

Spring 4-12-2019

Are they Young, or are they Different? A Comparative Study of Voting Millennials and Baby Boomers

Benjamin Jones
jones_b@lynchburg.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalshowcase.lynchburg.edu/utcp>

Recommended Citation

Jones, Benjamin, "Are they Young, or are they Different? A Comparative Study of Voting Millennials and Baby Boomers" (2019).
Undergraduate Theses and Capstone Projects. 120.
<https://digitalshowcase.lynchburg.edu/utcp/120>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Showcase @ University of Lynchburg. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Theses and Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Showcase @ University of Lynchburg. For more information, please contact digitalshowcase@lynchburg.edu.

Are they Young, or are they Different? A Comparative Study of Voting Millennials and Baby
Boomers

Benjamin Parker Jones

Senior Honors Project

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the graduation requirements
of the Westover Honors College

Westover Honors College

April, 2019

Dr. Timothy Meinke

Dr. Daniel Lang

Dr. Beth Savage

Abstract

Millennials are about to surpass the Baby Boomers as the largest generation in the United States. In a republican system where citizens are showing up to the polls in record lows, there is an emphatic effort to bring people to the polls. A lot of research has accumulated over the years showing that young people do not vote; however, why is it that specifically the Millennial generation is showing up in astronomically low numbers in comparison with young people in the past?

The purpose of this research is to find information that identifies the values of both Millennials and Baby Boomers. The values I investigated are individual-minded and community-minded traits. For Millennials, the first presidential election where the entirety of the generation could vote was 2016, and for Baby Boomers, the first presidential election where the entirety of the generation could vote was in 1984. I analyzed data from these two elections to compare and contrast the voting behavior and values of each respective generation. In doing so, this research either proves that Millennials are indeed different than Baby Boomers. It also sheds light as to how the United States government, activists, and campaigners can make it easier for or incentivize Millennials to vote in regards to their individual values.

Introduction

Recently, the Millennial generation has fallen victim to the young voter disease. As the youngest generation that is capable of voting, they are showing up in abysmal numbers compared to their Baby Boomer counterparts. In the 2016 Presidential election, 46.1% of all registered Millennials voted, while 70.9% of registered Baby Boomers voted (File 2017). The Millennial generation, like those before, has characteristics that holistically define them. These characteristics affect everything Millennials do, including how they interact in the workplace, how they treat others, and even how they vote. The purpose of this research is to discover Millennial generational values and the values of Baby Boomers, analyze how those values contribute to voting behavior, and offer solutions that are specifically designed to encourage Millennials to vote. When examining voting behavior, it is crucial to look at values in determining what motivates Millennials as a political body. Many determinants can then be used to factor how, when, or why a Millennial might vote. Why do Millennials vote in the first place? To what extent is Millennial voting behavior rooted in their values? What are their values and are their values different from the Baby Boomers' values? Discovering this information will be useful to democratic, political leaders who will be fighting for Millennial votes for decades to come. In looking strictly at the behavior of voting itself, campaigns must decide on what can appeal to the majority of the Millennial generation.

Literature Review

The Millennial generation is the most mystifying and appealing group of potential voters out there. In comparison to Baby Boomers, Millennials are about 40 years less experienced. The birth years of Baby Boomers range from 1946-1964 (ages 54-72), while the birth years of Millennials range from 1980-2000 (ages 18-38). With the Baby Boomers slowly dying off and the Millennials taking their place as the major voting bloc of the U.S, politics will soon be shaped by the new generation. The focus of upcoming campaigns, as seen during the latest election cycle, will likely be to emphasize youth engagement. Because of Millennials' poor voting track record during the 2008, 2012, and 2016 elections, where the turnout was 50%, 46%, and 51%, campaign managers are struggling to corral the new voters to the polls (Pew Research Center 2018). It is important to look at voting behavior in an attempt to infiltrate the minds of the Millennial generation to discover what it will take to incentivize political engagement. Is it just a phase? Will Millennials outgrow their political apathy?

There are roughly five schools of thought that provide insightful research about how to approach the question of why do people vote. These schools of thought include the Economic, Psychological/Values, Establishment, Media, and Unpredictable Schools. The first school of thought to be examined is the Economic School. The Economic School relies on the idea that the economy and affluence dictates different voting behaviors.

We need to look seriously at the idea that money, economics, and wealth matter. The first and most important theory is that young people do not vote because of the cycle of life. They do not have the burden of financial responsibility, children, or major expenses. According to this life-cycle hypothesis, it is essential for young people to grow into voting citizens who care about issues that are known to affect people. This is discussed by Achim Goerres (2007) who's research analyzes young European voters and attributes their political apathy to this hypothesis.

This is a long fought over theory in the study of voting behavior and belongs in the Economic School because of the strong connection to financial responsibility and affluence.

In the same school of thought, Jan Emmanuel De Neve, professor at the University College London, is someone who argues that changes to the economy pushes American voters to change or sway their political leaning. The results were that typically, after accounting for bias and other possible factors, the average median voter votes Democrat in times of economic prosperity and votes Republican in times of economic decline (De Neve 2014). The key factor of this research is income growth rates; as they rise, voters are more likely to vote for Democrats. As almost all Millennials are now entering the workforce, this information may prove vital to the future of noticing generational trends within voting behavior. Scholars like Hassell and Settle (2017) agree and focus on individual characteristics that contribute to voting, such as affluence. People who are positively affected by the economy will turnout more than those who are not. This distinction, to them, is classified as one's ability to vote. Affluent people are more able to vote for multiple reasons, which include the ability to transport themselves to the polls, heightened education and awareness of the issues, and generally higher involvement in politics, just to name a few. This bodes well for Baby Boomers, as they have had much more time to accrue wealth in comparison to their Millennial counterparts. However, it seems like connecting voting behavior to something as expansive and ever changing as the economy seems one-dimensional. There are too many variables such as media, family, and history for this to be a singular determinant.

The second school of thought is the Psychological/Values School, which predominantly describes the generational values of the Millennials and Baby Boomers. The Psychological/Values School looks exclusively at the internal values of Millennials and Boomers, the external

forces that might prevent or instigate their voting behavior, and how habit plays into the continuation of voting. The Psychological/Values School exemplifies the essence of the two generations according to their personal values.

