



University of Pennsylvania
Scholarly Commons

CUREJ - College Undergraduate Research
Electronic Journal

College of Arts and Sciences

4-22-2007

Educating Undergraduates for Democracy and Efficacy and the 2006 Penn Democracy Project

Max J. Dubin

University of Pennsylvania, MaxJDubin@gmail.com

This paper is posted at Scholarly Commons. <http://repository.upenn.edu/curej/48>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Educating Undergraduates for Democracy and Efficacy and the 2006 Penn Democracy Project

Abstract

Most political socialization research has focused on children, because this formative time provides the foundation for an individual's political self. However, both life experiences and changing societal roles of an individual as he/she ages suggests that political values can change throughout life. In particular, the lifecycle has certain moments that are particularly apt to political growth. One of these moments is college. Universities are currently rediscovering an important goal of their institution - preparing citizens for positive participation in society. Further, students are at an important "role changing moment," as they move from childhood to adulthood.

The college moment is the focus of the Penn Democracy Project. This study has surveyed Penn undergraduates over four years to understand what effect the undergraduate experience has on students. The study has found that college brings profound personal change and challenges, and on the whole, causes students to be less civically minded. Even students who had strong political influences as children are not immune to the pressures of this period.

This paper does not attempt to argue whether universities should have a responsibility to focus on the political socialization of its students. Every study of childhood development acknowledged the role of the classroom in political socialization, and current movements argue that universities should devote more attention to this as well. The paper only argues that universities do have a significant impact on students, and as an important institution in a democracy, can improve how it affects students. Overall, the study suggests that college is a transitional stage for students, and has a negative affect on student values. However, there are many opportunities to change that, and steer students in a positive direction, graduating civically minded scholars. In particular, schools can focus on empowering students – showing them that they can make a difference in the problems they see in society. The college experience for many can be discouraging, but a focus on building efficacy and showing students that they have the ability to impact their classroom, campus, or community can encourage democratic development.

Keywords

Political Socialization, Higher Education, College, Democratic Values, Democratic Development, Efficacy, Social Sciences, Henry Teune, Teune, Henry, Political Science

Educating Undergraduates for Democracy and Efficacy
and the 2006 Penn Democracy Project

by

Max Dubin

This thesis is submitted for fulfillment of

**Bachelors Degree in Arts
Department of Political Science
University of Pennsylvania**

2007

Advisor: Dr. Henry Teune

Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary	2
II.	Political Socialization	5
	a. Childhood Development and Family	
	b. Old Views on College	
	c. New Theories on College	
III.	The Penn Democracy Project	11
	a. Project Overview	
	b. Methodology	
	c. Penn Index	
	d. Values Index	
	e. Path Model for Political Socialization	
	f. Efficacy	
IV.	Conclusion	34
V.	Appendixes	37
	a. Further Survey Analysis	
	b. Penn Democracy Project 2006 Upperclassman Survey	
VI.	Bibliography	59

I. Executive Summary

In 2005, Margaret Spellings, the U.S. Secretary of Education commissioned a working group to study the state of American universities and make a board set of recommendations of how the country's university system should prepare itself for the future. The commission received a great deal of attention in the summer of 2006 as drafts were leaked that questioned the value of many higher education institutions. However, the final report highlighted the priorities of many people. It frequently noted a need to be "competitive in a globalizing world," and "workplace skills." Wherever the commission described the meaning behind a college diploma, the report stated that students should be prepared for a "knowledge economy." In every draft, there is no mention on developing students' values and role as a citizen or encouraging the university to be community centers. This omission is the result of disagreement about the role of the university in a democracy and on the political development of students.

Herbert Hyman, in 1959, established the study of political socialization. The theory attempted to explain how political values were passed down through generations. A surge of interest in the topic quickly followed. Researchers generally concluded that most political socialization occurred in childhood. Children absorbed concepts of authority, responsibility, and lawfulness from their families, and then through schools and peer interaction. However, by the end of the 1970s, interest in the field waned. Much of the attention had been fueled by the Cold War, with political scientists trying to understand how citizens became entrenched in democratic values in a world where an opposing set of political values existed in the Soviet Union. As political tensions eased, so did interest in the subject. A reemergence of research in political socialization has

occurred in the 1990s. The break up of the Soviet Union brought an explosion of new democracies, begging the question, how do people new to a democracy adjust?

Most political socialization research still focused on children, because this formative time provides the foundation for an individual's political self. However, later work has looked at continued political development (Culter and Steckenrider 1989). Both life experiences and changing societal roles of an individual as he/she ages suggests that political values can change throughout life. In particular, the lifecycle has certain moments that are particularly apt to political growth. One of these moments is college. Universities are currently rediscovering an important goal of their institution - preparing citizens for positive participation in society. Further, students are at an important "role changing moment," as they move from childhood to adulthood.

The college moment is the focus of the Penn Democracy Project. This study has surveyed Penn undergraduates over four years to understand what effect the undergraduate experience has on students. The study has found that college brings profound personal change and challenges, and on the whole, causes students to be less civically minded. Even students who had strong political influences as children are not immune to the pressures of this period.

This paper does not attempt to argue whether universities should have a responsibility to focus on the political socialization of its students. Every study of childhood development acknowledged the role of the classroom in political socialization, and current movements argue that universities should devote more attention to this as well. The paper only argues that universities *do* have a significant impact on students, and as an important institution in a democracy, can improve how it affects students. Overall,

the study suggests that college is a transitional stage for students, and has a negative affect on student values. However, there are many opportunities to change that, and steer students in a positive direction, graduating civically minded scholars. In particular, schools can focus on empowering students – showing them that they can make a difference in the problems they see in society. The college experience for many can be discouraging, but a focus on building efficacy and showing students that they have the ability to impact their classroom, campus, or community can encourage democratic development.

II. Political Socialization

The rules of society are not inherent knowledge, but must be learned. Preparation for participation in democratic society involves the inculcation of the values of a democracy. This process, by which political values are passed down generations, is known as political socialization. Judith Tourney writes that “Political socialization research attempts to describe what is learned about political life, from whom, at what stage in life, under what mediating conditions, and with what effects for the individual (and the political system).¹” Most political socialization theory emerged in the 1960s and 70s in response to the Cold War, and the desire to ensure the durability of democratic values. In a democracy, citizen is a role individuals take on. Orit Ichilov (1989) describes different aspects to this role. In particular, there is a set of beliefs one must take on. Democracies are founded on the belief that everyone gets the opportunity to vote and that their opinion counts equally to others. There are also participatory parts of citizen, for example, people are expected to follow the law. What makes being a citizen in a democracy unique is that all of these expectations are choices each individual makes. Citizens must choose to participate in society, consider the common good, or respect others’ rights of others to do the same. These qualities are learned, through family, school, and peer interaction. Disagreement arises about when these lessons are learned, and after that, if they can ever change.

Childhood Development and Family

Most childhood political socialization studies focuses on how young people develop their feelings towards the United States government. Merelman (142) chronicles a series of studies that connect how authority and protection relationships established in

¹ Tourney pg 26

the family translate into attitudes towards the President and then political leaders in general. Children connect the President, policemen, and parents as similar figures – protective, benevolent, and possessing authority. This explains the building of faith and trust in the political system, but does not expand into deeper democratic values. Studies on youth efficacy, the feeling that they can make a difference, are mixed. Some show slight increases over childhood (Easton and Dennis: 1967) but generally, strict authority structures in schools hinder that growth (Hess and Torney: 1967). Efficacy is an important democratic value that will be studied in the next chapter.

