TABLE 3

POLARIZATION RESULTS COMPARISON

Name	Filter	p (deg)[a]	θ (deg)[a]	Reference
V Hya	U	5.7 ± 0.3	59 ± 1	This paper
	...	(1.52, 1.66)	(6, 9)	Serkowski & Shawl (2001)
	B	3.6 ± 0.1	59 ± 1	This paper
	...	(1.31, 3.14)	(173, 14)	Serkowski & Shawl (2001)
	V	2.2 ± 0.1	124 ± 1	This paper
	...	(0.68, 2.26)	(172, 13)	Serkowski & Shawl (2001)
R For	V	(0.3, 2.1)	(54,77)	This Paper
	...	1.57 ± 0.02	148	Serkowski & Shawl (2001)
R Lep	B	(0.7, 2.5)	(42,109)	This Paper
	...	(1.2, 3.00)	(37, 59)	Raveendran (2002)
	...	(0.3, 3.46)	(4, 173)	Serkowski & Shawl (2001)
	...	(1.4, 2.71)	(19, 45)	Dyck & Sandford (1971)
	...	(1.7, 1.93)	(27, 44)	Kruszewski et al. (1968)
	V	(0.8, 1.8)	(48, 134)	This Paper
	...	(1.1, 1.94)	(28, 48)	Raveendran (2002)
	...	(0.55, 2.48)	(13, 72)	Serkowski & Shawl (2001)
	...	(1.53, 1.78)	(30, 33)	Dyck & Sandford (1971)
	...	(2.15, 2.21)	(22, 32)	Kruszewski et al. (1968)
	...	2.7	25	Serkowski (1966)
	R	(1.3,2.8)	(50, 135)	This Paper
	...	(1.65, 1.75)	(16, 49)	Raveendran (2002)
Y Cvn	B	(0.2, 1.2)	(50, 138)	This Paper
	...	0.57 ± 0.37	37 ± 18	Raveendran (1991)
	...	0.25	...	Serkowski (1971)
	V	(0.5, 1.5)	(49, 98)	This Paper
	...	0.58 ± 0.04	70 ± 2	Raveendran (1991)
	R	(1.6, 1.7)	(75, 131)	This Paper
	...	0.44 ± 0.04	62 ± 3	Raveendran (1991)

[a]The range of published values are indicated in parenthesis.

regions, where most of the linear polarization is produced.

Figures 9, 10, and 11 show the brightness and polarization as a function of time for RT Cap, T Dra, and Y Cvn, respectively. In general, ultraviolet polarization shows the largest time variations in degree of polarization and position angle. In all three cases, the brightness of the star in the *UBVR* bands was almost constant.

Serkowski (1966) found that some stars exhibit a well-defined relation between light and polarization variations such that the polarization achieves the largest value at minimum light and the smallest value at maximum light. However, Zappala (1967) has concluded, based on his observations of 12 stars, that there is no correlation between luminosity and polarization changes. Clearly, more observations covering a longer time base and a closer follow-up are needed to decide whether such correlation exists.

The rather weak wavelength dependence of linear polarization indicates that circumstellar grain scattering is the main mechanism responsible for the continuum polarization in carbon stars. The identification of grains in the envelope presents a major difficulty, because of the inverse nature of the problem involved. Polarization models of circumstellar grain scattering by Raveendran (1991) show that graphite does not adequately explain the mean polarimetric behavior of carbon stars. Furthermore, graphite grains do not explain the IR spectra of the