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CHAPTER ONE
THE ISSUE OF VOTER TURNOUT

Political historians have traditionally been more interested in leaders than followers. But with the emergence of the 'new' political history, American historians began to explore the party bases of the American political structure. Historians such as Lee Benson, Richard Jensen, Paul Kleppner, Samuel McSeveney, and Ronald Formisano have written case studies of major shifts in the political parties during the middle and late nineteenth century. According to their research, the roots of American political partisanship grew out of the diverse ethnic, cultural, and religious identities of the voting populace.

Benson's pathbreaking investigation of New York voters in the 1844 election initiated a new approach to the study of popular voting behavior. Benson's book postulates that political party membership during the second American party system was determined by religious and cultural factors. Jensen, Kleppner, and McSeveney concentrate upon the latter half of the nineteenth century, particularly the critical elections of the 1890's. All three emphasize the religious bases of partisanship and the shift in traditional party strongholds during the last decade of the century. The Democratic party of the Gilded Age, they argued, became the haven of religious pietists, groups unwilling to set the country's moral tone through governmental action. The Republican party, on the other hand, was composed primarily of evangelists, preaching for
the 'good' of society. Formisano tackled a slightly different problem by analyzing the involvement and growth of mass political parties within the development of the second party system in Michigan, but he also concentrated upon social and religious determinants of political behavior.

In spite of the many case histories exploring the growth and development of the second and third American party system, little research has focused on the composition of the potential electorate and the participation of that electorate in the voting process. All too rarely have historians examined the initial decision of each potential voter whether or not to vote. Instead, emphasis has been placed upon the secondary decision of whom to vote for and why.

The decision to vote and then for whom to vote are not necessarily independent processes. For example, an eligible elector can be induced to vote because issues, candidates, or offices are particularly important to him; thus the two decisions can go hand in hand. Yet, despite the continuous turnover of candidates, offices, and issues, some persons vote in virtually every election and others rarely vote in any.

Political scientists have argued that four attitudes affect a person's decision to vote. First, the activity and appeal of an individual campaign can cause a member of the potential electorate to go to the polls. The intensity of the interest in a particular campaign varies as the conditions pertaining to the contest change from election to election; thus, this is a short-term factor in a potential voter's attitude toward electoral participation. The other three attitudes, a potential voter's ethical perception of
voting, general political interest, and view of his political efficacy, are long-term factors, more durable in their intensity.

A voter's final decision is based upon the interaction of all four attitudes toward electoral participation. Some persons will vote on the issues, despite the lack of a sense of civic duty and no long-term interest in the political system. Another person will fail to vote because he lacks interest in the specific campaign, although he has a strong sense of civic obligation. So, in order to satisfactorily examine the electorate's secondary decision, for whom to vote, the historians' focus should shift to include the potential voter's initial decision to vote and thus to participate in the political system. The voter's first decision is the focus of this study.

Recent scholarship in a number of social science fields has shown that a wide range and complexity of forces determine the four previously mentioned prerequisites for voter participation, and thus, the act of voting. Every potential voter brings a basic set of sociological, psychological, historical, and institutional orientations to the polling place, which largely determines political involvement and party identification. According to these studies, psychological variables have the most immediate impact on a person's decision to vote. While historical, institutional, and sociological variables are more distant, there is an important bond between psychological and social determinants of popular voting behavior. Social factors in an individual's background influence psychological traits, which in turn help to shape the social action of the voter.

The process of political socialization shapes the character-
istics of popular voting behavior, but thus far there has been little systematic effort to link political socialization to the study of the historical dimensions of voting behavior. Restricted to an aggregate level of analysis and lacking the survey research techniques of twentieth century social scientists, historians have recognized the difficulty of research in this field. However, many contemporary studies of individuals and their political socialization are available to the historian. These studies have stressed a person’s family as the most important force that inculcates political values. For example, if a person’s family valued political participation, that person in later life would be more inclined to become politically involved than a person from a politically indifferent background.

Historians attempting to study psychological variables as explanations of voting have encountered even more difficulty than students of political socialization. Without survey research data, it is impossible for the historian to obtain precise measures of the attitudes, perception, and motivations of individual voters. Consequently, most historical studies of voting have placed very little emphasis upon psychological variables as explanations of voting behavior.

Many proposals and theories exist to explain the role of psychological and sociological factors in twentieth century political behavior. The political historians, although unable to test new hypotheses for individual political behavior, can apply these recent observations to earlier electorates to test their applicability across time. For example, several proposals exist for farmer involvement in the voting universe. Studies have shown
farmers in the last fifty years as less likely to become active in politics than urban residents. Other data suggest that rural voters lack a strong network of group identification, and for this reason they are extremely volatile in their partisan commitments. Yet the farmer of the last century encompassed the majority of the potential electorate and helped to produce a remarkably stable two party system of lasting political commitments. The differences between nineteenth century America, a society of farmers and today's political universe may partially invalidate contemporary research's applicability to the last century.

Often twentieth century political scientists' conclusions have divided into conflicting theories of voter behavior. As an example of psychological factors and voter participation, Gordon M. Connelly proposed that non-voters are more apathetic and dissatisfied with parties, issues, and candidates than voters. Based upon seemingly contradictory evidence, another researcher hypothesized that non-voters are less likely to be dissatisfied with political conditions than voters.

Any historian attempting to reexamine last century's voters in light of present voting theory must clearly evaluate his/her assumptions about the electorate. An important consideration is whether it is reasonable to expect that the same sort of factors which influence the modern electorate also influenced earlier voters. There have been several significant changes in the American electorate since 1860. The earlier electorate was a much more homogenous group. Generally, no women or blacks were allowed to participate as voters in the political system, and various legal and social restrictions were placed upon foreign-born voters.
Many of the changes that Walter Dean Burnham notices in the turn of the century American political universe were inconceivable to the mid-nineteenth century voter. Modern criteria of voting participation, such as voter turnout, drop-off, roll-off, ticket splitting, lose some of their relevance when applied to past generations. Voter turnout is difficult to estimate as eligibility requirements sometimes changed annually. The drop-off phenomenon implies a decline in participation in non-presidential election years. There is no definitive proof that during the early and mid-nineteenth century presidential elections attracted more voters than local and state elections. Roll-off, a measurement of the electorate's practice of voting for "prestige" offices but not for lower offices on the same ballot and at the same election, was more difficult in the last century because the voter was usually given a pre-printed party ticket with which to vote. The potential electorate was called upon to exercise their voting option numerous times per year and for many more offices than voters today. In addition, the average term of office was much shorter than at present.

Voting itself, once the decision to go to the polls had been made, was a very different experience from that which modern voters face. The form and mode of ballot distribution was not a government responsibility. Ballots or tickets were pre-printed by the political parties and only that parties' candidates were listed. Thus, a voter automatically endorsed the entire ticket unless he crossed out a candidate's name and inserted someone else's or obtained a printed split ticket.

Yet, there are many similarities between the electorate of the 1970's and that of the 1850's. The voter of the mid-nineteenth
century was not a newly enfranchised elector. Most property and/or taxpayer restriction of the electorate had been abandoned well before 1840. Widespread participation had been a fact for several decades. Also, the electorate participated within the structure of a well-defined two party system. There are differences, to be sure, but they do not seem nearly as significant as the broad similarities between the two periods.

My study will attempt to establish the existence of long-term factors in Cuyahoga County voter turnout from 1840 to 1860 and to assess the impact of specific factors on the level of electoral participation. The analysis is not designed to determine the relative impact of short-term attitudes, such as those toward a particular candidate or issue. In particular, my first inquiry is designed to test whether it is tenable to assume that the basic attitudes orienting a person to the political system influence the voting turnout of mid-nineteenth century electors. That is, does evidence exist to suggest the impact of long-term attitudes on voter turnout? Did a portion of the active electorate participate in every election, whereas another part of the active electorate only participate in an election if motivated by short-term factors, such as candidates, issues, and the level of office being contested? Were men who voted in non-presidential elections likely to continue voting? What were the apparent sizes of these two portions (voting and non-voting) of the potential electorate?

A second line of analysis is to determine the relationship, if any, between individual voter attributes and voter turnout. Data are available from the 1850 and 1860 United States censuses on occupation, real estate, personal wealth (1860 only), and
nativity of members of the potential electorate. While analysis of this type is often subject to ecological fallacy, I follow Ray Shortridge's lead and employ partial regression coefficients to avoid some of the pitfalls of simple correlation methods.

Third, I will examine if and how voter turnout is affected by political and institutional factors. In addition to examining the percentage of voter turnout across time, analysis will probe the scope of drop-off, roll-off, and ticket splitting. Did the closeness of an election encourage voter turnout and participation? What were the effects of third parties on voter participation throughout the period and especially during the critical election period of the mid-1850's? Did the nineteenth century electorate respond similarly to referenda and non-partisan elections as to partisan ones?

The data available for an analysis of nineteenth century electoral behavior shape my research strategy. The majority of my research is based upon two sources: local newspapers of the period and the manuscript returns of the sixth, seventh, and eighth United States censuses. The focus is upon the October and November election data. Thus, my research does not purport to explore turnout variations between all levels of electoral participation - nation, state, county, township, and city.

Reliance upon nineteenth century newspapers for election results poses a special set of limitations. The Democratic Plain Dealer and the various Free Soil, Republican, and Whig newspapers of the period were more attentive in reporting those elections which their political party won. After several October elections the Plain Dealer brushed off the state and county election immediately after its completion and never mentioned the Democrats' devastating
defeat. On one occasion the Plain Dealer remarked, "Since the election returns are dry and uninteresting this year, we shall leave their dull details to the Herald."20 By checking the Tribune Almanac, it was confirmed that all of the years for which the Plain Dealer did not print election results were years in which the Whigs continued their dominance of Cuyahoga County politics. In the early 1840's the press also preferred to report only the winner's majority for the county and each township. It was apparently more important to report shifts in voter loyalty than each township's total number of votes cast for each candidate. The nineteenth century press often served as spokespieces for political party policies rather than as chroniclers of political events.21

The three United States censuses of this period were utilized as the source of data as to the number of potential voters (all white males over twenty-one years old) and to obtain a demographic profile of the potential voters in each voting unit.22 Profiles and counts of potential voters could not be obtained more than once a decade because Ohio and Cuyahoga County did not undertake state or local censuses of demographic characteristics. The city of Cleveland did enumerate the city population by sex, age, and race for several years23 which were used to complement the United States census records of the period.

The number of potential voters was determined by including all white males over twenty-one years old without regard to nativity since it was not possible to insure that each potential voter was an United States citizen from the United States census. Thus, the figure that I calculated for each of the census years is the largest number of possible voters if all white men could vote.
Figures of voter turnout are, at best, rough approximations. Usually there are no lists of voters to draw on and there were no voter registration lists for Cuyahoga County from 1840 to 1860. Poll books or actual lists of voters were used in earlier elections in which the voters voiced their political choices vocally at a public meeting. Cleveland poll books exist only for isolated wards during selected elections of the 1830's.

Historians have calculated voter turnout in the nineteenth century before the implementation of voter registration laws in several ways, but the inaccuracy of the figures is always stressed. Merle Curti, author of The Making of An American Community, comments upon voter turnout by saying, "the basing of voting performance upon total male population eligible by virtue of age only invariably results in a percentage lower than actually existed." Most historians that have been concerned with voter turnout have utilized census records to count manually every potential voter when analyzing small political units. Thomas Kremm in his study of religion, ethnic background and voting in Cleveland, calculated the number of potential voters from the number of white males over twenty-one years listed in the 1860 census. When dealing with much larger political units than a single county or city, the practicality of the manual tabulation of potential voters becomes impossible.

Differences in means of calculating turnout and potential voters can yield different results for the same election. Thus, Richard McCormick sets voter turnout for the Ohio presidential election of 1828 as 76% of the potential electorate, whereas Donald Ratcliffe claims it is 89.9%. The actual number of potential voters used by Ratcliffe is based upon the state census of
qualified voters conducted every four years for legislative apportionment purposes. McCormick relied upon the federal census and interpolation for the specific years and elections between census. Other historians never mention how they determined the number of potential voters in an election.

When working with voter turnout, it is always important to know the percentage of foreign-born potential voters within each community. The aggregate census returns for the total population and nativity are always misleading. George Boeck reports that in the Iowa community of Burlington, the 1850 census found 39.8% of the adult male population foreign-born, while only 26.5% of the total population was not native-born. The figures from the 1860 census are even more striking: over half (54.5%) of the Burlington male population was foreign-born compared to 36.1% of the general population. By relying upon the total population for a demographic profile the percentage of foreign-born persons is underestimated. Thus, in the case of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County it was necessary to determine the voter profiles by analyzing census data of only adult white males.

This analysis constructs the political universe for selected townships and wards of Cuyahoga County from 1840 to 1860. Townships were selected on the bases of industry, ethnic, religious, and political variables. Only geographic units with stable boundaries during the period under study are examined to insure that the available statistics reflect the same village, industry, and population. The seven selected townships are spread across the county ranging from Mayfield in the northeast to Rockport in the northwest, and to Royalton in the southern part of the county; also, two wards
in the city of Cleveland are included.