The role of the school and family in political socialization of children is the center of childhood socialization studies. Families play an important role in childhood development. Described earlier, the parent is the reference point for children in understanding government authorities. However, the role of the school is described as much weaker in early work. Langton and Jennings (1968) report that high schools make little change in most students, and that there is “no relationship between participation in extracurricular activities and student political orientations².” However, these reports do indicate that students not exposed to political participation at home do benefit. A 1968 study by Langton found minority students were engaged and benefited from civics classes much more than other high school students. This new exposure can be a beneficial supplement to their dearth of political socialization at home.

Studies of adolescents were few, even in the heyday of political socialization theory of the 60s and 70s. Merelman even says “It could be argued...that the ambiguity of adolescent political orientations should serve as a warning to investigators that most of the important political orientations are formed in childhood, and that little of consequence

² Pg 150

is to be learned from further attention to adolescence (143).” Some claims that adolescent political socialization does not matter lean on arguments that young adults reject authority at this point in their lives, and are not open to political change. Merelman reports that half of 12th grade high school students identify themselves as independents. He concludes that a lack of party affiliation points to little development or interest in politics.

Old Views on College Development

Many of the studies on political development of young people end at age 16. They reveal that intellectual development from childhood to adolescence connects to political development from a world of rules to a world of laws. Children are able to understand politics in a more abstract way, for example, understanding the presidency separately from the President. A greater understanding of history allows young people look at the institutions and symbols of a country as long standing and puts leaders and issues in context. This accumulation of knowledge is important in young political development, expanding their understanding of government in their lives. More arguments against college age development can be found in a study by Philip E. Jacob³ found that college students rarely change their values and beliefs, despite efforts by schools to do so. However, he does make an exception. Teachers who are passionate and expressive about these values can often inspire and spark change in students. This occurs at institutions that allow for close discourse between students and professors, and where professors are encouraged to express their values judgments. Profound impact on the values and political development of college students can only occur at schools that make concerted

³ Jacob, 50

efforts to create an atmosphere for the sharing and challenging of values. Tead⁴ argues that introspection of values should occur in every discipline.

New Theories on College

The Universities as Sites for Democratic Development project believes that the college years are still ones of formation of political beliefs. The project argues that the life cycle for a student has changed, adulthood comes later and children have more time to learn and form civic values. In its founding document, Frank Planton writes “The presumption of this research project (and an unstated hypothesis) is that the phenomena of delayed adolescence, or what we prefer to call the deferral of adult responsibilities (independence, jobs, marriage, family responsibilities, etc.) has fundamentally altered previous generalizations about the political socialization of youth. Contemporary delays in the onset or achieving of political consciousness or identity underscores the salient role of the university today in shaping democratic attitudes and a sense of civic responsibility.”

For example, an older study argues that little change occurs after childhood. Easton and Dennis (1969) found that by age twelve most political viewpoints are set in place. This was the standard belief for most of the early political socialization movement. A key problem with the Easton and Dennis study was that there was no comparative data over time. Instead, data was compared over generations, with similar distributions of responses, but did not account for dynamics within these aggregate numbers. Longitudinal studies emerged that argued that there was significant change over time. Of particular interest was party affiliation and salient political issues. These proved to be more transient than expected. While change in party affiliation does show that all

⁴ Tead, 16

political beliefs are not permanent, political party affiliation can indicate reaction to specific events, and not a change in fundamental beliefs. In the United States, partisan affiliation changed significantly from the Vietnam War and Watergate, but that does not indicate large changes in the democratic values of the nation.

Deviating from early political socialization theory, contemporary research believes that political change can occur throughout life. Roberta Siegel writes that “Political dispositions do not become frozen at the end of the adolescent period (as once believed) but that change of varying degrees continues throughout the entire life course.⁵” One category of explanations is that traumatic events shape adult political development. In particular, war can alter the political outlook of participants and civilians experiencing national trauma. Young people, including soldiers, measured lower trust and high alienation towards the government following the Vietnam War (Laufer 1989). Current events such as war, national scandal, or terrorism are all cited as traumatic events that can shape political values. Another reason for change in political outlook by adults is a changing role in society. As an individual’s lifecycle progressed, he/she is faced with new positions in society and new responsibilities. Marriage, parenthood, and old age are examples of these changing roles.

College is another one of these moments. Gordon Direnzo argues that socialization is not consistent. Social change forces new generations to adopt reformulations of political values held by prior generations. Also, a change in status leads to new outlooks and responsibilities, and a changing political outlook. He describes the time around college as “realist shock,” and the “movement from one social position to

⁵ Siegel pg 459

another” can lead to “the learning-unlearning-relearning” of political values⁶. A similar model was described by David Sears⁷. He argues that too much emphasis is put on childhood political socialization. He argues that issue stances, and other political opinion indicators are dynamic. But, some viewpoints do remain the same, like party identification. He suggests studying how political values persist as time goes on, insisting that they evolve due to changing roles in society, outside influences, or just life experience, yet their ability to change may diminish with age.

These studies suggest that political socialization continues on past childhood. Important experiences or traumatic events can spur change in values. College is one of these defining moments. It pushes children to change roles and enter adulthood. This moment is an opportunity for students to “relearn” their beliefs, and the next section will study how schools can take advantage of this to create democratically minded citizens.

⁶ Drenzo pg 37

⁷ Sears, 73

IV. The Penn Democracy Project⁸

Project Overview

The Penn Democracy Project began in the spring of 2003 as a study of how the undergraduate experience shapes students' democratic development. This project arose from the belief that universities are important actors in democracies to educate the future leaders of countries. The 1998 Wingspread Declaration set the objectives of this project. The declaration, a product of a consortium of universities and higher education associations, argued that universities were originally intended to "educate for democracy." This goal has been lost in a capitalist world where schools focus on vocational education, trying to equip its graduates with as many tools to excel in a comparative global job market. This is not completely a failing of schools; its consumers, students, request this as well. Education is a market good, and students invest a great deal of money to attain college - they want to be learn "practical" knowledge for the workplace. In the 2006 Penn Democracy Project survey, students were asked what the primary goal of an undergraduate education should be. Only four percent answered "Fostering in students an inclination and ability to serve the common good." The overwhelming majority, sixty-eight percent, answered that schools should "Develop highly intelligent and creative students," and the rest of the respondents choose evenly, about fourteen percent each for preparing students for careers and for admission to graduate school. The majority choice is not a bad one, schools primarily should develop intellect and creativity, however, the small interest in training for the common good has

⁸ The 2006 upperclassman survey can be found in Appendix 1. The freshmen survey is identical, with a few changes in questions. Notably, knowledge questions are changed to reflect that recently matriculating students have not have the ability to learn about their new city and community. Further, some questions are modified from asking what activities they participate in to what they *plan* to participate in.

pushed it out of the campus over the years. The weight of the twenty eight percent who concern themselves only with getting top jobs and admittances has overwhelmed the higher callings of higher education.

The Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Civic Responsibility is a study on how to recapture the civic spirit of universities. The project studies how universities can better prepare graduates to be active citizens and also be centers for democracy for their communities. This project, and many others like it, is a sign that there is a reemergence of focus civic education at universities. In this spirit, the Penn Democracy Project is a study of the democratic development of Penn undergraduates. The survey is comprised of four sectors of citizenship.

Literacies and Understandings	Includes understanding of the workings of local and national government, and basic civic knowledge. It also includes knowledge of university government structures.
Competencies and Communications	Includes dialogue and discourse about political and social issues, like debate or challenging others who you disagree with. Also includes the breath and variety of news sources exposed to..
Values and Dispositions	Includes beliefs about human nature competitiveness, and what role government should have in society. Also, personal values, like feelings of efficacy, self wroth, civic responsibility, and ability to improve oneself.
Actions and Engagements	Includes active participation in politics. Including participation in university governance, voting, contacting public officials, volunteering, and protesting.

