

WORKING PAPERS OF THE
CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Paper #35

November, 1967

NON-RADICAL POLITICAL MOVEMENTS: POLITICAL MOBILIZATION
AND THE MIDDLE CLASS*

by

Howard Aldrich

*William Gamson, Albert J. Reiss, Jr., and David Segal read and commented on previous drafts of this paper. Needless to say, I have benefitted greatly from their efforts, and the present paper bears faint resemblance to its earlier ancestors. I am also indebted to Penny Aldrich, Mark Krain, James Norr, Ted Reed, and Edward Silva for assistance at various stages in the research process.

INTRODUCTION

In the last two decades research on political behavior has begun to catch up with developments in political theory. Progress has been uneven, however, especially with regard to research on political movements. More work has been done in the area of social movements than in that of political movements, and with good reason.¹ Political parties in the United States have tended to preempt areas of possible concern to potential political movements, e.g. the "War on Poverty," squeezing out non-political organizations.² Nevertheless, occasionally an issue arises which the political parties find unattractive or non-profitable, but which does have relatively wide-spread appeal. The recent controversy in Michigan over the adoption of Daylight Savings Time (DST) is just such an issue, and in fact provides us with an excellent example of a short-term political movement.

By means of an analysis of this movement we are able to examine the relevance of several of the central concepts of political sociology to political movements, e.g. mobilization, discontent, and politicization. Furthermore, through an examination of the natural history of the movement, from its inception to its ultimate dispersal, it is possible to construct a general picture of the political movement as a process as well as an organization.

This paper, then, seeks to answer a number of questions about political movements: How are people mobilized? What types of individuals participate? What is the immediate stimulus to participation? What is the resultant structure of the association?

An attempt has been made to ground a series of middle-range empirical generalizations in the data and to structure the final presentation in a way that allows for comparison between this study and previous research.³

The historical background of the DST controversy will be briefly mentioned in order to provide a wider framework for interpreting the data that follow. In 1965 Congress passed the Uniform Time Act, which required that all states follow statewide Daylight Time unless a state's legislature enacted an exempting law. Michigan was one of five states in which the legislature did enact such an exempting law, with a majority of each political party voting against DST. Reaction against the legislature's action was immediately forthcoming and within a few weeks the Senate Minority Leader, together with representatives from six state business associations and one labor union, established the "Citizens Committee for Daylight Savings Time Referendum." On March 28 the Committee issued a news release calling for volunteers to circulate referendum petitions, and by April 28 over ten thousand circulators had gathered almost two hundred thousand signatures. Thus in the relatively short span of thirty days the Committee mobilized sufficient resources to reverse the decision of the legislature and to put Michigan on DST for at least eighteen months (until the next election). Surely this feat alone qualifies the DST movement as a phenomenon worthy of study.

THE SAMPLE

The DST referendum petitions were deposited with the State Elections Board on April 28, and on May 9 we were granted permission to sample names of the circulators from the petitions.⁴ Using a systematic sampling procedure (sampling every k^{th} petition) we chose 500 names; as some persons had circulated more than one petition, we sampled without replacement. We have, then, a sample of the most active persons in the movement, the circulators, and not merely the petition signers. Five-hundred questionnaires were mailed on May 15, and within five weeks 273 were returned, a 54.6% response rate. There were approximately 12,000 circulators, so our sample represents a little more than 2% of the total group of active participants.

Limitations of the Sample

While we thus have a reasonably good sample of the circulators of DST petitions, it is apparent that we have not sampled all of the significant actors in the issue. Two important groups have been excluded: (1) Those persons who actively opposed DST, and (2) Those persons who were in favor of DST but who were not mobilized and did not circulate a petition. The latter exclusion is perhaps the most serious factor limiting our capacity to generalize from the study, for we have no sure method for exactly delimiting those characteristics which set off the activists from the non-activists among those in favor of DST. However, wherever possible we have tried to include comparisons between our sample and a comparable population for either Michigan or

another case study. These comparisons help somewhat to correct the unrepresentativeness of the sample as well as to show how the activists differ from a cross-section of the population.

MOBILIZATION

The DST controversy was above all a conflict between opposing organizations, involving the use of both legal and political strategies on the part of the proponents and opponents of DST. The Michigan Farm Bureau, plus bowling alley and theater proprietors, opposed DST and were initially successful in their lobbying attempts against the proposed time change: 18 of 20 Republican State Senators and 10 of 17 Democratic State Senators voted for the bill exempting Michigan from DST. Having failed in the State Senate, the advocates of DST, led by the Senate Minority Leader, formed the Citizens Committee for DST Referendum with headquarters in Lansing (the State capital). Several of the more powerful state commercial organizations were presented on the Committee: The Michigan Retailers Association, The Michigan Food Dealers Association, The Michigan Chain Stores Council, the Michigan State Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Detroit Board of Commerce, the Michigan Association of Broadcasters, and, the Michigan State Building Trades Council.

The major political parties did not take a public stand on the issue and thus neither was officially represented on either side of the controversy. Both parties were forced to remain overtly neutral because DST was an issue which cross-cut party lines; Democrats and Republicans were on both sides. The

cross-cutting nature of the issue is shown by the fact that a large number of people from both parties were highly involved in the movement. Almost 55% of the persons in our sample were Republicans, while about 35% were Democrats. With both parties internally divided in their feelings on the matter, their leadership could not afford the political repercussions of taking a stand on DST. Thus the movement developed outside of the regular channels of political influence.

The strategy adopted by the Citizens Committee made use of a constitutional provision requiring a referendum on an issue to be held upon the presentation of a specified number of signatures of qualified voters. The decision, then, as to organizational strategy was made by the Committee and not by the participants described in this paper. As discussed in the introduction, the Committee's action was successful. Therefore, the opponents of DST were put on the defensive. Their reaction to the DST committee's action was a legal one; their attorney sought legal action in both the State Appeals Court and the State Supreme Court. Pressure was also brought to bear on the State Board of Canvassers, asking them to delay acceptance of the DST Committee's petitions until after the courts could act. This move, however, was counter-acted in the legislature by the introduction of resolution asking that the "board perform its statutory duties and certify petitions asking for a vote of the people on the issue." The Attorney General of Michigan also pressured the State Board, asking them to pass upon the validity of the petitions despite litigation pending in the courts. The Appeals

Court turned down the opponents' suit, but the Supreme Court granted the opponents a temporary injunction against an immediate decision on the DST petitions by the Board. The delay was short lived, however, and the Supreme Court finally ruled that the State Board of Canvassers should go ahead with its evaluation of the petitions. On June 13 the Board officially put Michigan on DST.

The above discussion of the role of competing organizations in the DST controversy was intended only to convey an impression of the scope of the dispute, and not to serve as a full description of such a complex process. We will come back to the importance of these organizations in the conclusion. At this point the level of analysis shifts from a treatment of the organizations involved to a discussion of the participants mobilized by the DST Committee in support of the referendum petition. Of necessity, our analysis will be limited to those in favor of DST, but such terms as "issue public" and "potential partisans" should be recognized as being potentially applicable to both groups concerned with DST--the "pro's" and the "anti's."