Cuyahoga County boundaries were relatively stable, having undergone their last change in 1843. Three years before, Willoughby township became part of Lake County and in 1841 Orange township lost land to Russell township, Geauga County. Two years later this land was reannexed by Orange township and Cuyahoga County.

After 1843 all boundary changes were internal ones. Chagrin Falls township was organized in 1844 from Orange and Solon townships along the southeastern county line. East Cleveland was created in 1845 and grew in subsequent years to include part of Cleveland and Warrensville. Ohio City voted to end their rivalry with Cleveland in 1854 and joined the east side of the river by becoming Wards nine, ten, and eleven of the city of Cleveland.

Cleveland increased its number of wards several times through various redistrictings. For many years Cleveland city was made up of three wards and an unincorporated township area. In 1845 the remaining township area became the city's fourth ward and then ward boundaries were firm until the major redistricting, the year Ohio City was annexed. At that time Cleveland Township proper became city Wards one through eight.

In summary, popular voting behavior has often been studied by contemporary social scientists. Despite the limitations of aggregate level data, the time has come for historians to explore the time dimensions implicit in contemporary voting behavior hypotheses. Today's voters react to four variables which provide the basis of four attitudes toward voting behavior. These attitudes determine whether a potential elector is likely to participate regularly or
rarely. The jist of my research is to explore the political universe of Cuyahoga County from 1840 to 1860 and to determine the role of long-term factors in the potential electorate's decision to vote. Secondary analysis will study the impact of several sociological variables on long-term attitudes. Finally, analysis will include looking at political and institutional effects upon voter turnout.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER ONE

1Paul Kleppner defines the essence of "new political history" as the use of quantitative voting and demographic data and the adoption and adaptation of social science concepts to the explanation of historical phenomena. "Beyond the 'New Political History': A Review Essay", Historical Methods Newsletter, II, 2 (March, 1969), 2.


3Eras of critical elections are marked "by short, sharp reorganizations of the mass coalitional bases of the major parties which occur at periodic intervals on the national level." A longer and more complete definition can be found in Walter Dean Burnham's, Critical Elections and the Mainsprings of American Politics (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1970), p. 10.


7Ibid.


9One example is Seymour Lipset and others, "Psychology of Voting", in the Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. by Gardner Lindzey, pp. 1124-1175.
10 Campbell, p. 212.

11 J. Rogers Hollingsworth's article in *Agricultural History*, XXXIX, (1965), pp. 23-27, as mentioned in Benson and others, p. 8.


17 An ecological fallacy is committed by drawing conclusions about individual patterns from data about a geographic unit. See Appendix A.

18 Partial regression coefficients are synonymous with ecological regression coefficients. See Appendix B.

19 Although published collections of election statistics are available for this period, they report only the returns of the highest state and federal offices on a county level. See Appendix C for the list of newspapers employed in my data gathering.

20 Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 16, 1847, p. 2.

21 Newspapers present several restriction to the accuracy of the gathered data. It is impossible to correct any typographical errors in printing. Several years of election returns were not carried by the local papers or the newspapers themselves are no longer available. Despite the limitations of my data source I hope that over the twenty year period the statistical errors in reported election returns will be random and permit construction of a representative view of voting in Cuyahoga County.

22 Despite high geographic mobility in nineteenth century America, historians have found that available census data still very useful. Most frontier townships formed a social character at an early age which persisted for several decades. Formisano found upon inspection of voting profiles of townships in thirty-two Michigan counties that most townships, once population stabilized, took on a fairly predictable pattern of voter distribution.

23 Cleveland City directories were used for 1845 and 1847.


26 Ratcliffe, p. 461.


CHAPTER TWO

NINETEENTH CENTURY CUYAHOGA COUNTY

In 1795, the Connecticut State General Assembly abandoned the idea of dividing the Western Reserve into small tracts and selling them individually and adopted a new plan. The Western Reserve lands were sold in their entirety to the Connecticut Land Company, an association of forty-eight investors. General Moses Cleaveland, a lawyer from Canterbury, Connecticut and a member of the association's board of directors was selected to act as general agent of the company and to manage the land surveys east of the Cuyahoga River. Throughout the summer of 1796, Moses Cleaveland and the company's employees surveyed the eastern portion of the Western Reserve and selected the mouth of the Cuyahoga River as the site of the capital city, Cleveland. The following summer was also spent in surveying, by another exposition led by Seth Pease; this summer, the west side of the river. Population growth in Cleveland township in its first decade was slower than expected by the Connecticut Land Company. Ten years after its settlement Cleveland had no more than thirty inhabitants.

Cuyahoga County came into being by act of the Ohio legislature on February 10, 1807. At length, in May, 1810, Cuyahoga County was duly organized by the appointment of the proper officers, beginning its independent existence. By 1810 settlers lived in Cleveland, Euclid, Mayfield, Newburgh, Independence, and Brooklyn townships, and a few persons lived in Middleburg. The fifteen years following the War of 1812 were ones of rapid development in the
agricultural portion of the county's economy. In nearly every township, not previously occupied, settlements were begun within five years of the close of the war.

The location of Western Reserve towns was determined largely by their proximity to water power, the canal or natural resources. Small streams were adequate to operate flour mills. Woolen mills, tanneries, and cheese factories were not uncommon. Shipyards operated on almost every stream that entered Lake Erie. Despite the variety and volume of Western Reserve and Cuyahoga County production, wool and cheese were shipped in from the east, English blister steel and Pennsylvania iron and steel were imported, and Russian and Swedish iron satisfied a large part of industrial requirements. Industry developed slowly throughout the county because of a lack of available capital. The major source of cash for most early settlers was the production of "black salts" from ashes.

The thirties were a period of great growth and speculation for both the Western Reserve and the nation. With the economic crash in 1837, nearly every business in Cuyahoga County folded. By the spring of 1840, the communities began to recover, though only slowly, from the disastrous financial reverse of 1837. The 1840 United States Census reported a number of small industries within Cuyahoga County. Two cast iron enterprises were operating, producing 200 tons of cast iron and employing one hundred and two men. Other business ventures included: four woolen manufacturers, thirteen tanneries, two distilleries, six flour mills, fifteen grist mills, seventy sawmills, and one oil mill.

The decade of the fifties opened upon an era of great economic prosperity, fostered by the influence of the Mexican War and
territorial expansion. German and Irish immigrants continued to stream into the county, expanding their close-knit communities and preserving old-world traditions. The "Forest City" and the surrounding farming communities were rapidly losing their log cabins and frontier atmosphere.

The following townships were selected as representative of the nineteen townships in Cuyahoga County: Cleveland, Bedford, Independence, Mayfield, Middleburgh, Parma, Rockport, and Royalton. The first and second wards of Cleveland represented that urban center.1

Cleveland

Cleveland City and township both grew at phenomenal rates throughout the 1840 to 1860 period. In 1840 Cleveland City had a population slightly over six thousand persons and Cleveland township had almost a thousand inhabitants. During the ensuing decade in which the city expanded to swallow the remaining township lands, the population grew by 242% to 17,034 persons. The following decade Cleveland continued its exponential growth (254% increase) and swelled its numbers to over 43,000 inhabitants.

Agriculture, the stage coach, and the Ohio Canal had given many of the villages in Cuyahoga County a healthy start, and for several decades their future was more promising than that of Cleveland. In the race for pre-eminence, however, the city's strategic position of lake and canal had given it the lead in commerce and population growth on the Western Reserve by 1840. Under the impetus of canal commerce, Cleveland made great strides. Cleveland's wealth lay in shipping and trade. The city had grown steadily in importance and most of the 250 sailing vessels on Lake Erie in 1841 stopped at the port. Cleveland in the 1840's was the home of more
than eighty schooners and three steamboats.

By 1850 Cleveland was described as primarily a commercial city; its chief business was to receive produce from Northern Ohio and ship it east and to distribute eastern goods to the Western Reserve. The railroad building at mid-century did not change the character of these activities, but greatly widened their operations. After years of struggle by promoters and speculators, iron rails joined Columbus and Cincinnati with Cleveland. In 1851 the woodfires, brass-trimmed "Cleveland" locomotive made its initial run from the state capital to Cleveland.

During the early 1850's it was proposed that Ohio City and the City of Cleveland merge their previous rivalry and combine into one city along both sides of the Cuyahoga River. The proposition to unite was submitted to the voters of both cities in April, 1854, approved by them, and the annexation was completed by June of that year.

The Cleveland of the mid-nineteenth century is promoted as an ideal place to live and many came to settle at the mouth of the Cuyahoga River. The Cincinnati Gazette wrote:

"Cleveland is the most desirable city in the 'Great West' to live in. The town is clean, tasteful, elegant and healthful; for vegetables, fruit and flowers, it is pre-eminent-for groves, parks, and ornamental trees and shrubs, it is hardly surpassed by New Haven... Her public and private schools are excellent; her medical college superior to any in the West, and the prevailing character of her society is educational, moral, and religious. It is, therefore, 'just the spot', for the man of moderate income, to live and educate his family."²

The friendly editor of the Pittsburgh Business Directory sums up his view of Cleveland at mid-century by saying, "the city is one of the few places where we find united, great business advantages
Bedford

The population of Bedford, located in the southeastern section of the county remained relatively stable throughout the mid-nineteenth century, ranging from 2,021 in 1840 to 1,098 persons twenty years later. The township was settled in the fall of 1813 by four families from New England, though not officially organized until 1823. Throughout its first fifty years the township continued to be populated by descendants of New England families. Dairying and farming were the chief occupations of the inhabitants.

Because of the available water power provided by Tinker's Creek, various small industries sprang into operation along its banks. In the early 1820's, the Marble family, New England chair-makers, established the pioneer industry in Bedford and chair factories remained the principal industry for many years. During this period other manufacturing firms made blinds, woolens, and tanned leather.

By 1860 the township had one incorporated village (Bedford Village) with a population of approximately eight hundred and fifty persons. The village encompassed fifteen stores, one union school, and three churches. The churches in Bedford were primarily evangelical. The Disciple (Church of Christ) Church was formed in 1830 and underwent several revivals and by 1879 had a large attendance. The Baptist congregation was much smaller in size, under one hundred members, and was founded in 1834. The third established faith in Bedford was the moderately-sized Methodist-Episcopal church founded in 1833.
Independence

Independence township, while being smaller than Bedford township, had more diversity among its residents and a higher growth rate. The first settlers arrived in what was known as Township 6, Range 12 in 1812. In 1840 the township had under eight hundred residents. By 1843 the population was represented by eighty resident landowners in the township west of the Cuyahoga River and twenty-eight on the east side of the river. The population doubled by 1850 and continued to increase during that decade. By 1860 the township's reported population was 1,649 whites and fourteen blacks.

The township's only major industry besides farming was work in the stone quarries. Independence Village was the only village in the township and its approximate size can not be determined, although most likely it was smaller than Bedford Village. The township contained three churches organized before the Civil War. The Presbyterian Church, located in the village, remained small and by 1859 it had only thirty-five members. In 1850 the German families in the northeastern section of the township organized St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church. Two years later the residents of the northwestern part of the township formed St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church.

Mayfield

Mayfield in the extreme northeastern section of Cuyahoga County is smaller in population than both Independence and Bedford townships. Its population over the twenty years was very stable and the township experienced little growth. From a total of eight hundred and fifty-two persons in 1840, the population rose to only
1,079 by 1860. This is a net loss in population from the high of 1,117 residents at mid-century.

In 1804 the first settler moved to the area. In 1819 a township was formed, by the name of Mayfield, the first town meeting being held on the 14th day of June, in that year with twenty voters present. During the late 1820's there were a number of Mormon converts in the township, but the group moved away in 1831 to join a larger colony of Mormons.

This township had no village nor any industry besides farming. The only churches in Mayfield before 1860 seem to be the circuit preachers of the Methodist church, who constructed a building for worship in 1842.

Middleburgh

The Middleburgh township was organized in 1820, though settled in 1809, similarly to Bedford, by five families, most of which were emigrants from New England. The population of the township grew rapidly from 1840 to 1860 for a total increase of 700% during this period, from 400 persons to approximately 2,600. The village of Berea was incorporated in 1850.

The township grew rapidly by attracting a large number of foreigners to work in the quarries and stone mills. Berea grindstones were the most famous product of Middleburgh township and many miners were employed in the quarries. Other small industries included a school apparatus factory and two woolen manufacturers.

A Methodist society was formed in Middleburgh shortly after the War of 1812, which was supplied by circuit preachers. A number of churches sprang up in the 1850's in Middleburgh to satisfy
the desires of the diverse ethnic groups. The first resident preacher was not appointed until 1836 and the first church building was not completed until 1858. Most of the foreign born residents were of German descent and the German Methodist church was organized in 1850 for those who did not understand English well enough to wish to attend the Methodist church of Berea. The first congregational church of Berea was founded in the mid-1850's, but it grew slowly and remained small. St. Mary's Church of the Roman Catholic faith was established in 1855 and grew to include one hundred and twenty families in its membership in the next twenty years.