Methodology⁹

⁹ The 2005 and 2006 administrations were prepared and executed by the author. The pilot and 2004 study were run by other students.

The project survey, in its fourth year, has changed its survey methods slightly ever year. The survey was administered online. In the pilot study in spring 2004 tested one-on-one interviews, as well as paper and digital questionnaires. The results for the different tests were indistinguishable, and an online method was chosen. A sample was used for the first full administration. However, that 2004 survey left many questions about how small segments of the population acted, an especially important problem was that much of the undergraduate experience occurs in small, “self-segregated” groups, not in broad categories like year of study or schools.

The 2005 survey was expanded from a sample of the student body to a study of the population. The census approach was intended to allow closer inspections of these small Penn student communities. Overall, the response rate was low. In the 2004 survey, students were able to be targeted and volunteered to complete the survey. In 2005, the population was too large to encourage response directly. The low response rate prevented any accurate study of groups around Penn that the census had been designed to do. Little new information arose from the 2005 survey, and the 2006 survey returned to a sample, taking 250 students from each class. However, additional subjects were added. In 2005, students were able to volunteer to participate again to create a database for a longitudinal study which allows comparison of the same student between years. This list added 445 unique subjects to the study. Additionally, all of the nursing school students were sampled because the school is small, and a sample of it would result in too few responses for accurate analysis. The survey was also reformatted, so answers were easier to enter on the website and shortening the contact time.

For all of the iterations of the survey, similar publicity methods were used. In particular, students were first emailed to participate in the survey by the Penn Democracy Project. After two mailings, students involved in the project emailed direct requests to participate. Response rates for 2005 and 2006 follow.

Figure 1: Response Rates

Year	Class Size (2005)	Response Rate 2005	Response Rate 2006
Freshmen	2726	11.6	19.4
Sophomore	2386	13.6	26.6
Junior	2047	12.1	19.3
Senior	2981	6.6	20.8
Total	10140	11.3%	21.8

Response rates are relatively similar between classes, and are much higher with the sample in 2006 than the 2005 census.

Penn Index¹⁰

The Penn Index was a tool designed to aggregate the data across the survey into a simple measure. The index weights each of the four dimensions of the project equally, trying to capture the different aspects of citizenship without giving added weight to any dimension. The index is effective at finding hints trends of democratic development across the undergraduate schools and years. There are limitations to the index as well. Made from forty-five questions, the index can show general trends, but is too large to allow understanding of these changes. The large number of variables dampens the effect of each one, hiding patterns within the index. Finding important connections in the index are also difficult, since many of the survey's questions are already included in the score.

¹⁰ The Penn Index was developed in the spring 2004 Political Science class PSCI 291: Citizenship and Democratic Development by Henry Teune, Tavis Morello, and Anthony Inguaggiato. In the fall of 2005, Max Dubin reformatted the scoring and weighting of the index, while retaining the same theory behind it, notably measuring the four dimensions of the index equally.

Finally, many of the questions are “experiential” and can be significantly affected by current events. For example, Literacies and Understanding tests political knowledge, but testing understanding of the Supreme Court is changed when vacancies on the bench are filled and respondents are exposed to an unusual amount of information on the court. When this happened in 2005, the question on how nominees for the court were confirmed was dropped and other questions had to be reweighed. Similarly, in a presidential election year, more opportunities for canvassing and protesting are available, skewing the results. The Penn Index, however, does provide an important starting point for the study. Below are the mean and median scores for the 2006 study. The total score could range from 7 to 86.

Figure 2: 2006 Penn Index Data¹¹

	Penn Index Mean	Penn Index Median	Std Dev
Freshmen	52.1	52.5	13.08
Sophomores	55.8	56.7	14.77
Juniors	56.8	60.1	14.36
Seniors	62.1	64.4	11.56
College of Arts and Sciences	60.4	62.5	12.75
Wharton Business	52.1	55.2	15.10
Engineering	59.0	60.6	11.45
Nursing School	48.0	46.8	13.09

Some features of the 2006 Penn Index scores are similar to previous iterations of the survey. The College of Arts and Sciences has scores the highest Index mean every administration of the survey and the nursing school the lowest. A strange result is the

¹¹ For visual depictions of the 2006 data, see the histograms in Appendix B

high scores for the engineering school, which typically rank third in scoring. While the response rate for engineering students was sufficient, a break down of group found that forty percent were also students in another school, most commonly the College of Arts and Sciences. Without these dual-degree students, the engineering scores fall, but the sample size gets to small to make broad characterizations. The data also shows that there is a steady increase in scores over the undergraduate years. The 2005 data also showed this, while the 2004 and pilot data showed a significant drop in the sophomore year and a steady increase in the junior and senior years. The 2005 and 2006 administrations had strong response rates and careful data collection, aided by the experience of past years, and the general agreement between the two sets of data on the broad Penn Index measure suggests that the data are accurately capturing the college experience at Penn.

Values Index

As stated above, the Penn Index is adequate for rough generalizations, but a better measure needed to be developed that would allow more accurate comparison between samples and over time. Political socialization theory of children focuses first on the development of their attitudes towards authority and government (Easton and Dennis: 1967, Merelman 1990 and 1989). They view these institutions as benevolent, and learn to trust them. Political values, such as these, will become the center of focus for the study because it allows for the best comparison over time. While values are dependant on personal experiences, a values centered approach removes the year to year bias of elections, which provide inflated opportunities to participate in political events, or classes that refresh civic knowledge.

The primary political values question is question sixteen¹². The question is a series of thirteen statements about citizenship and personal responsibility that the subject is asked to respond to. A factor analysis of the thirteen questions found three powerful clusters of questions. This finding is particularly significant since the same exact clusters are found in the 2004, 2005, and 2006 data. In each cluster, three questions dominated in the factor weighting. These questions were pulled out and analyzed for connections. Each cluster had a clear underlying principle, Efficacy, Participation, and Civic Responsibility. The groupings are listed below.

Efficacy	
16.B	I feel that I could do as good a job in public office as most people.
16.C	I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics.
16.D	I feel I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing our country.
Participation	
16.E (Inverted)	So many other people vote in the national election that it doesn't matter if I vote or not.
16.F (Inverted)	The complexity of modern day issues requires that only the more simple questions should be considered publicly.
16.M (Inverted)	Participation of the people is not necessary if decision-making power is left in the hands of a few competent leaders.
Civic Responsibility	
16.I	It is my responsibility to get involved to make things better for society.
16.K	Being a good citizen means having some special responsibilities.
16.L (Inverted)	Being a good person is enough to make someone a good citizen.

The responses in each cluster suggest that the three traits are consistent indicators in the survey. A positive response to one efficacy question often was paired with positive

¹² See Appendix A

responses in the other two. The responses to these nine questions were aggregated to measure the total values score¹³. The mean scores for 2006 are in Figure 3.

Figure 3: 2006 Values Index Means¹⁴

	Values Index Mean	Std Dev
Freshmen	25.9	3.60
Sophomores	26.8	3.29
Juniors	26.1	3.29
Seniors	27.8	3.21
College of Arts and Sciences	27.3	3.26
Wharton Business	25.6	3.31
Engineering	26.9	3.29
Nursing	25.7	3.56

This Values Index score, which ranged from 9-36, was tested to see if it could pick up trend as well as the Penn Index. The Index mimicked all of the correlations that the Penn Index had. Dropping the other categories, including civic knowledge, and actions and engagements, the new index still had the same predictive power. This indicates that these three values capture variation across the survey and are central to understanding the undergraduate experience in this study¹⁵.