The analysis must begin at the core values within the generations. What are the values of the two generations? According to authors Twenge, Campbell, and Freeman, the Millennials care a great deal about individual values while other generations are more community-minded. These values include individualism and image as well as community and carefulness. Individualism revolves around promoting self-worth and the idea that everyone is different. When cultivating individualism, there is an emphasis on what is different, rather than what is the same. Image comes from how others perceive us, and Millennials specifically need others to accept them in some way. When focusing on these two facets, there is a general lack of concern for others, and there is civic disengagement (Twenge, Campbell, and Freeman 2012). The most educated and diverse, yet economically challenged generation has core values that look outwardly rather than inward (DeVaney 2015). This analysis of the generational values are key in evaluating the likelihood of voters coming to the polls.

Researchers abroad recognize values-based thinking as voting indicators. Rather than individual vs. community minded values, Schwartz came up with the theory of basic personal values. There are ten values that people could have and each one influences their voting behavior, or even if they vote at all. Those ten values are power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security (Barnea and Schwartz 1998). This model gives direction to voting habit and behavior, and some of these values overlap with individualism and community-mindedness; for example power, achievement, and self-direction fit with individualism, while benevolence, conformity, and

universalism fit with community-mindedness. The two authors use this information to determine whether during the 1998 Israeli election which people would vote for the two party leaders. Because the ten listed values are molded to fit the criteria of all voters, learning values of humans in general will help identify what values the Millennials and Boomers hold and how this will influence their voting choice. Vecchione et.al conducted a study in Italy analyzing the 2006 and 2008 national elections using the same criteria as Barnea and Schwartz, and their findings were that voting can change the relationship of political values but has no effect on one's personal values. These studies abroad are applicable to the United States because of their similar democratic government and election processes. Using international studies composed in democratic countries like Israel and Italy is useful for the U.S. as a guide for why citizens act in a particular way.

For more of an American perspective, there is the study conducted by Kenneth Mulligan (2008) that shows the importance of values in determining the vote for president. He found that the most influential factor in voting is party identification but that moral values also mattered. He uses a definition of moral values that says "...moral values reflect general beliefs about societal standards, lifestyles, the family, and the relation between these and social stability" (Mulligan 2008). According to his data, people frequently vote with the candidate that upholds their own moral values; this can be applied to all generations. Voting based on shared morality is a somewhat standard belief, but choosing what those values are for the Millennials and Boomers could determine what candidate would best sit atop the executive branch in 2020 .

The values of the Millennials and Boomers, once clarified and agreed upon, can then be used to predict the consequent behaviors that cause individuals of the generation to act in response to external factors. External factors play an important role in preventing people from

getting to the polls. Everyday stress from jobs, families, health, and other life stressors have a significant negative effect on voters. Individuals who want to be civically engaged, who want to vote, must weigh the cost of voting because it can be stressful (Hassell and Settle 2017).

Identifying the cost of an individual to vote is important in analyzing the Millennial generation and their response to everyday crises. The voter must weigh the importance of their vote with the financial or emotional cost that comes with casting that vote. This cost-benefit analysis creates a habitual response for future action and typically remains stagnant. However, with a generation focused on individualist values, it may be hard to justify the cost of voting to someone who has a specific agenda to be carried out.

People who are wealthier, healthier, and have an overall better life, are more likely to vote than those who have medical problems and strained income. Harder and Krosnick (2008) have come up with an evaluation of why people vote, which includes a model blending an individual's ability to vote, their motivation to vote, and the difficulty of voting. These three criteria (two of which extend from the values of the individual) will determine whether someone is likely to turn out to the polls. The difficulty of voting is something external, such as strict registration laws that impede an individual's ability to vote. The authors continue to say that the three mechanisms can be used to increase turnout; for example, if an organization wishes to reduce the difficulty of voting, maybe that organization should focus on allowing same-day registration in their state. The purpose of these two articles is that voting behavior is mendable; it can be shaped. However, if left untouched or unchanged, it will lead to poor, long-term habits.

The third school of thought is the Establishment School, which primarily looks at political action through response to the federal government. The Establishment School shows the reaction young people have to the establishment. Many youth populations believe that the

government is the solution to social problems within the United States, and young people have been at the forefront of social change for ages. The minutiae of everyday life also has an astronomical effect on keeping people, especially Millennials, away from the polls.

When beginning to analyze this school of thought, the establishment must be recognizable. The Establishment School focuses on those in power. Millennial voters during the 2016 Democratic primary substantially voted for Bernie Sanders as opposed to Hillary Clinton. He energized them by appealing to their anti-establishment, pro-socialist agenda. In Shelley and Hitt's article about the Democratic primaries, they even foreshadow in their conclusions that Millennial's disapproval of Hillary Clinton may cost her the election come November (2016, 281), and what a prediction that turned out to be. This anti-establishment mindset resides in the Millennial generation and could be connected to their overall political identity. The political identity of an individual is not solely determined by the generation, however, each generation has a distinct political identity, according to Fisher. He argues that the Millennial generation is very, "pro-Obama and very anti-Bush" (2017, 37), and these two candidates were all it took to predetermine the generation's political leanings for a long time. Using historical data to compare generations, Fisher argues that particular voting trends are generational and do not deteriorate. The determination of political identity shows macro-generational trends that will continue to fuel the anti-establishment fires. With a proclamation of the democratic-socialist push that was seen in the 2016 primaries, it seems to be that a Millennial wave of socialism may be coming to the United States. Regardless, the apprehension for those in power remain, and the Millennial generation is looking for replacements that would ensure the establishment embodies their own ideals.

In other ways, Millennials are actively protesting and making their mark on the political spectrum. Countless examples, including the recent Parkland Student Walkout, show that the leaders of change are the Millennial generation. Two Millennial led political movements include the Occupy Wall Street and Dreamers movements, which look for a change in the establishment or a significant change to policy that would help Millennials. The Occupy Wall Street movement was purposefully horizontal to include people of all races, genders, and backgrounds who were affected by the 2008 recession. It was led by, however, a majority of Millennials. In contrast, the Dreamers were a more specific group made up of immigrant children who were brought to the United States by their parents. Disregarding the differences, both movements were powered by technology, social media, and the concept of civil disobedience (Milkman 2014). Civil disobedience, made popular by civil rights activists in the 1960s, allows for the dissent of the Millennial generation to be heard in a nonviolent manner. These political movements' critique of the establishment leads the way to this school of thought, and it legitimizes the frustration and urge for change. This is very valuable in formulating the inspiration behind political action for the Millennial generation. This could be a major factor in what incites change, thus bringing more Millennial voters to the voting booths on Election Day.

