-person, peer-led presentation and a video option. Examples of how those items could directly impact their daily lives were also presented. Each group (control and treatment) completed the same

survey regarding their collegiate involvement, family voting habits, as well as political preferences, and other categories of interest prior to the presentation. After the treatment and the election, students completed a second survey describing their election day actions. Our results demonstrate a lack of impact that a single peer-led presentation has on young voter turnout as very few students voted. Overall, the presentation did not sway students to register or vote. While our data showed no statistical significance, the fact that some students voted who potentially would not have is still a success for democracy.

## **DEDICATION**

*To our families for their endless support in all our academic endeavors.*

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

### **Contributors**

We would like to thank our faculty advisors, Dr. Pathakis, and Dr. Fulton for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research. Additionally, we would like to thank Dr. Roblyer and his students of POLS 207 for their contributions to our survey distribution and completion. Finally, we would like to thank the URS Program for providing us this opportunity to grow deeper in our understanding of the field of research in Political Science.

### **Funding Sources**

We were given access to free software resources such as Qualtrics via Texas A&M University. Because of this, we needed and received no funding for this research.

## INTRODUCTION

Young voter turnout continues to be lower than any other age group in the United States (United States Census Bureau, 2022). Local elections have the smallest turnout of any election type, yet these elections often create changes that impact a citizen's daily life more than state or national election ballot items (Brennan, 2020). The City of College Station and the neighboring City of Bryan have 197,000 local residents and a student body consisting of over 73,000 students at Texas A&M University (Bryan, TX; College Station, TX; At a glance). Traditionally, in the state of Texas, the youngest voters (18-24 years) are the group with the smallest voter turnout for all election types (United States Census Bureau, 2022). College Station, where our sample was recruited, has a median age of 23 years, and shows no signs of straying from Texas's low state averages in young voter turnout (College Station, TX). This is especially interesting as the young voters are the age group most affected by local policies put in place in College Station. Yet barriers to voting, such as confusion with the election process, result in low voter turnout among college-aged voters (Richman and Pate, 2007). Taking into account the large number of young voters in College Station, TX, we wanted to see if a simple presentation about the local election on November 2, 2021, could increase student voter turnout.



# 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Our research relates specifically to young voter turnout in local elections. We found limited research pertaining to this relationship in academia. While local elections often impact individuals' daily lives more than other elections, we found it strange that they are studied less. Our literature review is primarily concerned with trends seen in college-aged voting groups and local elections in the United States.

## 1.1 College-aged Voters

The decline of social networks on the individual level has contributed to lower turnout among young voters (Putnam, 1995). Some reasons for this phenomenon include an increase in feeling busy, a decrease in social ties, and a decrease in the proportion of the U.S. population that has completed a bachelor's degree (Putnam, 1995). Putnam (1995) uses the phrase "social networks" to describe community involvement that the individual actively pursues. Further research shows that overall young Americans are disconnecting from public life (Delli Carpini, 2000). The findings by Putnam (1995) and Delli Carpini (2000) help to explain why we see such low voter turnout among young voters.

When young voters discuss politics with their family and friends, they are more likely to vote (Esser and De Vreese, 2007). This establishes participation in politics as a norm to follow (Bhatti & Hansen, 2012). Our study gathered data on how often students talked to their friends and family about politics. We believe this data will establish which groups are more inclined to vote prior to our influence. Compared to prior decades, young voters of 2000 were overall less interested in politics (Delli Carpini, 2000). We address the potential for this 2000s trend to

continue today by measuring college-aged voters' political interest. This will establish if this trend in college-voters is of concern to our study.

Until 2006, 21 U.S. states still restricted college students' ability to register to vote outside their "home" district (Richman and Pate, 2007; Ardoin et al., 2015). After 2006, changes in these states reduced the registration barriers college students faced and increased their voter turnout (Richman and Pate, 2007). Another barrier is that recent college students have higher rates of confusion and cynicism toward voting than older voting age groups (Richman and Pate, 2007; Brennan, 2020). In order to evaluate whether these barriers continue to influence college voters today, our study incorporates many of these potential barriers as reasons that could affect voter turnout.

Based on 2020 national election results, 51.4% of 18–24 year olds voted (United States Census Bureau, 2021). With a little over the majority of college aged voters going to the polls, there is still concern that more could be mobilized to vote when 76.0% of 64-75 year olds voted in 2020 (United States Census Bureau, 2021). Bennion and Nickerson (2016), find that one successful way to increase voter turnout is for universities to give presentations of efficacy. In 2006, 16 public college campuses received these presentations led by either professors or student volunteers (Bennion and Nickerson, 2016). The students that witnessed the presentation showed increases in voting (Bennion and Nickerson, 2016). Even in the 2006 midterm state election, turnout still increased by 2.6 percentage points and voter registration increased by 6 percentage points (Bennion and Nickerson, 2016). Using Bennion and Nickerson (2016) as a foundation, our study focuses solely on the impact of student-led presentations catered toward teaching the importance of voting in *local* elections. Additionally, our study brings in more about barriers to voting than Bennion and Nickerson (2016) originally included. Some of these barriers are: a

students' political upbringing, where students are registered to vote, and potential complications students may face during the voting process (absentee ballot issues, confusion regarding the process, etc.).

## **1.2 Local Elections**

Only 15-27% of eligible voters participate in local elections giving it the lowest voter turnout for any election type in the United States (Brennan, 2020). Elections in the United States are increasingly more nationalized, and, therefore, people are less inclined to vote in off-year local elections (Moskowitz, 2021; Hajnal and Lewis, 2003). However, when a local election is concurrent with national or state elections, local positions have a larger number of votes than they would in a nonconcurrent year (Hajnal et al., 2002). But college students will often only vote for the national offices and skip voting for local positions (Ardoin et al., 2015). Our research studies how to mobilize college students when only local issues are on the ballot. This provides a new lens through which to study voter participation in 2021.

## 2. THEORY

Drawing upon the previous literature, we formulate six hypotheses about the factors that influence individual voting behavior: peer influence, friend group influence, family influence, prior personal political interest, community involvement, and location of voter registration. To test these hypotheses, we derived several questions within our surveys from the American National Election Studies<sup>1</sup> and gave them a local election perspective. The first one of these hypotheses address whether a student's peers influences their decision to vote.

### 2.1 Peer Influence

Our study directly assesses the importance of peer-influence on a college-aged voter's decision to vote. As many students within POLS 207 are first-year undergraduate students and turned 18 years old recently, they may not have any established voting habits. We believe that a key component of an individual's decision to vote is how they are influenced by their peers. We define "peers" as any individual in the same age group as the sample audience, but outside a students' closest circle of friends. Based on this definition, we serve as the participants' peers. Studies show that college students can influence their peers to vote by having political conversations about voting (Bennion and Nickerson, 2016; Shea and Harris, 2006). For this reason, we studied our peers as opposed to older voting age groups. Overall, our presence shows how peers in the same age-group play a role in voting propensity.

---

<sup>1</sup> From the ANES Pilot 2018 questionnaire, questions 7, 21, 32, 9, 22, 23 of our Appendix A and 11, 14 of our Appendix B. From the ANES Timeseries 2020 questionnaire questions 21, 24, 25 of our Appendix A.