The Political Socialization of Matriculating Students

To understand what impact the Penn undergraduate education has on students, a brief study on life prior to college can be presented. There are few questions probing students' background, however family influence provides a rudimentary view of political development. Michael Riccards explains that the family can have a significant effect on

¹³ Negatively phrased questions E, F, M, and L were inverted, so that high scores reflected the more democratic response.

¹⁴ The notes describes for the 2006 Penn Index, for example, the high number of dual degree respondents in the engineering school, apply to these scores as well.

¹⁵ See Figure A.4 and 5 in Appendix A for a breakdown of the longitudinal data on the Values Index.

children's' political socialization. His study finds that in particular, family influences party affiliation, trust and tolerance of authority, and tolerance of others. These are formative democratic values. Riccards focused on the role of parents. In authoritarian homes, children tend to push away from their family's values. But, families that discuss politics openly tend to be more politically homogenous and engaged. A study by Kenneth Prewitt highlights the importance of childhood political socialization in a study of American political leaders. He finds that over half of surveyed political leaders point to their homes and schools as the source of interest in politics. However, these early engagers tended to be more partisan than leaders who enter political life later. They describe their reason for participation in the political spheres as highly partisan and competitive. However, leaders who become politically motivated later in life cite reasons like civic responsibility and calling. Riccards writes that "The family does lay the early foundations of partisanship, efficacy, self-esteem, information, trust, and morality."¹⁶

The Penn study asks respondents about their exposure to politics in the home in order to put the college experience in context. The findings of many background questions conclude that the differences in lifestyle manifest few differences in political socialization. The Penn data shows no significant correlation between household income or other family factors and democratic development. No significant correlations exist between community engagement or values development and attendance at public or private schools or homes in urban or suburban schools¹⁷. Religiosity also has no


¹⁶ Riccards 48

¹⁷ Other variables in these categories were tested, but samples are insufficient to make general claims. Only 24 respondents attended parochial schools and only 41 students identified themselves from rural areas. Both variables proved to also show no correlation, positive or negative, with any democratic development variable, further strengthening the findings that many of these background variables have little impact on political socialization.

predictive properties for these measures. More surprisingly, family income shows no connection with democratic socialization; however, the limits of the Penn study could explain this discrepancy. No matter what background students have, to matriculate at Penn, they must be academically accomplished. The average family income of respondents is also skewed, with half reporting an income of greater than \$100,000. While these exceptions may change the results some, the level of education achieved by parents is highly correlated with democratic development. The higher level of education achieved by both the mother and the father is positively correlated with engaging in the community and participating in political activities. However, both show no connection with the development of democratic values. Parent's education proves to be a better measure than the other background questions because it incorporates more exposure to political questions as children. The effect that may exist in family income is likely to be incorporated by education level while also capturing household discourse.

The education level of parents is powerful. 0041 simpler variable that has a much higher predicative power is how often politics is discussed in the home. This exposure to political ideas and debate significantly affects scores over all four years of college. Students were categorized as having discussed politics frequently moderately, or rarely in the home, and compared by their values index scores. The results in Figure 4 show significant differences in the dispersion of values scores, with students who discussed politics in the home frequently having a significant advantage entering school.

Figure 4: Values Scores by Discussion of Politics in the Home



Political socialization in early life stratifies undergraduates into statically different groupings that determine how they will develop during the college years. Respondents exposed to moderate political discourse in the home are generally moderate democrats, having the smallest standard deviation. Most political socialization theory argues that political values are established early in life. These graphs argue that is true, to a limit. Home life clearly sets important foundations, but there is a great deal of overlap and

variation in the groups. The college years also have variation, and are not fully explained by political socialization at home. Figure 3 showed the variation in change of political values over a year period. If the college experience still matters after exposure to politics in the home, the next concern is what differentiates the different groups established in Figure 4. There are many variables that ask about experiences at schools. Within each exposure group, correlations were measured between the values index and variables concerning the college experience. The variables with significant correlations are listed in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Significant Explanatory Variables for Variation in each Childhood

Socialization Group

Discuss Politics Frequently in the Home (Group 1)	Discuss Politics Moderately in the Home (Group 2)	Discuss Politics Rarely in the Home (Group 3)
Marches, Protests, Boycotts	Vote in National Elections	Will Challenge Derogatory Statements on Race and Beliefs
Challenge Professors in Class	Challenge Professors in Class	Challenge Professors in Class
Interaction in West Philadelphia	Interaction in West Philadelphia	Involved in Solving Problems in Home Community
Political Debate in Class	Take Leadership Positions	Political Debate in Class
Discuss Controversial Issues	Discuss Controversial Issues	Discuss Controversial Issues
Political Knowledge (Literacies and Understanding)	Take Classes that Challenge Your Views	Take Classes that Challenge Your Views
	Take Discussion Based Classes	Take Discussion Based Classes
	Participation in Student Government	
	Help solve Problems in the University Community	

The highly correlated factors were matched up in regressions to test how the chosen variable could predict values index scores. For a concise model, only groups of three variables were considered at a time. For students exposed to little politics at home, their

differences in political values are easily explained by school experiences. Many combinations of three variables listed above produced R-Squared of .5, meaning that 50% of the variation in the values scores for these students can be explained by the three variables in the regression. One strong example is a regression of “Political debate in class”, “Challenging Professor’s opinions”, and “Taking discussion heavy classes.” These variables indicate that students who were not exposed to politics in the home are establishing democratic values in the same way as youth, through the classroom and debate of ideas. Engagement remains a marginal factor for these students. The strength of the regression models for these students does show the large impact that these classroom experiences have for identifying developing democrats.


Students exposed to moderate or high amounts of political discourse are harder to model, since there are more differences in these subjects. For moderate exposure, regression models could explain 25% of the difference, using the variables “Political debate in class,” “Interacting with West Philadelphia,” and “Taking discussion heavy classes.” This is still a strong model, and the variables applicable to this group of students, shows how diverse their experiences are. Open discourse is still important, with “Participating in political debate” the strongest correlation, but in this group, interaction in the community outside of campus and actions define differences in the democratic development of these students. The most difficult group of students to define is children frequently exposed to political discourse. On one side, deep political engagement is one defining difference in this group. The high values index scorers in this group have translated their heavy exposure to politics into involvement in campaigns, boycotts, protests, and writing letters on important issues. The robust backgrounds these students

have make these actions a defining characteristic of this group. However, on the other end of the spectrum, there are some students exposed to politics in the home, but score low values scores. A surprising characteristic of this group is that these students score particularly low on general civics knowledge questions (Literacies and Understandings). This only appears as an important variable for these highly exposed students. It appears that some students reject the political sphere completely despite exposure. Tourney (1975) writes that many young people reject politics as a rebellion to parents and authority. This phenomenon is likely happening in all three groups, but only in the group most exposed to politics is it an important cleavage. It indicates that students who have been exposed to politics in a significant way may have already embraced or rejected political interest. Some students are highly motivated; others seem to avoid participation completely.

Many of these students translate their childhood experiences into active political participation on campus, and are actually strengthening their sense of civic duty. However, some seem to turn away from the political sphere completely, and many just loose resolve over the years. Even though in general, students exposed to a good deal of politics as children have high political values, college is a negative experience, even for them.