Recruitment and mobilization of individuals into formal voluntary associations usually takes the form of either a formal recruiting committee or else through informal social relationships. For example, Sills discovered that a majority of the Polio Foundation members were recruited on the basis of interpersonal, community, or organizational ties.⁵ Mens' service clubs chose their members from among the businessmen in the community who are known through informal contacts and through

their businesses.⁶ Even members of religious cults rely on personal, highly affect-laden contact with prospective members in order to convert them.⁷

Mass movements,⁸ on the other hand, involve a different type of mobilization. Kornhauser has hypothesized that mass movements pressure elites "in a direct and unmediated way, because there is a paucity of intervening groups to channelize and filter popular participation in the larger society...Where people are not securely related to a plurality of independent groups, they are available for all kinds of adventures and 'activist modes of intervention' in the larger society."⁹ Kornhauser calls such a lack of intervening groups the "atomization of the masses."

Between these two hypothesized modes of recruitment there lie other theoretical positions. Gamson speaks of "groups in various degrees of dormancy. Easton, for example, distinguishes organized groups from social groupings."¹⁰ "Individuals fall into such groupings as a result of the possession of certain common characteristics rather than because of a common effort for the achievement of collective purposes."¹¹ Gamson calls such groupings "potential partisans" because there exists the possibility that an issue will arise which will galvanize them into action.

"Potential partisans" actually are a subset of a larger quasi-group which may be called an "issue public." The issue public includes those both for and against an issue, but asserts nothing about their potential for action. It emphasizes the issue-specific nature of such groupings while leaving problematic

the actual degree of organization among members of the grouping.¹²
As Dahl points out, the unmobilized members of an issue public constitute what may be called "slack resources."

Most of the time...most citizens use their resources for purposes other than gaining influence over government decisions. There is a great gap between their actual influence and their potential influence. Their political resources are, so to speak, slack in the system. In some circumstances these resources might be converted from nonpolitical to political purposes....¹³

And, as Gamson has stated, "A major problem for partisan groups is the mobilization of potential resources."¹⁴

In the case of the DST issue, an issue public containing a large number of potential partisans lay dormant in the system, unaware of means to override the action of the legislature. The problem that arose for the Citizens Committee, then, was one of mobilizing a large block of unorganized citizens. The Committee was aided by the fact that their goal was legitimately within the normative structure of society, and the means they chose did not violate the prevailing values of the state. Legally and politically, the DST movement worked within the existing institutions of society. However, two obstacles prevented the committee from utilizing existing organizational structures: (1) The committee was nonpartisan and the parties were divided on the issue, and so therefore party machinery could not be used; and (2) No formal organization of "citizens for the promotion of DST" existed, so the committee had no method of assessing its potential strength and no existing organization to work through.

The type of mobilization effort finally chosen by the committee, recruitment through the mass media, had a number of

important consequences. First, the committee was able to conserve its financial resources and to divert them into other areas, e.g. postage and printing of the petitions. Second, maximum responsibility for the success of the movement was placed on citizen participation. Third, the process was almost entirely dependent on self-selection by potential partisans. Finally, no massive formal voluntary association was created which would have later been difficult to contend with, e.g. the problem of goal succession.

The Mass Media

The DST committee decided to call for volunteers to circulate referendum petitions, and they made this call through the mass media. Senator D. (Committee chairman) issued a one-page news release, followed by appeals broadcast over radio and television. As the "DST" issue was timely news, the mass media quickly followed up the initial message with feature stories and editorials. Public response was immediately forthcoming; thousands of people wrote to the Committee, requesting petitions, and tens of thousands of petitions were sent out.

The first announcement was made on March 28, and 66% of the respondents report hearing about the movement "before April 1st." Indeed, the overwhelming importance of the mass media in mobilizing potential partisans is indicated by the data in TABLE 1.

TABLE 1*

"Exactly how did you learn about the DST drive?"

<u>Means</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Radio	50.1	137
Newspaper	38.8	106
Television	28.6	78
Friend	12.8	35
At Work	4.8	13
Relative	2.2	6
Other	5.1	14

*Percents figured on a base of 273. Total does not add to 100% because of multiple mentions.

In terms of the number of persons affected, radio seems to have been most effective in that half of the respondents reported hearing about DST on the radio. Newspapers were second in number of mentions, and television third. Personal relations did play some part in the mobilization, as is indicated by the 35 people who said a friend had told them of the movement, and the 19 people mentioning "someone at work" or "relative" as a person who had told them about the movement. As Katz and Eldersveld state:

It may well be that for the overwhelming majority political campaigns are conducted in the mass media and through secondary sources rather than through any personal contacts with local or party representatives, or with candidates. Their apperceptive mass about the whole affair of elections is of something removed from their personal lives which takes place in the world of newsprint and television screens.¹⁵

The mass media were important not only for the number of persons mobilized, but also for the resulting structure of the movement. Kornhauser maintains that individuals are mobilized into mass movements because they are atomized, i.e. they are not related to one another through a series of independent groups but only through their relationship to a common authority. In the DST movement, however, individuals were atomized because they were mobilized. That is, the emergent structure of the movement resembled a "mass," in Kornhauser's sense. By utilizing a universalistic, impersonal method of mobilization instead of relying on existing organizations or personal relationships, the resultant organization was inevitably made up of clusters of individuals who had little knowledge of each other nor any direct communication with one another.

It should be noted that the concepts of "mass movement" and "atomization" refer to the structure of the movement itself and not to the underlying population. It may well be that all of the participants belong to voluntary associations and other organizations which link them to society. However, what is relevant here is the fact that these other organizational ties were ineffectual with respect to the DST issue. That is, the other organizational memberships were irrelevant to the person's participation in the DST movement. In fact, as will be discussed later, only 9% reported that they "belong to an organized group which came out in favor of DST." There were no "members" of the DST organization: "It makes no sense to speak of the 'member' of a group unless there are others also [in the group],

or of his particular rights and obligations in the subgroup unless they implicate corresponding rights and obligations on the part of fellow members."¹⁶

If an organized group of recruits were to develop, it would not be on a state- or regional-level. Instead, participants could recruit others at the local level, and carry out the task of collecting signatures at the local level. The significance of the mass media is emphasized by the fact that only 13% of the respondents answered that a particular person or group of persons actively tried to influence their decision to take an active part in the movement. Almost half of these respondents said the influencer was someone at work, and a quarter said that a friend had persuaded them.

Opinion Initiators

E. Jackson Baur, in a study of the dynamics of public opinion formation, summarized the process as follows:

A public originates when a plan for solving a social problem is perceived to have differential impact on personal interests and those affected believe that they can influence the outcome. Opinions emerge in primary interaction initiated by a person who senses the impact of the proposal and communicates his thinking to others.

The conceptual model envisages public opinion as developing through three stages of increasing social complexity: an early stage of mass communication, a middle stage in which voluntary associations become involved, and a final stage in which political institutions are activated. At each stage, however, opinions are relayed through primary groups in which the content is sharpened and clarified.¹⁷

Baur stresses the role of both opinion leaders (community-wide influentials) and opinion initiators (primary-group influentials)

in the communication process. There are many more opinion initiators than opinion leaders, since the role of community influential is difficult to attain and also because of the fact that there may be hundreds of primary groups in a community, each with its own opinion initiator.

The existence of opinion initiators in the DST sample was ascertained by having the respondents nominate themselves, a fact which probably leads to an overstatement of their number but which nevertheless cannot be avoided. Although almost nine-tenths of the respondents felt that no one had influenced their decision to take part, about 49% (133) said that they had attempted to persuade others to circulate petitions. TABLE 2 gives the number of persons the respondent sought to persuade. As Baur's theory would predict,

TABLE 2

"How many people did you try to persuade?"