The concept of technology and media transitions well into the fourth school of thought, which is the Media School. The role traditional media has in its coverage of the Millennial generation is discouraging. Pundits of all political leaning highlight the flaws and problems of the Millennials, and why they do not vote. It is important to notice that many of the sharers and prompters of the news are successful Baby Boomers. That is one reason why the Millennial generation is watching and reading less of the traditional media and looking for new ways to find

its information. This has significant implications on behalf of the future and how to involve Millennials in the voting process.

The Media School hones in on the role media plays in relaying political information as that may be important to the political identity of the Millennial Generation. The Millennial generation had what seems to be a good turnout for Obama, but it was still a low turnout. Martin P. Wattenberg (2016) offers an in depth analysis of how and why young people are not getting to the polls because of media disassociation. The argument made in his book is extensive but it primarily has to do with the media and representation. He states,

... advertisers will often pay top dollar to reach young adult viewers because their purchasing decisions are less likely to be determined by brand-name loyalties. Thus, if young adults aren't tuning in to traditional news broadcasts, the marketplace provides special incentives for news producers to package the news in alternative ways that might appeal to young voters. (Wattenberg 2016, 55)

Young Millennials are watching/reading less traditional news and the markets are shifting to better favor the up-and-coming generation. This means more influence in social media and soft news sources where Millennials are going to spend a majority of their attention. Similarly, Alison Novak (2016) looks specifically at how this media affects the political agency of Millennials by discouraging them from partaking in civic engagement. Millennials on social media believe that their political identity is intertwined with their online representation, and some even believe that their posts are enough political participation. Her research focuses on the lasting effects of media criticism on particular generations. For example, OJ Simpson is not remembered as a star running back after his infamous arrest, trial, and sentencing for murder. His actions and his portrayal in the media ruined his reputation. Novak insists that all it takes is one individual to be seen in a negative light for media to interpret an entire generation. This will

affect how traditional sources of media will be relayed, and for some companies in television and print, it may be enough to put them out of business in the long run.

There is a correlation with those who look at traditional media and higher voter turnout, therefore, it is important to note the lack in viewership and readership of Millennials and traditional media, while Baby Boomers have and will continue to have a consistent readership and following of traditional media. Traditionally, media influence and attunement is closely associated to increased voter turnout. In a book written by Mark N. Franklin (2004), he discusses habit as an important factor in voting. He arrives at the conclusion that voters who do not vote early in their adult lives leave a footprint of bad behavior that will follow them through later election cycles. Franklin argues that a solution to this problem is raising the age to vote. This, he argues, would increase habit by allowing for growth and development to continue in the individual before they have the right to vote, thus increasing voter turnout. If the most important factor of continuous voting is habit, increasing the voting age allows maturity to undergo, where hopefully more young people begin to realize how much politics affects them on an individual level. Media perpetuates this habit, especially considering the continued use of the statistic, “young people don’t vote.”

Lastly, there is an Unpredictable School of thought where voting is considered to be random and erratic. According to this School, there is no particular reason behind voting in a generational sense, as there is no distinction between generations; people vote based on individual factors specific to them. Different identities such as race, gender, religion, socioeconomic background, etc. play too much of a factor in why someone votes, and it is too broad of a spectrum for people to be grouped together in a generational voting bloc. Individuals vote solely on their own accord, in alignment with their own self-identity.

The best example of this case comes from a study of the impact of religious values, conducted by Jen'nan G. Read and David E. Eagle. This study was conducted to discover if religion was a good determinant for voting behavior. The results were that basically, religion cannot be the main and only factor for why people vote. The explanation behind this was that there were too many identities that play a role in particular behaviors. For example, gender and race played a large role in why people voted. The conclusion of the study was that identities matter, and each person has their own identity. People have a variety of identities that both determine if they vote and who they will vote for. Religion is not to be the most important determinant of why someone voted in a particular way. With Millennials being the most diverse generation to date, there is evidence that the melting pot of individuals might not make a clear and present identity for the whole group.

In another study conducted by Schwadel and Garneau (2014), age was examined, specifically looking at Baby Boomers, to see if there was a connection between age and political tolerance. According to the findings of the authors, age was not a factor of political tolerance in all generations, but it was important to Baby Boomers. This anomaly provides recognition of the randomness of the influence of age in political tolerance and participation. Whether or not Baby Boomers were more tolerant than other generations, it goes to show that individuals make decisions on their own, in their own manner with little regard for others. In this school of thought, Millennials and Boomers are sought out as individuals, abandoning the categorized identity of age groupings. Individuality is too great in American society for there to be a real congruent reason for why people do or do not vote. The weakness of this school is similar to the strength. It seems to be an easy way out. We can isolate for certain variables and attempt to see what factors cause people to vote. No, a perfect model does not exist because human behavior is

at times random, but patterns within individuals do emerge, and those patterns can show up in many people.

In light of these schools of thought, I focused my individual research on the Psychological/Values School. This school of thought opens the most amount of doors for my understanding of why people vote or do not vote. Evaluating the principles of the Millennials and Baby Boomers will be indicative of how/if they apply those principles in the civic arena. Also, as many of the schools of thought overlap, the articles within the Economic, Establishment, Media, and Unpredictable Schools will for the most part still be usable, as each has key insight and information into looking at the values of voters in general. Investigating trends within all schools of thought will ultimately have some role of formulating the psyche of the Millennial generation. After careful examination, it seems clear that the Psychological/Values School is the most encompassing and most accurate when trying to describe voting behavior.