The interaction of these moments lends itself to a path model. Figure 6 shows the progress of the political values index that arises from this data. Students begin with their childhood political socialization experience. They are exposed to different amount of

Figure 6: Path Model for Values Index



political discourse in the home, a proxy for this socialization, and begin college at approximately different democratic values levels. Next, college acts as a moment of transition, where students are exposed to positive influences, like political debate, research, and community service, and negative ones, like excessive competition or the feeling of powerlessness on campus. The lines during the college moment represent the different college experiences of the groups. The progress on these lines is explained by the appropriate variables listed in Figure 5¹⁸. For example, as students with frequent political exposure at home progress through college, they can be separated by their


¹⁸ The groups mentioned here are listed in Figures 5 on page 23. They refer to variables that have a high explanatory power for high, moderate, and low democrats.

responses to Group 1 variables like “Participation in Marches, Protests, and Boycotts¹⁹.” The regressions describes in conjunction with those variables are represented by these lines (A, B, C). This stylized model represents the overall decrease in the Values Index, and shows how each set of variables effects students over time. While childhood socialization sets an important foundation, but no matter how intense it was, college can still bring change.

Efficacy

In the longitudinal study, the Values Index was predicted to rise. The participants in the longitudinal study had to volunteer to participate, and even of those, only twenty percent participated, suggesting that these were motivated students. However, the change in Values Index between 2005 and 2006 dropped, considerably (Figure 7). Even in the short amount of time, values scores were not durable.

Figure 7: Change in Values Index Score Between 2005 and 2006



This finding led to a series of focus groups on the subject. In November 2006, five focus groups of Penn undergraduates convened to cover a range of topics relating to democratic

development²⁰. On the subject of values, several common themes arose. First, students described an intense level of competition. One business student explained that focus on job placement begins in the freshmen year, and can become overwhelming. In 2006, when asked what the primary goal of an undergraduate education should be, none of the students who lowered in their values score answered learning to service the common good, and 25% of them answered to get into good graduated schools or jobs (students whose value scores increase answered this only 15% of the time). However, when students were asked “Almost all humans are competitive with most other humans,” 83% disagreed. This response may be due to the broadness of the question, which suggests almost all human interaction is driven by competition. There is more variation on “Almost all humans have the potential for collaboration that exceed their potential for personal ambition.” The responses were split, with only 50% agreeing. This suggests that many students still feel that while society in general may be benevolent, as individuals, personal ambition supersedes the common good.

Students also spoke about feeling lost in the activity of school. In ever administration of the survey, freshmen have responded with overwhelming interest to try activities and take advantage of the opportunities at school. But in the focus groups, students said that it became harder to become established in these groups, that they had little influence or responsibility in groups unless they devoted themselves to becoming officers. They used similar language about their classes, saying that they moved in and out of semesters generally unnoticed in the classroom. Students said that this wasn't the

²⁰ The focus groups were not run by the author. They were an assignment for the Political Science 291 seminar on Citizenship and Democratic Development. The author instead observed the focus groups, and requested that the moderator ask a series of questions relating to democratic values. Two groups were random collections of students, while the other three focused on specific subsets of the population, including Fraternity and Sorority members, business students, and athletes.

case for every class, but they frequently took courses that involved listening to lectures, completing their evaluations, and then moving on. In group, the respondents agreed to a term for this, “sleepwalking.”

The students from the focus group were trying to explain that they feel unempowered at school. The Values Index was finding the same phenomenon. The components of the index ask if respondents feel they can make a difference in their community, or even if their participation in elections matter. To better understand this, the index scores were correlated with variables that measured participation at school to see what activities highly empowered students tended to participate in, and what disengaged students particularly avoid. The strongest correlations are listed in Figure 8.

Figure 8: Pearson Correlations of Indexes and Campus Activities²¹

	Penn Index	Values Index	Actions and Engagements Dimension
Participation in Extracurricular activities (measures number of activities and amount of commitment to each)	.089	.239**	.173**
I Challenge My Professors’ Opinions	.296**	.364**	.189**
Try to Solve Problems in My University Community	.233**	.132**	.309**
I Try to Solve Problems in My Home Community	.294**	.209**	.253**
I Interact with People in West Philadelphia Beyond Campus	.170**	.248**	.216**
Take Classes where I have My Views Challenged	.323**	.337**	.252**
Take Classes that Debate Controversial Issues	.431**	.450**	.269**
Take Classes with Significant	.164**	.181**	.122**

²¹ This table is of Pearson correlations with the Indexes. The Actions and Engagements Dimension is included separately from the Penn Index to see the connection between the campus activities listed in column 1 and political actions like voting or participating in elections. Correlations listed are the coefficients of the correlation. Coefficients with two asterisk (**) indicate that they are significant to the .01 level (two tailed test), a strong indication that these connections are not due to chance.

Discussion			
Have Leadership Positions on Campus	.182**	.077	.237**
Engage Peers in Political Debate	.442**	.493**	.239**

The correlations match what students were describing. Values, and efficacy²² in particular, are the key to understanding democratic development in undergraduates. First, students who scored high on the Values Index challenged themselves in the classroom. They take classes where they debate and discuss frequently and challenge their own views. This environment helps students escape the trap of “sleepwalking.” Classes where they interact allow them to add to the academic debates and produce valuable outputs. The question on discussion based classes was added for the 2006 survey, and is a powerful predictor of democratic development. In standard lecture classes, students can easily pass through the semesters answering exam questions, but never pushing themselves to add original ideas. Participating in more democratic classrooms encourages efficacy because students do not just produce ideas, but give them value to others by sharing.

Engagement in the university community is another venue for increasing efficacy. The University as Sites of Citizenship project states that part of universities’ commitment to democracy should include participation in the community around the school. Robert Putnam (2001) argues that young Americans now express themselves politically through community service. The Penn Democracy Project finds that participation in the community is an important way that students strengthen their sense of efficacy. However, the correlations in Figure 9 show, quality is important as well. The index scores are significantly correlated with interaction and problem solving in the outside community.

²² Efficacy is one of many terms that can be used to describe this concept. Negatively, it is powerlessness. Efficacy can be understood as a feeling of impact, that an individual can

However, general categories like participation in for credit and not for credit community service do not show important correlations. The difference is that actual participation in West Philadelphia allows students to see what differences they can make, and learn and react to the community in the process. This kind of interaction gives students the tangible results that they need to see how they can impact society. General community service may not have that. In the focus groups, some students described feeling that much of their community service was a waste of time. When asked what activities they participated in, they listed card making or cleaning parks. While these are noble causes, they add to the feeling of powerlessness - that their actions make little difference, and they turn off from participation.

Figure 9: Community Service Pearson Correlations

		Values Penn Index	Penn Index	Efficacy Questions
For Credit Community Service	Pearson Correlation	.093	-.065	.044
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.067	.224	.382
	N	391	356	396
Not for Credit Community Service	Pearson Correlation	.092	.015	-.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.068	.779	.852
	N	391	357	398
Interact With the West Philadelphia Community	Pearson Correlation	.248**	.170**	.151**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.003
	N	392	359	399
Help Solve Problems in the University Community	Pearson Correlation	.132**	.233**	.159**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.000	.001
	N	393	359	400

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Finally, extracurricular activities are an opportunity for students to feel more efficacious. Extracurricular participation provides direct political experience. Dawson and Prewitt (1969) describe this as an “apprenticeship mode” of political socialization, where young people participate in their own democratic institutions, and learn about participation, disagreement, and compromise. Clubs are ways for students to participate in small, manageable democratic organizations that can lead to lifelong participation in society. Research on student groups has generally shown that these organizations are places young people can hone their democratic values. M. Margaret Conway writes that “Skills, attitudes, and values are developed [in youth groups] that can be transferred to political participation to politically more relevant groups.²³” The Penn survey asks students what sorts of organizations they belong to and the amount of commitment that they have in each one. The weighted average of these responses gives a measure of extracurricular participation, but rewards deep commitment in activities considerably²⁴. Overall, higher index scores correlated significantly with more participation in activities. Figure 10 separates students in the top 50% of Values Index scores and shows the difference in weighted activities with lower scoring students. While higher value students are only slightly higher on average, they skew right, meaning higher Values Index students tend to be more committed to the activities they participate in.