<u>Attempted Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
0	50.9	139
1	5.5	15
2	7.7	21
3	8.1	22
4	5.5	15
5	5.5	15
6-10	6.2	17
11 or more	7.3	20
NA	3.3	9
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>273</u>

the target of influence in most cases was someone known personally to the respondent. TABLE 3 gives the number of respondents mentioning each type of target. Participants attempted to mobilize others from among persons they already knew, and in this manner local primary and secondary groups were brought into the political arena.

TABLE 3*

"What is the relationship of this person or these people [targets of influence] to you?"

<u>Targets</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Fellow employee	35.1	96
Friend	30.4	83
Neighbor	15.0	41
Relative	11.8	32
Spouse	11.1	30
Customer/client	1.5	5
Other	3.6	10

*Percents figured on a base of 273. Total does not add to 100% because of multiple mentions.

Moreover, the participants' attempts at recruitment apparently met with some degree of success, since 85.3% said they knew at least one other person who circulated a petition. Of course, this does not necessarily imply that the known circulator was recruited by the respondent, although this is probable. TABLE 4 presents the distribution of answers to the question "How many people do you

know who also circulated petitions?". The distribution of the relationships of the circulators known resembles the distribution of TABLE 3, in terms of rank order. Half mentioned "friends" as known circulators, 27% said "fellow employees," 8% mentioned "relatives," 7% said "neighbors," and no other person was mentioned more than seven times. These findings lend support to Robert Ross's contention that primary groups are important in generating commitment to a social movement. Ross states "Primary groups influence recruitment to social movements by legitimating action in face-to-face and salient terms--by making it conventional."¹⁸

TABLE 4

"How many people do you know who also circulated petitions?"

<u>Number Known</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
None	12.5	34
1-2	26.0	71
3-4	20.5	56
5-9	18.3	50
10-14	11.0	30
15-29	6.2	17
30 or more	1.9	5
NA	3.7	10
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>273</u>

We see, then, that the original extreme degree of impersonality of the movement was counter-acted by the tendency of the

participants to recruit their fellow employees, friends, and other relatively well known persons. Also, about 85% of the respondents reported that someone they knew also took part in the movement, and again these persons were fellow employees, friends, and others known personally by the participant. Although we have no information as to the affective bond between the circulator and those whom he attempted to recruit or those who also participated, it seems that primary groups played an important role in the DST movement for two reasons: (1) They served as information channels about the availability of petitions; and (2) They added legitimacy and social support to the action of the participant.

Mobilization was thus accomplished by the DST committee with only a slight expenditure of resources. The mass media carried the message of the movement into the homes of potential partisans, and many of those persons mobilized by this method extended the effect of the mobilization further by recruiting persons whom they met in the course of their everyday work or through social networks. The central committee had little control over the final structure of the movement: small clusters of participants, known more or less intimately by one another, carried out the actual program of the movement. This result may be seen simply as a division of labor among the totality of participants in the movement. The central committee coordinated publicity and distribution of petitions, while the lower-level participants carried out the leg-work, gathering signatures. Indeed, the central committee probably did not want control over such a sprawling and unwieldy structure. Such an organization is best left to die a natural death after the accomplishment of its mission.

DISCONTENT

Some degree of discontent with the existing state of affairs is undoubtedly present in all political systems. Such discontent may be focused on either the "political or 'input' process or on the administrative or 'output' process."¹⁹ The input process refers to the input of demands and support from such groups as political parties or interest groups into the polity. The output process refers "to that process by which authoritative policies are applied or enforced,"²⁰ by such structures as the governmental bureaucracy or the courts. Almond and Verba posit a continuum of orientation to political objects, ranging from allegiance to alienation. Allegiance implies a positive affective and evaluative orientation, while apathy is a sign of indifference, and alienation signifies negative affect and evaluation.²¹ Alienation differs from apathy in that the individual's

orientation toward the world of politics is not simply one of detachment, but of suspicion, distrust, hostility, and cynicism. These people believe that political office holders are corrupt, self-seeking and incompetent, that the whole political process is a fraud and a betrayal of the public trust.²²

Investigators using this global, unidimensional concept of alienation have found that individuals who are alienated from the political system tend to participate less in the system than those who do not feel alienated. For example, Kornhauser found that "among the people who feel politically effective..., almost four times as many rate 'high' in [political] trust as rate 'low'... while by contrast in the high futility group the proportions having high and low interest are nearly equal..."²³ Almond and Verba

report that "compared with those low in subjective competence, respondents higher on the scale are more likely to be party activists...and somewhat less likely to report no partisan affiliation."²⁴

William Kornhauser, however, hypothesizes that "social atomization engenders strong feelings of alienation and anxiety and therefore [leads to] the disposition to engage in extreme behavior to escape from these tensions."²⁵ Indeed, the point of Kornhauser's analysis is that people who are alienated readily become mobilized; persons who are dissatisfied with the outputs of the political system and who lack ties to an organization which would speak for their interests may join an activist and millenarian movement in their search for a solution.²⁶

These two sets of conflicting hypotheses arise out of a failure to specify the objects of political discontent. There are specific levels of the system at which discontent can occur, and conceptualizing "alienation" as a diffuse condition only obscures its relationship to political action. A more viable approach would be to specify what it is at each level of the system that people are reacting against, i.e. what are the objects of a person's alienation. Viewed in this light, alienation is transformed from a condition of the person's mind into a condition of the political order, with the various political objects seen as symbols of the individual's discontent. Gamson has suggested four objects of political trust: the incumbent authorities, the political institutions of a regime, the public philosophy of a regime, and the political community.²⁷ "They may be considered hierarchical, each being a generalization of trust attitudes at the previous level."²⁸

We also need to distinguish between "alienation" and "discontent." Perhaps the term alienation is best reserved for that diffuse condition discussed above, i.e., the complete and uncompromising rejection of the current political order.²⁹ Alienation implies a pervasive and enduring condition of the person's outlook on politics, while discontent (especially when it is issue-specific) may rise and fall over time. Discontent, when generalized over the entire hierarchy of political objects, constitutes alienation in the classical sense. This condition, for most people, seldom obtains. Instead, we would view many people in the system as being discontented at one time or another. But, it is only when large numbers are discontent at the same time and for the same reason that we would expect a political movement to meet with success in mobilization. Furthermore, the fact that many people are discontent at one particular point in time does not mean that they are therefore "alienated."

Individuals will respond differently to different types of governmental decisions, depending on their degree of alienation and its object, and on the type of issue involved. Gamson has laid out a series of predictions about the probable action a group will take, given a certain kind of governmental decision and the particular degree of trust characterizing the group.³⁰ The type of governmental decision we are concerned with is that of the issue whose content is relevant to the group. Gamson predicts that highly confident and highly alienated groups will be inactive, in this case, as the one is fairly certain as to a favorable outcome and the other has no hopes of one. The intermediate group,

halfway between alienation and allegiance, will be most active since it stands to gain most from a slight shift in the position of the authorities.

