

Service Learning and Non Service Class Impacts

On the Political Values and Attitudes

Underlying Civic Engagement

By Frank Cooney Ph.D.

Frank Cooney Consulting Services

Research Project Report For the SLCC Thayne Center

May 18, 2005

**Service Learning and Non Service Class Impacts
On the Political Values and Attitudes Underlying Civic Engagement**

| Table of Contents | |
|---|------|
| Content | Page |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Methodology | 2 |
| Findings | |
| The Value Placed on Keeping Up to Date on Political Affairs | 3 |
| Registered to Vote | 6 |
| Political Efficacy: Internal | 8 |
| Political Efficacy External | 10 |
| Political Trust | 12 |
| Satisfaction with Democracy | 15 |
| Social Trust | 17 |
| Degree of Interest in Present Political Campaigns and Presidential Winner | 19 |
| Attention to Media Campaign News | 21 |
| Student Assessments of Class Impacts | 23 |
| Conclusions | 32 |
| Bibliography | |
| Appendices | |
| A: Survey questionnaire | |
| B: Student Beginning of Class Political Attitude Survey | |

Service Learning and Non-Service Class Impacts on the Political Values and Attitudes Underlying Civic Engagement

By Frank Cooney Ph.D.
May 2005

Executive Summary

In the fall semester of 2004, the Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) Thayne Center supported four courses specifically designed to foster civic engagement by combining course content with service learning in the community.

Support for these courses was made possible by a grant from the Federal Corporation for National and Community Service to the Thayne Center for the purpose of strengthening service learning at Salt Lake Community College and fostering the institutionalization of service learning into the academic programs.

An extensive review of the literature was conducted on civic responsibility, civic engagement, political behavior, values and attitudes, and the outcomes of service learning courses. Prominent in the literature is the concern for low levels of civic engagement in America, particularly among young adults. Analysts see widespread citizen disengagement from political affairs as undermining the citizen involvement necessary to foster a healthy democracy and effective government.

Political scientists and sociologists have extensively researched political involvement and over the last four decades there has emerged a considerable body of literature on the values, attitudes and skills underlying the political dimension of civic engagement. Borrowing from these findings, a research plan was created to compare student political values and attitudes at the beginning and end of the semester in four service learning courses and compare the findings to similar courses without service learning.

The beginning of class survey was conducted during a one-week period from August 26 through September 3rd. The end of class survey was conducted after the Thanksgiving holiday break through the first week of December. The four sponsored service learning courses were: US Government & Politics, Political Science 1100 section 9, taught by David Hubert; American Civilization, History 1700 section 29, taught by Dawn Martindale; US History to 1865, History 2700 section 2, taught by Marianne McKnight; and, Race to Save the Planet, Environmental Technology 1010 section1 taught by Deanna Anderson

Through the collaboration of the History Department coordinator, Virginia Davidson and Political Science Department coordinator, Shari Sowards, all instructors of History 1700 and Political Science 1100 in the fall 2004 semester were invited to participate in a study of student political values and attitudes. The faculty were informed that the report results would keep all specific class identities anonymous.

This invitation resulted in a comparison group of 41 non-service learning classes that completed both the beginning and end of class survey. The 41 History and Political Science classes combined with the four service learning classes contained a total of 1,331 students in the beginning of class survey and 921 students at the end of the term survey.

It is clear from the findings that the classes studied varied greatly in their impact on students. The service learning classes were exemplary in fostering positive changes in some of the variable measured. The classes with a service component had significantly higher impacts than non-service classes on the following variables:

- ❖ Keeping up to date on political affairs
- ❖ Registering to vote
- ❖ Internal political efficacy
- ❖ Social trust
- ❖ Attention to media news on government and politics

The service and non-service classes had similar outcomes for:

- ✓ External political efficacy
- ✓ Political trust
- ✓ Satisfaction with democracy
- ✓ Interest in presidential winner and the political campaign

The similarity of outcomes noted above is affected by the fact that, for the most part, these four variables did not change in any classes.

The findings suggest that a number of the classes increased students' knowledge, skills and abilities relative to politics and government. Furthermore, many students indicate that they are aware of these changes and, in general, many feel they personally achieved a better understanding of government and politics.

However, the unchanged attitudes may be very significant for the students future civic engagement. Specifically, they report low levels of political trust in government and elected officials. They perceive that government is primarily run for the benefit of special interests. There is widespread belief that elections do not necessarily make government pay attention to what people think. All of these attitudes undermine the worth and meaning of voting. The following table details the start and end of semester findings on political trust.

| Percent of students who stated they believe: | Start % | End % |
|---|---------|-------|
| Government is run for the <u>benefit of all</u> the people? | 30 | 29 |
| Elections makes the government pay attention to what the people think <u>a good deal</u> | 31 | 35 |
| <u>Just about always or most of the time</u> you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right | 46 | 48 |
| <u>Not very many or hardly any</u> people running the government are crooked | 48 | 53 |

Paradoxically, 72 percent of the students state they are satisfied or fairly satisfied with the way democracy works in the United States. This attitude did not change during the study interval. Given students' negative attitudes toward government and officials noted above, the report discusses a number of possible interpretations of this seeming contradiction.

The data above represents the results for all students in the analysis. However, it is clear from the findings that classes varied greatly in their impact on students. The service learning classes were exemplary in fostering positive changes in some of the variable measured.

Individual service learning classes stood out for some of the variables studied.

Class SL_D had the highest increase in the value and importance of keeping up to date on political affairs followed by non service classes 43 and 29.

Class SL_B had the highest increase in voter registration followed by classes 21 and 24.

Class SL_D had the second highest increase in reported attention to the news after the highest increase found in class 30.

Class SL_B had the third highest increase in the presidential campaign after non-service classes 6 and 7.

It can be concluded that the service component significantly increases the likelihood that a class will foster some of the values, beliefs and attitudes that underlie civic engagement. Based on the variables measured in this research, it can be concluded that out of the 45 classes studied, service classes SL_B and SL_D had the greatest positive impact on the students relative to factors underlying civic engagement.

However, it needs to be noted that a few of the non-service classes had comparable results. There were particularly outstanding outcomes measured in non-service classes 43, 29 and 7. The results for all classes are contained in the full report.

Service learning and civic education are based on the belief that through the development of knowledge, skills and abilities, civic engagement can be fostered. The research findings lend support to the distinctive learning value of classes with a service component. Unfortunately, the findings do not provide reasons to encourage optimism that a service experience can overcome the existing strong political distrust of government and disillusionment with elected officials.

The findings in this research suggest that when the actions of government and political leaders continue to severely disillusion citizens, service learning education alone cannot be expected to foster a renewal of civic engagement.

Service Learning and Non-Service Class Impacts on the Political Values and Attitudes Underlying Civic Engagement

Introduction

In the fall semester of 2004, the Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) Thayne Center supported four courses specifically designed to foster civic engagement by combining course content with service learning in the community. The support for these courses was made possible by a grant from the Federal Corporation for National and Community Service to the Thayne Center for the purpose of strengthening service learning at Salt Lake Community College and fostering the institutionalization of service learning into the academic programs.

The Corporation holds that the fostering of civic responsibility is an essential component of the definition of service learning and service learning activities should be designed to build the participant's civic values and attitudes, civic knowledge, behavior and skills. The Corporation Grant also requires outcome assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of the service learning courses to foster civic engagement.

An extensive review of the literature on civic responsibility, civic engagement, political behavior, underlying values and attitudes and the outcomes of service learning courses was conducted. Prominent in the literature is concern for low levels of civic engagement in America, particularly widespread citizen disengagement from political affairs. (Ehrlich. 2000) (Keeter et al. 2002) (Carpini. 2000) This political disengagement is seen as undermining the citizen involvement necessary to foster a healthy democracy and effective government. The central issue is whether service learning can foster political engagement. (Gottlieb and Robinson. 2002) (Walker. 2002) (Eyler. 2001) (Westheimer & Kahne. 2003)

Political scientists and sociologists have extensively researched political involvement. Over the last four decades there has emerged a considerable body of literature on the values, attitudes and skills underlying the political dimension of civic engagement. (Morrell.2003) (Levi and Stoker. 2000) (Rahn & Transue. 1998) (Macedo et al. 2004) (Winter. 2003)) Borrowing from these findings, a research plan was created to compare student political values and attitudes at the beginning and end of the semester in these four courses and compare the findings to comparable courses without the service learning component.