*(H<sub>1</sub>) Students who receive the treatment presentation from their peers regarding the importance of local elections will be more likely to vote versus students in the control group.*

## **2.2 Friend Group Influence**

In this paper, we define “friend groups” as any *close* personal relationships a person has that is not a family member. People who discuss politics more frequently with those closest to them are more likely to participate in political activities, such as voting (Knoke, 1990; Huckfeldt and Sprague, 1995). Young voters turnout in higher numbers to the polls when they engage in conversations about politics with their friends (Esser & De Vreeseet, 2007). We theorize that our discussion of politics with the treatment group will increase the voter turnout for students who find political conversations with their friends difficult and have them infrequently. In our pre-election survey, we asked students how often they discuss politics with their friends, and how difficult they find these conversations (see Questions 34 and 25 in Appendix A). We grouped students’ responses to discussing politics with their friends into three categories: Frequently Discusses, Infrequently Discusses, and Neutral Difficulty with Any Range of Frequency. We define infrequently as those that discuss politics with their friends almost never or a few times a month and find these types of conversations with their friends harder. Next, we define frequently as those that have political conversations with their friends daily or a few times a week and find these conversations easier. Finally, neutral difficulty is any student who said they find political conversations with their friends to be neither easier nor harder. We focus on the influence our treatment can have on the students who have these conversations infrequently. We believe our potential influence will be greater for this group than the others mentioned.

*(H<sub>2</sub>) Students who discuss politics with their friends infrequently will be more likely to vote if they receive the treatment versus similar students in the control.*

### **2.3 Family Influence**

If a person's family is heavily involved in politics and political activity, they may place more importance on voting and view this behavior as a norm to follow (Bhatti & Hansen, 2012). Applying Bhatti and Hansen's (2012) findings to our research, we gathered information on the voting behavior of parents, as well as the students in our sample. In our pre-election survey, we asked students what political activities their parents engaged in, and if they were aware of their parents having voted in the last year (see Questions 23 and 8 in Appendix A). The primary socialization of the family unit decreases after an individual is no longer living at home (Bhatti & Hansen, 2012). Because students may not have been around their parents' voting habits for several months to several years, our treatment presentation on voting could remind them of the habits they grew up around and influence them to vote. Taking into account both the influence a respondent's parents may have had as well as our influence as peers, we derive hypothesis H<sub>3</sub>.

*(H<sub>3</sub>) Students who come from participatory families will be more likely to vote if they receive the treatment versus identical students in the control.*

### **2.4 Prior Personal Political Interest**

Scholars find that people who do not actively pursue political news and passively receive news through social media or social circles are overall less interested in politics (Gil de Zúñiga and Diehl, 2019; Huckfeldt and Sprague, 1995). Their studies support the formulation of our hypothesis concerning political interest and local election turnout. The first half of H<sub>4</sub> revolves around prior political engagement. In our pre-election survey, we asked students how often they participate in political activities (see Question 22 in Appendix A). The second half is about the

student's political interest (see Question 17 Appendix A). While a correlation between our treatment and those that report high political interest and participation may exist, we focus on those with low political interest and participation. We believe we would see the effect of our treatment with this group the most.

*(H<sub>4</sub>) Students with low political interest and participation will be more likely to vote if they receive the treatment versus similar students in the control.*

## **2.5 Influence of Community Involvement**

Another component that determines whether an individual votes is their level of community involvement. Gerber et al. (2016) find that church attendance in the general population is strongly associated with higher rates of voter turnout. Furthermore, individuals involved in other groups, such as social or sporting clubs, are associated with less selfish mindsets when voting due to their increased sense of collective democracy through being a team player (Etang et al., 2016; Huckfeldt and Sprague, 1995). To see the relationship of student community involvement and voting, we surveyed students about the number of hours per week they are involved in social, academic, service, and religious community organizations (see Questions 5, 19, 18 and 20 in Appendix A). We theorize that if the individual perceives that politics impacts their community in some way, they may view civic engagement and voting as more important. For our sample, more involvement in their university's community could lead to broader community involvement through voting.

We believe we will see the greatest impact of our treatment presentation in those that are moderately involved in their community. This group already has some expected tendency to vote, however, they may not see the impact that voting could have on their local community. Those that have low community involvement may not participate even if they receive the

presentation as they already choose not to participate in their local community. Those that have high community involvement are more likely to participate in voting based on their participation and therefore our treatment presentation may have limited impact on them.

*(H<sub>5</sub>) Students who are moderately involved in their community will be more likely to vote if they receive the treatment versus similar students in the control.*

## **2.6 Location of Voter Registration**

The further an individual lives from a polling place, the less likely they are to participate in an election (Dyck & Gimpel, 2005). To address this issue, we asked if/where students were registered to vote in both our pre-election survey and post-election survey (see Question 9 in Appendix A and Question 11 in Appendix B). We believe these questions help us understand the impact a student's proximity to their voting location has on whether they vote or not. If a student is registered in the Bryan/College Station area, they are extremely close to their voting location and would not have to travel far to vote in the local election. This would result in a low amount of effort needed to participate in the November 2 local election. We theorize that if a student is introduced to the ballot items via our treatment presentation, this will further lower the total effort they exert. Knowing what is on the ballot before voting reduces the amount of personal research necessary and time spent voting at the polls. Our treatment presentation contains information specifically pertaining to the ballot issues within the Bryan/College Station area. As this is the case, we believe that comparing students registered in the Bryan/College Station area can show the influence our presentation has on a student's decision to vote when geographical playing fields are equal. Based on the effort needed to participate in the local election, we formulate our sixth hypothesis.



*(H<sub>0</sub>) Students who are registered to vote in Bryan/College Station will be more likely to vote if they receive the treatment versus identical students in the control.*

### 3. METHODOLOGY

Bennion and Nickerson (2016) found that university students show small increases in voter turnout for *national* elections when they receive presentations about voting from a professor. Taking their increase into account, we want to apply this research method to encourage *local* election turnout on Texas A&M University's campus. The main increase noted in the study was due to the impact of the professor, not peers. One difference from the context of Bennion and Nickerson's (2016) study is that we will instead focus on local election turnout and not national election turnout. Overall, our study will fill the gap as there has been less research conducted evaluating the influence of peer-administered presentations on voter registration leading up to *local* elections.

Based on this gap, we will evaluate the sample population from College Station focusing primarily on young, college-aged voters. To conduct our research, we surveyed three introductory state and local government political science classes. All of these classes are taught by the same professor, which allows us to control for the influence a professor has upon their class. State and local government is a required class by the university; therefore, we were able to collect data from students whose majors are in a variety of departments at Texas A&M. One of the three class sections is the treatment group, while the other two sections make up the control group.

Out of the 427 students that completed our study in its entirety, 206 are from the treatment class and 221 are from the control classes. The treatment group received a short (approximately five minute) in-person presentation that highlighted the importance of participating in local elections for the upcoming election. This presentation discussed the impact

local politics has on the average college student, issues on the November ballot, and resources to learn more information. Those in the treatment group who did not attend the in-person presentation had the option to watch the treatment presentation via a pre-recorded video. Overall, 175 students from the treatment group saw the in-person presentation and 31 saw the video presentation. While inherent differences between a video presentation and an in-person presentation exist, we attempted to minimize these differences by making the presentation content as identical as possible. Our independent variable is the peer-led treatment presentation. Before we gave the presentation, all three of the sections completed a pre-election survey. The pre-election survey asked a few demographic questions, level of community involvement, and current and predicted involvement in political activities. A full description of the Pre-Election Survey is located in Appendix A.

After the local election on November 2, 2021, students received a follow-up post-election survey. The post-election survey asked a few demographic questions, if they watched our presentation in September 2021, and what format they watched this presentation through. The remaining questions were about if they voted in the most recent election and their registration status. A full description of the Post-Election Survey is in Appendix B. We collected students' Universal Identification Number (UIN) to create anonymity. We merged the data of both of the surveys into one data set using the UINs to analyze them simultaneously. The dependent variable for our study is whether or not these students voted in the November 2 local election. Both surveys were created through Qualtrics and were emailed to students by their professor. Students received extra credit in their state and local government course for completing each survey.