Taking up the threads of Gamson's argument, we would conclude that in the case of a content-specific issue a group will be most likely to take action when: (1) Their discontent is only slightly generalized beyond the lowest level of the "trust" hierarchy, i.e. the level of the authorities; (2) The issue is important enough to them so that a prior history of unfavorable outcomes is not a necessary factor in their discontent; (3) They are potentially able to overturn the unfavorable decision without "throwing the rascals out"; and (4) The issue is specific to a segment of the participant's life-space such that competing group loyalties are not made salient to those potential partisans mobilized. The above list of characteristics has obviously been generated from the DST data, and so we now turn to them.

DST and Discontent

DST was a relatively well-defined issue, unconnected with questions of the political institutions or public philosophy of the state government. Thus an individual quickly came to a position of "for or against DST." The large group of citizens favoring DST would not have taken action, however, had it not been for the DST committee. Given the opportunity to participate, thousands joined in the movement. Newspapers carried tallies of how state senators had voted on the DST bill; the political parties took no official stand. The news media carried both standard news features as well as editorials on the subject. Amid this amount

of activity it is unlikely that many persons failed to take a stand on the question. It would also have been difficult for them to avoid discussing the issue at least once during the month-long campaign for signatures for the DST referendum.

Thus, when the respondents were asked why they decided to participate, only 5 people were unable to give a reason. Almost 80% gave two reasons, and about half listed three reasons for participation. TABLE 5 gives the distribution of the first-mentioned reasons for participating.

TABLE 5*

"Explain why you decided to participate"

<u>Reason</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Personal benefits, e.g. recreation	32.2	88
Political indignation, e.g. lobbyists	15.8	43
Michigan in relation to Nation, e.g. to bring state into line with others	12.9	35
Democratic process, e.g. public should have a chance to vote on it	12.1	33
Reference group benefits, e.g. benefit my family or friends	10.6	31
Michigan as a state, e.g. help the tourist industry	5.2	14
Citizen duty to help out	4.8	13
Other	4.0	11
NA	1.9	5
	<u>99.5</u>	<u>273</u>

*Based on first response

TABLE 5 shows that personal benefits rank first in the group as a reason for participating, while political indignation ranks second. However, if we add the individuals mentioning some form of "democratic process" to those giving an indignant response, almost 28% of the respondents mentioned "discontent" with the authorities' decision as a first reason for participating. TABLE 6 presents a more specific breakdown of the "political indignation"

TABLE 6*

"Explain why you decided to participate"--Indignation Responses

<u>Response</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Public should have the opportunity to vote on DST	26.4	72
Legislature bowed to the pressures of special interest groups, negative mention of lobbyists	17.9	49
Bill passed by the legislature did not represent views of the majority--will of the people was ignored	11.0	30
Minority group or special interest group was against DST	5.5	15
Legislature unfair, no reason given	5.8	16
Legislature acted too quickly, e.g. rammed it down peoples throats	1.8	5
Rural interests dominate legislature	1.1	3
Other "democracy" response	2.2	6

*Includes first, second, and third response--therefore percents cannot be added. Percents are based on 273 cases. Number of respondents represented in the table equals 141.

and "democratic process" responses, with second and third responses included. Some respondents gave more than one "indignant" response, so therefore while there are 196 responses in TABLE 6, only 141 respondents are represented. In any case, 51.6% of the respondents indicated their discontent with the authorities' decision, and most focussed their discontent on the authorities themselves. The authorities either "sold out" to special interest groups or failed to heed the "will of the people."

On the one hand, these responses could be mere rationalizations of the participants' actions upon becoming involved in the movement. Under this assumption, people express discontent simply because a decision has gone against them, and not because of true feelings of hostility toward the authorities. On the other hand, there is much to recommend the use of these "discontent responses" as valid indicators of the respondents' actual affective state. The question was an open-ended one, with people asked only to "explain why you decided to participate." No cues were provided to structure the answers along any dimension, and no question that had come before had intimated that we were looking for a "discontent" response. Thus the answers were spontaneous expressions of the respondents' attitudes toward political objects, coming almost two months after the legislature had voted upon the DST bill. Furthermore, the "discontent" responses were usually mixed with other reasons given for participating, a fact which points to the participants' inability to distinguish between why they were discontent and why they decided to participate. This fusing together of two analytically distinct attitudes indicates

the intensity of the participants' discontent, as well as showing that both participation and discontent arose out of the person's desire for DST. There was no need for respondents to "rationalize" in answering the question; they need merely have said that they were "in favor of DST." Instead, they went on to give "discontented" responses and to explain why they were discontent. On these grounds, the responses have been used as reflecting true discontent.

As for the generalization of distrust to political institutions, the fact that 26.4% of the respondents felt that the "people should be allowed to vote on DST" seems to express a populist desire to go to the people, over the heads of the established authorities. However, no one stated that the legislature be done away with, or even reformed. Furthermore, there were few proposals to establish a "popular referendum" on a regular basis. Nevertheless, the tone of the participants' comments is definitely in keeping with the American tradition, emphasizing what Daniel Bell has said about American political institutions:

One of the reasons why psychological politics can flare up so much more easily here than, say, in Great Britain is the essentially 'populist' character of American institutions and the volatile role of public opinion. In the ill-defined, loosely articulated structure of American life, public opinion rather than law has been the more operative sanction against non-conformists and dissenters...It has always been easier to 'mobilize' public opinion on legislation here than it is in England, and in the United States the masses of people have a more direct access to politics...³¹

Yet another measure of the participants' discontent is provided in their answer to the question of "Do you see the DST drive as part of 'politics'?" At the same time their answers give us an

insight into the participants' concept of what 'politics' is all about. A "yes" answer was given by 41.4% and "no" by 52.7% (no answer was obtained from 4.9%). TABLE 7 presents the figures on why the respondents answered as they did. Once again we see that pressure groups and unreliable politicians are the targets of the participants' discontent (TABLE 7a). On the other hand, the movement was merely a convenient vehicle for the realization of the will of the majority (TABLE 7b). The issue "was of interest to everyone" and the DST movement "gave people a chance to take part in government."

TABLE 7a

Yes, politics--"why?"

<u>Response</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Pressure groups: used money or pressure in legislature	44.4	44
Legislators sold out the people or ignored will of majority	13.1	13
People exercising their constitutional right to petition (positive remark)	11.1	11
Politician using DST for person gain	9.1	9
Rural politicians dominate legislature	6.1	6
Political parties took sides	4.0	4
Other	12.1	12
	<u>99.9</u>	<u>99</u>

(NA=13, not included)

TABLE 7b*

Not politics--"why?"

<u>Response</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Issue was of interest to all people, people became involved because of personal reasons	41.7	30
Party politics did not enter in, no party took a stand, bi-partisan	34.7	25
Democratic process--people given a chance to take an active part in their government	9.7	7
Opposition to DST was "politics", not DST movement itself	9.7	7
Other	4.2	3
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>72</u>

(NA=73, not included)

*The sequence of questions may have produced the fifty-percent non-response rate on this question, as people who said "no" to the screening question may have thought that they didn't have to answer the "why" section.

Since so many people were upset by the activity of pressure groups in the legislature, we might do well to ask how salient these supposed groups were to the participants. In fact, fully 90.1% of the respondents said that they were "aware of any organized opposition to DST," and 89.7% were able to name at least one such group. TABLE 8 lists the proportion of people, in relation to the total sample, who named each opposition group.

TABLE 8*

"What groups do you think were against DST?"