This report will detail the overall semester change and class to class variation on the following variables:

- The importance of keeping up to date on political affairs
- Voter registration
- Internal political efficacy
- External political efficacy
- Political trust
- Satisfaction with democracy
- Social trust
- Degree of Interest in political campaign news and presidential winner
- Attention to media campaign news
- Student assessments of the impact of their class

Methodology

The beginning of class survey was conducted during a one-week period from August 26 through September 3rd. The end of class survey was conducted after the Thanksgiving holiday break through the first week of December. A total of 45 service learning and non service learning classes were involved in the survey at both time periods.

The four sponsored service learning courses were:

US Government & Politics, Political Science 1100 section 9, taught by David Hubert

American Civilization, History 1700 section 29, taught by Dawn Martindale

US History to 1865, History 2700 section 2, taught by Marianne McKnight

Race to Save the Planet, Environmental Technology 1010 section1, taught by Deanna Anderson

Through the collaboration of the History Department coordinator, Virginia Davidson and the Political Science Department coordinator, Shari Sowards, all instructors of History 1700 and Political Science 1100 in the fall 2004 semester were invited to participate in a study of student political values and attitudes. This invitation resulted in a comparison group of 41 non service learning classes that completed both the beginning and end of class survey. The 41 History and Political Science classes combined with the four service classes contained 1,331 students in the beginning of class survey and 921 students at the end of term survey.

The survey political values and attitude questions were drawn from a number of sources. The value of keeping up to date on political affairs was one of seven values questions in the annual survey of college freshmen conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. (HERI.2005) This survey is the largest and longest running monitoring of the values and beliefs of new college students in the country.

The survey of political attitudes by the American National Election Studies at the University of Michigan provided the political efficacy questions. (National Election Studies. 2004) Michael Morrell's article in Public Opinion Quarterly, "Survey and Experimental Evidence for a Reliable and Valid Measure of Internal Political Efficacy", provided a valuable synthesis of this literature. (2003)

Levi and Stroker's article in the Annual Review of Political Science, "Political Trust and Trustworthiness" provided a useful synthesis on the political trust literature. (2000) Rahn and Transue's article in Political Psychology, "Social Trust and Value Change: The Decline of Social Capital in American Youth, 1976-1995" provided a similar synthesis for social trust. (1998)

A full discussion of these sources and the review of the literature are contained in appendix A. The complete survey questionnaire with all questions and responses are provided in appendix B.

Findings

The Value and Importance of Keeping Up To Date on Political Affairs

The students were asked at the beginning and then again at the end of the semester how important it was to them personally to keep up to date with political affairs. The question as stated seeks a general overall assessment and leaves the meaning of the word political to each respondent's interpretation. It does not specify how a person keeps up to date, how much time is required or any specifics about what a citizen must know. For our understanding, the term political can be defined as the organization or action of individuals, parties or interests that seek to control the appointment or action of those who manage the affairs of a state. (Webster's. 1958)

Support for democracy in America is generally regarded as an essential for citizenship and that principle leads to the belief that to keep informed and up to date on the affairs of government is necessary in order to be a good citizen. This question on the extent that keeping up to date and staying informed is important can be considered as the single most important question in the survey.

Overall Semester Change

Very few SLCC students in the study held the view that keeping up to date is essential, either at the beginning or the end of the semester. Only 12 percent (155 of 1,331) held that view at the start and that figure rose only to 17 percent (152 of 920) by the end of the term. The following table details the beginning and end student responses on the value of keeping up to date on political affairs.

Value of Keeping Up to Date

| Importance level | Beginning of Semester | | End of the Semester | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------|---------------------|-----|
| | % | n | % | n |
| Essential | 11.6 | 155 | 16.5 | 152 |
| Very important | 43.3 | 576 | 46.6 | 429 |
| Somewhat important | 40.3 | 536 | 33.3 | 306 |
| Not important | 4.8 | 64 | 3.6 | 33 |
| Totals | 100.0 | 1331 | 100.0 | 920 |

When the "essential" and "very important" responses above are combined, the percentage giving importance to keeping up to date by the end of the term rose from 55 percent to 63 percent. The moderate rise of eight percent can be viewed as a positive reflection of the courses involved in the study. However, the fact that over a third of the students did not value keeping up to date on political affairs suggests the extent of civic disengagement in this survey group. The next variable to be examined in this report, voter registration, provides a second indicator of civic engagement or disengagement.

Overall Semester Change in Non Service versus Service Learning Classes

The statistical mean for the class responses will be used to compare the average response for the classes. The calculation of the mean was based on a five-point response scoring system. For the value of keeping up to date question, the “essential” response was scored as a five, very important a 4, somewhat important a 2, and the “not important” response as a one. A non-response was scored as a 3. A class mean of 4.00 would indicate that the average response was “very important”. A class mean was less than 4.00, would indicate that less than half the students held that keeping up to date was very important or essential.

The four service learning classes had twice the amount of increase as non service classes relative to the value and importance placed by the students on keeping up to date on political affairs. The research found a 17 percent increase in the service classes as a whole from an average response score of 3.16 to 3.70.

| Importance of Keeping Up to Date on Political Affairs | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------|--------------|--------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Beginning of semester | | | | End of semester | | | | | |
| Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Change | Percent change |
| Non service | 129.4 | 41 | 3.16 | Non service | 139.81 | 41 | 3.41 | 0.25 | 8.0% |
| Service | 12.65 | 4 | 3.16 | Service | 14.8 | 4 | 3.70 | 0.54 | 17.0% |

Class Variations

The table on the following page shows the beginning and end of class means for each class and the amount of change. Eight of the classes had a very significant change of, 0.64 or more, which is, more than a 20 percent increase over the semester. In addition, 18 classes had modest increases in the 10 percent range. Of these classes, fifteen showed increases and 3 classes decreases in the value of keeping up to date.

The four service learning classes are identified with the letter SL and A, B, C, or D to distinguish the four classes. The class identification numbers and letters will be kept constant in all subsequent tables. (e.g. “SL_A” is always the same class)

Three out of four of the service learning classes had significant student increases (20%+ and 15%) in keeping up to date. One service learning class did not have a significant change. The class “SL_D had the single highest increase among all 45 classes (+ 0.92). Five non-service learning classes had statistically similar averages of .85, .79 and .73.

Overall and individually, the service learning classes are exemplary relative to increasing the students’ value placed on keeping up to date on political affairs.

While three service classes showed significant change, it can be seen that the amount of change in the value of keeping up to date on political affairs is not distinctive from some of the other classes. Ten non-service classes (24%) exceeded the average service learning class gain of 0.54.