## 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

We analyze the effect of our treatment presentation by using R statistical software. Each table in the following section has percentages rounded to the nearest 100th of a percentage point. The percentages reflect the number of students who responded to the particular set of questions relating to each hypothesis, not the total number of students who completed any part of either survey. In our study, there are three groups students fall under: Treatment Group (In-person), Treatment Group (Video), and Control Group.

We begin our analysis by focusing on our first hypothesis.

*(H<sub>1</sub>) Students who receive the treatment presentation from their peers regarding the importance of local elections will be more likely to vote versus students in the control group.*

*Table 1*

H <sub>1</sub>		
	Yes, voted in November's local election	No, did not vote in November's local election
Treatment Group (In-person)	8 (6.84%)	109 (93.16%)
Treatment Group (Video)	2 (9.52%)	19 (90.48%)
Control Group	12 (8.05%)	137 (91.95%)

A greater percentage of students voted from the control group than either of the treatment groups. Out of those in the control group 8.05% voted whereas 6.84% voted from the in-person treatment group and 9.52% voted from the video treatment group. However, even when the values of the two treatment groups are combined into one, only 7.24% of students reported voting. From this table alone, it appears that our peer-led treatment presentation did not increase

the likelihood that a student participated in the local election. Our data for  $H_1$  shows no statistical significance to support our first hypothesis.

We continue our analysis of the data with our second hypothesis.

*(H<sub>2</sub>) Students who discuss politics with their friends infrequently will be more likely to vote if they receive the treatment versus similar students in the control.*

We have previously defined in our Theory section the categories we use to group the students in this section. We wanted to readdress that the table below reflects the responses by those that answered all the questions associated with it. As this is the case, we have small values for this table that are not statistically significant in the full context of our study.

Table 2

H <sub>1</sub>		
	Yes, voted in November local election	No, did not vote in November local election
Frequently Discusses		
Treatment Group (In-person)	1 (4.35%)	22 (95.65%)
Treatment Group (Video)	2 (33.33%)	4 (66.67%)
Control Group	4 (17.39%)	19 (82.61%)
Infrequently Discusses		
Treatment Group (In-person)	--	20 (100%)
Treatment Group (Video)	--	2 (100%)
Control Group	1 (3.33%)	29 (96.67%)
Neutral Difficulty with Any Range of Frequency		
Treatment Group (In-Person)	4 (12.12%)	29 (87.88%)
Treatment Group (Video)	--	9 (100%)
Control Group	1 (2.70%)	36 (97.30%)

Note: Values marked as "--" indicate a frequency of zero (0) where no student marked a response for that category.

Out of both treatment groups, more people (42 total) find their conversations with their friends to be “Neutral Difficulty with Any Range of Frequency.” The same trend is seen with the control group (37 total). We next look at the students in the “Infrequently Discusses” category in Table 2 to specifically address H<sub>1</sub>. This section of Table 2 shows that one more person from the control group voted compared to the treatment groups. While our recorded number of voters is statistically small, the data we have shows our hypothesis was incorrect. Comparing values of zero and one, however, are not enough to provide a full statistical analysis of the effects of our treatment on these students.

Next, we look at our third hypothesis.

*(H<sub>3</sub>) Students who come from participatory families will be more likely to vote if they receive the treatment versus identical students in the control.*

We categorized students' responses to their parents' level of participation into two groups: High Parent Participation and Low Parent Participation. We define high participation as a student whose parents voted in at least two elections and participated in at least four of the political activities listed in the survey. Low participation are those who voted in only one election and participated in three or fewer political activities in the survey. No student reported that their parents did not vote in any election, thus this category was excluded from Table 3.

*Table 3*

H <sub>3</sub>		
	Yes, voted in November's local election	No, did not vote in November's local election
High Parent Participation		
Treatment Group (In-person)	--	13 (100%)
Treatment Group (Video)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Control Group	3 (13.04%)	20 (86.96%)
Low Parent Participation		
Treatment Group (In-person)	1 (5.00%)	19 (95.00%)
Treatment Group (Video)	--	5 (100%)
Control Group	1 (3.57%)	27 (96.43%)

*Note: Values marked as "--" indicate a frequency of zero (0) where no student marked a response for that category.*

In Table 3, most students reported their parents have low parent political participation. Out of both treatment groups from students whose parents have high political participation, only one person reported voting in November 2021. Compared to 13.04% of students in the control group, only 7.14% of people in the treatment groups with parents who have high political involvement voted. This percentage shows *more* students from the control voted than the

students who received the treatment. While the values are low compared to our sample size, they are comparable from one group to another for a preliminary analysis. A full analysis can only be conducted with more data from the sample.

We continue our analysis with our fourth hypothesis.

*(H<sub>4</sub>) Students with low political interest and participation will be more likely to vote if they receive the treatment versus similar students in the control.*

For our fourth hypothesis, we grouped students' responses into two groups: Low Participation & Interest and High Participation & Interest. We define low interest as those that are slightly or moderately interested in politics, and low participation are those that engage in none or one of the political activities listed in the survey. High interest are those who are very interested or extremely interested in politics, and high participation are those who engage in more than 2 political activities.

*Table 4*

H <sub>4</sub>		
	Yes, voted in November's local election	No, did not vote in November's local election
High Participation & Interest		
Treatment Group (In-Person)	1 (33.33%)	2 (66.67%)
Treatment Group (Video)	--	--
Control Group	--	4 (100%)
Low Participation & Interest		
Treatment Group (In-Person)	--	1 (100%)
Treatment Group (Video)	--	--
Control Group	--	1 (100%)

*Note: Values marked as "--" indicate a frequency of zero(0) where no student marked a response for that category.*



We use Table 4 to address our fourth hypothesis. While our sample consisted of 427 students answering some part of both surveys, only 9 students from our sample answered the questions needed for this hypothesis. Therefore, we can not perform a full analysis on H<sub>4</sub> based on the data our sample provided. Any analysis we attempt to provide with this data could be incorrect given the extremely small sample.

Next, we look at our fifth hypothesis.

*(H<sub>5</sub>) Students who are moderately involved in their community will be more likely to vote if they receive the treatment versus similar students in the control.*

We created three groups based upon the student's overall community involvement hours per week in social, academic, service, and religious community organizations: Low Community Involvement, Moderate Community Involvement, and High Community Involvement. We define low community involvement as a student who participates in 0-2 community hours per week. Moderate community involvement refers to students involved in their community 3-5 hours per week. Finally, high community involvement are those involved in their community 6-10 or more hours per week.

Table 5

H.		
	Yes, voted in November's local election	No, did not vote in November's local election
High Community Involvement		
Treatment Group (In-person)	3 (6.82%)	41 (93.18%)
Treatment Group (Video)	1 (14.29%)	6 (85.71%)
Control Group	2 (3.51%)	55 (96.49%)
Moderate Community Involvement		
Treatment Group (In-person)	2 (6.45%)	29 (93.55%)
Treatment Group (Video)	--	3 (100%)
Control Group	2 (6.06%)	31 (93.94%)
Low Community Involvement		
Treatment Group (In-person)	3 (7.50%)	37 (92.50%)
Treatment Group (Video)	1 (9.09%)	10 (90.91%)
Control Group	8 (13.79%)	50 (86.21%)

Note: Values marked as "--" indicate a frequency of zero (0) where no student marked a response for that category.

Out of our survey respondents, 109 students reported having Low Community Involvement and 108 students reported having High Community Involvement. Our hypothesis pertains to Moderate Community Involvement. Comparing the percentages in this category, 6.45% of students in the In-person treatment group voted in November compared to 6.06% of students in the control group. A slightly greater percentage of students voted from the treatment group which supports our hypothesis. When we look at the *number* of students that voted in both general treatment and control groups, the same number of students voted from each. With a tie in responses, we cannot find support for our hypothesis based on this statistic. Overall, we would need more data in order to conclude whether our hypothesis was supported or not.