<u>Group</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Theaters and Drive Ins	74.8	204
Farmers and Farm Groups	71.1	194
Bowling Alleys	49.5	135
Bars and Taverns	26.0	71
Other groups	12.9	35

*Percents do not add to 100% because of multiple mentions.

"Theaters and farms" were most often named, and indeed 60.5% of the respondents mentioned both. Furthermore, 37.4% were able to name the first three groups on the list, and 7.7% named all four. Here we have our first bit of evidence demonstrating that DST participants were not merely a cross section of the population of Michigan, but were instead people fairly highly informed about politics. Such a high level of awareness of the

key figures in a public issue is in strong contrast to the usual lack of awareness uncovered by other studies. For example, Katz and Eldersveld found that only 18% of the people in Detroit could correctly name the Congressman from their own district.³² Aside from revealing the politicized nature of our sample, this finding also highlights the visibility of the organizations which were opposed to DST. The proponents of DST had little difficulty in recognizing and labeling the opposition forces.

One final factor which helped translate discontent into mobilization was the fact that the participants met with very little opposition to their participation. Only 6.6% reported that someone had tried to talk them out of circulating a petition. Of these 18 cases, 6 involved a friend, 3 someone at work, in 2 it was a neighbor, and the others were not classified.

We have seen that the participants were discontented, and that this discontent focussed mainly at the level of the authorities. On the other hand, almost half were not discontented and instead spoke in terms of personal benefits or benefits to their friends and relatives. Secondly, most participants were aware of opposition groups, and could name them. Finally, the participants met with little resistance among their friends and other peers to the circulating of petitions. Discontent was thus kept alive among the group by the awareness of groups working against them and by the tacit (or open) approval of their peers.

THE MIDDLE CLASS

Eighty-seven and a half percent of the participants are married, with an average of 2.2 children per family. Most of the participants are men (78.4%). The average age of the sample is 41.1 years; TABLE 9 presents the clustered age distribution of the sample.

TABLE 9

Age of Respondent

<u>Age Class</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>White Population of Michigan, 1960</u>	<u>% in Michigan Minus % in DST Sample</u>
20-29	40	14.6	24.1	- 9.5
30-39	77	28.2	22.8	+ 5.4
40-49	97	35.5	19.1	+16.4
50-59	43	15.7	16.0	- .3
60-69	11	4.0	11.0	- 7.0
NA	5	2.0		
	<u>273</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>93.0</u>	

For comparison, the fourth column of TABLE 9 gives the percentage of the white, over 20, population of Michigan in each age category (1960 census). The over 20 population was chosen as a comparison because only registered voters could circulate petitions and so minors were ineligible. As is to be expected, the 30 to 50 year old element of the population is heavily over-represented, with the 40-49 year old group the most active, in relative and absolute terms.

We have seen that the respondents reported the mass media as the most important information source about the movement. Furthermore, we know that newspaper readers come disproportionately from the higher income and educational strata. Converse and Dupeux report a very strong positive relationship between an "index of frequency of newspaper reading for political information" and an index of "amount of formal education."³³ DeGrazia, in Of Time, Work, and Leisure presents data from a survey conducted in 1957 which show that only 12% of people with less than an eight grade education reported "reading a magazine yesterday," compared with 40% of those with a college degree.³⁴ These findings alone would lead us to expect DST participants to be more educated than the general population.

There is another factor, however, which is of almost equal importance. Wolfinger puts the matter as follows:

In the charter election, as in many primaries, non-partisan elections, and referenda, the issues appeared before most voters more or less de novo. Customarily there is less interest and involvement in such elections. Exposure to campaign news persuades voters, rather than merely activating predispositions, as in presidential elections.³⁵

People who paid little attention to political news carried by the mass media would have little knowledge of the DST issue, and they surely would not hear of the DST committee. Thus the DST committee's attempt at persuading people to circulate petitions would first reach those people who customarily follow political news--the middle and upper-middle classes.³⁶

TABLE 10 bears out this assertion:

TABLE 10a*

Education of DST Respondent and Education of 1013 White Males,
Detroit Area, 1966

<u>Educational Level</u>	<u>% DST</u>	<u>% DAS</u>	<u>% Difference DST-DAS</u>
Less than a high school degree	3.7	30.6	-26.9
High school degree	28.2	27.5	+ .7
High school plus tech. training	5.5	6.5	- 1.0
High school plus some college	23.8	18.4	+ 5.4
College degree	24.2	8.6	+15.6
College degree plus grad study	2.6	7.9	+ 5.0
Post graduate degree	10.3		
Not reported	1.8	.5	
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	
N	273	1013	

TABLE 10b**

Occupation of DST and DAS Respondents

<u>Occupational Category</u>	<u>% DST</u>	<u>% DAS</u>	<u>% Difference DST-DAS</u>
Professional, tech. & kindred	37.9	19.2	+18.7
Farm and farm manager	---	.1	- .1
Managers, officials, and prop.	23.4	15.3	+ 8.1
Clerical & kindred workers	16.9	6.4	+10.5
Sales workers	4.5	6.0	- 1.5
Craftsmen, foremen & kindred	9.9	25.2	-15.3
Operatives & kindred workers	3.3	22.2	-18.9
Service workers	4.1	3.9	+ .2
Laborers, except farm & mine	---	1.7	- 1.7
	<u>100.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	
N	243	1004	

*Note: Detroit Area data courtesy of Dr. E. O. Laumann and Dr. H. Schuman, DAS directors for P938, 1966.

**DST figures exclude 24 housewives, students, and retired persons, and 5 NA; DAS figures exclude 4 students and 5 NA.

It is apparent that the DST participants, on the whole, are disproportionately in the higher educational and occupational strata. Of course, not all of this difference is due to the selective nature of the mass media audience. Instead, much of the difference can be explained by the greater degree of politicization of these middle and upper-middle class persons, as I hope to point out in the next section.

POLITICIZATION

As Milbrath has pointed out, political activity can be conceptualized along an active-inactive dimension. "Most citizens have both active and passive postures toward politics... Some persons are almost totally inactive; some are active in one type of behavior but passive in others; some active in a wide variety of behaviors."³⁷ Indeed, it is possible to think of political involvement in a population as a hierarchy from apathetic withdrawal to active participation in political affairs. Milbrath has summarized an enormous body of research with the statement: "higher socioeconomic status (SES) is positively associated with increased likelihood of participation in many different political acts; higher SES persons are more likely to vote, attend meetings, join a party, campaign, and so forth."³⁸ Therefore, since we have seen that DST participants come disproportionately from the upper socioeconomic levels, we would expect them to be highly active in politics.

TABLE 11 illustrates that this is the case--DST participants are actively involved in a wide range of political activities. For comparison, figures from the 1956 SRC survey and 1959 New Haven

survey are included, where available. DST participants may have been concerned with political outputs in the case of the DST issue, but it is obvious that they are also oriented to the input aspects of the political system.