Value of Keeping Up to Date on Political Affairs: Beginning and End by Class

| Classes Sorted High to Low on Percent Change | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| Beginning of Class | | | | End of Class | | | | |
| Course # | Mean | N | Std. Dev. | Course # | Mean | N | Std. Dev. | Change |
| SL_D | 2.86 | 14 | 0.949 | SL_D | 3.78 | 9 | 1.093 | 0.92 |
| 43 | 2.97 | 29 | 1.239 | 43 | 3.82 | 22 | 1.097 | 0.85 |
| 29 | 2.71 | 34 | 1.088 | 29 | 3.50 | 26 | 1.175 | 0.79 |
| 21 | 2.84 | 25 | 1.106 | 21 | 3.60 | 20 | 1.142 | 0.76 |
| 3 | 3.39 | 28 | 1.031 | 3 | 4.13 | 16 | 0.719 | 0.73 |
| 2 | 3.00 | 13 | 1.354 | 2 | 3.70 | 10 | 1.252 | 0.70 |
| SL_C | 3.26 | 23 | 1.287 | SL_C | 3.94 | 16 | 1.063 | 0.68 |
| 30 | 2.97 | 33 | 1.185 | 30 | 3.64 | 25 | 1.150 | 0.67 |
| 7 | 3.15 | 20 | 1.137 | 7 | 3.77 | 13 | 1.092 | 0.62 |
| 10 | 3.67 | 24 | 0.702 | 10 | 4.27 | 15 | 0.458 | 0.60 |
| 4 | 3.27 | 26 | 1.151 | 4 | 3.85 | 13 | 0.899 | 0.58 |
| 40 | 2.91 | 35 | 1.011 | 40 | 3.46 | 28 | 1.105 | 0.55 |
| SL_B | 3.07 | 28 | 1.303 | SL_B | 3.56 | 32 | 1.294 | 0.49 |
| 14 | 3.76 | 25 | 0.926 | 14 | 4.24 | 17 | 0.752 | 0.48 |
| 28 | 2.78 | 27 | 1.155 | 28 | 3.24 | 21 | 1.136 | 0.46 |
| 1 | 3.33 | 27 | 1.177 | 1 | 3.76 | 17 | 1.251 | 0.43 |
| 11 | 3.00 | 26 | 1.058 | 11 | 3.43 | 14 | 1.158 | 0.43 |
| 5 | 3.40 | 20 | 1.095 | 5 | 3.81 | 16 | 0.911 | 0.41 |
| 6 | 3.41 | 39 | 1.069 | 6 | 3.81 | 31 | 1.078 | 0.40 |
| 18 | 2.92 | 25 | 0.997 | 18 | 3.31 | 13 | 1.182 | 0.39 |
| 20 | 3.27 | 30 | 0.907 | 20 | 3.64 | 25 | 1.036 | 0.37 |
| 22 | 2.89 | 28 | 1.166 | 22 | 3.26 | 27 | 1.196 | 0.37 |
| 8 | 3.41 | 32 | 1.103 | 8 | 3.74 | 27 | 1.318 | 0.33 |
| 38 | 3.12 | 34 | 1.122 | 38 | 3.42 | 24 | 1.176 | 0.30 |
| 23 | 3.14 | 28 | 1.044 | 23 | 3.38 | 21 | 1.161 | 0.24 |
| 35 | 3.03 | 30 | 1.098 | 35 | 3.25 | 12 | 1.138 | 0.22 |
| 19 | 3.16 | 25 | 1.143 | 19 | 3.38 | 16 | 1.310 | 0.22 |
| 33 | 3.30 | 33 | 1.132 | 33 | 3.48 | 23 | 1.275 | 0.18 |
| 37 | 2.83 | 36 | 0.941 | 37 | 3.00 | 31 | 1.317 | 0.17 |
| 34 | 3.03 | 34 | 1.058 | 34 | 3.16 | 25 | 1.281 | 0.13 |
| SL_A | 3.46 | 24 | 1.179 | SL_A | 3.53 | 19 | 1.389 | 0.07 |
| 45 | 2.94 | 32 | 1.162 | 45 | 3.00 | 21 | 1.095 | 0.06 |
| 24 | 3.60 | 25 | 1.041 | 24 | 3.65 | 17 | 1.169 | 0.05 |
| 13 | 3.30 | 33 | 1.015 | 13 | 3.25 | 20 | 1.070 | -0.05 |
| 42 | 3.06 | 31 | 1.153 | 42 | 3.00 | 29 | 1.439 | -0.06 |
| 17 | 3.00 | 14 | 1.038 | 17 | 2.93 | 14 | 0.997 | -0.07 |
| 41 | 2.79 | 34 | 1.067 | 41 | 2.72 | 25 | 1.208 | -0.07 |
| 12 | 3.31 | 35 | 1.323 | 12 | 3.23 | 22 | 1.193 | -0.09 |
| 26 | 3.03 | 31 | 1.110 | 26 | 2.94 | 16 | 1.124 | -0.09 |
| 25 | 3.57 | 30 | 1.165 | 25 | 3.46 | 13 | 1.050 | -0.11 |
| 44 | 3.21 | 33 | 1.139 | 44 | 3.09 | 23 | 1.083 | -0.13 |
| 39 | 3.25 | 32 | 1.218 | 39 | 3.00 | 29 | 1.035 | -0.25 |
| 36 | 3.04 | 28 | 1.319 | 36 | 2.67 | 21 | 1.354 | -0.37 |
| 31 | 3.16 | 31 | 1.128 | 31 | 2.79 | 19 | 1.357 | -0.37 |
| 27 | 3.47 | 32 | 1.270 | 27 | 3.07 | 28 | 1.215 | -0.40 |
| Total | 3.16 | 1276 | 1.127 | Total | 3.40 | 921 | 1.197 | 0.25 |

Registered to Vote

Overall Semester Change in Non Service versus Service Learning Classes

There was a reported 16 percent increase in voter registration from the beginning to the end of the study period. At the end of the semester, almost 75 percent of the students reported that they were registered. This is both a statistical and substantive increase.

Student voter registration increased over twice as much in the service classes compared to traditional classes without a service component. Registration in service classes increased from 54 to 85 percent. The increase in the traditional classes from 58 to 73 percent was also statistically significant.

| Registered to Vote | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|----|-------|-----------------|---------------------------|----|---------|--------|-------------------|
| Beginning of semester | | | | End of semester | | | | | |
| Class | Sum of Sum of means | N | | Class | Sum of Sum of Means | N | Average | Change | Percent change |
| Non service | 2381.4 | 41 | 58.08 | Non service | 2997.5 | 41 | 73.11 | 15.03 | 25.9% |
| Service | 217.8 | 4 | 54.45 | Service | 341.8 | 4 | 85.45 | 31.00 | 56.9% |

Class Variations

During the semester there was a large amount of media coverage of the November elections. The extent that students paid attention to the political news will be examined later in this report. It can be assumed that some students were prompted to register as a result of the media or direct contact registration efforts. That would not explain any difference in the amount of registration change by class.

There was a huge variation in the reported registration from class to class at the beginning of the term. 88 percent stated they were registered in class 14 and only 28 percent reported being registered in class 18.

By the end of the term, class 12 had the highest percent registered with 91 percent compared to the lowest registration reported in class 43 with 50 percent.

The overall increase in class registration was 16 percent. The service learning classes far exceeded the overall increase in registration with three of the classes reporting increases over 30 percent. The fourth service class had a 25 percent increase. The overall 31 percent registration increase in the four service classes was almost double the 16 percent average increase for all classes.

The change in voter registration is a very strong indicator that the service learning classes fostered the growth of values and attitudes underlying civic responsibility and engagement.

Percent of Class Registered to Vote: Beginning and End by Class

| Classes Sorted High to Low on Percent Change | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|
| Beginning | | End of Semester | | |
| Course # | %registered | Course # | %registered | %Change |
| SL_B | 42.9 | SL_B | 81.3 | 38.4 |
| 21 | 40.0 | 21 | 75.0 | 35.0 |
| 24 | 48.0 | 24 | 82.4 | 34.4 |
| 36 | 39.3 | 36 | 71.4 | 32.1 |
| SL_C | 56.5 | SL_C | 87.5 | 31.0 |
| 44 | 39.4 | 44 | 69.6 | 30.2 |
| SL_A | 54.2 | SL_A | 84.2 | 30.0 |
| 8 | 56.3 | 8 | 85.2 | 28.9 |
| 19 | 40.0 | 19 | 68.8 | 28.8 |
| 27 | 50.0 | 27 | 78.6 | 28.6 |
| 2 | 61.5 | 2 | 90.0 | 28.5 |
| 35 | 46.7 | 35 | 75.0 | 28.3 |
| 18 | 28.0 | 18 | 53.8 | 25.8 |
| SL_D | 64.3 | SL_D | 88.9 | 24.6 |
| 6 | 64.1 | 6 | 87.1 | 23.0 |
| 43 | 27.6 | 43 | 50.0 | 22.4 |
| 12 | 68.6 | 12 | 90.9 | 22.3 |
| 30 | 42.4 | 30 | 64.0 | 21.6 |
| 23 | 64.3 | 23 | 85.7 | 21.4 |
| 34 | 47.1 | 34 | 68.0 | 20.9 |
| 13 | 54.5 | 13 | 75.0 | 20.5 |
| 4 | 65.4 | 4 | 84.6 | 19.2 |
| 22 | 67.9 | 22 | 85.2 | 17.3 |
| 40 | 54.3 | 40 | 71.4 | 17.1 |
| 26 | 58.1 | 26 | 75.0 | 16.9 |
| 7 | 60.0 | 7 | 76.9 | 16.9 |
| 25 | 60.0 | 25 | 76.9 | 16.9 |
| 29 | 55.9 | 29 | 69.2 | 13.3 |
| 45 | 68.8 | 45 | 81.0 | 12.2 |
| 28 | 55.6 | 28 | 66.7 | 11.1 |
| 11 | 76.9 | 11 | 85.7 | 8.8 |
| 37 | 47.2 | 37 | 54.8 | 7.6 |
| 3 | 67.9 | 3 | 75.0 | 7.1 |
| 1 | 81.5 | 1 | 88.2 | 6.8 |
| 5 | 70.0 | 5 | 75.0 | 5.0 |
| 38 | 58.8 | 38 | 62.5 | 3.7 |
| 10 | 75.0 | 10 | 78.6 | 3.6 |
| 41 | 52.9 | 41 | 56.0 | 3.1 |
| 39 | 53.1 | 39 | 55.2 | 2.0 |
| 42 | 74.2 | 42 | 75.9 | 1.7 |
| 31 | 58.1 | 31 | 57.9 | -0.2 |
| 14 | 88.0 | 14 | 82.4 | -5.6 |
| 33 | 75.8 | 33 | 69.6 | -6.2 |
| 17 | 78.6 | 17 | 71.4 | -7.1 |
| 20 | 60.0 | 20 | 52.0 | -8.0 |
| Total | 57.2 | Total | 73.3 | 16.1 |