Finally, we conclude our data analysis by evaluating our sixth hypothesis.

*(H<sub>6</sub>) Students who are registered to vote in Bryan/College Station will be more likely to vote if they receive the treatment versus identical students in the control.*

Table 6

H <sub>6</sub>		
	Yes, voted in November's local election	No, did not vote in November's local election
Registered in Bryan/College Station		
Treatment Group (In-person)	3 (25.00%)	9 (75.00%)
Treatment Group (Video)	1 (25.00%)	3 (75.00%)
Control Group	2 (9.52%)	19 (90.48%)
Registered at a Different Address		
Treatment Group (In-person)	5 (4.76%)	100 (95.24%)
Treatment Group (Video)	1 (5.88%)	16 (94.12%)
Control Group	10 (7.81%)	118 (92.19%)

The answer choices “No” and “Don’t Know” from Q11 in Appendix B were excluded from Table 6 as no respondents in this table chose either option. We focus on those registered in Bryan/College Station to address H<sub>6</sub>. Out of both treatment groups within this section, four students (25%) voted. For the control group within this section, two students (10.53%) voted. Based on these statistics, more students that were registered in Bryan/College Station voted from the treatment groups than from the control group. Only 37 students from the total 287 respondents for this section are registered to vote in the Bryan/College Station area. Therefore, “Registered in Bryan/College Station” shows larger percentages for voters when compared to those registered in a different area. With additional data, we could more accurately assess our hypothesis.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the analysis of our research shows our treatment did not influence students who received it to vote any more than those in the control group. Due to the low number of respondents who completed all questions in both surveys, we are not able to evaluate our findings with any degree of statistical significance. We only required two questions in each survey, therefore, skipping questions was permitted. Each table exclusively includes answers from students who answered all the questions associated with the variables. By skipping over one question that was utilized in a table, even if they answered the other questions, students would be excluded from that table's data. We address other limitations that may have impacted the results of our study below.

### 4.1 Limitations

Within our research, there were a few limitations that may have influenced the results we received from our study. One limitation we believe influenced our results is that students did not fill out the survey. Although we originally started with a sample size of approximately 1,200 students, only 427 students submitted both surveys in our study. These results are surprising as students received extra credit for their state and local government class for each survey they submitted.

The next limitation we observed was that in the same week students could watch our treatment presentation video, the professor sent out another video to all three classes. Students may have believed the professor's video was the treatment video discussed in Q20 of Appendix B. We believe this caused inaccuracies when students answered this question, resulting in more students reporting they watched the presentation than possible.

Finally, we want to address the limitation that students may have inaccurately filled out survey responses. It is possible that students guessed on their responses to certain questions, such as their parent's level of political participation or what elections their parents have voted in. Additionally, technology and human errors such as mis-selecting a response on the survey could increase this inaccuracy. As with any survey, there are certain inaccuracies to be expected in individuals reporting their answers. With the limitation of inaccuracy in mind, our current results may not reflect students' true answers to the survey questions.

#### **4.2 Future Research**

One way this research could be expanded upon is by repeating this treatment presentation multiple times throughout the semester prior to the election. This may increase the importance that students give toward the election and registering to vote. Another way this research could be expanded in the future is through a non-geographically limited sample. Having surveys and the treatment accessible and promoted through an online format could increase how representative our sample population is. Additionally, refining our presentation message could impact the results seen from our study. By creating different treatment messages about voting and testing them to see which message has the greatest influence, we may better understand what motivates college-aged students to vote. Furthermore, recruiting social media influencers or celebrities to give these messages could also impact the results seen in this study. As students often see these individuals as having a higher status, they may give more importance to their messages about this topic.

Finally, potentially adding additional hypotheses may benefit our analysis. For each of our hypotheses we could first test the influence of the variable itself without the inclusion of our treatment. This would provide a more thorough baseline for the political tendencies of the

sample. Then we could test the impact of our treatment in a second hypothesis. We believe adding to each hypothesis will help us better understand to what extent the influence seen is from our treatment variable. While our study did not show statistical significance overall for our data, we hope that new directions of future research will lead to more students voting.

## REFERENCES

- American National Election Studies. (2018, December 21). *ANES 2018 Pilot Study Questionnaire Specifications: Version 20181205*. ANES 2018 Pilot Study Questionnaire Specifications. Retrieved March 31, 2022, from [chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Felectionstudies.org%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2018%2F12%2Fanes\\_pilot\\_2018\\_questionnaire.pdf&clen=1045288&chunk=true](chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Felectionstudies.org%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2018%2F12%2Fanes_pilot_2018_questionnaire.pdf&clen=1045288&chunk=true)
- American National Election Studies. (2021, July 19). *ANES 2020 Time Series Study: Pre-Election and Post-Election Survey Questionnaires*. ANES 2020 Time Series Study. Retrieved March 31, 2022, from [chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Felectionstudies.org%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2021%2F07%2Fanes\\_timeseries\\_2020\\_questionnaire\\_20210719.pdf&clen=3098502&chunk=true](chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Felectionstudies.org%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2021%2F07%2Fanes_timeseries_2020_questionnaire_20210719.pdf&clen=3098502&chunk=true)
- Ardoin, P. J., Bell C. S., & Ragozzino, M. M. (2015). The Partisan Battle Over College Student Voting: An Analysis of Student Voting Behavior in Federal, State, and Local Elections. *Social Science Quarterly*, 96(5), 1178-1195.
- At a glance - Texas A&M University, College Station, TX. (n.d.). At a Glance - Texas A&M University, College Station, TX. Retrieved November 30, 2021, from <https://www.tamu.edu/about/at-a-glance.html>.
- Bennion, E. A., & Nickerson, D. W. (2016). I Will Register and Vote, If You Teach Me How: A Field Experiment Testing Voter Registration in College Classrooms. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 49(4), 867–871.
- Bhatti, Y., & Hansen, K. M. (2012, September 28). Journal of Elections, public opinion and parties. Leaving the Nest and the Social Act of Voting: Turnout among First-Time Voters. Retrieved February 1, 2022, from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/citedby/10.1080/17457289.2012.721375?scroll=top&needAccess=true>
- Brennan, J. (2020). Increasing voter turnout in local elections. National Civic League. Retrieved April 2, 2022, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.32543/naticivirevi.109.1.0016>

- Bryan, TX. (n.d.). Data USA. Retrieved November 30, 2021, from <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/bryan-tx>.
- College station, TX. (n.d.). Data USA. Retrieved November 30, 2021, from <https://datausa.io/profile/geo/college-station-tx>.
- Delli Carpini, M. X. (2000) Gen.com: Youth, Civic Engagement, and the New Information Environment, *Political Communication*, 17(4), 341-349, DOI: 10.1080/10584600050178942 chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2F
- Dyck, J. J., & Gimpel, J. G. (2005). Distance, Turnout, and the Convenience of Voting. *Social Science Quarterly*, 86(3), 531–548. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42956079>
- Esser, F., & De Vreese, C. H. (2007). Comparing Young Voters' Political Engagement in the United States and Europe. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(9), 1195–1213. <https://doi-org.srv-proxy1.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/0002764207299364>
- Etang, A., Fielding, D. and Knowles, S. (2016), WHO VOTES EXPRESSIVELY, AND WHY? EXPERIMENTAL EVIDENCE. *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 68, 105-116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/boer.12033>
- Gerber, A., Gruber, J., & Hungerman, D. (2016). Does Church Attendance Cause People to Vote? Using Blue Laws' Repeal to Estimate the Effect of Religiosity on Voter Turnout. *British Journal of Political Science*, 46(3), 481-500. doi:10.1017/S0007123414000416
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., & Diehl, T. (2019). News finds me perception and democracy: Effects on political knowledge, political interest, and voting. *New Media & Society*, 21(6), 1253–1271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818817548>
- Hajnal, Z. L., Lewis, P. G., & Louch, H. (2002). Municipal Elections in California: Turnout, Timing, and Competition. *Public Policy Institute of California*. [https://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_302ZHR.pdf](https://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_302ZHR.pdf)
- Hajnal, Z. L., & Lewis, P. G. (2003). Municipal Institutions and Voter Turnout in Local Elections. *Urban Affairs Review*, 38(5), 645–668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087403038005002>
- Huckfeldt, R., & Sprague, J. (1995). Citizens, politics and Social Communication. Cambridge



University Press.