Higher commitment to extracurricular activities is correlated to higher values scores because students who participate deeply are able to be influential in the groups. It

²³ Conway Pg 299

²⁴ In the numerator, each activity was given a score, 1 for low commitment to 4 for heavy commitment. This was divided by a weighted average. The lower the commitment, the higher the denominator. Ex. A low commitment activity was worth 1, while a high commitment was worth .25, so when divided, high commitment was weighted over involvement in many activities weakly.

is not enough just belong to groups; students strengthen their efficacy when they can make a difference, and work with fellow members to come to agreements on issues and organize events. In the focus groups, students said that clubs could be discouraging because they felt they had no voice.

Figure 10: Extracurricular Participation by Valued Index Score



Like community activities or a democratic classroom, well run clubs can provide an opportunity for students to act passionately and see the impact their actions make on others. This becomes clearer when looking specifically at what organizations correlate most strongly with high political scores.

Figure 11: Campus Activities Correlations

		Values Index	Penn Index	Efficacy Questions
Athletics	Pearson Correlation	.111*	.031	.135*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.028	.557	.007
	N	393	359	399
Student Government	Pearson Correlation	.078	.140**	.166**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.125	.008	.001
	N	392	358	398

Cultural Organizations	Pearson Correlation	.062	.055	-.015
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.221	.304	.761
	N	392	358	398
Pre-Professional Clubs	Pearson Correlation	.022	-.123*	-.031
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.668	.020	.538
	N	393	359	399
Political Advocacy Organizations	Pearson Correlation	.367**	.334**	.382**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
	N	393	359	400
Religious Originations	Pearson Correlation	-.051	-.035	-.048
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.312	.511	.342
	N	393	359	399
Academic/Honors Clubs	Pearson Correlation	.120*	-.007	.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.017	.902	.113
	N	391	357	397
Publications and Media	Pearson Correlation	.113*	.077	.151**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.026	.149	.003
	N	390	357	396
Performing Arts	Pearson Correlation	.051	-.040	-.040
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.313	.452	.427
	N	389	355	395
Fraternities and Sororities	Pearson Correlation	.157**	.067	.191**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.207	.000
	N	392	359	398

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Looking at the Penn Index and efficacy score, origination that encourage democratic participation, teamwork, debate, and tangible results are the most encouraging for democratic values. Unsurprisingly, political advocacy student government, and publications groups are highly correlated. They encourage students to become active and give them opportunities to make decisions and see its impact. Surprisingly, athletic teams and fraternities and sororities also score high on values. They follow the same model. They give students small communities where as teammates or brothers, they make decisions, work together, and have many opportunities to be leaders and make a difference in their organization.

IV. Conclusion

The college years are a moment of transition for students, which opens the opportunity for significant change in students' political outlooks. Students are put in highly competitive environments, are independent for the first time in their life, and need to start considering post graduation plans. Further, they are now members of a larger school community, where the classroom and extracurricular activities can be impersonal. These changes can be disaffecting for students. In 2006, students were asked how efficacious they feel.

Reflecting on the problems you see in society, how much a difference do you believe *you* can personally make in working to solve the problems you see?

No Difference At All	2.0%
Almost No Difference	13.9%
A Little Difference	34.2%
Some Difference	36.7%
A Great Deal of Difference	12.9%

These responses are startling. Undergraduates at a top research university do not feel empowered to affect the world around them.

Chapter III looked at the characteristic of highly efficacious students and what their undergraduate experience was like. First, these students did not all come from very political homes. Some started with a strong democratic foundation growing up in a house where the family debated political issues, but many of these students became disengaged over the years. Similarly, many students who started without these influences improved over college. Students who continued to grow politically were in environments that showed them that they could make significant impacts around them. For some, this can be in the classroom, where students are challenged to create and defend original ideas. This process makes a college education not just about absorption of information, but

adding to the conversation. Students are also empowered by working in the community. Students can apply their studies and passions to making real improvements in their community. This is particularly important because it is a tangible experience, not just an academic exercise. Students can see how they can apply their studies for the common good – a goal of higher education that many students do not cite as important. Finally, students can empower themselves in peer-to-peer interaction in campus groups. It is crucial that this is not just surface participation, but deep commitment, where students engage their group members, participate in decisions, and help in participation. Students who responded that they had a leadership position on campus correlated very strongly with values scores and engagement in the community.

This data is Penn specific. Until similar studies are preformed at schools across the country, it is impossible to know if the Penn Democracy Project is a single case study of the college experience, or an anomaly. Further, all cohorts in the study are members of the same generation. They have been shaped by the same political events and debates. Studies across generations would be needed to understand if the phenomenon of dynamic political values and low sense of efficacy is due to the college experience, or distinct events of the period, like the war on terror or a highly partisan electorate. However, it is clear that political socialization does not end at childhood, and that the undergraduate years are an important moment of transition for students. Political values are dynamic at this time, changing even over one year. Universities who want to graduate civically minded scholars need to focus on how to encourage efficacy. In the classroom, students should be challenged more and pushed to do original research, which allows them to

permanently add to the academic debate²⁵. Schools should also encourage more outlets to apply their studies to the community, whether local or global, to see how their studies can directly effect change. Schools can also encourage deeper participation on campus by opening new ways for students to effect policy or giving them the resources to see through significant projects. Whatever policies are enacted, they should encourage a feeling of student impact, that they are not powerless to make change. These experiences will hopefully provide the foundation for further civic engagement through adulthood.

²⁵ Appendix A has a study on school majors and democratic development, which shows how different teaching methods and disciplines may affect political values.

Appendix A

The following is additional data from the Penn Democracy Project in 2005 and 2006.

Some data is further detail on items mentioned in the paper, other figures are not, but add to the understanding of the survey results and the arguments made in the paper.

Figure A.1: Graphs of the Penn Democracy Index by Year (2006)





Figure A.2: Graphs of the Values Index by Year (2006)

Values Index (9Qs)


Freshmen



Values Index (9Qs)

Values Index (9Qs)


Sophomores



Values Index (9Qs)

Values Index (9Qs)


Juniors



Values Index (9Qs)

Values Index (9Qs)

Seniors



Values Index (9Qs)

Figure A.3: Correlations between Majors and Indexes

Respondents' majors were categorized by the listings below. Correlations between the majors and Indexes reveal that Social Sciences and Humanities are strongly correlated with political values and engagement, further supporting the conclusions that active debate is positive for political values. Hard Wharton business majors were significantly negatively correlated with values.

Social Sciences – Political Science, Economics, Sociology...

Hard Sciences – Biology, Chemistry...

Hard Wharton – Accounting, Finance...

Soft Wharton – Marketing, Business and Public Policy

Humanities – Languages, Arts ...

Correlation Coefficients

	Actions and Engagement Dimension	Penn Index	Values Index
Social Science Major	.168**	.311**	.252**
Hard Science Major	-.091	-.197**	-.079
Hard Wharton Major	-.117*	-.068	-.117*
Soft Wharton Major	.029	.063	.026
Humanities Major	.169**	.134*	.040

**** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

*** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

Figure A.4: Longitudinal Change in Extracurricular Activities

The following graphs the difference between aggregate campus activities over 2005 and 2006. The score is the total number of organizations affiliated with, weighted by the amount of commitment to the activity (Range from 12-48). The graph shows that students significantly change the amount and commitment of activities even over one year. Many increase, and an equal number decrease.





Figure A.5: Change in Values Index by Change in Activities

The longitudinal data is split between students who increase campus activity over the 2005-2006 year and decrease. The following are graphs of the Values Index distribution for each of these groups. The results are that both groups have an average drop in values scores, but students who are less engaged on campus are also more likely to lower in valued score, and also more likely to drop lower. However, in both groups, there are students with considerable increases in scores.