Personal Political Efficacy: Internal

To produce an internal or personal political efficacy score, students were asked to agree or disagree with six statements and their responses summed to produce a total efficacy score. In general, the efficacy statements focus on the individual's assessment of his or her ability to understand politics and government and whether or not one's participation makes a difference.

For each question, the strongest efficacy response was scored as a five and the least efficacious response as a one. A strongly efficacious response on all 6 questions would therefore produce a score of 30 and a respondent consistently answering with the non-efficacious response would receive a score of six. A class with an average score of 18.00 would be interpreted as a moderate efficacy score.

Overall Semester Change in Non Service versus Service Learning Classes

The student's sense of internal political efficacy increased considerably more in the service classes although the changes over the semester and the difference between the two groups is not as large as for the value placed on keeping up to date on political affairs. The research found a 14.6 percent increase in the service classes and a 9.6 percent increase in the traditional classes

| Internal Political Efficacy | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------|--------------|--------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Beginning of semester | | | | End of semester | | | | | |
| Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Change | Percent change |
| Non service | 775.47 | 41 | 18.91 | Non service | 849.83 | 41 | 20.73 | 1.81 | 9.6% |
| Service | 77.5 | 4 | 19.38 | Service | 88.84 | 4 | 22.21 | 2.84 | 14.6% |

Class Variations

The overall increase in the mean of 1.81 obscures the considerable difference between the classes, which ranged from a high increase of +4.30 to a low of +0.07. Students in roughly half of the classes (22 of 45) did not have a change of 10 percent or higher in their class average for internal political efficacy.

In roughly half of the classes (23 of 45) the average gain in efficacy was over 10 percent. with the single largest gain of + 4.30 reported in class # 35. The 14 classes with efficacy gains of 15 to 20 percent included three out of four of the service learning classes. The fourth service class had an efficacy increase of over 10 percent.

Analysis of the internal efficacy variable supports the idea of a distinctive positive impact of the service learning classes. Again it can be noted that there were non-service learning classes with comparable positive changes. Ten non-service classes equaled or exceeded the service class average efficacy gain of 2.83.

Internal Political Efficacy: Beginning and End by Class

| Classes Sorted High to Low on Change | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| Beginning of Class | | | | End of Class | | | | |
| Course # | Mean | N | Std. Dev. | Course # | Mean | N | Std. Dev. | Change |
| 35 | 17.87 | 30 | 4.953 | 35 | 22.17 | 12 | 3.973 | 4.30 |
| 13 | 17.67 | 33 | 5.041 | 13 | 21.40 | 20 | 4.018 | 3.73 |
| 7 | 19.75 | 20 | 4.229 | 7 | 23.31 | 13 | 2.810 | 3.56 |
| 10 | 19.46 | 24 | 5.421 | 10 | 22.73 | 15 | 3.863 | 3.28 |
| SL_C | 20.35 | 23 | 5.365 | SL_C | 23.56 | 16 | 4.412 | 3.21 |
| 43 | 17.55 | 29 | 3.747 | 43 | 20.68 | 22 | 2.626 | 3.13 |
| 6 | 19.82 | 39 | 4.850 | 6 | 22.90 | 31 | 4.214 | 3.08 |
| 29 | 17.76 | 34 | 4.229 | 29 | 20.81 | 26 | 4.290 | 3.04 |
| SL_B | 18.14 | 28 | 5.296 | SL_B | 21.16 | 32 | 4.259 | 3.01 |
| SL_D | 19.43 | 14 | 4.653 | SL_D | 22.33 | 9 | 4.123 | 2.90 |
| 4 | 19.96 | 26 | 5.786 | 4 | 22.85 | 13 | 5.210 | 2.88 |
| 39 | 17.47 | 32 | 4.677 | 39 | 20.34 | 29 | 4.498 | 2.88 |
| 1 | 20.07 | 27 | 4.922 | 1 | 22.94 | 17 | 4.190 | 2.87 |
| 11 | 19.62 | 26 | 4.234 | 11 | 22.43 | 14 | 3.368 | 2.81 |
| 27 | 16.53 | 32 | 3.967 | 27 | 19.29 | 28 | 3.905 | 2.75 |
| 3 | 19.71 | 28 | 4.276 | 3 | 22.19 | 16 | 4.215 | 2.47 |
| 12 | 18.74 | 35 | 5.147 | 12 | 21.14 | 22 | 4.663 | 2.39 |
| 24 | 19.36 | 25 | 4.680 | 24 | 21.71 | 17 | 4.210 | 2.35 |
| 8 | 21.13 | 32 | 4.824 | 8 | 23.44 | 27 | 3.994 | 2.32 |
| 2 | 19.85 | 13 | 4.038 | 2 | 22.10 | 10 | 5.724 | 2.25 |
| SL_A | 19.58 | 24 | 5.429 | SL_A | 21.79 | 19 | 4.211 | 2.21 |
| 42 | 19.10 | 31 | 4.036 | 42 | 21.10 | 29 | 4.491 | 2.01 |
| 30 | 17.73 | 33 | 4.639 | 30 | 19.64 | 25 | 5.032 | 1.91 |
| 38 | 18.32 | 34 | 4.597 | 38 | 20.13 | 24 | 3.927 | 1.80 |
| 14 | 23.20 | 25 | 4.203 | 14 | 24.94 | 17 | 3.648 | 1.74 |
| 20 | 18.73 | 30 | 4.307 | 20 | 20.28 | 25 | 2.937 | 1.55 |
| 21 | 17.04 | 25 | 5.135 | 21 | 18.45 | 20 | 4.032 | 1.41 |
| 26 | 18.23 | 31 | 4.287 | 26 | 19.63 | 16 | 3.138 | 1.40 |
| 18 | 17.92 | 25 | 4.873 | 18 | 19.31 | 13 | 4.385 | 1.39 |
| 22 | 19.54 | 28 | 4.014 | 22 | 20.81 | 27 | 3.971 | 1.28 |
| 23 | 18.75 | 28 | 4.402 | 23 | 19.90 | 21 | 3.330 | 1.15 |
| 34 | 18.62 | 34 | 3.885 | 34 | 19.76 | 25 | 4.226 | 1.14 |
| 31 | 19.10 | 31 | 4.847 | 31 | 20.21 | 19 | 4.328 | 1.11 |
| 28 | 17.44 | 27 | 4.013 | 28 | 18.52 | 21 | 4.676 | 1.08 |
| 40 | 17.31 | 35 | 4.831 | 40 | 18.21 | 28 | 3.900 | 0.90 |
| 5 | 20.95 | 20 | 3.790 | 5 | 21.75 | 16 | 3.804 | 0.80 |
| 19 | 19.16 | 25 | 4.802 | 19 | 19.81 | 16 | 5.218 | 0.65 |
| 33 | 19.52 | 33 | 4.280 | 33 | 20.09 | 23 | 5.460 | 0.57 |
| 44 | 18.30 | 33 | 4.391 | 44 | 18.87 | 23 | 4.037 | 0.57 |
| 36 | 18.21 | 28 | 4.104 | 36 | 18.71 | 21 | 3.810 | 0.50 |
| 25 | 21.13 | 30 | 3.875 | 25 | 21.62 | 13 | 4.214 | 0.48 |
| 41 | 18.15 | 34 | 4.186 | 41 | 18.56 | 25 | 4.900 | 0.41 |
| 37 | 18.31 | 36 | 3.956 | 37 | 18.55 | 31 | 3.414 | 0.24 |
| 45 | 18.97 | 32 | 3.856 | 45 | 19.05 | 21 | 3.584 | 0.08 |
| 17 | 19.43 | 14 | 3.413 | 17 | 19.50 | 14 | 2.981 | 0.07 |
| Total | 18.86 | 1276 | 4.623 | Total | 20.68 | 921 | 4.349 | 1.81 |