TABLE 11*

Political involvement for DST participants, 1956 Survey Research Center respondents, and 1959 New Haven respondents

TABLE 11a

Worked as a campaign worker

DST respondents	19.4%
SRC respondents	3.0%
New Haven respondents	8.0%

TABLE 11b

Attended a political meeting or rally

DST respondents	47.6%
SRC respondents	7.0%
New Haven respondents	23.0%

TABLE 11c

Gave money to a political party

DST respondents	39.9%
SRC respondents	10.0%
New Haven respondents	26.0%

TABLE 11d

Put a political bumper sticker on car

DST respondents	48.7%
-----------------	-------

*Survey Research Center data are from The American Voter, p. 51, Campbell et al. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964). New Haven data are from Raymond Wolfinger, "The Influence of Precinct Work on Voting Behavior," POQ, 27, 3 (Fall 1963), p. 391.

Thus, far from being alienated from political life, the participants have had extensive prior experience in politics. In fact, 29% reported that they had "circulated a petition before." Personally, then, the participants are well integrated into the political system. However, in view of the significance often attributed to the role of group membership, we would expect to find evidence of group affiliation playing an important part in a person's decision to participate in the DST movement. On the contrary, only 9% of the participants reported that they were a "member of an organized group which came out in favor of DST." Of these 9%, 44% said that the group was the Chamber of Commerce, 26% mentioned a sports club, and the other responses were scattered.

In the case of DST, then, the participants are distinctive in their degree of political activity, not in the extent of their group affiliations. We have neglected one important political factor, however--party affiliation. The possibility exists that one of the political parties was co-opted by the DST organization and that one party dominated the movement. TABLE 12 gives the party identification distribution for the DST sample and for 1013 white males in the Detroit Area, 1966.

TABLE 12

Party identification, DST participants and DAS respondents (1966)

<u>Party Identification</u>	<u>DST</u>	<u>DAS</u>
Strong Republican	23.4	10.3
Weak Republican	15.4	15.5
Independent-Rep. leaning	15.8	5.6
Independent	7.0	9.1
Independent-Dem. leaning	12.8	8.8
Weak Democrat	8.4	24.9
Strong Democrat	13.6	23.7
Other and not reported	3.7	2.2
	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
	N=273	N=1013 White males

Republicans are predominant in the sample, as the right-hand column of TABLE 12 illustrates. There are 23.2% more Republican identifiers than would be expected, and 22.6% fewer Democrats than expected. We have seen that DST participants come disproportionately from the upper socioeconomic strata. As Key, Lipset, and others have pointed out, party preference is highly associated with socioeconomic status. For example, Lipset found that in 1956 68% of the "business and professional" category voted Republican, while only 50% of "manual workers" did so.³⁹ Key reports that in 1960 only 46% of the "business and professional" category voted Democratic, while 59% of the unskilled workers voted Democratic.⁴⁰

Thus the disproportionate number of Republicans in the DST sample arises from the fact that the participants are disproportionately

from the higher socioeconomic strata. What still remains to be explained is the connection between participation and socioeconomic status. The question has been reserved for this section because so many other studies have found that political activity is closely related to an individual's degree of integration into the larger social system, i.e. the sphere of economic and social activity.

No attempt will be made here to review the vast body of literature on why people become involved in political life. Lane and Milbrath, among others, have summarized some of the existing literature.⁴¹ Instead, I want to briefly discuss the relationship of politicization, discontent, and political influence, drawing on Dahl's excellent discussion of the subject.⁴²

Perhaps the most significant fact about politics in American society is that political participation is very unevenly distributed in the population. A small group are extremely active, a slightly larger group are active intermittently, and the majority of citizens participate solely by voting. As Dahl puts it, "...one of the central facts of political life is that politics... lies for most at the outer periphery of attention, interest, concern, and activity."⁴³ And, given that only a small number of people ever attempt to influence the course of political affairs, it follows that the role these few play in politics is greatly exaggerated through the non-participation of the many.

What factors, then, are important in inducing people to attempt political influence? Dahl lists four factors, of which three will be considered here: (1) a relatively large amount of

political resources; (2) a high degree of confidence in a successful outcome; and (3) a high valuation of a favorable outcome of the decision.⁴⁴

(1) Economic Resources. On all indicators of political resources, DST participants rank toward the top of the hierarchy. Sixty-one percent have had at least a year of college, 83% are in professional, business, and white-collar occupations, and the majority are middle-aged, at the height of their earning power. These are the people most likely to express an opinion, to write a letter to their Congressman, and to be active in voluntary associations. They are educated enough to have at least a minimal understanding of the political system, and their position in the stratification hierarchy accords them access to the means of influencing what is going on around them.

(2) Political Confidence. The possession of these "middle-class" resources⁴⁵ not only provides a person with opportunities of influence, but also with the political confidence to attempt influence. As we have seen in TABLE 11, almost 40% of the DST participants have given money to a political party, about 19% have been a campaign worker, and 48% have attended a political meeting or rally. What is perhaps more indicative of confidence in one's ability to influence others is the fact that almost half of the participants reported displaying a political bumper-sticker on their car. Two other findings, not reported previously, are also relevant here: 70% report voting in a party primary in the last two years; and 85% say they voted in the 1966 election (turnout in Michigan in 1964 was only 69%).

Dahl hypothesizes that the relationship between having what he calls "middle-class resources" and participation is a reciprocal, reinforcing process. People with middle-class resources are more likely to participate and thus gain confidence, and conversely people with middle-class resources are more likely to be confident and thus attempt influence.⁴⁶

(3) Personal Rewards. It is probably a truism that the larger the reward an individual attaches to the outcome of an event, the more likely he is to attempt to influence the outcome. For people who are not political professionals, this factor is undoubtedly highly issue-specific. That is, while professionals are likely to value many forms of political activity, non-professionals are more apt to be drawn into an activity only when it will clearly benefit them. "Citizens to whom a decision is salient participate briefly and then for the most part return to their previous levels of activity."⁴⁷

Both political parties waived jurisdiction over DST, in a sense; the issue was too costly for the parties in view of the rather extreme polarization of public opinion on the matter. Party leaders took the position that they stood to gain little and to possibly lose a great deal if their party became publicly identified with either side of the DST controversy. Thus DST, as it finally developed, was an issue which promised personal or group benefits, but carried no implications for the existing political institutions. With such a "non-political" issue, we would expect personal rewards to be high on the list of benefits. Secondly, we would expect expressions of political discontent to be

directed at the legislature as a body, rather than at either of the parties. TABLE 13⁰ indicates that this indeed is the case.

TABLE 13*

Reason for participating in DST movement

<u>Reason</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Personal benefits, e.g. more time for sports, travel, house work	64.4	175
Political indignation	43.2	118
Democratic process	28.2	77
Michigan in relation to nation, e.g. to bring state into line with others	26.4	72
Reference groups would benefit, e.g., benefit friends or family	23.1	63
Citizen duty to take part	11.7	32
Benefits to Michigan, e.g. would help tourist industry	11.0	30
Other	12.1	33
NA	1.5	4

*Percents are based on N of 273. Up to three responses were used per respondent, so the column of percents cannot be added to 100.0%. In other words, this table gives percents based on the total number of responses, while TABLE 5 gives only the first response for each respondent.

"Personal benefits" totaled 64% of the mentioned reasons for participating, the largest single category. Two other categories of rewards along this dimension were mentioned, reference group benefits (23%) and benefits to Michigan (11%). Of course, we may assume that all participants were for DST, but what is

interesting is the large number of "benefit" type responses intertwined with a large number of very intense "indignation" responses (as pointed out in the section on Discontent).