Knoke, D. (1990). Networks of political action: Toward theory construction. Retrieved February 22, 2022, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2579133>

Moskowitz, D. (2021). Local News, Information, and the Nationalization of U.S. Elections. *American Political Science Review*, 115(1), 114-129. doi:10.1017/S0003055420000829

Pate, A., & Richman, J. (2007). College Students and Voting. *Conference Papers -- Southern Political Science Association*, 1–18.

Putnam, R. (1995). Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 28(4), 664-683. doi:10.2307/420517 chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgclefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2F

Richman, J., & Pate, A. (2010). Can the College Vote Turn Out?: Evidence from the U.S. States, 2000-08. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 10(1), 51–68. <https://doi-org.srv-proxy2.library.tamu.edu/10.1177/153244001001000103>

Shea, D. M., & Harris, R. (2006). Why Bother? Because Peer-To-Peer Programs Can Mobilize Young Voters. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 39(2), 341–345. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20451744>

United States Census Bureau. (2022, January 11). *Current Population Survey Data*. Census.gov. Retrieved February 3, 2022, from <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/data.html>

United States Census Bureau. (2021, April 29). *2020 Presidential Election Voting and Registration Tables Now Available*. United States Census Bureau. Retrieved April 2, 2022, from <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2021/2020-presidential-election-voting-and-registration-tables-now-available.html>

## APPENDIX A: PRE-ELECTION SURVEY

Q31 In order to get credit for this survey, please type your UIN below (Please check this number is correct as this is your only way to receive extra credit): \_\_\_\_\_

Q30 **Title of Research Study:** Voter Turnout for State and Local Elections

**Investigator:** Dr. Kristy Pathakis and Dr. Sarah Fulton

### **Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?**

You are invited to participate in this study because we are trying to learn more about: the impact of internal efficacy on first year undergraduate students. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because of your current enrollment in a POLS 207 course. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate.

### **Why is this research being done?**

The survey is designed to gather data on students' participation in local and state elections, as well as participation within their community.

### **How long will the research last?**

It will take less than 5 minutes to complete the pre-election survey.

It will take about 5 to 10 minutes to undergo the treatment presentation, if your class is selected.

It will take about 1 to 3 minutes to complete the post election survey.

In total, these research tasks will take about 20 minutes to complete.

### **What happens if I say “Yes, I want to be in this research”?**

If you decide to participate, please do the following:

Complete both the survey that is currently being administered as well as the follow up survey of the same nature in November.

You could be selected to participate in the treatment presentation. Your selection into this treatment group or the control group is not correlated to any of the independent or dependent variables within this research study. Selection into one or the other is essentially random and is uncorrelated with any of the key variables of interest.

### **What happens if I do not want to be in this research?**

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You can decide not to participate in this research and it will not be held against you. You can leave the study at any time.

### **Is there any way being in this study could harm me?**

There are no sensitive questions in this survey that should cause discomfort. However, you can skip any question you do not wish to answer, or exit the survey at any point.

### **What happens to the information collected for the research?**

You may view the survey host's confidentiality policy at: <https://www.qualtrics.com/privacy-statement/> No direct personal identifiers will be collected. Your information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law.

### **Who can I talk to?**

Please feel free to ask questions regarding this study. You may contact Dr. Pathakis or Dr. Fulton later if you have additional questions or concerns at [kpathakis@tamu.edu](mailto:kpathakis@tamu.edu) or [safulton@tamu.edu](mailto:safulton@tamu.edu). If you want a copy of this consent for your records, you can print it from the screen.

If you wish to participate, please click the “**I Agree**” button and you will be taken to the survey. If you do not wish to participate in this study, please select “**I Disagree**” or select X in the corner of your browser.

I Agree (1)

- I Disagree (2)

*Skip To: End of Survey If Title of Research Study: Voter Turnout for State and Local Elections Investigator: Dr. Kristy Pat... = I Disagree*

Q1 Are you 18 years of age or older?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

*Skip To: End of Survey If Are you 18 years of age or older? = No*

Q2 Who is your teacher and what is your class section number?

- Roblyer, 207-500 (17)
- Roblyer, 207-501 (18)
- Roblyer, 207-502 (19)

Q35 What year did you graduate from high school?

- before 2016 (16)
- 2016 (10)
- 2017 (11)
- 2018 (12)
- 2019 (13)
- 2020 (14)
- 2021 (15)

Q16 When was your first semester at Texas A&M?

- before Fall 2015 (1)
- Fall 2015 (2)
- Spring 2016 (3)
- Fall 2016 (4)
- Spring 2017 (5)
- Fall 2017 (6)
- Spring 2018 (7)
- Fall 2018 (8)
- Spring 2019 (9)
- Fall 2019 (10)
- Spring 2020 (11)
- Fall 2020 (12)
- Spring 2021 (13)
- Fall 2021 (14)

Q15 What is your expected graduating class year at Texas A&M?

- Fall 2021 (1)
- Spring 2022 (2)

- Fall 2022 (3)
- Spring 2023 (4)
- Fall 2023 (5)
- Spring 2024 (6)
- Fall 2024 (7)
- Spring 2025 (8)
- Fall 2025 (9)
- Spring 2026 (10)
- Fall 2026 (13)
- After Fall 2026 (11)
- I have already graduated (12)

Q3 Academic College at Texas A&M University

- College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (1)
- College of Architecture (2)
- Mays Business School (3)
- College of Dentistry (4)
- College of Education and Human Development (5)
- College of Engineering (6)
- College of Geosciences (7)
- Bush School of Government and Public Service (8)
- School of Law (9)
- College of Liberal Arts (10)
- College of Medicine (11)
- College of Nursing (12)
- Irma Lerma Rangel College of Pharmacy (13)
- School of Public Health (14)
- College of Science (15)
- College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences (16)

*Skip To: Q14 If Academic College at Texas A&M University = College of Liberal Arts*

*Display This Question:*

*If Academic College at Texas A&M University = College of Liberal Arts*

Q14 What is your major within the College of Liberal Arts?

- Anthropology (1)
- Economics (2)
- International Studies (3)
- History (4)
- Philosophy (5)
- Psychological and Brain Sciences (6)

- Communication (7)
- English (8)
- Hispanic Studies (9)
- Performance Studies (10)
- Political Science (11)
- Sociology (12)

Q18 How many hours a week are you involved in Philanthropic/ Service Organizations? Ex: Big Event, Aggie Replant, American Red Cross

- 0 (1)
- 1 (2)
- 2 (3)
- 3 (4)
- 4 (5)
- 5 (6)
- 6 (7)
- 7 (8)
- 8 (9)
- 9 (10)
- 10 or more (11)

Q5 How many hours a week are you involved in Social Student Organizations? Ex: Greek Life, FLO, SLO, Fish Camp

- 0 (1)
- 1 (2)
- 2 (3)
- 3 (4)
- 4 (5)
- 5 (6)
- 6 (7)
- 7 (8)
- 8 (9)
- 9 (10)
- 10 or more (11)

Q19 How many hours a week are you involved in Academic Student Organizations? Ex: Professional School Organizations

- 0 (1)
- 1 (2)
- 2 (3)
- 3 (4)
- 4 (5)

- 5 (6)
- 6 (7)
- 7 (8)
- 8 (9)
- 9 (10)
- 10 or more (11)

Q20 How many hours a week are you involved in Religious Groups?