Methodology

There are two values that I think are both broad enough to encompass a majority of individuals and specific enough to differentiate Millennials from the Boomers. These values are individual-mindedness and community-mindedness. The data used in this research analyzed the elections of 2016 and 1984 to see if Baby Boomers and Millennials had different values as young voters, and the data came from the American National Election Studies (ANES) Cumulative Time Series Study. I chose these presidential elections because they were the first elections in which all Baby Boomers and Millennials could vote collectively. ANES asks its respondents to

answer a multitude of questions to find reputable information on who exactly is voting in presidential elections. As a trustworthy source of information, with thousands of respondents and data-points, ANES is the best way to find information on Millennials and Boomers who voted and asks questions about their values. Once the data was found, I needed a way to organize it. SPSS is statistical software that allows me to organize my data, run thousands of tests, and isolate independent variables from my dependent variable, which is whether the respondent voted or not? I created my own datasets in SPSS organized by ages 18-37¹ with the independent variables being questions found in the Cumulative Time Series Study that I found best represented the community-minded and individually-minded traits. I chose these ages because they represent the years of all those eligible to vote within each prospective generation. Before I get to the questions themselves, I must explain how I deemed these questions to be the most suitable.

To begin, I need to define the variables in this study. The dependent variables of the study are *whether or not Boomers and Millennials voted as young people*. I am looking for factors that would alter or affect the dependent variable. Those factors, or independent variables, are the individual-mindedness and community-mindedness traits. For the sake of this research, I must operationalize these terms because of their ambiguity. Community-mindedness should be defined by the sense of belonging to one's community and affiliation within one's specific community. Individual-mindedness focuses more on the image of one's self, while adhering firstly to the in-group, i.e., those who have strong, interpersonal bonds with those closest to

¹ These ages were the ages of Millennials at the time of the 2016 presidential election, characterized by the years 1980-2000. These are the widely agreed upon birthdates of the Millennial generation that are used for this study. It was necessary to take the same age range of Baby Boomers as well.

oneself (Twenge et al. 2012). An in-group is separate from a community which may consist of multiple different in-groups.

There are three components that help identify whether someone is community-minded. The first component is motive. An analysis of motivation can pinpoint why someone does something (Harder and Krosnick 2008). For example, everyone knows the classic story of Robin Hood. When looking at his personality in the context of the first component, he would easily be considered a community-minded person. He steals from the wealthy to give to the poor, regardless of the consequences he may face. In his eyes, the community is suffering more than he ever could by getting caught, and that is what motivates him to help his community. Motive is what drives individuals to do something, whether it be for their interest or for the interest of others. In analyzing Millennials, there needs to be an understanding of what inspires them to come out and vote.

The second component is sacrifice. To be community-minded, people must sacrifice some of their liberties and well-being for the sake of the community. This also means that to be individually-minded, someone is not willing to give up those liberties. The sacrificial component can be used to analyze the willingness of an individual to make a decision that may not be in their own interest but may be in the best interest of others. The willingness to do something and scale of sacrifice is the determining factor of this component.

The third and final component is time. Time is more of a physical indicator of individual-mindedness and community-mindedness, measuring the time spent doing something that is considered to be individually focused or community focused. Because it can be measured, time spent doing community service, going to rallies, and being active in the community reveals the community-mindedness trait. Whether one can commit 40 hours a week or once a month,

time spent helping the community is indicative of a community-minded person. Community-minded people give up their own free time to help others.

Using these three components, I determined which questions from the ANES Cumulative Study that I needed to investigate to hone my research. Aside from the three control variables of age, gender, and income—three conclusive and highly researched variables looking at voting behavior—my study looks at possible identifiers of individualism and communitarianism. Also, I think it is important to mention why I did not use education level as a control variable in this study, as it is considered traditionally a good indicator in how likely someone is to vote. According to the surveys analyzed, it was difficult to pick out questions that were asked similarly enough in both the 2016 and 1984 data. If the questions did not match well enough, I thought it was best to not use the variable so not to skew the data. This is what happened in the case of the education variable as the questions asked in the 2016 and 1984 surveys did not align with each other.

The first question I researched was “Would you say you/do you go to (church/synagogue) every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, a few times a year, or never?” (ANES). This was anticipating a relationship between religion and politics that has changed over time. This question will help discover the underlying differences between Millennials and Baby Boomers, especially considering Boomers are known to be more religious. It abides by the three components of motive, attending service is more important than self-worship, sacrifice, giving up individual’s time to be with a community of worshippers, and time, which is spent at the church.

I then looked at “Would you say that you have been/were very much interested, somewhat interested, or not much interested in the political campaigns (so far) this year?”

(ANES). Here is more of a direct example of political participation/interest. This will gauge the activism of young voters by seeing the correlation between voting and political interest. It clearly follows the three components. Motive is a factor for how much someone wishes to engage in political activity, specifically voting. Moreover, an individual must sacrifice their time to engage in the political process, including campaigns. Lastly, individuals need to put time into the system to be active participants.

The next question I researched was “Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?” (ANES). This question serves as a substitute for trust. There is research that suggests the more people trust in government, the more they will vote. The analysis from this question will focus on the pessimistic attitude vs. the optimistic attitude of voters to see if there is a correlation to trust in the government. This question focuses heavily on the motive component, but looks mainly at the government’s motive rather than the voter’s motive. The motive of the government can then be used to determine the motivation level of the citizens who vote.

The next variable I looked at was Defense spending and whether or not people believe that it should increase, decrease, or stay the same (ANES). The purpose of this was to question the differences between the two generations and to see if one was different from the other. Increasing the defense spending implies a greater sense of community, as the individual wishes to protect those around them to a greater degree. Motive in this case is harder to determine, but sacrifice is a pretty easy. Is an individual okay with the government spending more on my protection than on my education, or whatever other department that might need that money? When it comes to finances, there is always going to be a sacrifice made.

I then looked at this question: “If people were treated more equally in this country [would] we would have fewer problems?” (ANES). This question is a determinant of community-mindedness, as it asks about a problem of morality within the American community. In analyzing this question, it seems apparent that it is a good indicator of community-mindedness. What motivates the individual would be to better the American public, regardless of the person’s response. Also, if the respondent answered yes, they may be willing to sacrifice something of theirs for the sake of others.