Change in Values Index


Change in Activities is Negative



Change in Values Index 2005-2006

Change in Values Index

Change in Activities is Positive



Change in Values Index 2005-2006

Appendix B: The Penn Democracy Project Upperclassman Survey 2006

**Penn Democracy Project
Sophomore, Junior, and Senior Survey 2006**

1) What is your idea of a good citizen in a democracy?

2) How involved are you in the following activities at Penn?

	Not at All	A Little	Somewhat	Very
For-Credit Community Service (in a seminar or class)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-Credit Community Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Varsity/Club/Intramural Sports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student government (includes Undergraduate Advisory Boards)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cultural/Support Organization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pre-Professional Groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Political/Advocacy Organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Religious Groups	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic/Honors Organizations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publications and Media	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Performing Arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Greek Life / Social Clubs or Societies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3) We know that most Penn students don't vote in student government elections. Usually between one-quarter to one-half of those eligible actually vote. Did you vote in the last student government election?

- a. Voted
- b. Did Not Vote

4) If you did not vote, what was the primary reason?

- a. Just not interested.
- b. Dislike politics.
- c. Unfamiliar with candidates and/or issues.
- d. Feel student government is ineffective.
- e. Other (please indicate):

5) In the past 12 months, have you taken part in a march, demonstration, protest, or rally?

- a. No, have not done it
- b. Yes, have done it, but not in last 12 months
- c. Yes, have done it, and within last 12 months
- d. Have done it, don't know whether in last 12 months or not

6) In the past 12 months, have you contacted or visited a public official - at any level of government - to ask for assistance or to express your opinion?

- a. No, have not done it
- b. Yes, have done it, but not in last 12 months
- c. Yes, have done it, and within last 12 months
- d. Have done it, don't know whether in last 12 months or not

7) In the past 12 months, have you bought/not bought a certain product or service because you like/dislike the social or political values of the company that produces or provides it?

- a. No, have not done it
- b. Yes, have done it, but not in last 12 months
- c. Yes, have done it, and within last 12 months
- d. Have done it, don't know whether in last 12 months or not

8) In the past 12 months, have you worked as a canvasser - having gone door to door for a political or social group or candidate?

- a. No, have not done it
- b. Yes, have done it, but not in last 12 months
- c. Yes, have done it, and within last 12 months
- d. Have done it, don't know whether in last 12 months or not

9) Have you ever been a founding member of a student group on your campus?

- a. Yes
- b. No

10) Have you ever run or applied for student government or an undergraduate advisory board?

- a. Yes
- b. No

11) Have you ever enrolled in a class that you thought might challenge your political or cultural beliefs?

- a. Yes
- b. No

12) How likely are you to:	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Very Likely
Challenge derogatory comments pertaining to Race?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Challenge derogatory comments pertaining to Religion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Challenge derogatory comments pertaining to Sexual Orientation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Challenge derogatory comments pertaining to Gender?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Challenge a professor with whom you disagree?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13) We know that most citizens don't vote in all elections. Usually between one-quarter to one-half of those eligible actually vote. How often do you vote in local and national elections?

- a. Always
- b. Sometimes
- c. Rarely
- d. Never

14) If you answered "Rarely" or "Never," what is the primary reason?

- a. Just Not Interested.
- b. Dislike Politics.
- c. Unfamiliar with candidates and/or issues.
- d. Feel powerless and unable to change things.
- g. Other (please indicate):

15) Who is the Secretary of State

- a. Donald H. Rumsfeld.
- b. Thomas Ridge.

- c. Colin L. Powell.
- d. Condoleeza Rice.

16) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. If people were treated more equally, we would have fewer problems in this country.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. I feel that I could do as good a job in public office as most people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I feel I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing our country.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. So many other people vote in the national election that it doesn't matter if I vote or not.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The complexity of modern day issues requires that only the more simple questions should be considered publicly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Every citizen should have an equal chance to influence government policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The government has a responsibility to make sure everyone has a job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. It is my responsibility to get involved to make things better for society.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. It is my choice to get involved to make things better for society.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Being a good citizen means having some special responsibilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

l. Being a good person is enough to make someone a good citizen.

m. Participation of the people is not necessary if decision-making power is left in the hands of a few competent leaders.

17) Reflecting on the problems you see in society, how much a difference do you believe *you* can personally make in working to solve the problems you see?

- a. A great deal of difference.
- b. Some difference.
- c. A little difference.
- d. Almost no difference.
- e. No difference at all.

18) How often do you interact, either formally or informally, with the residents of West Philadelphia outside of Penn's campus?

- a. Very Often.
- b. Often.
- c. Occasionally.
- d. Almost never.
- e. Never.

19) How often do you use the following sources to find out about news?

	At least once a day	Once every few days	Once a week	Not at all
Print Media (newspapers, magazines, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Television Media (local news, network news, cable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

news)

Radio Media

Internet Media (msnbc.com, cnn.com, etc...)

20) Have you ever worked informally with someone or some group to solve problems in the *University City/West Philadelphia Community* If *yes*, was this in the last 12 months or not?

- a. Yes, within the last 12 months.
- b. Yes, but not within the last 12 months.
- c. No, haven't done it.
- d. Don't know.

21) Have you ever worked informally with someone or some group to solve problems in *your home community* If *yes*, was this in the last 12 months or not?

- a. Yes, within the last 12 months.
- b. Yes, but not within the last 12 months.
- c. No, haven't done it.
- d. Don't know.

22) How often do you engage in the following practices?

	Not often at all Valuable	Somewhat often Valuable	Often Valuable	Very Often Valuable
a. Working cooperatively with diverse people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Having your views challenged	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Discussing and negotiating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

controversial issues

d. Engaging in political or social debate with your friends

23) The University City Science Center...

- a. ...is located on Market Street between 34th and 38th streets, resting on the site of a once vibrant neighborhood now called the "Black Bottom."
- b. ...was built in the early 1990s by Daniel Libeskind, Penn's Paul Philippe Cret Professor of Architecture, who is known for his winning design of the World Trade Center memorial.
- c. ...came to financial ruin in the early 1970s after only five years in existence and is regarded as the most costly venture in the history of the University.
- d. ...was welcomed by residents of West Philadelphia as a means of using science and technology to improve the quality of life in their community.

24) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Almost all humans are competitive with most other humans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Almost all humans have a potential for good that exceeds their potential for bad.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Almost all humans have a potential for honesty that exceeds their potential for dishonesty.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Almost all humans have a potential for collaboration that exceeds their potential for personal ambition.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Almost all humans have the potential to make intelligent, moral decisions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| f. Almost all humans put their own self-interest ahead of the common good. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Almost all humans are prejudiced or intolerant of others. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Almost all humans have the capacity to collaborate with others. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

25) In the past 12 months, did you contribute money to a candidate, a political party, or any organization that supported candidates?

- a. No, have not done it
- b. Yes, have done it, but not in last 12 months
- c. Yes, have done it, and within last 12 months
- d. Have done it, don't know whether in last 12 months or not

26) In the past 12 months, did you volunteer for a political organization or candidate(s) running for office?

- a. No, have not done it
- b. Yes, have done it, but not in last 12 months
- c. Yes, have done it, and within last 12 months
- d. Have done it, don't know whether in last 12 months or not

27) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

- | | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. The world is divided into two parts: the weak and the strong. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. People of different backgrounds should have different rights and responsibilities. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- c. Democracy requires schooling systems that produce citizens who work for the common good.
- d. Democratic societies are only possible if almost all citizens can achieve their potential for good.

28) What should be the primary goal of an undergraduate education?