External Political Efficacy

While Internal Political Efficacy measures the respondents' sense of personal political aptitude, external efficacy reflects the respondent's perception of how public officials and government respond to them. The two external political efficacy questions are again scored with a range of 5 to 1 for the most to least efficacious responses. Combining the two questions produces a possible score sum of 10 to 2. A class mean of 7.50 indicates a moderate level of efficacy.

Overall Semester Change in Non Service versus Service Learning Classes

The most striking finding from the research on external political efficacy was that the scores started low and stayed low in both groups of classes. There was virtually no change in the averages of the service classes of 6.38 to 6.49 and 6.44 to 6.48 for the non-service classes.

| External Political Efficacy | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------|--------------|--------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Beginning of semester | | | | End of semester | | | | | |
| Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Change | Percent change |
| Non service | 264.12 | 41 | 6.44 | Non service | 265.7 | 41 | 6.48 | 0.04 | 0.6% |
| Service | 25.52 | 4 | 6.38 | Service | 25.95 | 4 | 6.49 | 0.11 | 1.7% |

Class Variations

While there is a significant range from high to low of -1.05 for class 38 to -1.03 for class 14, it can be seen in the following table that two-thirds of the classes had less than a 10 percent change (+/- 0.65). Also notable is the finding that of the 14 classes with a change of 10 percent or more, five of these classes changed in the direction of a loss or decline in sense of political efficacy.

Only one of the service learning classes had a change larger than 10 percent of the beginning class average. The five classes with the largest change are all non-service learning classes.

External political efficacy is a perception that interrelates the self and public officials. It seems to be similar to the next variable to be analyzed. That factor, political trust, focuses directly on the respondent's attitudes toward the responsiveness and integrity of government and public officials.

External Political Efficacy: Beginning and End by Class

| Classes Sorted High to Low on Change | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| Beginning of Class | | | | End of Class | | | | |
| Course # | Mean | N | Std. Dev | Course # | Mean | N | Std. Dev | Change |
| 38 | 5.53 | 34 | 2.019 | 38 | 6.58 | 24 | 1.863 | 1.05 |
| 3 | 5.93 | 28 | 2.142 | 3 | 6.94 | 16 | 1.982 | 1.01 |
| 5 | 5.80 | 20 | 1.989 | 5 | 6.75 | 16 | 1.438 | 0.95 |
| 7 | 6.60 | 20 | 2.210 | 7 | 7.38 | 13 | 2.022 | 0.78 |
| 19 | 6.24 | 25 | 2.260 | 19 | 7.00 | 16 | 2.449 | 0.76 |
| SL_D | 5.36 | 14 | 2.925 | SL_D | 6.11 | 9 | 2.977 | 0.75 |
| 11 | 6.46 | 26 | 1.726 | 11 | 7.21 | 14 | 1.888 | 0.75 |
| 12 | 6.34 | 35 | 2.057 | 12 | 7.09 | 22 | 1.659 | 0.75 |
| 21 | 5.92 | 25 | 2.040 | 21 | 6.55 | 20 | 1.761 | 0.63 |
| 27 | 5.06 | 32 | 2.094 | 27 | 5.64 | 28 | 2.468 | 0.58 |
| 10 | 6.88 | 24 | 2.071 | 10 | 7.40 | 15 | 1.805 | 0.53 |
| 22 | 6.75 | 28 | 2.102 | 22 | 7.22 | 27 | 2.136 | 0.47 |
| 24 | 6.24 | 25 | 2.332 | 24 | 6.71 | 17 | 1.724 | 0.47 |
| SL_C | 6.87 | 23 | 2.160 | SL_C | 7.25 | 16 | 1.342 | 0.38 |
| 43 | 6.66 | 29 | 1.857 | 43 | 6.95 | 22 | 1.759 | 0.30 |
| 8 | 7.19 | 32 | 1.975 | 8 | 7.44 | 27 | 1.826 | 0.26 |
| 29 | 6.47 | 34 | 2.205 | 29 | 6.65 | 26 | 2.097 | 0.18 |
| 36 | 5.82 | 28 | 1.945 | 36 | 6.00 | 21 | 2.191 | 0.18 |
| 40 | 6.14 | 35 | 2.031 | 40 | 6.32 | 28 | 1.765 | 0.18 |
| 34 | 6.41 | 34 | 1.971 | 34 | 6.56 | 25 | 2.123 | 0.15 |
| 1 | 5.59 | 27 | 1.947 | 1 | 5.71 | 17 | 1.572 | 0.11 |
| 18 | 6.28 | 25 | 1.720 | 18 | 6.38 | 13 | 1.261 | 0.10 |
| 45 | 6.53 | 32 | 2.257 | 45 | 6.62 | 21 | 2.156 | 0.09 |
| 6 | 7.03 | 39 | 2.006 | 6 | 7.10 | 31 | 1.868 | 0.07 |
| 37 | 6.17 | 36 | 1.920 | 37 | 6.23 | 31 | 2.140 | 0.06 |
| 44 | 6.18 | 33 | 2.023 | 44 | 6.22 | 23 | 1.476 | 0.04 |
| 42 | 6.97 | 31 | 1.760 | 42 | 6.90 | 29 | 2.006 | -0.07 |
| 2 | 6.54 | 13 | 2.332 | 2 | 6.40 | 10 | 1.776 | -0.14 |
| 35 | 6.43 | 30 | 1.870 | 35 | 6.17 | 12 | 1.801 | -0.27 |
| 23 | 6.96 | 28 | 1.915 | 23 | 6.67 | 21 | 1.906 | -0.30 |
| SL_A | 6.54 | 24 | 2.085 | SL_A | 6.21 | 19 | 2.250 | -0.33 |
| 33 | 6.55 | 33 | 2.551 | 33 | 6.17 | 23 | 1.899 | -0.37 |
| 31 | 6.74 | 31 | 2.265 | 31 | 6.37 | 19 | 1.862 | -0.37 |
| SL_B | 6.75 | 28 | 2.030 | SL_B | 6.38 | 32 | 2.012 | -0.38 |
| 25 | 6.23 | 30 | 2.239 | 25 | 5.85 | 13 | 1.819 | -0.39 |
| 30 | 6.70 | 33 | 2.271 | 30 | 6.28 | 25 | 1.671 | -0.42 |
| 41 | 7.12 | 34 | 2.012 | 41 | 6.60 | 25 | 1.958 | -0.52 |
| 20 | 6.97 | 30 | 2.025 | 20 | 6.44 | 25 | 1.446 | -0.53 |
| 13 | 6.55 | 33 | 2.137 | 13 | 6.00 | 20 | 1.747 | -0.55 |
| 4 | 5.96 | 26 | 2.049 | 4 | 5.38 | 13 | 2.434 | -0.58 |
| 28 | 6.48 | 27 | 1.988 | 28 | 5.81 | 21 | 1.965 | -0.67 |
| 26 | 6.58 | 31 | 2.262 | 26 | 5.81 | 16 | 2.105 | -0.77 |
| 17 | 6.93 | 14 | 2.433 | 17 | 6.00 | 14 | 2.253 | -0.93 |
| 39 | 6.88 | 32 | 1.996 | 39 | 5.90 | 29 | 1.698 | -0.98 |
| 14 | 7.32 | 25 | 1.651 | 14 | 6.29 | 17 | 2.312 | -1.03 |
| Total | 6.45 | 1276 | 2.100 | Total | 6.49 | 921 | 1.957 | 0.05 |

Political Trust

Six questions comprise the Political Trust Index and reflect different dimensions of government such as responsiveness, effectiveness and honesty. The survey responses were scored from one to five for lowest to highest trust. The total scores for the six question index range from a high of 30 to a low of six. A score of 16 reflects a somewhat low average level of political trust.