- 0 (1)
- 1 (2)
- 2 (3)
- 3 (4)
- 4 (5)
- 5 (6)
- 6 (7)
- 7 (8)
- 8 (9)
- 9 (10)
- 10 or more (11)

Q21 How many hours a week do you work for pay?

- I don't work for pay (5)
- 1-9 hours a week (1)
- 10-19 hours a week (4)
- 20-29 hours a week (8)
- 30-39 hours a week (9)
- 40 or more hours a week (7)

Q7 When it comes to politics, would you describe yourself as liberal, conservative, or neither liberal nor conservative?

- Very conservative (1)
- Somewhat conservative (2)
- Closer to conservative (7)
- Neither liberal nor conservative (3)
- Closer to liberal (6)
- Somewhat liberal (4)
- Very liberal (5)

Q32 Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an independent, or what?

- Republican (2)
- Democrat (1)

- Independent (3)
- Other (4)

Q8 Are you aware of your parents/guardians voting in any of the following below? *Mark all that apply.*

- Local elections (1)
- State elections (2)
- National elections (3)
- None of the above (4)

Q9 Are you registered to vote, or not?

- Yes, registered to vote at my current address in Bryan/College Station (Brazos County) (1)
- Yes, registered to vote at a different address (3)
- No, not registered (4)
- Don't know/ I do not recall (5)

*Skip To: Q27 If Are you registered to vote, or not? = Yes, registered to vote at a different address*

*Skip To: Q10 If Are you registered to vote, or not? = No, not registered*

*Skip To: Q10 If Are you registered to vote, or not? = Don't know/ I do not recall*

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you registered to vote, or not? = Yes, registered to vote at a different address*

Q27 Where are you registered to vote?

- Out of State (3)
- A different Texas county other than Brazos County (4)

*Skip To: Q28 If Where are you registered to vote? = A different Texas county other than Brazos County*

*Display This Question:*

*If Where are you registered to vote? = A different Texas county other than Brazos County*

Q28 In what county in Texas are you registered to vote?

- |                                      |                                     |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Anderson (3)   | <input type="radio"/> Borden (21)   | <input type="radio"/> Carson (37)        |
| <input type="radio"/> Andrews (6)    | <input type="radio"/> Bosque (22)   | <input type="radio"/> Cass (38)          |
| <input type="radio"/> Angelina (7)   | <input type="radio"/> Bowie (23)    | <input type="radio"/> Castro (39)        |
| <input type="radio"/> Aransas (8)    | <input type="radio"/> Brazoria (24) | <input type="radio"/> Chambers (40)      |
| <input type="radio"/> Archer (9)     | <input type="radio"/> Brazos (25)   | <input type="radio"/> Cherokee (41)      |
| <input type="radio"/> Armstrong (10) | <input type="radio"/> Brewster (26) | <input type="radio"/> Childress (42)     |
| <input type="radio"/> Atascosa (11)  | <input type="radio"/> Briscoe (27)  | <input type="radio"/> Clay (43)          |
| <input type="radio"/> Austin (12)    | <input type="radio"/> Brooks (28)   | <input type="radio"/> Cochran (44)       |
| <input type="radio"/> Bailey (13)    | <input type="radio"/> Brown (29)    | <input type="radio"/> Coke (45)          |
| <input type="radio"/> Bandera (14)   | <input type="radio"/> Burleson (30) | <input type="radio"/> Coleman (46)       |
| <input type="radio"/> Bastrop (15)   | <input type="radio"/> Burnet (31)   | <input type="radio"/> Collin (47)        |
| <input type="radio"/> Baylor (16)    | <input type="radio"/> Caldwell (32) | <input type="radio"/> Collingsworth (48) |
| <input type="radio"/> Bee (17)       | <input type="radio"/> Calhoun (33)  | <input type="radio"/> Colorado (49)      |
| <input type="radio"/> Bell (18)      | <input type="radio"/> Callahan (34) | <input type="radio"/> Comal (50)         |
| <input type="radio"/> Bexar (19)     | <input type="radio"/> Cameron (35)  | <input type="radio"/> Comanche (51)      |
| <input type="radio"/> Blanco (20)    | <input type="radio"/> Camp (36)     | <input type="radio"/> Concho (52)        |

- o Cooke (53)
- o Coryell (54)
- o Cottle (55)
- o Crane (56)
- o Crockett (57)
- o Crosby (58)
- o Culberson (59)
- o Dallam (60)
- o Dallas (61)
- o Dawson (62)
- o Deaf Smith (63)
- o Delta (64)
- o Denton (65)
- o DeWitt (66)
- o Dickens (67)
- o Dimmit (68)
- o Donley (69)
- o Duval (70)
- o Eastland (71)
- o Ector (72)
- o Edwards (73)
- o El Paso (74)
- o Ellis (75)
- o Erath (76)
- o Falls (77)
- o Fannin (78)
- o Fayette (79)
- o Fisher (80)
- o Floyd (81)
- o Foard (82)
- o Fort Bend (83)
- o Franklin (84)
- o Freestone (85)
- o Frio (86)
- o Gaines (87)
- o Galveston (88)
- o Garza (89)
- o Gillespie (90)
- o Glasscock (91)
- o Goliad (92)
- o Gonzales (93)
- o Gray (94)
- o Grayson (95)
- o Gregg (96)
- o Grimes (97)
- o Guadalupe (98)
- o Hale (99)
- o Hall (100)
- o Hamilton (101)
- o Hansford (102)
- o Hardeman (103)
- o Hardin (104)
- o Harris (105)
- o Harrison (106)
- o Hartley (107)
- o Haskell (108)
- o Hays (109)
- o Hemphill (110)
- o Henderson (111)
- o Hidalgo (112)
- o Hill (113)
- o Hockley (114)
- o Hood (115)
- o Hopkins (116)
- o Houston (117)
- o Howard (118)
- o Hudspeth (119)
- o Hunt (120)
- o Hutchinson (121)
- o Irion (122)
- o Jack (123)
- o Jackson (124)
- o Jasper (125)
- o Jeff Davis (126)
- o Jefferson (127)
- o Jim Hogg (128)
- o Jim Wells (129)
- o Johnson (130)
- o Jones (131)
- o Karnes (132)
- o Kaufman (133)
- o Kendall (134)
- o Kenedy (135)
- o Kent (136)
- o Kerr (137)
- o Kimble (138)
- o King (139)
- o Kinney (140)
- o Kleberg (141)
- o Knox (142)
- o La Salle (143)
- o Lamar (144)
- o Lamb (145)
- o Lampasas (146)
- o Lavaca (147)
- o Lee (148)
- o Leon (149)
- o Liberty (150)
- o Limestone (151)
- o Lipscomb (152)
- o Live Oak (153)
- o Llano (154)
- o Loving (155)
- o Lubbock (156)
- o Lynn (157)
- o Madison (158)
- o Marion (159)
- o Martin (160)
- o Mason (161)
- o Matagorda (162)
- o Maverick (163)
- o McCulloch (164)
- o McLennan (165)
- o McMullen (166)
- o Medina (167)
- o Menard (168)
- o Midland (169)
- o Milam (170)
- o Mills (171)
- o Mitchell (172)