The last question I investigated was essentially, should the government increase or decrease environmental spending, or should it stay the same (ANES)? I figured that this would be a great question to determine community-mindedness. An individual’s actions to save the environment is essentially naturally community-minded. Protecting the environment protects others, especially in regards to human health. The motive an individual has for saying increase is community-oriented. There is a little sacrifice component as well, like what rights are you willing to give up to achieve this increase in spending (again, there is always a price when there is a budget involved), but this is not a major component of this question. The most important is the motive.

Hypotheses

My hypotheses are: *If Millennial voters prove to be individually-minded, then they will be less likely to vote; If Baby Boomer voters show the same traits as Millennials, then it is clear that non-voting is multigenerational; Baby Boomer voters will be more religious than Millennials, but will still exhibit traits of individual-mindedness; Millennials and Baby Boomer voters will be more actively involved in the political process than non-voters; Baby Boomer*

voters will trust the government less than the Millennials; Millennial and Boomer voters will equally want to spend less on defense; Millennial and Baby Boomer voters will want a society where equality is the main doctrine; and Millennials will care more about the environment than Baby Boomers. These hypotheses will examine whether young people are subsequently less likely to vote or if there is a generational difference between Boomers and Millennials. The two groups will be examined at their youngest available voting ages. I want to see if they show similar or different voting behaviors based on their responses to these certain questions. The best explanation for this hypothesis lays in the works of Twenge et.al where they outline the differences between communal-minded and individual-minded people. These are two variables that can be tested. Individual-minded people are less likely to vote because voting is more community driven. However likely an individual is to vote based solely on their own agenda, it is still a community driven act, affecting a wider range of people than the individual. The act of voting for the community-minded person is second nature, while the act of voting for the individual-minded person is either a nuisance or for self-gain.

Results

For my research, I conducted logistic regression analysis. Logistic regression is different from linear regression in the sense that logistic regression is to be used for a variable that is bivariate instead of multivariate. Linear regression implies the independent and dependent variables have a linear relationship, but with a dependent variable with only a bivariate response, the lines would be parallel using a linear regression. Because my dependent variable is bivariate (a yes or no question), I could not run linear regression analysis. Linear regression represent linear relationships between multiple responses to the dependent variable, while logistic

regression distinguishes the probability, or log odds (logarithmic probability), of the dependent variable with only two responses. Where there is a one-unit increase in the independent variable there is an increase or decrease in the log odds of the dependent variable. The difference in log odds between the two bivariate of the dependent variables is how I will obtain my results. In my case, the probability difference equation can tell me how likely someone is to have voted or not voted because of the independent variable.²

The tables on the next few pages describe the findings that help determine the relationship between the independent variables and voting. I am testing first for the statistical significance of the data. The statistical significance shows confidence levels of there being a relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable. It is written in confidence levels and probabilities, where the closer to .00, the more likely there is a relationship. If the statistical significance is .05 then with a 95% confidence level, I can say the independent variable has a relationship with the dependent. The beta (β) shows the direct relationship the independent variable has on the dependent variable; it shows the direction (positive or negative) and the change in units. Most importantly, the difference between the minimum and maximum responses for each significant variable as determined by the difference formula is listed as well. These percentages, found using the logistic regression formula, allow me to make a direct statement about the relationship between voting and that variable based on the minimum statistical response and the maximum response.

² See Appendix for logistic regression formula and probability difference equation.

Table 1: 1984 Control Variables

Variable	β	Std. Error	Significance	Probability Difference
Age³	.073	.020	.000***	Min = 37% Max = 76% Difference = 39%
Gender	.407	.207	.050**	Min = 58%⁴ Max = 87%⁵ Difference = 29%
Income	.518	.105	.000***	Min = 25% Max = 200%⁶ Difference = 175%

***Sig \leq .01; **Sig \leq .05; *Sig \leq 0.1

N = 618

The first logistic regression analysis took place with the control variables in the 1984 election. For this test, all three controls reported back as statistically significant with all three having positive betas as well. The Age variable had a 39% difference between the eldest and youngest Baby Boomers. The 38 year-olds were 39% more likely to vote than the 18 year-olds. This is not surprising, and even sheds light to the theory that older people vote more frequently. In regards to gender, females were 29% more likely to vote than males. The most stunning result is the income variable. The variable was broken into five percentiles; 0-16, 17-33, 34-67, 68-95, 95-100; these percentiles equate to the average median income in America. These percentiles grouped individuals based on their stated income levels, and the results were that those belonging to the 95th percentile or above were 175% more likely to vote than those of the 16th

³ Ages 18-37

⁴ Male

⁵ Female

⁶ Top 5% of accumulated wealth

percentile or lower. This strongly supports the claim that wealthier people tend to vote more than poor people.

Table 2: 1984 Independent Variables

Variable	β	Std. Error	Significance	Probability Difference
Church Attendance	-.376	.081	.000***	Min = 161%⁷ Max = 36 %⁸ Difference = 125%
Political Interest in Campaigns	.982	.160	.000***	Min = 28%⁹ Max = 202% ¹⁰Difference = 174%
Trust	.088	.206	.670	N/A
Defense Spending	-.090	.064	.161	N/A
Egalitarianism	.020	.085	.819	N/A
Environmental Spending	.086	.169	.611	N/A

***Sig \leq .01; **Sig \leq .05; *Sig \leq 0.1

N = 618

In looking at the independent variables of the 1984 survey, only two questions were statistically significant with voting. The first is church attendance, which is a surprising result. Although I assumed that Baby Boomers would be reportedly more religious, it seems that it also has a great correlation with political participation as well. The beta was negative which means that the more frequently you visited church, the more likely you were to vote; as a matter of fact, you were 125% more likely to vote if you attended church every week than if you never

⁷ Every week attendance

⁸ No attendance

⁹ No participation in political campaigns

¹⁰ Some participation in political campaigns

attended. The other variable that was statistically significant was a person's interest in political campaigns. If you were interested and engaged with the campaigns, an individual was 174% more likely to vote than if they were uninterested. This is a staggering result that shows the importance of political engagement and how likely someone is to vote if they are engaged.

In regards to the non-significant variables, there is a wide range of factors that make it difficult to determine their correlation to voting. The most obvious is that there is too much variance in the responses; it is too random.