Two components of the reward dimension emerge from the data: the individual's image of the ways in which DST would benefit him, his family, friends, and the state, and the individual's desire for political revenge. The latter usually took the form of a wish to restore the balance of political power between the elected officials and the electorate of Michigan. The first component is a social one, the second, political. Very few people mentioned economic benefits; of those that did, 85.7% made reference to benefits for the state of Michigan (30 out of 35). The remaining 5 people said that they thought DST "would help my business." Thus less than 2% of the sample stated that they participated in order to achieve some sort of economic reward. The political component reflects benefits accruing to the participants as citizens, while the social component expresses benefits distributed over a more varied set of roles.

Returning now to the issue of politicization and discontent, we can briefly summarize the ideas of this section. Politicization and discontent are both important conditions for political mobilization, especially so in the case of middle class political movements. The process of politicization is necessary if people are to be made aware of the possibilities inherent in political action. Individuals must be oriented both to the output and the input processes of their government before the thought of constructive group political action will arise. The politicization

process has gone furthest in the middle class, and a relatively large proportion of this class are more-or-less continuously involved in political life. Also, while perhaps the bulk of the middle class remains politically inactive in normal periods, their high level of social skills and large amount of political resources make them always a source of potential activists.

Discontent is also necessary in that most people, even in the middle class, are not generally concerned about day-to-day political affairs. Thus it is only in a time of relatively high discontent that politicized citizens can be induced to move from citizen to participant status. The DST committee was able to recruit a large group of participants because there existed in the population an issue public sufficiently politicized and discontent to be receptive to attempts at mobilizing them.

CONCLUSION

The role of organizations in channeling and structuring conflicts has long been recognized; organizations transform conflicts between isolated individuals into conflicts between organized bodies. Indeed, a major contribution of Georg Simmel to the theory of conflict was his analysis of conflict between groups as another form of interaction, with distinctive properties and functions of its own. Simmel saw conflicts between groups as providing "classes and individuals with reciprocal positions which they would not find, or not find in the same way, if the causes of hostility were not accompanied by the feeling and the expression of hostility--even if the same objective causes of hostility were in operation."⁴⁸ The DST controversy was pulled from the

realm of individualized hostility into the arena of organized conflict by the DST central committee on the one side and the Michigan Farm Bureau, the Michigan Association of Theater Owners, and a group of bowling alley proprietors, on the other side. The pro-DST coalition actually represented six separate organizations, and several other organizations gave money but were not represented directly on the committee. Both sides in the conflict claimed that they represented the citizens of Michigan, even though they differed as to what they said the people want. However, as Banfield has pointed out, there are two types of "representativeness."

The 'representativeness' of a position is judged in part by the number and character of the civic associations supporting it. The political head has some notion...of the number of members claimed by each organization, of the degree of their involvement in the particular issue, and of the association's ability to get attention in the press...But there is another sense in which an association, or a coalition of them, is deemed 'representative', and representativeness in this other sense is more important. Each association has created for itself a corporate personality and aura. It has made itself both the custodian and the symbol, as well as the spokesman, of certain values which are widely held in the community and in the name of which it feels especially entitled to speak.⁴⁹

Furthermore, it is important to the association that it achieve and maintain the correct symbolic significance. The DST committee was highly successful in this respect, for it was never cited in the press as a coalition of business and commercial organizations but always as the Citizen's Committee, a highly favorable image. On the other hand, the opponents of DST did not unite behind a "front" organization, but employed attorneys and issued press releases as a coalition, and they were cited in the press as such.

The DST committee, because of its favorable image, had no difficulty in recruiting persons to work at the local level, distributing petitions. In fact, the committee's success in projecting its "Citizen" image was so successful that only 44.7% of the respondents said they even knew the name of someone on the committee. Of these 122 persons, 100 named Senator D., and only 10 people were able to name a person or organization other than Senator D. Of course, the opponents of DST were hampered in that there was very little they could do on a mass basis to oppose the DST committee. For instance, they could not circulate petitions for a referendum against DST, for it was precisely the popular referendum which they were against. Instead, they fought the issue in the courts and in the mass media.

In view of the importance of organizations in the DST controversy, we might do well to look at what interests each of them served. Gusfield's definitions of the three types of political conflict are useful here in guiding the analysis. Class politics is "political conflict over the allocation of material resources." Status politics is "political conflict over the allocation of prestige." And expressive politics is "political action for the sake of expression rather than for the sake of influencing or controlling the distribution of valued objects."⁵⁰ All three of these strains run through the DST conflict, but at different levels.

Clearly, the organizations making up the DST committee stood to gain material benefits from the adoption of DST in Michigan. Business and industry are oriented toward a regional or national

market, and a time discrepancy between Michigan and her surrounding states would only hinder economic transactions. Two of the opponents of DST also would receive material benefits if Michigan were to remain on Eastern Standard Time. Proprietors of bowling alleys and theaters complained that people would want to stay out of doors to take advantage of the extra hour of daylight in the evenings, instead of going bowling or to a movie. The extra hour of daylight in the evening posed an especially difficult problem for the proprietors of drive-in theaters, for the adoption of DST would mean that the first feature could not begin until almost nine o'clock. This would make the drive-in unattractive to parents of small children, as well as to other people who were in the habit of going to bed before midnight.

If these groups had expectations of gaining material benefits from their action, what rewards did the others expect to receive? Previous sections of this paper have discussed the benefits that participants expected to receive, classifying them as social, political, or economic. We can dismiss the category of economic benefits, as only 5 people thought that DST would somehow benefit their business. We have seen that political indignation was often given as a reason for participating; and, as Gusfield has stated:

The struggle to control the symbolic actions of government is often as bitter and as fateful as the struggle to control its tangible effects. Much of our response to political events is in terms of their dramatic, symbolic meaning.⁵¹

While Gusfield treats this as primarily status politics, it appears that expressive politics were of equal importance to the DST

participants. Most of the conflicts over the allocation of prestige centered around the relationship of the state of Michigan to the rest of the nation. Michigan was "losing face" in being one of the few states to not adopt DST; indeed, people said that they "wanted to bring Michigan into line with the rest of the states--why should we be the oddball?" Perhaps "prestige" was also at stake in political indignation to that extent that people felt their rights as citizens had been abrogated, e.g. "they ignored the wishes of the people."

However, expressions of rage and indignation can also be taken for purely what they are--political action for the sake of expression. By participating in the DST movement people were making known to the legislature their displeasure at its actions, as well as gaining something which they personally favored. We must not overdraw this picture of the DST movement as expressive politics, however; for the participants, the major benefits seem to have been social ones.

One opposition group has not yet been discussed--the Michigan Farm Bureau. A farmer (who is also a legislator) summed up his reasons for opposing DST as follows:

We're already ahead of our time zone by an hour. We're really in the Central Time Zone, but some 20 years or more ago we advanced to Eastern Standard Time. The argument was made then that Michigan had many business contacts with the east and was an industrial state, so we should move up to eastern time. If we moved again, we would be on double-fast time.

Opposition to DST in the Upper Peninsula, the most rural and economically depressed region of Michigan, was so intense that residents there refused to set their clocks ahead even when the State Board

of. Canvassers certified and put the state officially on DST. Conflict in this instance appears to be predominately one of status. Rural legislators have traditionally controlled the legislature, and the old time was "their time," or as some of them put it, "God's time." This rural-urban split is reflected in our sample of DST participants. Almost 90% of them were from Southeastern Michigan, the most heavily urbanized and industrialized portion of the state, while only 1 respondent in the sample was from the Upper Peninsula. Despite their claims to the contrary, farmers stood to gain very little in the way of material benefits from their opposition to DST. In fact, farmers in the Ann Arbor area admitted that it made little difference to them, insofar as methods of farming were concerned. There were, then, elements of status politics on both sides of the controversy, perhaps mixed with a trace of expressive politics.