Overall Semester Change in Non Service versus Service Learning Classes

The findings for the variable of political trust are similar to external political efficacy. The level of trust was low and stayed low in both types of classes. The service class ending average score of 16.33 reflects a low level of trust and the 3.3 percent increase is not significant. The non-service classes had almost exactly the same statistics.

| Political Trust | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------|--------------|--------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Beginning of semester | | | | End of semester | | | | | |
| Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Change | Percent change |
| Non service | 645.6 | 41 | 15.75 | Non service | 667.1 | 41 | 16.27 | 0.52 | 3.3% |
| Service | 63.2 | 4 | 15.80 | Service | 65.3 | 4 | 16.33 | 0.52 | 3.3% |

The degree of trust as measured in the political trust index varied from question to question and warrants a closer examination of the specific responses at the end of the semester. Survey respondents are quite cynical about government being run by a few big interests looking out for themselves with only 29 percent believing that government is run for the benefit of all. Only just over a third (35%) believe that elections matter in the sense that they make the government pay significant attention to what the people think. These two positions directly clash with the ideological statement "of the people, by the people, for the people."

Roughly half of the respondents responded in a positive manner on three of the questions in the political trust index. These are: trusting the government to do what is right at least most of the time, that hardly any of the people running the government are crooked and only some of what we pay in taxes is wasted by people running the government. In all three of these questions, the aggregated percentage includes the highly trusting and somewhat trusting responses.

Three quarters of those in the survey gave a positive response that the government over the years has paid attention to what people think in deciding what to do. However, only 12 percent believe that the government pays attention to what people think a good deal of the time and another 65 percent think this happens some of the time, for a combined 76 percent positive response.

| Percent of Positive Responses for Political Trust Questions | | |
|---|-------|-------|
| Question | Start | End % |
| Government is run for the <u>benefit of all</u> the people? | 30.0 | 28.8 |
| Elections makes the government pay attention to what the people think <u>a good deal</u> | 31.1 | 34.9 |
| <u>Just about always or most of the time</u> you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right | 45.8 | 47.8 |
| <u>Not very many or hardly any</u> people running the government are crooked | 48.3 | 53.0 |
| People in government waste <u>some or don't waste very much</u> of the money we pay in taxes | 51.1 | 54.6 |
| Over the years, the government pays <u>a good deal or some</u> attention to what people think when it decides | 69.6 | 76.5 |

Class Variations

The range of potential scores on political trust goes from a high of 30 to a low of 6. A score of 18 is not an indication of significant levels of trust. For example, it reflects the response that only "some of the time" do elections make the government pay attention to what people think.

At the beginning of the semester, the most trusting class had a score of 17.59. The least trusting class averaged 12.85. By the end of the term the highest class trust score was 18.97 while the lowest class average was 12.41.

The change column in the Trust by Class table clearly shows that the overall average change is a reflection of widely varying change from class to class. In 13 of the 45 classes there was a decline in the students' political trust. On the positive side, there were six classes where the mean increased by 2 whole points or more. An additional 11 classes had an increase in trust in from 1 to 1.99. In summary, there is not a common pattern for class outcomes on political trust.

The combined four service learning classes had an average change in their mean of 0.52. However that average obscures the large differences between the service classes. Service learning class SL_D had more than a 10 percent gain (+1.85). Service class SL_B had a decrease of 1.33. The amounts of change in the other two classes were smaller. Only class SL_C had a change similar to the average for all four classes. It should be noted that the service class with the largest change had an extremely low level of trust to begin the semester.

There is a significant low level of political trust among the respondents. The extent of the perception that government is run by a few big interests is striking. The cynical attitudes toward the meaningfulness of elections are also noteworthy. Finally, less than half the students in the survey believe that most of the time you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right. If these perceptions reflect the reality of government in America, it would be extremely difficult for any college class to change student's minds. If these are misperceptions on the part of the students, then, it could be argued, the presentation of facts to the contrary could build support for political trust. In summary, perceptions and beliefs relative to the concept of political trust appear to lie at the center of any effort to foster civic engagement.

Political Trust Beginning and End by Class

| Classes Sorted High to Low by Change | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| Beginning of class | | | | End of class | | | | |
| Class | Mean | N | Std.Dev. | Class | Mean | N | Std.Dev. | Change |
| 5 | 12.85 | 20 | 4.440 | 5 | 15.25 | 16 | 4.865 | 2.40 |
| 12 | 15.51 | 35 | 5.232 | 12 | 17.86 | 22 | 4.223 | 2.35 |
| 14 | 15.24 | 25 | 4.719 | 14 | 17.41 | 17 | 5.635 | 2.17 |
| 7 | 15.15 | 20 | 5.174 | 7 | 17.15 | 13 | 5.145 | 2.00 |
| 17 | 14.86 | 14 | 5.998 | 17 | 16.86 | 14 | 5.318 | 2.00 |
| 25 | 13.00 | 30 | 4.283 | 25 | 15.00 | 13 | 4.708 | 2.00 |
| 6 | 17.03 | 39 | 5.456 | 6 | 18.97 | 31 | 4.378 | 1.94 |
| SL_D | 11.93 | 14 | 4.714 | SL_D | 13.78 | 9 | 3.993 | 1.85 |
| 43 | 17.10 | 29 | 4.161 | 43 | 18.91 | 22 | 3.816 | 1.81 |
| 20 | 16.83 | 30 | 5.127 | 20 | 18.48 | 25 | 3.356 | 1.65 |
| 35 | 17.67 | 30 | 3.651 | 35 | 19.17 | 12 | 4.130 | 1.50 |
| 34 | 16.26 | 34 | 4.195 | 34 | 17.64 | 25 | 3.915 | 1.38 |
| 44 | 15.73 | 33 | 4.618 | 44 | 17.09 | 23 | 4.814 | 1.36 |
| 36 | 15.21 | 28 | 4.149 | 36 | 16.52 | 21 | 4.760 | 1.31 |
| 27 | 13.09 | 32 | 4.067 | 27 | 14.32 | 28 | 5.938 | 1.23 |
| SL_A | 17.38 | 24 | 5.174 | SL_A | 18.53 | 19 | 4.274 | 1.15 |
| 38 | 15.18 | 34 | 4.217 | 38 | 16.21 | 24 | 4.872 | 1.03 |
| 29 | 14.85 | 34 | 4.613 | 29 | 15.81 | 26 | 5.973 | 0.95 |
| 40 | 16.60 | 35 | 4.545 | 40 | 17.54 | 28 | 4.384 | 0.94 |
| 19 | 16.44 | 25 | 4.770 | 19 | 17.38 | 16 | 5.620 | 0.93 |
| 37 | 15.50 | 36 | 4.326 | 37 | 16.29 | 31 | 5.515 | 0.79 |
| 45 | 17.59 | 32 | 4.970 | 45 | 18.38 | 21 | 5.104 | 0.79 |
| 22 | 17.07 | 28 | 5.610 | 22 | 17.81 | 27 | 4.574 | 0.74 |
| 3 | 14.21 | 28 | 4.263 | 3 | 14.88 | 16 | 5.644 | 0.66 |
| 31 | 15.74 | 31 | 4.885 | 31 | 16.37 | 19 | 5.600 | 0.63 |
| 11 | 17.27 | 26 | 5.273 | 11 | 17.86 | 14 | 6.585 | 0.59 |
| 30 | 16.64 | 33 | 5.561 | 30 | 17.20 | 25 | 4.397 | 0.56 |
| SL_C | 16.70 | 23 | 4.724 | SL_C | 17.13 | 16 | 4.631 | 0.43 |
| 10 | 14.17 | 24 | 4.770 | 10 | 14.53 | 15 | 4.068 | 0.37 |
| 21 | 16.08 | 25 | 5.187 | 21 | 16.25 | 20 | 4.598 | 0.17 |
| 23 | 18.00 | 28 | 5.375 | 23 | 18.14 | 21 | 4.304 | 0.14 |
| 4 | 12.92 | 26 | 4.498 | 4 | 12.92 | 13 | 4.856 | 0.00 |
| 8 | 17.16 | 32 | 4.691 | 8 | 16.96 | 27 | 4.587 | -0.19 |
| 41 | 15.47 | 34 | 5.077 | 41 | 15.12 | 25 | 4.428 | -0.35 |
| 39 | 16.09 | 32 | 4.788 | 39 | 15.66 | 29 | 4.203 | -0.44 |
| 28 | 15.96 | 27 | 4.848 | 28 | 15.38 | 21 | 5.408 | -0.58 |
| 26 | 15.52 | 31 | 4.891 | 26 | 14.56 | 16 | 4.718 | -0.95 |
| 42 | 16.16 | 31 | 5.132 | 42 | 15.21 | 29 | 4.048 | -0.95 |
| 2 | 17.23 | 13 | 5.904 | 2 | 16.10 | 10 | 4.433 | -1.13 |
| 33 | 15.12 | 33 | 5.284 | 33 | 13.96 | 23 | 4.894 | -1.16 |
| 24 | 15.04 | 25 | 4.344 | 24 | 13.76 | 17 | 2.796 | -1.28 |
| SL_B | 17.18 | 28 | 5.264 | SL_B | 15.84 | 32 | 5.765 | -1.33 |
| 1 | 14.11 | 27 | 4.846 | 1 | 12.41 | 17 | 4.287 | -1.70 |
| 18 | 17.20 | 25 | 4.143 | 18 | 15.46 | 13 | 3.307 | -1.74 |
| 13 | 16.70 | 33 | 5.053 | 13 | 14.35 | 20 | 5.274 | -2.35 |
| Total | 15.76 | 1276 | 4.929 | Total | 16.28 | 921 | 4.936 | 0.56 |