Table 3: 2016 Control Variables

Variable	β	Std. Error	Significance	Probability Difference
Age ¹¹	.015	.018	.399	N/A
Gender	.329	.194	.090*	Min = 87% ¹² Max = 121% ¹³ Difference = 34%
Income	.380	.090	.000***	Min = 51% Max = 237% ¹⁴ Difference = 186%

***Sig \leq .01; **Sig \leq .05; *Sig \leq 0.1

N = 774

Finally we have made it to the 2016 variables. The control variables for the 2016 survey were not as conclusive, specifically with age. 38 year-olds were not necessarily more likely to vote than their younger counterparts, which is a promising non-result. This leads to an assumption that the Millennial generation is different from other young people. These results show that age may be significantly less important in whether someone votes as a Millennial, which goes against almost every other theory in political science. I would like to do some

¹¹ Ages 18-38

¹² Male

¹³ Female

¹⁴ Top 5% of accumulated wealth

follow-up research to find out more about this particular result, as it has the potential to be my most important finding.

The other two variables were mostly similar, with women being 34% more likely to vote than men and those belonging to the 95th percentile or above in regards to income level were 186% more likely to vote than those in the 16th percentile or lower.

Table 4: 2016 Independent Variables

Variable	β	Std. Error	Significance	Probability Difference
Church Attendance	-.091	.068	.180	N/A
Political Interest in Campaigns	.592	.140	.000***	Min = 51%¹⁵ Max = 168%¹⁶ Difference = 117%
Trust	-.603	.231	.009***	Min = 116%¹⁷ Max = 64%¹⁸ Difference = 52%
Defense Spending	-.115	.061	.058*	Min = 146%¹⁹ Max = 74%²⁰ Difference = 72%
Egalitarianism	-.123	.090	.172	N/A
Environmental Spending	.062	.150	.679	N/A

***Sig \leq .01; **Sig \leq .05; *Sig \leq 0.1

N = 774

These results were a little different than the results of the 1984 survey. Political interest remains significant to Millennials. Millennials that follow campaigns and are interested in

¹⁵ No participation in political campaigns

¹⁶ Some participation in political campaigns

¹⁷ Do not trust the government

¹⁸ Trust government

¹⁹ Decrease in defense spending

²⁰ No change/raise in defense spending

campaigns are 117% more likely to vote than those who are not. The differences between the 2016 and 1984 data lie in the next two results. Trust was significant to Millennials and the results were surprising. Because of the negative beta, the results show that Millennials who thought the government only had interests for itself were 52% more likely to vote than those who thought the government was acting in the best interests of the people. This opposes information previously known about government trust and the likelihood of voting. This result suggests that the least trustworthy a government is perceived to be, the more likely Millennials are to vote. Moreover, Millennial voters believe that the defense spending should be greatly decreased. People who said the defense spending should greatly decrease were 72% more likely to vote than those who said it should greatly increase.

Analysis

I would like to first discuss the implications of my chosen variables that were not statistically significant and why they were inadequate indicators. I think for each of the insignificant variables there was a disconnect between the question asked and what I wanted the question to say. One of the difficult decisions made for this study was abandoning the idea of conducting my own survey to use the survey of a well-established, well-resourced polling group. In alleviating my research of bias and vastly increasing the number of respondents, I received strong, unwavering results, but to do this, I had to give up some of the creative freedom in asking very specific, hand-crafted questions that would give more conclusive results. Also, there was a problem with the question selection process in regards to the two years of study. There were countless examples of the 1984 survey or the 2016 survey asking a question that was not asked

in the opposing year. I chose, for congruency, to abandon these questions and only focus on questions that were asked on both surveys, limiting my option pool.

With this being said, one of the most significant results was that age was not a factor in the Millennial data (Table 3). Older Millennials were not more likely to vote than younger Millennials, and because it is one of the largest generations, with a 20 year age difference between its oldest and youngest population, this is extremely surprising. Millennials are breaking down the stigma that young people will vote more when they are older. A growing gap and disassociation with traditional media, just like Wattenberg says, may be affecting how young people view politics, permanently (2016). This result also emphasizes the importance of habit and supports the research of Barnea and Schwartz (1998). It may be more important than ever for young people to begin voting sooner rather than later. With no correlation between older Millennials and younger Millennials, it is unclear whether or not the youths' voting habits will change as they get older; time will be the ultimate decider. This is different, however, from the Baby Boomers as they (Table 1) did show that age was significant, meaning that older Boomers may have had a different upbringing, or were at a different point in their lives. Social maturity appears to be taking longer as Millennials are integrating into the workplace and into roles of citizens much slower than Boomers had done in 1984. Perhaps this is indicative of distrust toward the government and refusal to assimilate and be part of the status quo.

Another very striking result in my study was the difference between Baby Boomers and Millennials' religious attendance and the effect it had on Baby Boomers' participation. Religiosity is a community driven result. The results are directly opposing Read and Eagle (2011) who found that religion was too broad to account for voter participation. Baby Boomers in particular were 125% more likely to vote if they attended church on a weekly basis than those

who did not attend at all. This is a staggering percentage and holds information that is vital to the identity of the Baby Boomer generation back in 1984. Their dedication and commitment to the church and to the community shows that they are community-minded. I would like to ask the respondents a follow-up question about the reasons they attend church every week, with possible answers being to be closer with God, it is my duty, I do not want others to think less of me, or because I want to be a regular part of the church community. Knowing this motive would help conclude the study and say more definitively that Baby Boomers were community-minded.

Opposingly, Millennials showed a significant correlation between government trust and voting as well as defense spending and voting. Millennials were 52% more likely to vote if they distrusted the government than if they trusted it. This is indicative of the Establishment School having a real effect, as Millennials appear to distrust the government and are inspired in voting to change it. This result could mean many different things, but the most important is that Millennials and Baby Boomers are different in how they view government. Boomers were definitely more skeptical than previous generations, but now more than ever are young people skeptical of their government. Millennials also were 72% more likely to vote if they believed the government should greatly decrease defense spending. This means that Millennials are more self-interested due to the decrease of spending on the protection of others; however, it also could be that they care intrinsically for the soldiers or care more about money going to infrastructure and technology. It is difficult to determine exactly what the result means, but the closest we can get is that the issue matters to them. The most important thing is that there is a difference between Millennials and Baby Boomers.