Parma

Benjamin Fay, of Massachusetts, and his family were the first settlers in 1816 in the area designated as Parma township in 1826. One of the youngest townships in Cuyahoga County, Parma, also, had a large German population. The population of Parma in 1840 was nine hundred and sixty-five persons which increased to almost fifteen hundred residents by 1860. Throughout the mid-nineteenth century, Parma continued a strictly agricultural community and had no village within its borders.

This township seems to have had relatively few and small churches for the size of its population. The Freewill Baptist church had a small, though volatile membership ranging from five to sixty members, though no church building was constructed. St. Paul's Church, organized in 1858 with twenty-five communicants, was a reformed protestant German congregation.
Rockport

Rockport's population is similar to that of Parma in size and composition. It was primarily an agricultural township with few manufacturing interests. Rockport was formed as a civil township in February, 1819. It grew from twelve hundred persons in 1840 to eighteen hundred by 1860, yet Rockport was the home of many church congregations of many denominations and limited life-times. The Baptist church in Rockport lasted from 1832 to 1850. The Freewill Baptist church spanned the period from 1840 to 1858 though usually had a small membership. The Swedenborgian faith had several families of adherents in Rockport, who organized the first new Jerusalem church in 1841. An unknown though large segment of the township's population attended the Methodist-Episcopal church and there were three churches of that faith in the township. St. Patrick's Church (Roman Catholic) was located in southern Rockport beginning in 1852 with a congregation of thirty families. St. Mary's church, also Roman Catholic, though supported by the German Catholics was founded in the southern part of the township in 1854 with fourteen families. The German protestants in Rockport organized the German evangelical church in 1851 with a membership of fifteen families.

Royalton

Royalton split from the township of Brecksville in 1818 to become a separate civil township. It was a prosperous farming community with a small, stable population ranging from 1,050 in 1840 to thirteen hundred persons twenty years later. Royalton was the only village in this predominantly agricultural and dairying township. Excellent building stone was to be found in two quarries, but the
lack of railway facilities and transportation limited the stone market to local consumption.

Five churches served the community, ranging from the Disciple Church to St. Mary's (Roman Catholic) Church. The Roman Catholic church, an extremely small congregation, was not organized until 1854 for the nine catholic families in Royalton. The other churches in the community were the first Baptist church, the Freewill Baptist church and the Methodist-Episcopal church.

The townships surrounding Cleveland were small agricultural communities comprised of primarily New England emigrants. By 1840 these farming communities were no longer frontier towns. Log cabins were a rare sight and the last bears had been driven out ten years before. Increasing numbers of industries and foreign immigrants settled in the towns and villages in the 1850's. Most of the developing industries were small and concentrated in skilled artisan crafts or in exploitation of local natural resources. Thus, chair manufacturing and grindstone cutting employed many of the non-farmers. Each township represented a variety of religious interests and the diversity of the townships' religious experiences grew as their populations grew in size.
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CHAPTER THREE

VOTER TURNOUT AND THE LAW

Political and social scientists of the mid-twentieth century have become quite interested in the declining rate of voter participation in all levels of elections. Substantial research has been undertaken to determine the role of structural barriers to voting in this continuing pattern of low participation. Voter registration and other forms of restrictive suffrage requirements have always had the potential for significantly altering the American party system. Legal control of suffrage regulates the composition of political parties and thus the conduct of party politics. In the United States, voter registration laws were enacted during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in order to decrease voting, especially fraudulent voting, but also voting by transients, illiterates, blacks, immigrants and poor-whites. Voter registration, printed party ballots, polling hours, and varying voter qualifications have played significant roles in selecting an American electorate and in setting the limiting levels of voter involvement and turnout.

Voter qualifications in Cuyahoga County and the state of Ohio shifted slightly during the period of my study. Ohio's first state constitution, adopted in 1802, decreed in Article four, Section one, the electorate to be "all white male inhabitants above the age of twenty-one years having resided in the state one year next preceding the election, and who have paid or are charged with a state or county
The last qualification, requiring that an elector must also be a taxpayer, was eliminated from active use before the adoption of the second state constitution in 1851. Of particular note, in this first constitution is the lack of a United States citizenship requirement.

Though several historians have commented upon the lack of a citizenship requirement in Ohio until the adoption of the second constitution, legislation was passed by the Ohio General Assembly in 1841 establishing United States citizenship as a requirement. This same piece of legislation dropped the taxpayer qualifications, although from newspaper accounts it appears to have been utilized in occasional cases to restrict the electorate. According to the Cleveland Herald (Whig) newspaper, a resident of a county township was not allowed to vote because of his poverty.

"Among the first of the electors in the township of Brecksville who came to the polls to deposit his votes, October 8th, was an old and honored soldier of the revolution. His vote was challenged by a Locofoco (Democrat). The old patriot has resided in the town several years but was not charged with a state or county tax. He is poor and therefore according to 'progressive Democracy' he should not vote." 

Despite the obviously political nature of this complaint, it appears valid. This is the only such example of a voter being challenged on tax qualifications that was mentioned in the Whig and Republican press from 1840 to 1860.

After 1840 voters were required to produce evidence of naturalization if they were not native-born citizens of the United States. If the judges of the election suspected a man to be unqualified as an elector, the potential elector had to produce for inspection a certificate of naturalization and state under
oath that he was the person named in the certificate. If the certificate of naturalization was "lost, destroyed, or beyond his power to produce" the elector must swear to the judges where and when he was naturalized. To allow a man to vote was left to the discretion of the judges of the election.

The press, prior to a number of elections, urged residents to bring their naturalization papers to the polls or commented upon the large numbers of persons being naturalized immediately before an election. In 1844 the Whig paper in Cleveland noted that a very large portion of the Democratic increase "has been obtained by means of naturalization." In Hamilton County alone some 2,000 voters were "manufactured" in the few weeks before the election. Ten years later naturalization of foreigners continued to be an issue among the political parties. Between the spring township and the fall state and county elections, eight hundred foreigners were naturalized in Cleveland; of those, the Cleveland Leader felt most would vote against the Republicans.

Other voter qualifications such as residency requirements and criminal records, remained basically the same throughout Ohio's early years. Voters were required to have lived within Ohio for the period of a year and to abide by any local residency regulations. It was not possible to determine if Cuyahoga County or any of its townships imposed their own voter qualifications before 1857. An ordinance passed in early 1857 stated that no person may vote in Cuyahoga County unless he has resided in the county for at least thirty days and in the ward or township twenty days prior to election day.

Two additional factors affected the potential voter's view
of participation in an election: the length of polling time and the number of elections each year. The length of time in which the polls were open varied from election to election. On the average they were open eight hours on the day of the election: from 10:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. In 1844 the city election polls were open only until 5:00 P.M., and near the end of the two decades the polls were open for voters to cast their ballots as early as 6:00 A.M. in the morning.11

Another difference between the political universe of nineteenth century America and ours is the plethora of elections and elective offices in the earlier period. Voters could expect to be called upon to vote at least three times per year. Few of the townships in Cuyahoga County had incorporated towns so only voters in Cleveland and Ohio City voted in March, when city elections were held. All townships, including those with incorporated areas, held township elections for township officers and trustees the first week of April. One or two miscellaneous elections usually took place in the next six months of the year. Elections were held often to fill vacancies and elect members of school districts or justices of the peace. The major election of each year was held in October—every year to fill the many state and county offices. The presidential election was always held the first Tuesday of November.

Thus, the electorate was expected to participate more actively just by voting than today's voters. To claim to have voted in every election meant much more! The Cleveland Leader in 1860 felt it a "capital thing to get in the habit of working and voting early in the season, especially in presidential years."12

Before nearly every election, the party presses warned their
readers of voter fraud perpetrated by their political opposition. Usually the warnings were meant to keep the electorate aware of the possibility of fraud rather than an exposition of actually wrong-doings. Over and over again the voters were admonished to "challenge every voter whose right to vote you at all question." The Whigs of Cuyahoga County were asked in 1844, "Are all the appropriate committees appointed for the supervision of the election for detecting illegal voting?" At the election of 1848 the same cry was repeated, "Let the polls be attended by faithful challengers." And again in 1852, "Friends, look well to the ballot: We very much fear that corruption is stalkings abroad with fearless front. Meet it, and crush it instantly. Let the legal voters protect their rights at every hazard." By 1856 the Republican press was even more outraged by the possibility of electoral fraud. "On next Tuesday, the desperate and unprincipled fraction that we fight, will attempt, in some localities, to secure their purposes by the most outrageous frauds upon the ballot box. We would counsel no hasty bloodshed, but these desperate men must be met. The purity of the ballot box must be maintained at all hazard. If force is necessary then by force, but we earnestly hope there may be no necessity in any quarter for extreme measures. Let the solid and influential citizens of every precinct throughout the day of the election stand about the polls, and their influential presence may be a sufficient protection. We would most earnestly urge upon the Republican everywhere the vital necessity of shielding the ballot box from imposition and fraud." The seeming paranoia of election fraud was not completely unfounded. Once every several years a serious case of fraud came to light in Cuyahoga County. It is difficult to determine the extent of fraudulent voting through one newspaper, since the press usually mirrored only one major political party. Few if any of the
charges were substantiated or appear to have resulted in criminal convictions.

The largest election crime during this period on the Western Reserve was not in Cuyahoga County, but did have repercussions there. Reportedly, two railroad carloads of men were transported to Perry County from Pennsylvania and adjoining counties for the 1852 election. The *Daily True Democrat* claimed that it was a "notorious fact that men were busy for weeks buying votes of persons along the lines of adjacent railroads. Voters were contracted for on the Steubenville and Indiana railroads, for one dollar a head. Offers of two dollars each for voters were made." Eventually, the election was ruled invalid and the state representative, winner of that election, lost his seat in the Ohio General Assembly.

Most of the other election frauds reported by the Western Reserve newspapers were on a smaller scale. In 1840 forged certificates of naturalization with blanks for names were reportedly prepared in New York for the western market. Two years later it was rumored that several Democratic city councilmen who were also judges of elections at ward polls would admit persons to vote who did not have a naturalization certificate. By 1854 the Whig papers were obviously on the look-out for illegal voters. In the October election of that year over three hundred potential voters were challenged and turned away from the polling places in the city of Cleveland. There were apparently no prosecutions or convictions however, as the newspaper account does not mention if any of those fraudulent voters faced criminal charges.

In another minor incident a voter complained in a letter to the editor that in the October 1856 election, the election judges
had taken the ballot boxes home when they had gone to supper. The author of this letter felt that this incident indicated a major breach in electoral ethics. "I hope that ballot boxes may be permitted to remain in the sight of the people." In 1857 the Cleveland Leader pointed out a mistake in the official election results. A candidate for city clerk received ten fewer reported votes in each of two city wards than the number in the poll books of both ward clerks.

The only violent occurrence in the elections of Cuyahoga County from 1840 to 1860 took place during a minor election in May, 1855. A mob took control of the polls of the first and second wards, promising to allow no anti-"Know-Nothings" to cast their votes. They kept all foreigners away from the polling place by beating them. The city government, made up of a majority of Know-Nothings, avoided the locations and declined to intervene in the fracas. No fewer than 100-150 persons were hurt in the two wards during the day.

The comprehensive election law of 1840 outlined specific punishments for a wide variety of voting crimes. Any person convicted of fraudulent voting was to be "imprisoned in the penitentiary and kept at hard labor, not more than three years, nor less than one year" and to lose his rights as an elector. It is difficult to determine the effectiveness of this law as a deterrent to election fraud. Only one case was convicted and reported by the Whigs or Republicans during the twenty years under study. In this case, in 1843, three persons were convicted of voting more than once each in the Cleveland township election. They were each sentenced to the penitentiary for one year. The several Democratic newspapers in central Ohio exulted that "three pipe-laying Clay Whigs" had fallen
into the hands of the law. The Cleveland Herald quickly denied such charges and identified the convicted as Democrats.28

As a remedy for much of the fraudulent voting, voter registration was from time to time proposed in Ohio and Cuyahoga County. The implementation of voter registration began in the United States around 1840.29 To prevent fraud, voters were gradually required, first locally in urban areas and then, statewide, to register well in advance of the election. Yet only near the end of the nineteenth century did voter registration, literacy tests, and poll taxes combine to substantially reduce voter participation.

While attempts at voter registration were instituted in Cuyahoga County during the 1840's, they appear to have caused no significant decline in voter turnout. Voters in 1845 and 1846 were faced with the necessity of registering. The township trustees and judges of elections in Cleveland met approximately one month before the state and county elections to revise the assessor's list of voters. The newspapers also called on the electorate to prepare for the election by confirming that their names were "duly registered."30 Registration was permitted up to one hour before the polls opened on October 14, 1845, at a voter's regular polling place.