- Montague (173)
- Montgomery (174)
- Moore (175)
- Morris (176)
- Motley (177)
- Nacogdoches (178)
- Navarro (179)
- Newton (180)
- Nolan (181)
- Nueces (182)
- Ochiltree (183)
- Oldham (184)
- Orange (185)
- Palo Pinto (186)
- Panola (187)
- Parker (188)
- Parmer (189)
- Pecos (190)
- Polk (191)
- Potter (192)
- Presidio (193)
- Rains (194)
- Randall (195)
- Reagan (196)
- Real (197)
- Red River (198)
- Reeves (199)
- Refugio (200)
- Roberts (201)
- Robertson (202)
- Rockwall (203)
- Runnels (204)
- Rusk (205)
- Sabine (206)
- San Augustine (207)
- San Jacinto (208)
- San Patricio (209)
- San Saba (210)
- Schleicher (211)
- Scurry (212)
- Shackelford (213)
- Shelby (214)
- Sherman (215)
- Smith (216)
- Somervell (217)
- Starr (218)
- Stephens (219)
- Sterling (220)
- Stonewall (221)
- Sutton (222)
- Swisher (223)
- Tarrant (224)
- Taylor (225)
- Terrell (226)
- Terry (227)
- Throckmorton (228)
- Titus (229)
- Tom Green (230)
- Travis (231)
- Trinity (232)
- Tyler (233)
- Upshur (234)
- Upton (235)
- Uvalde (236)
- Val Verde (237)
- Van Zandt (238)
- Victoria (239)
- Walker (240)
- Waller (241)
- Ward (242)
- Washington (243)
- Webb (244)
- Wharton (245)
- Wheeler (246)
- Wichita (247)
- Wilbarger (248)
- Willacy (249)
- Williamson (250)
- Wilson (251)
- Winkler (252)
- Wise (253)
- Wood (254)
- Yoakum (255)
- Young (256)
- Zapata (257)
- Zavala (258)

*If Are you registered to vote, or not? = Don't know/ I do not recall  
Or Are you registered to vote, or not? = No, not registered*

Q10 Do you have a plan to get registered before the October 4 deadline?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q11 Do you plan to vote in the November 2 local election?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

*Skip To: Q12 If Do you plan to vote in the November 2 local election? = No  
Display This Question:*

*If Do you plan to vote in the November 2 local election? = No*

Q12 Why do you not plan to vote November 2?

- Confused on process to obtain an absentee ballot (1)
- Absentee Ballot Issues (7)
- Am not registered to vote in Bryan/College Station (2)
- Am not registered to vote anywhere (12)
- Won't travel to where I am registered to vote (6)
- Confused by election process (3)
- Not feeling informed enough (4)
- Do not find local elections important (5)
- Do not believe my vote can impact an election (8)
- Do not have time to go vote (9)
- Will not be able to miss work to go vote (10)
- Do not have a mode of transportation to go to a polling site (11)

Q17 How interested are you in information about what's going on in government and politics?

- Extremely interested (1)
- Very interested (2)
- Moderately interested (3)
- Slightly interested (4)
- Not interested at all (5)

Q22 During the past 12 months, have **you** done any of the following? *Mark all that apply.*

- Attended a meeting to talk about political or social concerns (1)
- Given money to an organization concerned with a political or social issue (2)
- Joined in a protest march, rally, or demonstration (3)
- Posted a message or comment online about a political issue or campaign (4)
- Tried to persuade anyone to vote one way or another (5)
- Worn a campaign button, put a sticker on your car, or placed a sign in your window or in front of your house (6)
- Given money to any candidate running for public office, any political party, or any other group that supported or opposed candidates (7)
- Gotten into a political argument with someone (8)
- None of these (9)

Q23 How about your parents/guardians? During the past 12 months, have your **parents/guardians** done any of the following? Mark all that apply.

- Attended a meeting to talk about political or social concerns (1)
- Given money to an organization concerned with a political or social issue (2)
- Joined in a protest march, rally, or demonstration (3)
- Posted a message or comment online about a political issue or campaign (4)
- Tried to persuade anyone to vote one way or another (5)
- Worn a campaign button, put a sticker on your car, or placed a sign in your window or in front of your house (6)

- Given money to any candidate running for public office, any political party, or any other group that supported or opposed candidates (7)
- Gotten into a political argument with someone (8)
- None of these (9)

Q33 How often do you talk about politics with your **family**?

- Daily (4)
- A few times a week (5)
- A few times a month (6)
- Almost never (7)
- Do not recall/ Don't know (9)

Q24 Over the past four years, has it become easier or harder for you to talk about politics with your **family**?

- A great deal easier (1)
- Somewhat easier (2)
- Slightly easier (3)
- Neither easier nor harder (4)
- Slightly harder (5)
- Somewhat harder (6)
- A great deal harder (7)

Q34 How often do you talk about politics with your **friends**?

- Daily (4)
- A few times a week (5)
- A few times a month (6)
- Almost never (7)
- Do not recall/ Don't know (9)

Q25 How about your friends? Over the past four years, has it become easier or harder for you to talk about politics with your **friends**?

- A great deal easier (1)
- Somewhat easier (2)
- Slightly easier (3)
- Neither easier nor harder (4)
- Slightly harder (5)
- Somewhat harder (6)
- A great deal harder (7)

## APPENDIX B: POST-ELECTION SURVEY

Q18 In order to get credit for this survey, please type your UIN below: \_\_\_\_\_

Q15 **Title of Research Study:** Voter Turnout for State and Local Elections

**Investigator:** Dr. Kristy Pathakis and Dr. Sarah Fulton

### **Why am I being asked to take part in this research study?**

You are invited to participate in this study because we are trying to learn more about: the impact of internal efficacy on first year undergraduate students You were selected as a possible participant in this study because of your current enrollment in a POLS 207 course. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate.

### **Why is this research being done?**

The survey is designed to gather data on students' participation in local and state elections, as well as participation within their community.

### **How long will the research last?**

It will take about 12 minutes to complete the pre-election survey.

It will take about 5 to 10 minutes to undergo the treatment presentation, if your class is selected.

It will take about 1 to 3 minutes to complete the post election survey.

In total, these research tasks will take about 20 minutes to complete.

### **What happens if I say “Yes, I want to be in this research”?**

If you decide to participate, please do the following: Must have previously completed the Pre-Election Survey from September and complete the following survey that is being administered.

You might have been selected to participate in the treatment presentation. Your selection into this treatment group or the control group is not correlated to any of the independent or dependent variables within this research study. Selection into one or the other is essentially random and is uncorrelated with any of the key variables of interest.

### **What happens if I do not want to be in this research?**

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You can decide not to participate in this research and it will not be held against you. You can leave the study at any time.

### **Is there any way being in this study could harm me?**

There are no sensitive questions in this survey that should cause discomfort. However, you can skip any question you do not wish to answer, or exit the survey at any point.

### **What happens to the information collected for the research?**

You may view the survey host's confidentiality policy at : <https://www.qualtrics.com/privacy-statement/> No direct personal identifiers will be collected. Your information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. The results of the research study may be published but your identity will remain confidential.

### **Who can I talk to?**

Please feel free to ask questions regarding this study. You may contact Dr. Pathakis or Dr. Fulton later if you have additional questions or concerns at [kpathakis@tamu.edu](mailto:kpathakis@tamu.edu) or [safulton@tamu.edu](mailto:safulton@tamu.edu). If you want a copy of this consent for your records, you can print it from the screen.