As I have endeavored to point out in the body of the paper, individuals and organizations became involved in the DST controversy for a variety of reasons, and they followed divergent strategies to their goals. The pro-DST forces initially lost the struggle in the legislature, and so they next formed an organization to carry the fight "to the people." For several reasons, which I have tried to point out, this tactic was highly successful. On the other hand, the anti-DST forces were originally successful in the legislature, only to find themselves in a conflict of a much larger scope. They fell back on a legal strategy, but only succeeded in delaying the ultimate success of the DST committee by approximately a month. It is apparent that to truly

understand political movements, future research will have to focus both on the organization of the conflict and on the characteristics of the participants who give life to the conflict.

FOOTNOTES

1. Cf. the following literature for a general, theoretical discussion of social movements: Herbert Blumer, "Social Movements," in Lee (ed.) Principles of Sociology (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1955), pp. 199-220; Wm. B. Cameron, Modern Social Movements: A Sociological Outline (New York: Random House, 1966); Rudolf Herberle, Social Movements (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc., 1951); Neil Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior (New York: The Free Press, 1963); Hans Toch, The Social Psychology of Social Movements (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1965); and Mayer Zald, Roberta Ash, "Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay, and Change," Soc. Forces, 44, 3 (March 1966), 327-341.
2. This obviously is not true of the present division of public opinion as to the war in Vietnam, and many organizations have sprung up outside of the two major parties.
3. For a discussion of this perspective cf. Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategy for Qualitative Research (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967).
4. I am indebted to Mark Krain for assistance in drawing the sample, and to Robert Montgomery, Head of the State Elections Division of the State Department, for allowing us the free use of his office facilities and unlimited access to the referendum petitions.
5. David Sills, The Volunteers (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), p. 250.
6. Charles Marden, Rotary and Its Brothers (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1935), passim.
7. John Lofland and Rodney Stark, "Becoming a World-Saver: A Theory of Conversion to a Deviant Perspective," ASR, 30, 6 (Dec. 1965), 871-2.
8. Here I am following Arnold Rose in conceptualizing mass movements in terms of their structure, not goals: "We use the term 'mass society' to refer to a social situation characterized by numerous and frequent formation of people into audiences--in which communication is one-way from a leader or propagandist and there is very little interaction among members." The Power Structure (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 186, footnote 8.
9. William Kornhauser, The Politics of Mass Society (New York: The Free Press, 1959), pp. 37-38.
10. William Gamson, Power and Discontent (forthcoming), p. 39.

11. Ibid., p. 39.
12. The term "issue public" as well as its use here is derived from Philip Converse, "The Nature of Belief Systems in a Mass Public," in D. Apter (ed.) Ideology and Discontent (New York: The Free Press, 1964), pp. 206-256.
13. Robert Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), p. 305.
14. Gamson, op. cit., p. 113.
15. Daniel Katz and Samuel Eldersveld, "The Impact of Local Party Activity upon the Electorate," POQ, 25, 1(Spring 1961), 16-17.
16. S. F. Nadel, The Theory of Social Structure (New York: The Free Press, 1964), p. 91.
17. E. Jackson Baur, "Public Opinion and the Primary Group," ASR, 25, 2(April, 1960), 218-219. Cf. also Sidney Verba, Small Groups and Political Behavior (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961).
18. Robert Ross, "Primary Groups and Fraternity in Social Movements," Working Paper No. 89, Center for Social Organization Studies (Chicago: University of Chicago, Department of Sociology, July, 1967).
19. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1965), p. 14.
20. Ibid., pp. 14-15.
21. Ibid., pp. 20-21.
22. Angus Campbell, "The Passive Citizen," Acta Sociologica, 6 (1962), p. 14.
23. Arthur Kornhauser, et al., When Labor Votes (New York: University Books, 1956), p. 159.
24. Op. cit., p. 190.
25. Wm. Kornhauser, op. cit., p. 32.
26. Ibid., pp. 177-182.
27. Op. cit., p. 59.
28. Ibid.
29. For a discussion of the various meanings of alienation cf. Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," ASR, 24, 6 (Dec. 1959), 783-791; Irving Howe, "New Styles in 'Leftism',"

Dissent (Summer 1965), esp. p. 306; Kenneth Keniston, The Uncommitted, Alienated Youth in American Society (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1962), esp. pp. 204-205. For applications of the concept of alienation to various groups, cf. Gilbert Abacarian and Sherman Stange, "Alienation and the Radical Right," Journ. of Politics, 27, 4 (Nov. 1965), 776-798; Arthur Neal and Salomon Rettig, "Dimensions of Alienation Among Manual and Non-Manual Workers," ASR, 28, 4 (August 1963), 599-608. For a further discussion of the multidimensionality of alienation cf. Neal and Rettig, "On the Multidimensionality of Alienation," ASR, 32, 1 (Feb. 1967), 54-64.

30. Ibid.
31. Daniel Bell, "The Dispossessed--1962," in Bell (ed.) The Radical Right (New York: Garden City: Doubleday, 1963), pp. 32-33.
32. Katz and Eldersveld, op. cit., p. 22.
33. Philip Converse, Georges Dupeux, "Politicization of the Electorate in France and the United States," in Campbell et al., Elections and the Political Order (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966), p. 275. Moreover, it is precisely those persons who most closely follow the political news who are most informed about political affairs, as Berelson, et al., state: "...the more people read about and listen to the campaign in the mass media, the more likely they are to 'know the score'--to know about the issues of the election and to perceive correctly the candidates' stands on the issues." Voting (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 248. And, as TABLE 8 indicated, DST respondents were highly informed as to issues and persons.
34. Sebastian de Grazia, Of Time, Work, and Leisure (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1964), Table 8, p. 443.
35. Raymond Wolfinger, "The Influence of Precinct Work on Voting Behavior," POQ, 27, 3 (Fall 1963), 398.
36. Arnold Rose, in a study of 71 organizational leaders in Minnesota, found that 75% had "some college," and 52% were in the professional or managerial occupational category. Rose, op. cit., p. 168.
37. Lester Milbrath, Political Participation (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965), p. 9.
38. Ibid., p. 17.
39. Seymour Lipset, Political Man (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1960), p. 304, Table I.

40. V. O. Key, Jr., Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups (fifth ed.), (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1964), p. 216, Table 8.3.
41. Robert Lane, Political Life (New York: The Free Press, 1959); Milbrath, op. cit.
42. Dahl, op. cit., Chapters 24-26.
43. Ibid., p. 279.
44. Ibid., p. 282.
45. Ibid., p. 288.
46. Ibid., p. 292.
47. Ibid., p. 301.
48. Georg Simmel, Conflict (New York: The Free Press, 1955), trans. K. Wolff, p. 18.
49. Edward Banfield, Political Influence (New York: The Free Press, 1961), p. 273.
50. Joseph Gusfield, Symbolic Crusade (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1963), pp. 18-19.
51. Ibid., p. 167.