The identical procedure seems to have been used the following year for the fall elections. Yet a newspaper article from 1845 implies that voter registration was a means of shortening the length of time it took to vote rather than a requirement to cast a ballot. "The boards of registry are required to meet on October 12th at the usual place of holding elections in each ward, to review and correct their lists of voters. This will prevent delay at the polls in making proof of a name being omitted by fraud, accident, or mistake."31
With that election the idea of voter registration died in Cleveland for another decade.

Later in the year the Ohio General Assembly voted to repeal the registry law by a vote of 19-15 in the State Senate. The Cleveland Leader was not sorry to see the idea being discarded. "The present law is operative in only a small portion of the state, and is but a slight barrier to fraudulent voting as enforced, at least in this city. We shall not regret its repeal." Even the Plain Dealer complained about the registry law and pointed out that in 1846 no assessment of the voting lists was made. The Democratic press feared being disenfranchised by a Whig law and a Whig legislature.

Ten years later the Cleveland Leader (Republican) printed a series of articles endorsing voter registration. If their proposals had been adopted, they might have significantly restricted the electorate. It was suggested that "every voter (should) register his name at the place where he intends to vote ten days before the day of election." To avoid the vague language of the earlier law, it was put forth that anyone whose name was not on the list would not be allowed to vote. Two weeks later the Leader continued its push for voter registration.

"Every good citizen who is in favor of honest voting, and is willing to make a slight sacrifice to time to secure it, will welcome such a law and will not consider it the least abridgment of his proper freedom.

"The necessity we are now under of constantly watching the polls to prevent the perpetration of frauds is a burning disgrace to the country. Let us have a good registry law, with honest inspectors at the polls, and nine-tenths of the frauds that are perpetrated at every general election will be prevented."
The next month the press suggested that a person who could not read or write should not vote. They announced themselves unwilling to leave some of the "most momentous questions ever submitted to the country" in the hands of the "benighted class of voter who cannot read or write." It appears that neither the state nor Cuyahoga County followed through on the Leader's proposals, at least before the Civil War. Thus, for most of the period from 1840 to 1860 there was no voter registration law on the books, and at no time was one enforced.

Black suffrage during this period remained for the most part a hypothetical question; few, if any, blacks were allowed to vote. The judges of the election posted at every polling place from each party were allowed to challenge any auspicious voter and in the case of blacks, if the Whigs or Republicans did not make such a challenge, the Democrats always would. (The Democrats' philosophy was "...Negroes, black as Erebus, are allowed to vote...There is fusion for you, black and white fusion. The next step will be in bed together...".) In 1856 the Ohio Supreme Court decided a suit against an election judge for refusing to receive the vote of a "colored person who is more than half white." The Cleveland Leader emphasized that if such a situation arose in Cuyahoga County there would be a court case, but one can not find any record of such a case actually being prosecuted in Cuyahoga County.

Although the electorate in Cleveland and the surrounding townships were not manipulated by law, it is difficult to determine the effect of other factors. The ballot in each election was prepared and printed by each political party and only listed the candidates on issues that a party was supporting. Voting a straight party
line was stressed over and over in the newspapers. As usual the
statements about fraudulently printed tickets range from warnings
to the readers to examples of wrong or misleading printings. "Look
out for split tickets, one of the most common devices of your oppo-
nents to deceive the unwary. The county will be flooded with them
as usual..." 40

Almost every election year brought accusations of fraudulent
tickets, especially in the 1850's. In 1840 Whigs were warned that
a ticket headed 'regular Whig ticket' actually contained a Democrat
for Sheriff and misspelled the name of the Whig candidate for
Commissioner to render that vote invalid. 41 The same tactics were
employed in 1851, substituting James D. Cleveland for clerk in place
of Robert F. Paine. 42 Four years later the problem of fraudulent
tickets was a state-wide concern. Supposedly, a defunct printing
company was used to print large quantities of tickets changing the
name of the candidate for governor. 43 1858, 1859, and 1860 all
were years in which there was at least one ticket printing fraud. 44

The printing of ballots by the respective parties had another
interesting twist. The ballots were subject to frauds by rival par-
ties, but the parties also controlled which candidates or issues the
voter would know about or vote upon. In 1857 the Republican party
decided to print ballots with only four of the six proposed amend-
ments to the state constitution attached. 45 The party clearly did
not feel that the voter should make up his own mind on these issues.

In sum, the process of voting in mid-nineteenth century Cuya-
hoga County was structurally different than today's. Frauds existed
on all levels, with and without the proposed cure-all of voter regis-
tration. It appears likely that the legal barriers and restrictions
to voter participation did not, however, produce important beha-

vioral changes in voting patterns other than the effect of setting

obstacles for split-ticket voting.

With the expansion of the electorate, specifically to the in-

clusion of blacks and women, the differences in observable voter

patterns may have been accentuated. More variables have been added
to the political participation system in the form of sex and race.
The systematic differences, however, do not seem to predetermine
the results of an inquiry into whether basic attitudes orienting
a person towards political participation in the twentieth century
also influenced the nineteenth century potential voter.
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CHAPTER FOUR

TIME FACTORS AND VOTER TURNOUT

The psychological, sociological, historical, and institutional variables that affect voter turnout in nineteenth century Cuyahoga County have both long and short-term components. Long-term factors, as mentioned in chapter one, are the voter's ethical perception of voting, general interest in politics, and view of the voter's own political efficacy. These attitudes do not fluctuate rapidly from election to election. Short-term factors, such as individual campaigns, candidates, and issues have much less durability.

Throughout this chapter I will document that long-term factors play a larger role in determining a potential elector's attitude toward political participation than short-term factors. Since the historian can not directly measure the impact of long-term factors on a long deceased potential electorate, another measure of the weight of these factors must be used. A voter's prior voter turnout is interpreted as indicative of the action of long-term factors. Analyses of voters and townships in nineteenth century Cuyahoga County examine levels of voter turnout to locate patterns of voter stability, and thus the operation of long-term factors on the potential electorate.

By comparing changes in the level of voter turnout from election to election for seven townships in Cuyahoga County, it is possible to determine the similarity of changes in voter turnout between townships. This analysis of township level changes in voter turnout employ correlation coefficients to demonstrate the similarity or
non-similarity of shifts in township levels of voter participation. If the correlations generate positive coefficients close to a value of +1.0 that would suggest that change in voter turnout is not a random process and that the short-term factors cause the townships to react in similar ways. If the uniformity of shift in voter turnout coefficients produced was close to zero, then no pattern of reaction to short-term factors would be discerned and voting on the township level would appear to be random.

TABLE IV-1. Correlation Coefficients Indicating the Relationship Between Changes in Voter Turnout and Townships in Cuyahoga County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>1842-1844</th>
<th>1844-1845</th>
<th>1845-1847</th>
<th>1847-1848</th>
<th>1848-1849</th>
<th>1850-1851</th>
<th>1851-1852</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1852-1853</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-1854</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-1855</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-1856</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1857</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-1858</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-1859</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859-1860</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this correlation show a strong positive relationship for the consistency of change in voter turnout among the townships in Cuyahoga County. For every election the townships observed shifts in voter turnout in the same direction. That is, in every election year the change in electoral participation was the same for all townships. For many elections the magnitude of change is also very similar between the townships. Values of .92 for 1848 to 1849, .91 for 1851 to 1852, and .92 for 1859 to 1860 suggest remarkably similar township responses to short-term factors. In elections, such as those in the mid-1840's, where the magnitude of the coefficients is lower, the size of the change in voter turnout is not as analogous for all townships. This data suggests that
short-term factors define changes in the level of voter turnout from one election to the next. But the average level of turnout in each community is determined by long-term factors acting independently of each election.

Stability of voter turnout, itself, would suggest that a township exhibiting a high turnout rate might do so because a larger proportion of its voting population has developed a strong sense of political involvement. Since the factors involving a sense of political interest are long-term factors, one would not expect them to shift radically between any pair of consecutive elections.

Correlation coefficients have also been commonly used to measure the degree to which township voter turnout percentages fluctuate across time. If a township's population has developed a strong political interest, then there should be stability of voter turnout across time and thus a positive correlation coefficient. Any negative correlation values produced would indicate a volatile electorate, responsive to short-term factors. Low values, either side of zero would discount stability of voter turnout and suggest that short-term factors were of slightly greater importance than long-term factors.

TABLE IV-2, Correlation Coefficients Indicating the Relationship Between the Level of Voter Turnout in Two Consecutive Elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Pair</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1842-1844</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-1845</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-1847</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-1848</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-1849</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849-1850</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1851</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1852</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-1853</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-1854</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-1855</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-1856</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1857</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-1858</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-1859</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859-1860</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the correlations presented in Table IV-2
indicate a high level of voter turnout stability throughout most of the twenty year period in Cuyahoga County. An exception to the pattern was the mid-1840's which exhibited a significant degree of voter volatility. Despite the perrenial short-term effects of candidates, issues, and campaigns, voters in each township reflect a stable disposition toward electoral participation. Thus, a township with a higher than average voter turnout in one election, usually exhibits above average electorate participation in the ensuing election. The same is true for townships of lower voter turnout; they are consistently lower than average.

Although these Cuyahoga County townships exhibited great voter turnout stability for most of the years from 1840 to 1860, it is necessary to look further for any observable secondary cyclical patterns. Historians tend to assume that the highest office on the ballot brings more voters to the polls in a given election than the other offices. A corollary assumes that the presidential and gubernatorial elections will interest more voters, hence, producing a higher turnout for those elections. If this is true, then presidential and gubernatorial elections should show a consistently higher voter turnout than the non-presidential and non-gubernatorial elections. Although discussion of actual voter turnout levels for these elections will be later in this chapter, I will test the relative stability of these cyclical trends. One aspect of this cyclical turnout pattern, if it exists, should be a higher level of stability of voter turnout within the separate cycles than over the entire twenty year period.
TABLE IV-3. Correlation Coefficients Indicating the Relationship Between the Level of Voter Turnout in Two Consecutive Gubernatorial Elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1842-1844</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-1848</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-1850</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1851</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1853</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853-1855</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-1857</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-1859</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV-4. Correlation Coefficients Indicating the Relationship Between the Level of Voter Turnout in Two Consecutive Non-Gubernatorial Elections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1845-1847</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-1849</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849-1852</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-1854</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854-1856</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-1858</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-1860</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation coefficients for gubernatorial and non-gubernatorial elections in Tables IV-3 and IV-4 show less stability than the correlations between consecutive elections. Ten of the sixteen correlations for consecutive elections produce coefficients with significant values. The independent cycles, gubernatorial and non-gubernatorial elections, do not demonstrate a similar level of stability of voter turnout. Although generating the same number of negative coefficients, the independent cyclical figures present significant positive correlations in only seven of fifteen cases. Thus, despite the general positive relationship between the stability of voter turnout and gubernatorial elections, association between them is not as strong as for consecutive elections.

Although most of the voter turnout stability correlations for Cuyahoga County suggest support for the influence of long-term factors on voter stability, the relationship is not as strong as that found by Ray Shortridge in his study of voter behavior in the American Mid-West from 1840 to 1872.\(^3\) His county level data produced no negative correlations, whereas my analysis of townships in
Cuyahoga County generated 25% of the total as negative correlations. Several explanations are possible; that Cuyahoga County is an isolated example of voter volatility or that Shortridge's aggregate level analysis obscured township level effects. His analysis of voter turnout stability may be promoted by general averaging effects which have masked the effect of short-term factors upon voter turnout. My analysis of the townships in Cuyahoga County suggests a stable level of voter participation in a small geographic unit, however, a level of voter stability which is subject to occasional extreme short-term factors.

Since the number of townships being examined is small, direct examination of the stability of voter turnout in each township is possible and useful. The stability of voter turnout and similarities of change in voter turnout are evident from study of graphs of each township's level of electoral participation. The mid-1840's exhibited a high degree of voter volatility with rapid responses to short-term factors, but the rest of the twenty year period was stable and exhibits the underlying pattern of long-term factors as the determinants of electoral participation.

Weather appears to be the short-term factor which affected the level of voter turnout severely in 1847. The Free Soil newspaper on October 13, 1847 reported that "it is a bad day for the election in this quarter. It rains, rains, rains...." This is the only election for which data is analyzed which had extremely poor weather conditions. Its elimination from the analysis provides a higher level of stability across all elections.

The following section views each township graphically and then analyzes the flow of voter turnout within each community.
Stress is placed upon the average level of voter turnout, shifts toward greater or lesser participation across time, differences between gubernatorial and off-year elections, and patterns generated by presidential elections.
FIGURE IV-1. Bedford Township Voter Turnout, 1840-1860.