If you wish to participate, please click the “**I Agree**” button and you will be taken to the survey. If you do not wish to participate in this study, please select “**I Disagree**” or select X in the corner of your browser.

I Agree

I Disagree

*Skip To: End of Survey If Title of Research Study: Voter Turnout for State and Local Elections Investigator: Dr. Kristy P... = I Disagree*

Are you 18 years of age or older?

Yes

- No

*Skip To: End of Survey If Are you 18 years of age or older? = No*

Q19 Who is your teacher and what is your class section number?

- Roblyer, 207-500 (MWF 3:00 PM - 3:50 PM)
- Roblyer, 207-501 (MWF 8:00 AM - 8:50 AM)
- Roblyer, 207-502 (MWF 9:10 AM - 10:00 AM)

Q20 In September, did you watch the thesis students' presentation on local voting habits?

- Yes, I watched the in-person presentation during my 8 AM lecture time
- Yes, I watched the video of the presentation
- No

Q11 Are you registered to vote?

- Yes, registered to vote at my current address in Bryan/College Station (Brazos County)
- Yes, registered to vote at a different address
- No, not registered
- Don't know/ I do not recall

*Skip To: Q16 If Are you registered to vote? = Yes, registered to vote at a different address*

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you registered to vote? = Yes, registered to vote at a different address*

Q16 Where are you registered to vote?

- Out of State
- A different Texas county other than Brazos County

*Skip To: Q17 If Where are you registered to vote? = A different Texas county other than Brazos County*

*Display This Question:*

*If Where are you registered to vote? = A different Texas county other than Brazos County*

Q17 In what county in Texas are you registered to vote?

- |                                 |                                |                                     |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Anderson  | <input type="radio"/> Borden   | <input type="radio"/> Carson        |
| <input type="radio"/> Andrews   | <input type="radio"/> Bosque   | <input type="radio"/> Cass          |
| <input type="radio"/> Angelina  | <input type="radio"/> Bowie    | <input type="radio"/> Castro        |
| <input type="radio"/> Aransas   | <input type="radio"/> Brazoria | <input type="radio"/> Chambers      |
| <input type="radio"/> Archer    | <input type="radio"/> Brazos   | <input type="radio"/> Cherokee      |
| <input type="radio"/> Armstrong | <input type="radio"/> Brewster | <input type="radio"/> Childress     |
| <input type="radio"/> Atascosa  | <input type="radio"/> Briscoe  | <input type="radio"/> Clay          |
| <input type="radio"/> Austin    | <input type="radio"/> Brooks   | <input type="radio"/> Cochran       |
| <input type="radio"/> Bailey    | <input type="radio"/> Brown    | <input type="radio"/> Coke          |
| <input type="radio"/> Bandera   | <input type="radio"/> Burleson | <input type="radio"/> Coleman       |
| <input type="radio"/> Bastrop   | <input type="radio"/> Burnet   | <input type="radio"/> Collin        |
| <input type="radio"/> Baylor    | <input type="radio"/> Caldwell | <input type="radio"/> Collingsworth |
| <input type="radio"/> Bee       | <input type="radio"/> Calhoun  | <input type="radio"/> Colorado      |
| <input type="radio"/> Bell      | <input type="radio"/> Callahan | <input type="radio"/> Comal         |
| <input type="radio"/> Bexar     | <input type="radio"/> Cameron  | <input type="radio"/> Comanche      |
| <input type="radio"/> Blanco    | <input type="radio"/> Camp     | <input type="radio"/> Concho        |

- Cooke
- Coryell
- Cottle
- Crane
- Crockett
- Crosby
- Culberson
- Dallam
- Dallas
- Dawson
- Deaf Smith
- Delta
- Denton
- DeWitt
- Dickens
- Dimmit
- Donley
- Duval
- Eastland
- Ector
- Edwards
- El Paso
- Ellis
- Erath
- Falls
- Fannin
- Fayette
- Fisher
- Floyd
- Foard
- Fort Bend
- Franklin
- Freestone
- Frio
- Gaines
- Galveston
- Garza
- Gillespie
- Glasscock
- Goliad
- Gonzales
- Gray
- Grayson
- Gregg
- Grimes
- Guadalupe
- Hale
- Hall
- Hamilton
- Hansford
- Hardeman
- Hardin
- Harris
- Harrison
- Hartley
- Haskell
- Hays
- Hemphill
- Henderson
- Hidalgo
- Hill
- Hockley
- Hood
- Hopkins
- Houston
- Howard
- Hudspeth
- Hunt
- Hutchinson
- Irion
- Jack
- Jackson
- Jasper
- Jeff Davis
- Jefferson
- Jim Hogg
- Jim Wells
- Johnson
- Jones
- Karnes
- Kaufman
- Kendall
- Kenedy
- Kent
- Kerr
- Kimble
- King
- Kinney
- Kleberg
- Knox
- La Salle
- Lamar
- Lamb
- Lampasas
- Lavaca
- Lee
- Leon
- Liberty
- Limestone
- Lipscomb
- Live Oak
- Llano
- Loving
- Lubbock
- Lynn
- Madison
- Marion
- Martin
- Mason
- Matagorda
- Maverick
- McCulloch
- McLennan
- McMullen
- Medina
- Menard
- Midland
- Milam
- Mills
- Mitchell

- Montague
- Montgomery
- Moore
- Morris
- Motley
- Nacogdoches
- Navarro
- Newton
- Nolan
- Nueces
- Ochiltree
- Oldham
- Orange
- Palo Pinto
- Panola
- Parker
- Parmer
- Pecos
- Polk
- Potter
- Presidio
- Rains
- Randall
- Reagan
- Real
- Red River
- Reeves
- Refugio
- Roberts
- Robertson
- Rockwall
- Runnels
- Rusk
- Sabine
- San Augustine
- San Jacinto
- San Patricio
- San Saba
- Schleicher
- Scurry
- Shackelford
- Shelby
- Sherman
- Smith
- Somervell
- Starr
- Stephens
- Sterling
- Stonewall
- Sutton
- Swisher
- Tarrant
- Taylor
- Terrell
- Terry
- Throckmorton
- Titus
- Tom Green
- Travis
- Trinity
- Tyler
- Upshur
- Upton
- Uvalde
- Val Verde
- Van Zandt
- Victoria
- Walker
- Waller
- Ward
- Washington
- Webb
- Wharton
- Wheeler
- Wichita
- Wilbarger
- Willacy
- Williamson
- Wilson
- Winkler
- Wise
- Wood
- Yoakum
- Young
- Zapata
- Zavala

*Display This Question:*

*If Are you registered to vote? = Yes, registered to vote at my current address in Bryan/College Station (Brazos County)  
Or Are you registered to vote? = Yes, registered to vote at a different address*

Q12 Did you vote in the November 2 local election?

- Yes
- No

*Skip To: Q13 If Did you vote in the November 2 local election? = No  
Skip To: Q14 If Did you vote in the November 2 local election? = Yes*

*Display This Question:*

*If Did you vote in the November 2 local election? = No*

Q13 Why not?

- Absentee Ballot Issues

- Am not registered to vote in College Station/Bryan
- Won't drive to where I am registered to vote
- Did not acquire an absentee ballot
- Confused by election process
- Not feeling informed enough
- Do not find local elections important
- Forgot to vote
- Not eligible to vote

*Display This Question:*

*If Did you vote in the November 2 local election? = Yes*

Q14 Which one of the following best describes how you voted?

- Definitely voted in person at a polling place before election day
- Definitely voted in person at a polling place on election day
- Definitely voted by mailing a ballot to elections officials before election day
- Definitely voted in some other way
- Not completely sure whether I voted or not

Q21 Is this the first election you could have voted in since turning 18?

- Yes
- No