Satisfaction with the Way Democracy Works in the United States

The political trust questions dealt with specific aspects of government such as efficiency and the responsiveness of government to the will of the people. The survey also contained a general question about the respondent's satisfaction with the way democracy works in the United States. This question allows the respondent to consider all aspects of government they consider relevant and to combine these multiple perceptions into one overall evaluation.

There were two primarily positive response choices (satisfied and fairly satisfied) and two primarily negative responses (not very and not at all satisfied). For calculation of the class means, the satisfied response was scored as a five, fairly satisfied as a four, don't know a three, not very satisfied a two and the not at all satisfied as a one.

Overall Semester Change in Non Service versus Service Learning Classes

There was no change in the student's satisfaction with the way democracy works in the United States in either the traditional or service learning classes.

| Satisfaction with Democracy | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------|--------------|--------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Beginning of semester | | | | End of semester | | | | | |
| Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Change | Percent change |
| Non service | 150.30 | 41 | 3.67 | Non service | 150.37 | 41 | 3.67 | 0.00 | 0.0% |
| Service | 14.57 | 4 | 3.64 | Service | 14.66 | 4 | 3.67 | 0.02 | 0.6% |

The following table details student response percentages at the beginning and end of the semester and shows that there was virtually no change. Roughly 72 percent responded with one of the positive satisfaction choices at both time periods. This is a surprising finding given the high levels of distrust of government and elected officials.

| Time | Satisfied | Fairly Satisfied | Not very satisfied | Not at all satisfied | Don't know or no response | Total |
|-----------|-----------|------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------|
| Beginning | 20.4 | 52.0 | 16.3 | 4.8 | 6.6 | 100 % |
| End | 21.3 | 52.0 | 17.6 | 3.7 | 5.4 | 100 % |

Class Variations

The classes at the beginning of the semester varied significantly from each other on the level of student satisfaction with democracy in America. Classes with the highest satisfaction had means of 4.00 and over while the least satisfied classes averaged 3.00. Four of the six classes with the highest satisfaction levels declined over the semester. The 14 lowest classes at the start of the term either declined further or did not change in satisfaction level.

Only 10 classes had a 10 percent or more change during the semester. Five increased and five decreased in satisfaction. All ten of these classes with change were non-service learning classes.

Extent Satisfied with Democracy in the United States: Beginning and End by Class

| Classes sorted high to low on change | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|----------|-------------|------|-----|----------|--------|
| Beginning of term | | | | End of term | | | | |
| course # | Mean | N | Std. Dev | course # | Mean | N | Std. Dev | change |
| 7 | 3.65 | 20 | 1.089 | 7 | 4.15 | 13 | 0.689 | 0.50 |
| 20 | 3.87 | 30 | 1.306 | 20 | 4.36 | 25 | 0.700 | 0.49 |
| 6 | 3.72 | 39 | 1.050 | 6 | 4.19 | 31 | 0.601 | 0.48 |
| 34 | 3.62 | 34 | 0.888 | 34 | 4.00 | 25 | 1.118 | 0.38 |
| 31 | 3.58 | 31 | 1.432 | 31 | 3.95 | 19 | 1.129 | 0.37 |
| 22 | 3.89 | 28 | 1.133 | 22 | 4.22 | 27 | 0.801 | 0.33 |
| 8 | 3.66 | 32 | 1.125 | 8 | 3.96 | 27 | 0.808 | 0.31 |
| 43 | 4.00 | 29 | 0.802 | 43 | 4.23 | 22 | 0.813 | 0.23 |
| SL_D | 3.00 | 14 | 1.301 | SL_D | 3.22 | 9 | 1.202 | 0.22 |
| 12 | 3.97 | 35 | 1.071 | 12 | 4.18 | 22 | 0.733 | 0.21 |
| 36 | 3.57 | 28 | 0.959 | 36 | 3.76 | 21 | 0.889 | 0.19 |
| 40 | 3.83 | 35 | 0.954 | 40 | 4.00 | 28 | 0.981 | 0.17 |
| 11 | 3.92 | 26 | 1.093 | 11 | 4.07 | 14 | 0.997 | 0.15 |
| 27 | 3.03 | 32 | 1.092 | 27 | 3.18 | 28 | 1.249 | 0.15 |
| 17 | 3.79 | 14 | 1.051 | 17 | 3.93 | 14 | 0.997 | 0.14 |
| 25 | 3.33 | 30 | 1.295 | 25 | 3.46 | 13 | 0.967 | 0.13 |
| 45 | 3.69 | 32 | 1.061 | 45 | 3.81 | 21 | 0.814 | 0.12 |
| 44 | 3.85 | 33 | 0.795 | 44 | 3.96 | 23 | 0.825 | 0.11 |
| 38 | 3.65 | 34 | 1.125 | 38 | 3.75 | 24 | 0.944 | 0.10 |
| 10 | 3.38 | 24 | 1.135 | 10 | 3.47 | 15 | 1.125 | 0.09 |
| 30 | 3.82 | 33 | 1.211 | 30 | 3.88 | 25 | 0.833 | 0.06 |
| SL_C | 3.74 | 23 | 1.054 | SL_C | 3.75 | 16 | 1.125 | 0.01 |
| 2 | 4.00 | 13 | 1.225 | 2 | 4.00 | 10 | 1.155 | 0.00 |
| 5 | 3.40 | 20 | 1.353 | 5 | 3.38 | 16 | 1.204 | -0.03 |
| 41 | 3.59 | 34 | 1.019 | 41 | 3.56 | 25 | 1.121 | -0.03 |
| 37 | 3.81 | 36 | 1.091 | 37 | 3.77 | 31 | 1.230 | -0.03 |
| 33 | 3.42 | 33 | 1.173 | 33 | 3.39 | 23 | 0.988 | -0.03 |
| SL_A | 4.04 | 24 | 1.083 | SL_A | 4.00 | 19 | 1.202 | -0.04 |
| 19 | 3.80 | 25 | 1.000 | 19 | 3.75 | 16 | 1.000 | -0.05 |
| 35 | 3.83 | 30 | 1.147 | 35 | 3.75 | 12 | 1.138 | -0.08 |
| SL_B | 3.79 | 28 | 1.315 | SL_B | 3.69 | 32 | 1.176 | -0.10 |
| 3 | 3.43 | 28 | 1.289 | 3 | 3.31 | 16 | 1.401 | -0.11 |
| 14 | 3.48 | 25 | 1.262 | 14 | 3.35 | 17 | 1.367 | -0.13 |
| 28 | 3.67 | 27 | 1.177 | 28 | 3.52 | 21 | 1.209 | -0.14 |
| 18 | 4.04 | 25 | 0.889 | 18 | 3.77 | 13 | 0.725 | -0.27 |
| 42 | 3.81 | 31 | 0.946 | 42 | 3.52 | 29 | 1.153 | -0.29 |
| 23 | 4.11 | 28 | 0.832 | 23 | 3.81 | 21 | 0.981 | -0.30 |
| 29 | 3.74 | 34 | 0.931 | 29 | 3.42 | 26 | 1.238 | -0.31 |
| 24 | 3.44 | 25 | 1.261 | 24 | 3.12 | 17 | 1.111 | -0.32 |
| 21 | 4.04 | 25 | 0.841 | 21 | 3.70 | 20 | 1.129 | -0.34 |
| 4 | 3.00 | 26 | 1.296 | 4 | 2.62 | 13 | 1.193 | -0.39 |
| 13 | 3.52 | 33 | 1.121 | 13 | 3.10 | 20 | 1.334 | -0.41 |
| 26 | 3.35 | 31 | 1.018 | 26 | 2.94 | 16 | 1.389 | -0.41 |
| 1 | 3.22 | 27 | 1.188 | 1 | 2.76 | 17 | 1.393 | -0.46 |
| 39 | 3.81 | 32 | 1.030 | 39 | 3.31 | 29 | 1.039 | -0.50 |
| Total | 3.67 | 1276 | 1.115 | Total | 3.70 | 921 | 1.101 | 0.02 |