- Gubernatorial Election
- Non-Gubernatorial Election
- Presidential Election
* Questionable Election Returns
  see Footnote 5.
Bedford

Bedford's eligible voters flocked to the polling place in 1842 and 1844 to deposit their tickets, with an incredible 91% and 86% of the potential electorate voting in the October elections. Immediately after the 1844 election, voter participation dropped sharply and within three years, had declined to 31%. The subsequent thirteen October elections under analysis do not exhibit such extremes of voter turnout. Participation averaged close to fifty percent for those elections with only minor fluctuations in individual elections. The short-term factors from election to election had less of an effect upon a man's likelihood to go to the polls on election day. Voter turnout across this decade also showed no long-term movements of greater or lesser voter involvement.²

Elections for governor had much the same pattern as all seven selected townships in Cuyahoga County. That is, there was a higher level of participation in the gubernatorial elections than non-gubernatorial elections for the 1840's and the reverse pattern during the next decade. An average of almost seventy percent of the potential electorate voted for the office of governor in the earlier decade compared to an average level of 60% voter participation in all October elections. The 1850's reverse this pattern with slightly fewer members of the eligible electorate voting in gubernatorial elections. Five percent more of the potential electorate participated in off-year elections.

Presidential elections, held the first Tuesday of November, always brought more voters to the polls than the state and county elections. Participation in presidential elections usually brought 14% more voters into the political process than the October elections of the same year.
FIGURE IV-2. Independence Township Voter Turnout, 1840-1860.
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   see Footnote 5.
Independence

The voters of Independence township had much the same electoral behavior as the other townships in Cuyahoga County. Voter turnout was highly volatile during the 1840's exhibiting within a three year period both the highest and lowest levels of voter participation in this twenty year period. After a high of 69% in 1844, the measure of voter involvement sank to 27% in 1847, the year of the severe rainsburr. This instability produces an average voter turnout for the 1840's lower than that of the subsequent ten year period. Independence, contrary to many of the surrounding communities, had a higher level of voter turnout during the 1850's than in the previous decade. The average voter turnout for the forties was almost fifty percent, whereas it climbed to almost 58% during the next ten years.6

Not only did the fifties have a turnout average above that of the earlier years, they have an evident increase in voter involvement throughout the decade. After a slight decline in the early fifties, voter turnout increased over twenty-five percent in the October elections over the next six years.

Gubernatorial elections, however, produced a different pattern, a return to the norm for Cuyahoga County elections. Higher levels of voter turnout and the contest for the Ohio governorship gave a positive correlation for the first decade, but during the 1850's any evidence of a positive relationship disappeared. Eight percent more men went to the polls in non-gubernatorial years than in the gubernatorial elections.

Voter response to presidential campaigns exhibits the same upward movement as the October elections throughout the 1848-1860
period. More voters consistently participated in these November elections but not by a wide margin. In 1848 only 4% more persons voted for president than for state representative. A similar pattern is replayed in both the 1852 and 1860 elections.
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see Footnote 5.
Mayfield

The average Mayfield voter went to the polls more consistently than most of the Cuyahoga County electorate. The average voter turnout approaches seventy percent of all adult males. The turnout in any election never dropped below forty percent and was below fifty percent only once. The general pattern of turnout from election to election was similar to those of the other townships; the extremely high voter participation of the early forties crashed to 58% and 42% in 1845 and 1847, respectively. In general, voter stability increased so that by 1860 the average variance between elections in voter turnout had decreased from over twenty percentage points to less than six. The average voter had developed a firm orientation to the ballot and was less influenced by short-term factors, such as the emotional appeal of each campaign. Despite the decrease in variance, voter participation generally decreased across the time period.

Increased participation in the political process for "prestige" offices is a misleading and perhaps inaccurate hypothesis in the case of Mayfield township. Although data was available for only two presidential elections, voter involvement was higher in one of the two years for the October election. In the other (1860), the presidential candidates led the state and county office seekers by eighteen percent more voters. As the federal elections generated no clear pattern, neither did the election of governor in alternate years. Because of the missing data for the 1840's the comparison might be misleading, but voter involvement was ten percent higher in campaigns including a race for the governorship for the earlier decade. The 1850's (with no missing data) discounts such a pattern by averaging six percent fewer voters in gubernatorial years.
FIGURE IV-4. Middleburgh Township Voter Turnout, 1840-1860.
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Only half of the Middleburgh voters came to the polls on most election days. This township never had a high percentage of voter turnout, varying between 68% and 37% (1842 and 1847) with an average of fifty percent turnout. The level of voter turnout did not climb or decline appreciably during either decade, averaging 48% for the following ten elections. Neither did the gubernatorial races deviate from the turnout average. Despite the stable voter turnout for the period from 1840 to 1860 as a whole, considerable shifts in the electorate's participation occurred from year to year, usually moving equal-distance from the fifty percent mark in alternate elections.

The turnout level, however, for the period's presidential elections does not repeat the shifts in the October election turnout and in fact, climbs throughout the 1850's. For the 1848 and 1852 November elections the two levels of elections, national and state, differed less than two percentage points. The average Middleburgh voter, at least at mid-century, was not more likely to vote in presidential elections than for state and county candidates. However, by 1860 the October voter turnout had remained virtually stable while the presidential voter turnout had risen to almost eighty percent.
FIGURE IV-5. Parma Township Voter Turnout, 1840-1860.
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see Footnote 5.
Parma

Voter turnout in Parma township was volatile. The average percentage of voter turnout hovered at fifty percent for both decades although the first decade had a slightly higher average (52% versus 48%). The paucity of data for the 1840's presents a problem as no accurate pattern can be drawn from the decade that had both the most volatile electorate and the highest and lowest levels of voter turnout in this period. Almost three-fourths of the eligible voters participated in the 1844 election, whereas only one-third of the electorate came to the polls three years later.

The drawing power of gubernatorial elections had opposite consequences in the two decade. In the 1840's the office of governor appears to have brought more voters than average to the polls, producing an almost ten percent jump in the decade's average. However, for the following ten years the participation in gubernatorial contests dropped significantly to below the level for non-gubernatorial elections.

The presidential election returns were also quite volatile; achieving a seventeen point spread among the three elections. Electoral participation in the national campaign was not always above the state and county level voter turnout. In 1852 the November (presidential) voter turnout was three percent lower than involvement in the October balloting. This was more than an exception to the pattern as the turnout in the previous year's October election was another three points higher than 1852. The 1848 and 1860 presidential elections caused eighteen and thirty-one percent more voters to participate than the October elections of the same years.
FIGURE IV-6. Rockport Township Voter Turnout, 1840-1860.

x Gubernatorial Election
- Non-Gubernatorial Election
* Presidential Election
Rockport

Rockport voter turnout, similar to the pattern exhibited by most townships was at an extremely high level during the early 1840's, followed by an abrupt drop in 1845 and 1847. Despite this voter volatility, the electorate's rapid response to short-term factors, the average voter turnout across both decades was 51%. The level of voter participation declined for the entire period, so that the 1840 decade reports an average of 55% voter turnout, whereas the following decade it dropped to less than fifty percent, 46%. As the years passed the stability of the electorate's response to elections grew, with the later elections exhibiting both fewer extremes of turnout and generally less voter participation.

The gubernatorial elections again present a puzzle for the 1840 to 1860 period. The first ten years the average voter was more inclined to participate in an election for the governorship than in one with another state office leading the ticket. Just the reverse situation characterized the 1850's with only 44% of the electorate voting compared to an average of 47% for all October elections from 1851-1860.

The presidential elections for 1848, 1852, and 1860 echoed the general trend for the October elections, although with a higher level of voter participation. At all times the presidential elections motivated more of the potential electorate than did the same year's October elections. The strength of this difference ranged from five to ten percentage points in each of these elections, whereas the average presidential turnout was 62% compared to an October election average turnout from 1848 to 1860 of 48%.
FIGURE IV-7. Royalton Township Voter Turnout, 1840-1860.
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The average voter turnout in October elections in Royalton did not differ significantly between the two decades, though, the 1840's were particularly unstable from election to election, exhibiting both the highest and lowest voter turnouts for this mid-nineteenth century period (72% and 34%). In surveying the twenty year period two factors come into view immediately; first, the lack of any pattern in voter turnout before 1848 and the stability of the voter turnout after that year, and secondly, the gentle upward drift in voter participation from 1848 to 1860. The Royalton electorate appears not to be affected by short-term factors, because there is a generally smooth annual pattern of voter participation from 1848 to 1860.

No clear pattern emerged from the analysis of voter turnout in gubernatorial elections. During the 1840's the average turnout for such an election was significantly above that of the non-gubernatorial years. Because of missing data, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions for this decade. In opposition to the earlier pattern, the fifties presents no positive correlation between the election of the Ohio governor and voter turnout.

For two out of the three presidential elections for which data was available, voter turnout was at least ten percentage points above the general level of voter involvement for the period and even the previous month's state and county election. However, in 1860 the pattern is broken as the level of voter turnout for the October balloting rose above that of the Lincoln-Douglass-Breckenridge presidential contest. The presidential election returns also exhibited the same pattern of stability as did the October elections. The
three elections varied by less than ten percentage points.
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Both wards of Cleveland do not have enough elections data to draw meaningful conclusions about patterns of voter involvement in the electoral process. In general, voter turnout was significantly lower in these urban areas than in the surrounding farming townships. The average voter turnout for the 1840's in ward one was 42% and just slightly higher at 43% for the second ward. Gubernatorial elections, in general, attracted more voters to the polls, but not many more than usual. Almost half of the eligible white men over twenty-one years old usually voted for governor in the first ward, with a slightly lower average for the second ward.

The one presidential election figure available conformed to the usual pattern. Turnout was just above that of the October elections for state and county offices.

The analysis to this point has dealt with patterns of voter behavior in township level data. A more precise testing of whether long term psychological and sociological factors influenced individual voters can be used to estimate proportions of active voters and non-voters in the potential electorate. Ecological regression analysis can be used to estimate these proportions of the electorate. The coefficients obtained by regressing the turnout rates for the townships in the second election upon the turnout levels found for townships in the first election provide estimates for the proportion of voters and abstainers in the earlier election who then vote or abstain in the later one. The following equation is employed:

\[ Y_j = b_0 + b_1 X_{1j} + E_j \]

\( Y_j \) is the dependent variable, in this case the level of voter turnout in the later election in \( j \)th township; \( b_0 \) is the intercept value.
of the linear regression. The independent variable, the turnout in the jth township in the earlier election is multiplied by the regression coefficient, \( b_1 \), and \( E_j \) is the residual term. In order to utilize this statistical method one assumption must be made: that the difference in the two proportions of voters and non-voters does not vary consistently with the level of voter turnout.

If the data for a complete multi-level analysis were available, then the regression equation used would appear as below:

\[
Y_{lj} = b_0 + b_1 \bar{x}_{1j} + b_2 \bar{x}_{2ij} + E_{ij}
\]

The second independent variable, \( \bar{x}_{2ij} \), would measure the aggregate effect of voter turnout. If the level of voter turnout was linked with the difference in the proportions of non-voters and voters between the first and second elections, the second regression coefficient would not be equal to zero. Since data on individual voting behavior is not available, ecological regression coefficients can be used as an estimate for individual level effects by assuming the aggregate effect to be zero.

The following analysis using ecological regression techniques estimate the individual level behavioral patterns for voter turnout. The figures in Table IV-5 represent the differences in turnout rates in the second election between those who voted and those who did not in the earlier election. If long-term factors determine a potential voters' actions, then these estimates will be positive and indicate a sizeable difference in turnout rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1842-1844</th>
<th>1844-1845</th>
<th>1845-1847</th>
<th>1847-1848</th>
<th>1848-1849</th>
<th>1852-1853</th>
<th>1853-1854</th>
<th>1854-1855</th>
<th>1855-1856</th>
<th>1856-1857</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voters</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It appears from the table that the hypothesis is consistent with estimated individual voter turnout behavior. The voters in one election were more likely than abstainers to vote in the next election. There were no years in which the non-voter in the previous election was more likely to vote than the previous voter. The average difference for the two decades between voters and non-voters in a previous election who vote in the next was 75%. Only three of the sixteen coefficients fall below a 50% difference, and of those three, two of them are during the exceptionally volatile middle 1840’s.

Ecological regression can also predict the actual proportion of voters and non-voters in one election who cast ballots in the next election. For this analysis, the intercept value, $b_0$, is the proportion of non-voters in the earlier election who vote in the second one. The sum of the intercept value and the regression coefficient, $b_0 + b_1$, is the estimated proportion of those who vote in the first election and again in the later one, in other words, members of the active electorate. This table is to read, as for the 1842 to 1844 span 99.2% of the 1842 voters turned out in 1844, while only 6% of the 1,842 non-voters in Cuyahoga County participated in the 1844 election.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voters</th>
<th>Non-Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1842-1844</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-1845</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-1847</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847-1848</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-1849</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849-1850</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1851</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These findings are consistent with the view that a voter's long-term orientation toward politics influenced his decision to vote. An average of 85% of the voters in one election decided to participate in the next election, whereas less than an estimated 25% of the non-voters in an earlier election went to the polls in the second election. These figures express a stronger split between voters and non-voters than Shortridge's data predicted for the midwest in the nineteenth century. He expected more than 80% of the voters to continue voting in the next election and less than 40% of the non-voters to enter the active electorate in the succeeding election.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR

1 See chapter one, p. 2.

2 Shortridge makes this assumption in pp. 97-98 of his dissertation.

3 Shortridge, "Psychological Level of Politics and Voter Turnout", Chap. 2.

4 Cleveland Herald, October 13, 1847, as quoted in the Annals of Cleveland, 1847.

5 Of 129 elections examined only seven had a candidate or issue garner more than twenty votes than his fellow ticket members. Since most tickets were distributed as pre-printed party ballots, it seems unusual for one candidate to have surged significantly ahead of the field. To consider the possible effects of these cases, I analyzed my data with both the highest voter turnout levels and the second highest to check for misleading trends and invalid conclusions, if, those elections were the result of fraudulent returns.