Please choose only one of the following

- a. Preparing students for specific careers.
- b. Developing highly intelligent and creative students.
- c. Preparing students for admission to top graduate programs.
- d. Fostering in students an inclination and ability to serve the common good.

29) Please identify the branch of student government that specializes in:

- | | UA
Disagree | SCUE | NEC | SPEC |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Issuing proposals related to the academic curriculum. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Organizing class and university wide social events. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Running elections. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Improving campus policy and distributing over \$1 million to its sister branches. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

30) Who is the mayor of Philadelphia?

- a. Ed Rendell
- b. Rick Santorum
- c. Sam Katz
- d. John Street

31) In the line of presidential succession, the vice president is followed by

- a. Secretary of State.
- b. President Pro Temp of the Senate.
- c. Speaker of the House.
- d. Secretary of Homeland Security

32) What is the Declaration of Independence?

- a. A document passed by the American colonies that defines the fundamental American civil liberties that government cannot defy.
- b. A text that ensures a system of "checks and balances" by clearly defining the powers of the President, federal courts, and Congress.
- c. A three-part document issued by the American colonies that includes a discussion of the rights of man and a lengthy list of grievances aimed at King George III.
- d. The first Constitution of the United States, which was written during the early stages of the American Revolution and called for a strong central government.

33) The USA PATRIOT Act...

- a. ...was passed on the first Memorial Day of the new millennium and commended the Minutemen for their service at Lexington and Concord.
- b. ...gave the President the power to declare war on any state aiding and abetting terrorists.
- c. ...was passed in the wake of September 11th and mandated significantly reduced immigration from all nations other than the major Western democracies.
- d. ...gave law enforcement agencies greater surveillance and investigative powers through amendments to such laws as the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA).

34) Which of the following is not a permanent member state of the United Nations Security Council

- a. United States
- b. Russian Federation
- c. United Kingdom
- d. Japan
- e. Both "b" and "d"

35) All of the following are democracies *except for*:

- a. Mexico
- b. South Korea
- c. Saudi Arabia
- d. Germany
- e. Both "b" and "c"

36) In political matters, people often talk of "liberal" and "conservative." On a scale of 1 to 10, with one being the most liberal and 10 being the most conservative, where do you think your views fall generally speaking?

37) Since your arrival on campus for the fall semester, have you been contacted or approached to register to vote?

- a. Yes
- b. No

38) If you were contacted or approached, did you register or change your registration status as a result?

- a. No, and I am not registered to vote.
- b. No, and I am registered to vote.
- c. Yes, and I registered for the first time in Pennsylvania.

- d. Yes, and I changed my registration to Pennsylvania from another state.

39) How many courses have you taken in which discussion is a significant part? (Include current classes)

- a. None
 b. Very Few
 c. Few
 d. Many
 e. Most

40) Have you ever been elected or chosen for a leadership position at an organization at Penn?

- a. Yes
 b. No

Background Information

1) School (check all that apply)

- College
 Engineering
 Wharton
 Nursing

2) Majors(s)/Concentration(s)

3) Minor(s)

4) Class

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

5) Are you a transfer student?

- Yes
- No

6) Sex?

- Male
- Female

7) Are you a US citizen?

- Yes
- No

8) Are you currently registered to vote for state/national elections?

- a. Yes
- b. No

**9) Please indicate the group or groups in which you would include yourself.
(Check all that apply)**

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> African American | <input type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islander |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caribbean American | <input type="checkbox"/> Mexican American |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caucasian (including Middle Eastern) | <input type="checkbox"/> Puerto Rican- Commonwealth |

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese | <input type="checkbox"/> Puerto Rican- Mainland |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Korean | <input type="checkbox"/> Cuban American |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Latino:
<input type="text"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Filipino | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese-Laotian-
Cambodian | <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
<input type="text"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> South Asian-Indian-Pakistani | |

10) In what type of area were you raised?

- Rural
- Suburban
- Urban

11) In what country or US state were you raised?

12) What type of high school did you attend?

- Public
- Parochial
- Private
- Other

13) What was the approximate size of your graduating class?

- <50
- 50 to 100
- 101 to 250
- 251 to 500

>500

14) What is the highest degree that your parents attained?

	Some High School	High School or Equiv.	Some College	College	Graduate or Professional
<i>Mother</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Father</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15) Mother's Occupation?

16) Father's Occupation?

17) What is your approximate household income?

- < \$30,000 / year
- \$30,000 - \$50,000 / year
- \$50,000 - \$70,000 / year
- \$70,000 - \$100,000 / year
- > \$100,000 / year

18) How religious do you consider yourself?

- Very religious
- Religious
- Somewhat religious
- Not religious

19) How many semesters have you lived in each of the following locations while at Penn (including this semester)?

Quad:

Mayer :

Hill: Sansom Place:
KC/EH: Greek (on or off campus):
High Rises: Off Campus (West Philly):
Dubois: Off Campus (Center City):
Gregory: Abroad:
Stouffer: N/A:

20) What are your plans after graduation?

- a. Law School
- b. Medical School
- c. Other Professional or Graduate School
- d. Work
- e. Service (e.g., Teach for America, Peace Corps, Americorps)
- f. Military/Armed Services
- g. Undecided

22) When you were growing up, how often were politics discussed in your household?

- a. Regularly.
- b. Sometimes.
- c. Rarely.
- d. Never.

Bibliography

- Boyte, Harry, and Elizabeth Hollander. "Wingspread Declaration." Wingspread Conference (1999).
- Conway, Margaret M. "Fostering Group-Based Political Participation." Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy (1989): 297-312.
- Delli Carpini, Michael X. "Age and History: Generations and Sociopolitical Change." Political Learning in Adulthood (1989): 1-55.
- DiRenzo, Gordon J. "Socialization for Citizenship in Modern Democratic Society." Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy (1989): 25-46.
- Ichilov, Orit, ed. Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy. New York: Teachers College P, 1990.
- Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Jaros, Dean. Socialization to Politics. New York: Praeger, 1973.
- Kezar, Adrianna J., Tony C. Chambers, and John C. Burkhardt, eds. Higher Education for the Public Good. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- Laufer, Robert S. "The Aftermath of War: Adult Socialization and Political Development." Political Learning in Adulthood (1989): 415-455.
- Merelman, Richard M. "The Role of Conflict in Children's Political Learning." Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy (1990): 47-66.
- Merlman, Richard M. "The Adolescence of Political Socialization." Sociology of Education 45 (1972): 134-166.

- Morello, Tavis, Max Dubin, and Anthony Inguaggiato, eds. The Penn Model, Index, and Survey. 30 June 2005. Democracy Project of the Center for Community Partnerships.
- Oldham, Cheryl, comp. United States. Department of Education. A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education. Sept. 2006.
- Owen, Diana. "Service Learning and Political Socialization." PS: Political Science and Politics 33 (2000): 638-640.
- Planton, Frank. Council of Europe. Universities as Sites of Citizenship and Civic Responsibility. Feb. 2002.
- Putnam, Robert D. Bowling Alone. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.
- Riccards, Michael P. The Making of the American Citizenry. New York: Chandler Company, 1973.
- Sigel, Roberta S., ed. Political Learning in Adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago P, 1989.
- Sears, David O. "Whither Political Socialization Research?." Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy (1989): 69-97.
- Strang, Ruth. "Democracy in College." The Journal of Higher Education 11 (1940): 33-37.
- Tead, Ordway. "Emphasis on Values in College Teaching: the Ethical Aspect of Education." The Journal of Higher Education 31 (1960): 14-20.
- Torney, Judith V., A N. Oppenheim, and Russell F. Faren. Civic Education in Ten Countries. Stockholm: Halsted P, 1975.