One of the important results coming from this study lies with the campaign interest variable. It is the only significant independent variable that both Baby Boomers and Millennials

had similar results. At 124% and 117% respectively, it is clear that being active in the political process incentivizes people to vote. This variable is the silver lining of the research that shows the similarities between the two voting blocs. In its simplest form, Baby Boomers and Millennials show that participation in politics matters. Being active and engaged in the political process is crucial in going out and voting. Reaching a wider spread audience, being inclusive, and encouraging participation will increase voter turnout in both generations.

My hypotheses about Millennials and Baby Boomer have given mixed results, as it appears that Millennials are individually-minded but Boomers are more community-minded. The differences of the two seem to suggest that nonvoting is not necessarily a young person thing exclusively. From my research, it appears that, yes, Millennials and Baby Boomers had low voter turnouts when they were younger, but older Boomers (in their 30's) were more likely to vote than their younger counterparts; this was not the case for Millennials. It seems to be taking longer for Millennials to assimilate and get to that voting stage, and maybe they never will get to the idolized 60-70% turnout rate. I believe that my method of choosing questions is the biggest reason for this result. This does not, however, mean the research is a failure at attributing characteristics to both Baby Boomers and Millennials, as it is clear the two generations have differences between them. It is just inconclusive for now, as it is difficult to pinpoint questions that best suit this study. My hypothesis about Baby Boomers and Millennials being similar has also been disproven, as it appears Baby Boomers and Millennials are more dissimilar than they are similar. Baby Boomers and Millennials, however, had similar results in their political participation, gender, and income. Although the campaign interest variable data was similar, the other variables showed major differences in how and why each respective generation voted. With Boomers caring more about religion and Millennials more about government action/inaction, it is

clear that they have differing perspectives and reasons for voting. This may lead to an important discovery in the Political Science field in that maybe young people are, indeed, different depending on the generation. This seems plausible; as times change, values change, and a difference of 30 plus years makes people different.

It may be the case that young people do not vote as much as older people; however, not all young people are the same. This study proves that the young Baby Boomer generation and the young Millennial generation were different and had different values, things that distinguished one group from the other. There is a gap between Millennials and Baby Boomers. As values shift, technology advances, and ideologies move, younger people begin to think differently. This is very important in understanding how to incentivize the younger generations to vote. Not all young people are the same as the generation before it, so each generation needs to be evaluated on an individual basis. To solve this problem, here are my recommendations for how to encourage the Millennials and future young voters to vote.

Government agencies like the Census Bureau, the US Election Assistance Commission, or even the Department of Education should also run non-partisan advertisements on non-news-related channels, radio stations, and through internet video campaigns. These advertisements would not be associated with candidates but would be public service announcements to remind citizens of the importance of voting. This would hopefully reach audiences that do not watch the news or political pundits of any kind who may be less informed about the act of voting. There are many campaigns on the internet, specifically on social media that are geared toward voting, and running similar campaigns about the positive effects of voting on individuals and communities from an unbiased source may improve people's outlook on voting in general.

Another recommendation would be to increase voter registration drives on both college campuses and in the general public, making them accessible to more people. Voter registration drives are a good way to register those who are not registered either because they have moved, do not have a driver's license, or are new citizens. Increasing these types of drives makes voting available to more people, giving these people the opportunity to vote (Harder and Krosnick 2008). Young people who move away from home are many times left unregistered in their new state of residence and this is a major problem for many of them. Giving them access to vote is the first step in getting them to the polls.

Lastly, I had the idea of the Department of Education implementing a mandated Mock Election Day in high schools the first Monday of every November to simulate Election Day. This initiative will help show students that their actions or inactions affect themselves and those around them. The main curriculum would be left to the discretion of the states and different school boards, but the baseline standard would be that each student must participate in a lifelike election and be able to correctly reason why voting is important. This could take many shapes, but a few examples include a mock election for favorite teachers, school policy changes that receive 100% of student vote, and actual voting procedure for real candidates running for office. For seniors and those who are eighteen, there would be mandatory voter registration as well. Differing from Wattenberg's recommendation of mandatory voting, which I find as intrusive and against the foundational ideas that built this country, mandatory voter registration, allows for all people to have the ability to vote, but recognizes their right to choose. Making it as easy as possible for people to have the means to vote, will bode well for American democracy. This Mock Election Day would give students familiarity with the voting process and teach them that voting has positive repercussions. In abiding by the Mock Election Day suggestion, young

people will be fulfilling their individual needs to vote. Showing the repercussions of voting and the effect that voting has on the individual will greatly increase the likelihood of young people voting.

Conclusion

This research will substantially add to the literature of political science and voting behavior. I found that Millennials are not necessarily growing up more likely to vote as in previous generations. This directly opposes the life cycle hypothesis and it would be beneficial for more research to be conducted on behalf of this finding. Attributing values to both Baby Boomers and Millennials as young voters helps identify differences in this newer generation that can be useful in determining the likelihood of the generation to vote. Knowing their values and their voting behavior is essential to understanding how they will be inspired to vote more.

Millennials have the lowest voter turnout of all the eligible voting generations, and the purpose of this research was to discover why they voted and what would inspire more of them to vote. I wanted to look at the Baby Boomers during the 1984 election as a comparison to see if generational traits even existed or to see if it really was a young person problem. To complete this task, it was necessary to choose values that were identifiable in the Millennial generation that easily contributed to their lifestyle. In analyzing the two values of community-mindedness and individual-mindedness, I discovered that Millennials were more likely to vote if they were interested in political campaigns and were skeptical of the U.S. Government. There were mixed results, showing paradoxical information between Millennials and Boomers, supporting the idea that they are indeed different from each other during their younger years. This research sheds

light on the issues of grouping young people into an unchangeable, unmalleable, voting bloc, when in reality, all it takes is some investment into who they are as people.

Also, one of the most important takeaways from this research is to realize the gravitas in consequences of not voting. Millennials who do not vote are contributing to the lack of representation for issues in Congress that are important to young people such as health care reform, college affordability and student loan reform, and increasing environmental protections. New policy recommendations and ideas could more easily be implemented to help give Millennials and young people easier access to vote and more knowledge about the voting process. This is essential for the American democratic process to continue. For future research, I would like to create my own survey based on my own criteria and for the purpose of having the best results possible for the research questions. This was something I struggled with throughout the process, and having my own survey questions would better my chances of getting a definitive answer as to who the Millennials and Baby Boomers are.