6 The 1854 and 1858 Independence elections gave questionable levels of voter turnout. After using the second highest levels of voter turnout for these two years and recalculating the decade's average, the difference between the two decades was smaller. The 1850's level of turnout remained above that of the earlier decade (56% v. 50%).

7 Shortridge, p. 104.
CHAPTER FIVE

VOTER TURNOUT AND INDIVIDUAL ATTRIBUTES

From the data analyzed in the previous chapter one can see that in the nineteenth century members of the potential electorate developed regular modes of participation or non-participation. The ecological regression coefficients predicted that there was continuity to individual behavior. Thus, a person whose long-term attitudes oriented him toward voting was more likely to vote and to continue voting than a non-voter. Voting for each individual was not a random process.

This chapter will analyze the causal significance of several measurable social factors upon voting participation. These are by no means the sum of possible psychological or sociological factors, but merely the most measurable from a distance of over one hundred years from the potential electorate of Cuyahoga County. The analysis will explore three areas of possible influence upon individual voting behavior. Each area will first be approached upon the aggregate township level and later, where possible, upon the individual voter level. Social environment, social class, and nativity are three individual characteristics that might have affected the long-term voting orientation of a member of the Cuyahoga County electorate.

Data were available to measure the effects of farm as compared to non-farm occupation, population density, social wealth and status, and foreign-born as compared to native-born upon levels of
voter turnout. Since this demographic information was available at ten year intervals and the composition of the townships changed rapidly in this period of growth for the Western Reserve, it was necessary to limit the time dimension of the voter profiles. Correlation coefficients and ecological regression coefficients are calculated for the two years on either side of the census years, thus, the conclusion drawn throughout this chapter are based upon the data for eight elections from 1840 to 1860.

Potential voter occupations are divided into farm and non-farm categories and correlations are calculated between the occupational percentages for each township and the level of voter turnout. No clear pattern of job effects develops over the eight elections. Drawing on the 1850 census material, the more rural towns tended to have greater voter participation than towns with higher percentages of non-farm job holders. Although all five correlation values from 1848 to 1852 give positive correlations for farmer voter turnout only one year produces a figure of significant magnitude. This correlation tendency reverses with use of the 1860 data. Two of the three correlation values point to more electoral participation in townships with lower percentages of farmers. The 1860 correlation value is zero, indicating that there is no relationship between a township's percentage of farmers and its level of voter turnout for that election. It seems that occupation did not significantly alter one voting behavior though these are indications that the voting turnout of non-farmers increased during the period under study.

The voting behavior of individuals can be made clearer by using ecological regression to estimate individual voter actions,
The percentage of farming occupations in each township is employed in the linear regression equation as the independent variable and turnout is the dependent variable. Table V-1 estimates the difference in the percentage of voter turnout between farmers and non-farmers.

### TABLE V-1. The Estimated Difference in the Percentage of Farmers that Vote and the Percentage of Non-Farmers that Vote in an Election.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farmers (%)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-Farmers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>-49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>-37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An average of twenty percent more farmers coming to the polls than persons with non-farm jobs is predicted from the 1850 data. With the increasing concentration of non-farm occupations, the distinctive tendency of more farmers than non-farmers to vote is not evident in the next decade's census material. Farmers in 1858 and 1859 display a severe drop in voter participation, but by 1860 both groups display an almost equal likelihood of participating or not participating in the political process.

The sum of the intercept value and the partial regression coefficient estimates the proportion of farmers who vote in a particular year's election. The intercept value alone is the estimate of the proportion of non-farmers who vote in an election.

### TABLE V-2. Estimates of Actual Percentages of Farmers and Non-Farmers who Vote in an Election.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farmers (%)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-Farmers (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td></td>
<td>1857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td></td>
<td>1858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td></td>
<td>1859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td></td>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an average election, 56% of the farmers participated by going to the polls, with the proportion of voters falling below fifty percent on two occasions. Non-farmer participation doubled between 1852 and 1858 with almost 90% of the non-farmers predicted to have voted in the latter year. This extremely high level of voter turnout fell back again so that by 1860, more farmers were voting than non-farmers. The eight election estimates point to a relatively stable farming electorate, complemented with a more volatile, but growing non-farm portion of the active electorate.

The farm and non-farm occupation percentages in this analysis are based upon seven predominantly rural townships in Cuyahoga County. Data for the city of Cleveland were unavailable in usable form, thus the analysis is limited in the scope of its conclusions. The terms farm and non-farm apply to job classification only, not the population density of a growing urban center or its surrounding farming communities.

Correlations between voter turnout and township population density were also calculated. Negative coefficients indicate a relationship between decreasing population density and the level of voter turnout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1842</th>
<th>1843</th>
<th>1844</th>
<th>1845</th>
<th>1846</th>
<th>1847</th>
<th>1848</th>
<th>1849</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1853</th>
<th>1854</th>
<th>1855</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures report a relatively strong positive relationship
between rural townships and higher voter turnout. The only exceptions to this pattern are three elections in the early 1840's.

Both the analysis of farm and non-farm occupations and township population density suggest similar conclusions. Farmers and residents of rural communities were oriented toward participation more than non-farm potential voters in more densely populated townships. Shortridge in his analysis of mid-western voting behavior did not find a relationship between rural farming communities and a higher level of voter turnout. More research will have to be done on a wider scope to deny or to confirm these hypotheses.

An analysis of the influence of wealth and social status factors on voter attitudes toward political participation is the next step in the breakdown of the influence of demographic characteristics on voter turnout. The classified occupations are divided into three groups, lower, middle, and upper status, as are the wealth figures, and these subgroups are used as the components of a $3 \times 3$ matrix. This matrix provides a workable social status variable. The scale ranges from one to five with one as the position of highest social status and five, the lowest. 4

Township correlation coefficients utilizing this scaling procedure yield mixed results. Positive coefficients indicate a relationship between the level of voter turnout and the proportion of members of that social status range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VS.</th>
<th>L.1</th>
<th>L.2</th>
<th>L.3</th>
<th>L.4</th>
<th>L.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A reversal of the township correlations occurred between the two censuses. To check the radical nature of this inversion, township correlations were calculated for the entire period using first just the 1850 data and then solely the 1860 material. Evidence of a shift in the patterns of voter turnout is reflected in both groups, suggesting that the extreme changes in the correlation coefficients are feasible.

The 1850 census suggests that townships with a large population of low occupational status and low wealth displayed the highest levels of voter participation. As a township's level of middle and upper status potential voters increased the township's level of voter turnout declined. The 1860 data on the other hand proposes an opposite pattern of voter involvement. Townships with the highest level of poor and lower class white men also had the lowest levels of voter turnout. Townships with larger proportions of middle and upper middle status voters produced the higher levels of voter turnout.

When data for the city of Cleveland's first two wards is included in the 1850 correlations a similar pattern emerges. A positive correlation resulted only for the lowest level of the status matrix and voter turnout, all other levels of social status resulted in negative relationships on the township level.

A similar set of statistical procedures can be employed in the analysis of the relationship between native and foreign-born voters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>-.32 -.64 -.45 .40 .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>-.50 -.63 -.24 .21 .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>.01 .24 .03 .52 -.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>-.23 .58 .32 .27 -.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>-.11 .51 .50 -.02 -.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the rates of voter turnout. The rural townships of Cuyahoga County were not homogenous communities. Although most had been originally settled by New England families, large portions of their potential electorates were foreign-born by 1850. In that year township proportions of foreign-born ranged from 55.8% in Parma to only 14.8% in Mayfield township. During the next decade the population continued to shift rapidly in most townships. Mayfield remained the extreme exception to this pattern of change, increasing its foreign-born voting population by only 3.1% to 17.9% of the potential electorate. Four townships changed from predominantly native-born populations to majorities of foreign-born voters within ten years.

The characteristic correlation coefficients yield a negative relationship between the percentage of foreign-born eligible voters and the township's level of voter turnout. The size of the negative correlation decreases over time but remains significant in magnitude through 1860.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of ecological regression analysis produces a similar pattern on the individual level. The independent variable is the nativity of the potential electorate, while the dependent variable remains the rate of voter turnout.
TABLE V-6. Estimated Differences in the Level of Voting Participation Between Foreign-Born and Native-Born Members of the Potential Electorate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Foreign-Born</th>
<th>Native-Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the end of the period the estimated difference in rates of participation and non-participation for foreign-born voters had decreased.

The estimated percentage of voters among the foreign-born potential electorate also remained fairly constant across the twelve year period. By 1860 less than fifty percent of the foreign-born electorate were active voters in the October elections.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Foreign-Born</th>
<th>Native-Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the foreign-born population increased its proportion of the communities, its participation level grew slowly. By 1860 less than half of the potential foreign-born voters went to the polls in a given election, whereas most native-born men were voters and continued to be voters.

In sum, by 1860 many shifts had occurred in the Cuyahoga County active electorate. An increasing percentage of non-farmers came to the polls so that by the end of the period their rate of parti-
cipation equaled that of farmers. Analysis of voting behavior based upon social status was inclusive, but indications point to a radical change in the level of voter turnout by most status groups during this decade. Finally, as stated above, the percentage of foreign-born electors continued to rise, while the level of native-born participants remained constant.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE

1. Shortridge did not limit the time applicability of his voter profiles. He used the 1850 values over a sixteen year period from 1840 to 1856. I think such use of the values would be extremely misleading in an era of such rapid foreign immigration.

2. Correlation Coefficients Indicating the Relationship Between Voter Turnout and Level of Farming Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farming Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Shortridge, p. 130.

4. See Appendix D.

5. Correlation Coefficients Indicating the Relationship Between Voter Turnout, Including the City of Cleveland, and Status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>-.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. An attempt was made to use ecological regression coefficients to predict the action of individuals within each social status category, but this method proved to be unsatisfactory. If the sample of Cuyahoga County townships had been larger in size and more diverse in the distribution of status groups, one could use ecological regression coefficients to predict the action of individuals within each status group.
CHAPTER SIX

EFFECTS OF POLITICAL PHENOMENA ON VOTER TURNOUT

Psychological and sociological variables provide an incomplete view of voting behavior. Obviously, the political system plays an important role in shaping voter behavior. Examination of a number of political phenomena and variables can reveal more about the strength and direction of voter turnout. Ticket-splitting, roll-off, drop-off, third parties, election competitiveness, and office appeal are analyzed upon the aggregate level to further define the factors acting upon the nineteenth century Cuyahoga County electorate.

Obstacles to ticket splitting caused by the nineteenth century mode of ballot distribution are examined in chapter three.\(^1\) As a result of this practice nation-wide, Burnham suggests that the 99\% levels of straight ticket voting that he found in the nineteenth century "may have been an artifact of the party ballots then in use."\(^2\) Formisano, on the other hand, reports that ticket splitting did occur in antebellum Michigan and that it was regarded by contemporary political observers as a deliberate display of independence of party.\(^3\) Ticket splitting was obviously discouraged by the convenience of the pre-printed party ballots but not prevented.

To determine successfully the prevalence of such acts of political independence is extremely difficult. Burnham proposes a crude definition of ticket splitting as "the difference between the highest and lowest percentage of the two party vote."\(^4\) This defin-
ition does not adapt to third-party activity or a party running candidates for only a portion of the offices on the election ballot. In addition, by using percentages, the definition interprets any significant voter roll-off as ticket splitting.

An analysis of five elections from 1840 to 1860 that did not have independents or third parties running ballots suggests the existence of ticket splitting in Cuyahoga County. Measurable ticket splitting was usually less than ten percent, but jumped to over 25% for several county offices. This suggests that the average voter followed his party's judgment for state and national candidates, but acted as an individual when he knew the candidates for local office personally.

Ticket splitting was probably higher in elections with third parties or parties running only partial slates. The local parties would form loose coalitions to fill in blanks on their tickets. For instance, the Free Soilers nominated only state candidates in 1850 and their membership supported Whigs for state representative, Cuyahoga County sheriff, and auditor.

Voter roll-off, another political phenomena discouraged by pre-printed ballots, also occurred frequently in nineteenth century Cuyahoga County. The percentage of the electorate who vote for some of the offices, but not all in a given election, is another measure of the strength of voter participation. Voter roll-off is defined as the difference between the percentage of voter turnout for any office and the level of turnout for the highest office on each ballot. The largest percentage of voter roll-off on each ballot became the measure of total roll-off for that election.

Voter roll-off varies significantly across this twenty year
period in Cuyahoga County. When the data are analyzed on an annual basis, a distinct pattern emerges. During the period of strong third party and independent candidates activity from 1848 to 1854, voter roll-off was very high. For three years in this period voter roll-off averaged above 40% for the seven townships. The other high levels of voter roll-off range from 16% to 27%. In other words, at least one in every four voters did not vote for a candidate for every office on the ballot.

During the early and mid-1840's and the later 1850's, voter roll-off was extremely low. Third party activity during this period was either non-existent or involved a small minority of the voting populace, such as the early Liberty party. Usually there is a less than 5% rate of voter roll-off in these years. Stated another way, only one in twenty voters failed to vote a complete ballot.

Regardless of other variables, there was little difference in the percentage of roll-off from township to township. The only variance in this pattern is Cleveland's first ward, which had an average percentage difference in voter turnout twice that of the other civil divisions. This can be explained. All of the first ward samples come from the 1840's and the majority of these from the last half of that decade, a very volatile period of voter participation. Thus the Cleveland's first ward average voter roll-off would be higher than an average calculated over the entire twenty year period.

Voters did not necessarily peel off moving down the list of offices from highest to lowest. Historians have often assumed that the "prestige" offices on the ballot elicit the greatest voter
excitement and, hence, the greatest voter turnout, and that as a consequence of this assumption voter participation drops in off-year elections. Study of nineteenth century Cuyahoga County indicates that the "prestige" of the office is no guarantee of increased voter participation.

By ranking the vote-getters in each election and each township one can determine which office and level of political office attracted the most voters to the polls. The analysis here includes only the October elections, which usually featured three levels of offices on each ballot: state, district, and county. The state level of government is usually represented by gubernatorial candidates, but often included: lieutenant governor, secretary of state, state treasurer, members of the board of public works, judges on the state supreme court, attorney general, and state auditor. The number of state-wide offices increased across the twenty year period. The district level offices include both state and federal offices filled on a district or regional level; usually this is the state senator, state representative, and member of congress. The county offices include: sheriff, county auditor, commissioner, surveyor, prosecuting attorney, coroner, county treasurer, and recorder.

The results of this ranking indicate that the highest offices are not necessarily those attracting the most voters. The decade of the 1840's had a ranking of state level first, followed by county offices with district offices last. It appears that voters expressed their interest in that order. Usually roll-off occurred first in district offices. More voters usually voted for most county offices than for their Congressional representative.

Differences existed for individual offices among all levels.
The governorship attracted the highest percentage of voters half of the time it was on the ballot during the 1840's. The highest vote-getters in the other four elections are county auditor (twice), state senator, and state treasurer. In the following decade the strength of state candidates increased and although county and district elections remained second and third, respectively, the differences between these two levels diminished. The individual offices which attracted the highest percentage of voter turnout in each election are the state-level offices.

A shift in the patterns of voter participation is visible across this twenty year period. State offices in the 1850's attracted more interest and a larger voter turnout than either of the other levels of government on the ballot. Individual county offices no longer interested as large a percentage of the potential electorate as they had in the 1840's. The electorate's behavior changes and appears to suggest that by the Civil War state level offices truly 'led' the party tickets.

Many historians find that presidential races elicit more voter participation than any other level of office. Fomisano, in his study of Michigan politics, states that an average of 17% more Michigan voters participated in presidential elections than in the ensuing gubernatorial election from 1840 to 1860.6 This pattern usually holds for the Cuyahoga County electorate, however, five of nineteen township presidential elections has lower voter participation than the October state and county elections of the same year. The average difference between presidential and non-presidential elections in Cuyahoga County was 4.3%.

One should be cautious in assuming that the higher prestige
elective offices attract greater voter participation than other
elective offices. The gubernatorial elections from 1840 to 1860
in Cuyahoga County are an interesting case study. The contest for
the Ohio governorship from 1840 to 1850 excited more attention
than the off-year elections. However, the pattern reversed itself
in the following decade. In most of the examined townships the
electoral participation average was higher in off-year elections.

Thus, for the townships in Cuyahoga County, the proposed cy-
clical pattern between gubernatorial and non-gubernatorial and
presidential and non-presidential elections can not be substantiated.
Voter turnout did not follow a smooth pathway from one presidential
election to the next and from one race for governor to another.

A decline in voter participation is often noted in non-can-
didate and non-partisan elections. Although none of the October
elections were solely either of these, two referenda were placed
on the ballot during the twenty year period. Non-partisan slates
of candidates often ran in township and city elections, but this
analysis concentrates on the fall elections.

The state and county ballot in 1848 carried a question on the
sale of county land. Voter response to the issue was mixed. Six
of the eight reporting townships marked a slight drop in voter
turnout (1-4%) for that ballot item, but the issue was no the lowest
vote-getter on the ballot. However, for the other two political
units, voter participation dropped sharply. Middleburgh township
voter turnout sank to 26% from an average of 50% for the other
offices and the drop in Cleveland's first ward was even more severe,
from 53% to 13% voter turnout.

Voters in 1856 voted on a proposed state bank charter. The
response of the townships is again mixed, but shows more of an
overall drop in voter participation. Bedford maintained its level of turnout, but Mayfield, Middleburgh, Royalton, and Rockport experienced a voter roll-off of 50% on this question.

These are the only referenda returns that I could locate, although other questions were placed on the ballot from time to time. The city of Cleveland held its own sewer bond elections attached to the October ballot and amendments to the state constitution were also attached to the ballot if they were supported by the local party. This sample suggests that greater voter interest and participation lay in partisan candidates, rather than referenda in nineteenth century Cuyahoga County.

It has been proposed that the more competitive the political parties, the greater the likelihood of high rates of participation. Suggested reasons for this phenomena are party competition usually generates interest among the electorate and gives potential voters the impression that they can affect the outcome of an election.

To test this hypothesis for the mid-nineteenth century Cuyahoga County electorate, correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the relationship, if any, between closeness of the election and rates of voter turnout. Negative coefficients in Table VI-1 indicate a relationship between these two variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The coefficients vary significantly across the seventeen elections. Half of the elections indicate some positive relationship between the two variables, but of those, only the 1851 and 1847 elections have non-trivial values. The correlation coefficients comparing the townships and all elections indicate that there is no relationship between election competitiveness and voter participation. In other words, the closeness of an election did not bring members of the potential electorate to the polls.

Election closeness and rate of voter turnout might be better measured on another level. Cuyahoga County was a Whig and later Republican stronghold throughout this period. Many of the elective offices were decided on the state level and thus, the impact of the closeness of the whole election can not be measured solely upon the county level.

Third parties were an integral part of the political process in nineteenth century Cuyahoga County. The Liberty party, the Free Soilers, the Republicans, and various independents all were significant elements of the electorate. Twentieth century political scientists argue that third parties expand the base of electoral politics by appealing to constituencies uninvolved in politics and largely ignored by the major political parties. Although third parties may activate some voters historically, the overall level of voter participation across the nation usually declined when third parties appeared.

The pattern of voter turnout in Cuyahoga County supports this proposal. The correlation coefficients demonstrating the relationship, or lack of one, between the level of voter turnout and the significant third party vote are presented in Table VI-2.
TABLE VI-2. Correlation Coefficients Indicating the Relationship Between Third Party Activity and the Level of Voter Turnout for Elections with Third Parties on the Ballot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows a small negative relationship between the two variables. Voter turnout appears to be slightly depressed as the third party grew in strength.

Decline in turnout in third party elections has been ascribed to cross-pressures. When an individual with equal leanings toward two or more of the contestants, the dissonance is resolved by voter withdrawal and non-participation. Another possible reason for decline in voter turnout is that supporters of the major political parties see little chance of a third party victory and thus have little incentive to vote.
NOTES FOR CHAPTER SIX

1 see pp. 36-37.
4 Burnham, p. 9.
5 Shortridge is an example of this assumption, p. 130.
6 Formisano, p. 273.
7 see. p. 37.
8 Hollingsworth, in Benson, American Political Behavior, pp. 10-11.
11 Mazmarian, p. 78.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

Every student of politics assumes that the nature of political participation affects the performance of a political system. But for several reasons the relationship between the performance of political systems and the support which sustains them and the demands that shape their outputs remains unclear. Social scientists have explored some of the bases of political participation in this century through survey research techniques. Research remains to be done to illuminate the historical aspects of political participation, particularly voting behavior.

Historians are turning to probe these important questions of political participation and its relationship to the political structure. Walter Dean Burnham and Richard McCormick, among others, have challenged students and historians, alike, to weigh their political assumptions in an historical perspective. The process has only just begun. Ronald Formisano has explored the relationship between party development and the political process in frontier Michigan. Ray Shortridge has studied the factors affecting voter turnout and party identification upon the mid-nineteenth century electorate. Many questions remain to be answered about these studies and the enumerable areas that have not yet been closely examined by historians.

My study is a first step in analyzing voter behavior on the local level. The Cuyahoga County electorate in the mid-nineteenth
century was found to be responsive to both short and long-term voting factors. As seen in chapter four short-term factors in Cuyahoga County affect the voting populace similarly, but it is the long-term factors that determine townships and individuals' levels of participation.

Chapter five examined several measurable long-term variables and their effects on the level of voter turnout. Men with farming occupations appear to have come to the polls more often and more consistently than non-farmers. Rural townships tended to have a higher level of participation. Social status and wealth variables produced no clear pattern of voter involvement, although there appear to be changes under way during the 1850's. Native-born members of the potential electorate voted more often than foreign-born men. This could have been caused by a combination of factors. As chapter three points out the foreign-born voter was at the mercy of the election judges. Throughout this period he had to produce a certificate of naturalization in order to vote. This would probably lower the percentage of the foreign population entitled to vote. But in keeping with the proposed long-term factors, a foreign-born potential voter might have had a lower level of political interest or different perspective upon this 'civic duty' voting.

Chapter six looks at the effect that the election processes have had upon voter participation. Pre-printed party ballots discouraged ticket splitting. Various offices led the party tickets and shifts in the offices which incited the most voter interest occurred over the twenty year period. Third parties, independent and referenda all served to depress the level of voter turnout in the nineteenth century Cuyahoga County.
But asking the proper questions is not the only requirement for future explorations in political history. Methodology has become of ever increasing importance. Its meaning has changed radically for recent historians. Twenty-six years ago an historian wrote that historical methods consisted of two questions:

"Having found the documents, he will have to establish two things about them: first, are they authentic, or what part of them are, if only some of them are or sections of some are authentic? Second, how much of the authentic are credible, and to what extent?"

The importance of methodological problems in electoral research, as in many other historical fields, has reached revolutionary proportions. Unfamiliarity with methods can easily lead to misleading conclusions.

In sum, methods as well as conclusions are an area for close scrutiny by historians. In the final analysis knowledge of history is only as good as the methods on which it is based.
NOTE FOR CHAPTER SEVEN

APPENDIX A

THE PROBLEM OF THE ECOLOGICAL FALLACY

Since historical voting analysis is limited to aggregate data, one applicable general approach is the testing of proposed hypotheses based upon twentieth century individual survey research. The indirect mode of analysis is designed to test whether specific patterns of voting behavior and basic attitudes influences the electorate. If no evidence can be found then the hypothesis can be rejected for nineteenth century Cuyahoga County.

By using township and ward level data for determining the statistical relationship for the individual within those political units, the problem of the ecological fallacy enters the picture. A plethora of warnings exist in the technical literature about the ecological fallacy - the assumption that the correlation calculated for a distribution of townships along two variables accurately measures the association between the variables among the individuals within those townships. An example of such a wrong assumption within the context of my analysis would be, that in a study of the voting habits of foreign-born voters in Bedford and Independence, to assume that Bedford with the higher percentage of native-born persons and higher percentage of voter participation and turnout would enable one to conclude that the foreign-born population in Independence was directly responsible for the lower voter involvement in that township.

Clearly, the above example could possibly be correct, but in
most cases one would be drawing conclusions based on no direct
evidence. The researcher has not directly linked the low voter
turnout in Independence with the assumption that foreign-born
individuals vote less often than native-born persons. Numerous
other possible explanations must be explored and another statisti-
cal method employed before such a conclusion for these particular
townships is established.

A number of procedures for circumventing this problem have
been presented by historians and social scientists.¹ This project
employs one which uses the coefficients produced by ecological re-
gression. For a detailed explanation see appendix B.

Regression analysis allows one to study the linear relationship
between an independent variable and a dependent variable, in this
case, voter turnout, while taking into consideration the effect
of an independent variable, such as previous voter turnout, nativity,
or occupation.

The use of regression involves the acceptance of several assump-
tions and limitations to analysis. The major assumption is that the
regression values do not vary as a function of the magnitude of the
township level percentages. This is to say that the size and strength
of a particular characteristic does not affect the individual voter's
decision to turn out on election day.