Voter turnout will play a crucial role in the 2020 elections, and with all Millennials eligible to vote, including the first few years of Gen Z's, candidates running for office will be striving to increase voter turnout. To increase voter turnout, candidates must run campaigns geared toward those who are voting. For Millennials, the best strategy might be to focus on local issues and a platform that discusses the policies discussions Millennials want to have, specifically around spending less on the Department of Defense. The best way to get things done is through change, and if young Americans want a change in the establishment, there is no better way than through their voice. This is the tactic of progressive candidates such as Bernie Sanders and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, and if there are no other efforts to cater to young voters, then they will continue to receive Millennial support.

Appendix

Probability Difference Equation

$$P1(R=1) = \frac{e^{constant + H2\beta(H2) + H3\beta(H3) + H4\beta(H4) + H5\beta(H5) + H6\beta(H6) + H7\beta(H7) + H8\beta(H8) + H1\beta(1)}}{1 + e^{constant + H2\beta(H2) + H3\beta(H3) + H4\beta(H4) + H5\beta(H5) + H6\beta(H6) + H7\beta(H7) + H8\beta(H8) + H1\beta(1)}}$$

1+e

$$P2(R=4) = \frac{e^{constant + H2\beta(H2) + H3\beta(H3) + H4\beta(H4) + H5\beta(H5) + H6\beta(H6) + H7\beta(H7) + H8\beta(H8) + H1\beta(4)}}{1 + e^{constant + H2\beta(H2) + H3\beta(H3) + H4\beta(H4) + H5\beta(H5) + H6\beta(H6) + H7\beta(H7) + H8\beta(H8) + H1\beta(4)}}$$

$1+e$

Works Cited

- Barnea, Marina F., and Shalom H. Schwartz. 1998. "Values and Voting." *Political Psychology* 19 (1) (Mar 1) :17-40. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3792112>. (Accessed September 10, 2018).
- De Neve, Jan-Emmanuel. 2014. "Ideological Change and the Economics of Voting Behavior in the US, 1920–2008." *Electoral Studies* 34:2738. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261379413001595>. (Accessed March 20, 2018).
- DeVaney, Sharon A. 2015. "Understanding the Millennial Generation." *Journal of Financial Service Professionals* 69 (6):114. <https://ezproxy.lynchburg.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=110556940&site=ehost-live&scope=site>. (Accessed February 4, 2018).
- File, Thom. 2017. "Voting in America: A Look at the 2016 Presidential Election." *United States Census Bureau*, https://www.census.gov/newsroom/blogs/random-samplings/2017/05/voting_in_america.html (Accessed November 12, 2018).
- Fisher, Patrick. 2017. "A Political Outlier: The Distinct Politics of the Millennial Generation." *Society* 2018 (55): 35-40.
- Franklin, Mark N. 2004. *Voter Turnout and the Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Established Democracies since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harder, Joshua, and Jon A. Krosnick. 2008. "Why do People Vote? A Psychological Analysis of the Causes of Voter Turnout." *Journal of Social Issues* 64 (3) (Sep):525-49. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00576.x/abstract>. (Accessed February 20, 2018).

- Hassell, Hans J. G., and Jaime E. Settle. 2017. "The Differential Effects of Stress on Voter Turnout." *Political Psychology* 38 (3) (Jun): 533-50. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/pops.12344/abstract>. (Accessed February 20, 2018).
- Gimpel, James G., Irwin L. Morris, and David R. Armstrong. 2004. "Turnout and the Local Age Distribution: Examining Political Participation Across Space and Time." *Political Geography* 23 (1):71-95.
- Goerres, Achim. 2007. "Why are Older People More Likely to Vote? the Impact of Ageing on Electoral Turnout in Europe." *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9 (1)(Feb):90-121. <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpl/bjpi/2007/00000009/00000001/art00006>.
- Milkman, Ruth. 2014. "Millennial Movements: Occupy Wall Street and the Dreamers." *Dissent* 3 (61) Summer 2014. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/548291> (Accessed February 4, 2018).
- Mulligan, Kenneth. 2008. "The "Myth" of Moral Values Voting in the 2004 Presidential Election." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 41 (1) (Jan):109-14.
- Novak, Allison. 2016. *Media, Millennials and Politics: The Coming of Age of the Next Political Generation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Pew Research Center. 2018. "Voter turnout rates in presidential elections, by generation." http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/04/03/millennials-approach-baby-boomers-as-largest-generation-in-u-s-electorate/ft_16-05-13_millennialvoters_turnout-2/. (Accessed March 16, 2019).
- Read, Jen'nan G., and David E. Eagle. 2011. "Intersecting Identities as a Source of Religious

- Incongruence." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 50 (1):11632.
<https://ezproxy.lynchburg.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hlh&AN=58757253&site=ehost-live&scope=site>. (Accessed September 10, 2018).
- Russ, Terry. 2007. "Baby Boomer and Volunteerism." M.A. State University of New York Empire State College.
- Schwadel, Philip, and Christopher R. H. Garneau. 2014. "An Age–Period–Cohort Analysis of Political Tolerance in the United States." *The Sociological Quarterly* 55 (2):421-52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tsq.12058>.
- Shelley, Fred M., and Ashley M. Hitt. 2016. "The Millennial Vote in the 2016 Democratic Primary Elections." *Southeastern Geographer* 56 (3):273-82. <https://ezproxy.lynchburg.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=118451758&site=ehost-live&scope=site>. (Accessed February 4, 2018).
- Twenge, Jean M., W. K. Campbell, and Elise C. Freeman. 2012. "Generational Differences in Young Adults' Life Goals, Concern for Others, and Civic Orientation, 1966-2009." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 102 (5) (May):1045-62. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22390226>. (Accessed February 4, 2018).
- Vecchione, Michele, Gianvittorio Caprara, Francesco Dentale, and Shalom H. Schwartz. 2013. "Voting and Values: Reciprocal Effects Over Time." *Political Psychology* 34 (4) (Aug):465-85.

Wattenberg, Martin P. 2016. *Is Voting for Young People?*. New York: Taylor & Francis.