¹Charles Dollar and Richard Jensen, see Historians Guide
ECOLOGICAL REGRESSION

Ecological regression estimates for individuals can be made using only aggregate level data. This appendix outlines the underlying justifications for this cross-level inference procedure.

If individual level data were available, then the following table could be readily compiled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voted in time 2</th>
<th>Abstained in time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted in time 1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstained in</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
Y_1 & = x_1 \\
Y_2 & = x_2
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
X_1 & = \text{proportion of the electorate that voted in time 1.} \\
X_2 & = \text{proportion of electorate that did not vote in time 1.} \\
Y_1 & = \text{proportion of electorate that voted in time 2.} \\
Y_2 & = \text{proportion of the electorate that did not vote in time 2.}
\end{align*}
\]

cell a = voters in both elections, 
cell b = persons that voted in time 1, but not in time 2, 
cell c = persons that voted in time 2, but not in time 1, 
cell d = non-voters in both time 1 and time 2.

These equations follow from the above equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) \quad a+b &= X_1 \\
(2) \quad c+d &= X_2
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
X_1 + X_2 &= 1.0 \\
Y_1 + Y_2 &= 1.0
\end{align*}
\]
To provide predictions upon whether voters are more likely than non-voters to turn out in the next election, one calculates the row percentages. Figure 2 presents the table with row percentages.

**Figure 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voted in time 2</th>
<th>Abstained in time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted in time 1</td>
<td>$P_{11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstained in time 1</td>
<td>$P_{21}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$Y_1$, $Y_2$, $X_1$, $X_2$ are as defined above.

And it follows that:

1. $P_{11} = a/X_1$
2. $P_{12} = b/X_1$
3. $P_{21} = c/X_2$
4. $P_{22} = d/X_2$

Thus, $P_{11}$ equals the proportion of the proportion of time 1 voters who vote in time 2; $P_{12}$ equals the proportion of the proportion of time 1 voters who abstain in time 2; $P_{21}$ equals the proportion of proportion of time 1 abstainers who vote in time 2; and $P_{22}$ equals the proportion of the proportion of time 1 abstainers who abstain in time 2.

In this example, the goal is to compare $P_{11}$ and $P_{21}$ to see whether time 1 voters were more likely than time 1 abstainers to vote in the time 2 elections. Since $a$, $b$, $c$, and $d$ are not available to the historian, and $X_1$, township level turnout in time 1,
and \( X_1 \), township level turnout in time 2, are, the problem is to use the values for \( X_1 \) and \( Y_1 \) to obtain estimates for \( P_{11} \) and \( P_{21} \) in order to infer the cell entries from the marginals.

(3) can also be stated as:

(5) \( a = P_{11} X_1 \)
(6) \( c = P_{21} X_2 \)

Hence, because \( Y_1 = a + c \)

(7) \( Y_1 = P_{11} X_1 + P_{21} X_2 \)

substituting the value of \( X_2 \) from (2); \( X_2 = 1.0 - X_1 \) into (7)

(8) \( Y_1 = P_{11} X_1 + P_{21} (1 - X_1) \)
(9) \( Y_1 = P_{11} X_1 + P_{21} (1 - P_{21} X_1) \)
(10) \( Y_1 = P_{21} X_1 (P_{11} - P_{21}) \)

Equation (11) corresponds to a least squares regression statement for a collection of cases.

(11) \( Y_1 = b_0 + b_1 X_1 \)

The elements in the regression equation (12), correspond to the elements in (11):

(12) \( b_0 = P_{21} \) the constant term.

\( b_1 = P_{11} - P_{21} \)

\( P_{11} \) is the estimate for the other proportion of interest which is being estimated is obtained by:

(13) \( b_1 = P_{11} - P_{21} \)

\( P_{11} = b_1 + b_2 \)

\( P_{11} = b_1 + b_0 \)

Hence, the regression statistics obtained by regressing \( Y_1 \) on \( X_1 \) can be used to estimate \( P_{11} \) and \( P_{21} \).

Using the estimates assumes that the population was closed—that the same individuals were observed in both elections. Clearly
this assumption is not met in this analysis.

Also, the procedure assumes no aggregate level effect, i.e., that \((P_{11} - P_{21})\) does not change as a function of \(X_1\).

\footnote{This appendix is an adaptation of one used by Shortridge in his unpublished dissertation, Voting Patterns in the American Mid-West, 1840-1872.}
APPENDIX C

SOURCES OF ELECTION DATA

My best sources of nineteenth century newspapers and election returns were the Western Reserve Historical Society and the Cleveland Public Library, both of Cleveland, Ohio.

1840 missing data
1840P missing data
1841 missing data
1842 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, November 2, 1842, p. 3.
1843 missing data
1844 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 23, 1844, p. 3.
1844P missing data
1845 *Cleveland Herald*, October 20, 1845, p. 3.
1846 missing data
1847 *Daily True Democrat*, October 19, 1847, p. 3.
1848 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 14, 1848, p. 2.
1848P *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, November 10, 1848, p. 2.
1849 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 12, 1849, p. 2.
1850 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 10, 1850, p. 2.
1851 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 15, 1851, p. 3.
1852 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 18, 1852, p. 2.
1853 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 14, 1853, p. 3.
1854 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 14, 1854, p. 3.
1855 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 15, 1855, p. 2.
1856 *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 17, 1856, p. 3.
1856P missing data
1857 Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 23, 1857, p. 3.
1858 Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 16, 1858, p. 3.
1859 Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 12, 1859, pp. 2 and 3, and the Cleveland Leader, October 12, 1859, p. 2.
1860 Cleveland Morning Leader, October 14, 1860, p. 3.
1860P Cleveland Plain Dealer, November 7, 1860, p. 2.
APPENDIX D

ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL VOTER ATTRIBUTES

My data for the individual voter characteristics was randomly selected from the manuscript censuses of 1850 and 1860. I chose the first three potential voters from each page of the census and recorded the man's occupation, wealth, and nativity. The potential voters were selected by this means because of the random nature of the censustaker's job. Pages were filled in order with no attempt to avoid selecting more than two of the three voters per page from one household to insure that each page was not subject to the familial persistence of a single occupation.

NUMBER OF POTENTIAL VOTERS IN EACH TOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bed.</th>
<th>Ind.</th>
<th>May.</th>
<th>Mid.</th>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Roc.</th>
<th>Roy.</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>1253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NUMBER OF ENTRIES MADE FROM EACH TOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bed.</th>
<th>Ind.</th>
<th>May.</th>
<th>Mid.</th>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Roc.</th>
<th>Roy.</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I utilized the scaling and classification procedure that Ronald Formisano employed in his book, The Birth of Mass Political Parties. His book is drawn from an analysis of a similar electorate; the state of Michigan from 1827 to 1861.
Occupations were divided into two basic divisions, farm and non-farm, and then subdivided within these two major categories following Formisano's approach.

**Farm**

1. laborers
2. tenants, renters
3. farmers with land $500 or less
4. " " " $501 - 1000
5. " " " $1001 - 3000
6. " " " $3001 - 5000
7. " " " $5001 - 9999
8. " " " $10,000 and up

**Non-Farm**

1. unskilled
2. semi-skilled
3. skilled
4. service
5. sales
6. clerical
7. managers, officials
8. professionals
9. proprietors

The terms farm and non-farm were used to avoid overuse of urban terminology in application to a county of predominantly farming townships. One short-coming of this division is one's inability to differentiate an actual urban occupation (in the modern sense) from a skilled artisan also listed as non-farm. This difference is not crucial for my analysis.

Over two hundred occupational listings were found in my sample from the potential electorate.

**Farmer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farmer</th>
<th>Farmer &amp; Butcher</th>
<th>Farmer &amp; Blacksmith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Farmer &amp; Carpenter</td>
<td>Farmer &amp; Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer &amp; Butcher</td>
<td>Farmer &amp; Clergyman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer &amp; Carpenter</td>
<td>Farmer &amp; Cooper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer &amp; Clergyman</td>
<td>Farmer &amp; Grocer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer &amp; Cooper</td>
<td>Farmer &amp; Horticulturist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer &amp; Grocer</td>
<td>Farmer &amp; Mason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer &amp; Horticulturist</td>
<td>Farmer &amp; Mechanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Farm Laborer
Farm Laborer

Urban Unskilled
Ash Peddlar
Domestic Drayman
Gardener
Janitor of State House
Laborer
Peddlar
Servant
Collier

Urban Semi-Skilled
Bell Hanger
Boatman
Cab Driver
Coffee & Spice Grinder
Cook
Cutler
Dairyman
Driver
Lime Burner
Lumberman
Milkman
Rope Maker
Sailor
Seaman
Soap Boiler
Stage Driver
Stone Turner
Stonecutter
Teamster
Well Digger
White Washer
Currier
Waggoner
Furnace Man

Urban Skilled
Artist
Baker
Basket Maker
Beef Packer
Blacksmith
Blind Manufacturer
Block and Pump Manufacturer
Boat Engineer
Boiler Maker
Boot Maker
Brass Founder
Brewer
Brick Maker
Broom Maker
Builder
Butcher
Cabinet Maker
Carpenter
Carpenter & Joiner
Carriage Maker
Carriage Trimmer
Chair Manufacturer
Chandler
Cigar Manufacturer
City Watchman
Clock Maker
Coach Trimmer
Confectioner
Cooking Glass Manufacturer
Cooper
Dancing Master
Distiller
Draper
Engine Builder
Engineer
Engraver
Forgeman
Glass Manufacturer
Globe Manufacturer
Glue Manufacturer
Gold Pen Manufacturer
Grindstone Manufacturer
Grindstone Maker
Gunsmith
Hatter
Hardware Manufacturer
Harness Maker
Hat and Cap Manufacturer
Iron Manufacturer
Jeweller
Joiner
Lard Oil Manufacturer
Linen Weaver
Livery Maker
Livery Manufacturer
Locksmith
Machinist
Marble Engineer
Mason
Mattress Maker
Mechanic
Miller
Millwright
Miner
Morocco Dresses
Moulder
Painter
Paper Maker
Plasterer
Printer & Glazier
Pump Maker
Pump Manufacturer
Saddler
Saleratus Manufacturer
Sash Manufacturer
Shingle Maker
Ship Carpenter
Shoe Maker
Stone Mason
Tailor
Tanner
Tanner & Carrier
Thatcher
Thresher
Tin & Cooper Smith
Tin & Sheet Iron Manufacturer
Tinsmith
Turner
Umbrella Man
Upholsterer
Wagon Maker
Wheelwright
Woolen Manufacturer
Carpet Weaver
Sailmaker
Carriage Maker & Joiner
Carriage Painter
Printer
Bookbinder
Millstone Manufacturer
Tallow Chandler
Manufacturer
Rake Factory

Urban Sales
Agent
Boat Agent
Bookseller
Contractor
Express Agent
Market man
Railroad Contractor
Shoe Dealer
Speculator
Tobaccionist
Wood Buyer
Land Agent
Railroad Agent

Urban Service
Barber
Boarding House
Hotel Keeper
Inn Keeper
Livery Keeper
Ostler
Oversees Public Works
Saloon Keeper
Tavern Keeper

**Urban Official**
Canal Collector
City Inspector
Constable
County Auditor
County Treasurer
Judge Court of C.P.
Judge of Supreme Court
Postmaster
President of Board of Health

**Urban Clerical**
Bank Teller
Book Keeper
Clerk
Law Student
Student

**Urban Professional**
Architect
Attorney
Clergyman
Dentist
Doctor
Druggist
E. Clergyman
Editor
Jewish Priest
Lawyer
M.E. Preacher
Magistrate
NLP Clergyman
Physician
Pres. Clergyman
Professor
Professor French
Professor Music
R.C. Bishop
Teacher
Teacher & Book Keeper
Veteranarian Surgeon
Surveyor
Banker

**Urban Proprieter**
Beef and R>rk Packer
Butcher & Provision Dealer
Flour Dealer
Grocer
Grocer & Hotel Keeper
Landlord
Liquor Dealer
Lumber Dealer
Merchant
Produce Dealer
Seed Merchant
Stove Dealer
Wool Merchant
Leather Dealer

These are the social status matrices employed for each census year.

1850 Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Job</th>
<th>Middle Job</th>
<th>Low Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Job</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Job</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Job</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Est. High</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>&gt;$1000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Est. Middle</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>&gt;$300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Est. Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1860 Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Job</th>
<th>Middle Job</th>
<th>Low Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Job</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Job</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Job</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Est. High</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>&gt;$700</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Est. Middle</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>&gt;$300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Est. Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are the aggregate voter profiles of each township:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year: 1850</th>
<th>Bed.</th>
<th>Ind.</th>
<th>May.</th>
<th>Mid.</th>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Roc.</th>
<th>Roy.</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Rural</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Urban</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>05.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Level 1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Rural</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Urban</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Level 1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Level 2</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Level 3</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Level 4</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Level 5</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Foreign</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Native</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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