Social Trust

A general sense of trust in the citizens of a society is seen as a foundation stone for democracy. It was possible to compare student answers on one question at the beginning and end of the semester. The question was: "Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance or would they try to be fair."

As measured by this single question there is a low level of social trust among the students in the survey. Less than half of the respondents responded that most people try to be fair if they have a chance to take advantage of others. There was, in effect, no change in social trust among the respondents with 40 percent at the beginning and 42 percent at the end of the semester believing that most people try to be fair to others.

Social Trust Response Percentages

| | Most try to be fair | Most try to take advantage | Don't know / no response | Total |
|-------|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| Start | 40.4 % | 45.5 % | 14.1 % | 100 % |
| End | 41.9 % | 42.7 % | 15.4 % | 100 % |

Overall Semester Change in Non Service versus Service Learning Classes

The positive social trust response was scored as a 3, don't know/no response as a 2 and the distrusting response as a 1. A class average of 2.00 and over indicates a majority of students with a trusting social perspective. There was a slight social trust decrease in the traditional classes and no change in the service classes.

| Social Trust | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-----------------|--------------|--------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Beginning of semester | | | | End of semester | | | | | |
| Class | Sum of Means | Number | Average | Class | Sum of means | Number | Average | Change | Percent change |
| Non service | 252.8 | 41 | 6.17 | Non service | 233.23 | 41 | 5.69 | -0.48 | -7.7% |
| Service | 25.27 | 4 | 6.32 | Service | 25.74 | 4 | 6.44 | 0.12 | 1.9% |

Class Variations

In the beginning of the semester the highest class had a social trust mean of 2.43 and the lowest class was 1.64. The highest class had almost a 20 percent drop in it's social trust mean over the course of the term. A number of classes with the highest starting means on social trust had declines in social trust.

Two of the service learning classes had significant 25 percent increases in social trust. This is an intriguing finding given the low levels of initial trust among the students and raises the question might the increased class interaction and group work in the service classes account for the distinctive impact? However, one service class had a significant decrease of 15 percent in the class social trust mean and the fourth no change. The inconsistent findings raise a question about possible differences in implementation of the service learning component in the four service learning classes.

Social Trust: Beginning and End by Class

| Classes sorted high to low on change | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| Beginning | | | | End of term | | | | |
| Class # | Mean | N | Std. Dev | Class # | Mean | N | Std. Dev | Change |
| 43 | 1.76 | 29 | 0.830 | 43 | 2.36 | 22 | 0.790 | 0.61 |
| 14 | 1.80 | 25 | 0.866 | 14 | 2.35 | 17 | 0.862 | 0.55 |
| SL_A | 2.04 | 24 | 0.955 | SL_A | 2.58 | 19 | 0.692 | 0.54 |
| SL_C | 2.04 | 23 | 0.976 | SL_C | 2.56 | 16 | 0.814 | 0.52 |
| 18 | 1.76 | 25 | 0.926 | 18 | 2.08 | 13 | 0.862 | 0.32 |
| 11 | 2.12 | 26 | 0.864 | 11 | 2.43 | 14 | 0.756 | 0.31 |
| 4 | 1.92 | 26 | 0.891 | 4 | 2.23 | 13 | 0.927 | 0.31 |
| 1 | 1.70 | 27 | 0.869 | 1 | 2.00 | 17 | 0.935 | 0.30 |
| 2 | 1.85 | 13 | 0.899 | 2 | 2.10 | 10 | 0.994 | 0.25 |
| 5 | 1.95 | 20 | 0.945 | 5 | 2.19 | 16 | 0.911 | 0.24 |
| 39 | 1.88 | 32 | 0.942 | 39 | 2.10 | 29 | 0.860 | 0.23 |
| 29 | 1.76 | 34 | 0.890 | 29 | 1.96 | 26 | 0.958 | 0.20 |
| 26 | 1.87 | 31 | 0.922 | 26 | 2.06 | 16 | 0.929 | 0.19 |
| 13 | 1.91 | 33 | 0.947 | 13 | 2.10 | 20 | 0.912 | 0.19 |
| 8 | 2.00 | 32 | 0.916 | 8 | 2.19 | 27 | 1.001 | 0.19 |
| 3 | 1.79 | 28 | 0.917 | 3 | 1.94 | 16 | 0.929 | 0.15 |
| 12 | 2.09 | 35 | 0.919 | 12 | 2.23 | 22 | 0.813 | 0.14 |
| 30 | 1.91 | 33 | 0.914 | 30 | 2.04 | 25 | 0.889 | 0.13 |
| 7 | 1.80 | 20 | 0.951 | 7 | 1.92 | 13 | 1.038 | 0.12 |
| 23 | 1.64 | 28 | 0.911 | 23 | 1.76 | 21 | 0.889 | 0.12 |
| SL_D | 1.79 | 14 | 0.893 | SL_D | 1.89 | 9 | 1.054 | 0.10 |
| 28 | 1.96 | 27 | 0.980 | 28 | 2.00 | 21 | 0.949 | 0.04 |
| 27 | 1.72 | 32 | 0.851 | 27 | 1.75 | 28 | 0.967 | 0.03 |
| 34 | 2.12 | 34 | 0.913 | 34 | 2.12 | 25 | 0.781 | 0.00 |
| 38 | 1.79 | 34 | 0.946 | 38 | 1.79 | 24 | 0.977 | 0.00 |
| 6 | 2.21 | 39 | 0.894 | 6 | 2.19 | 31 | 0.980 | -0.01 |
| 45 | 2.13 | 32 | 0.976 | 45 | 2.10 | 21 | 0.995 | -0.03 |
| 37 | 2.00 | 36 | 0.926 | 37 | 1.97 | 31 | 0.948 | -0.03 |
| 20 | 2.13 | 30 | 0.973 | 20 | 2.08 | 25 | 0.954 | -0.05 |
| 21 | 1.84 | 25 | 0.987 | 21 | 1.75 | 20 | 0.910 | -0.09 |
| 42 | 1.90 | 31 | 0.908 | 42 | 1.79 | 29 | 0.861 | -0.11 |
| 40 | 1.94 | 35 | 0.968 | 40 | 1.82 | 28 | 0.905 | -0.12 |
| 41 | 2.15 | 34 | 0.925 | 41 | 2.00 | 25 | 0.913 | -0.15 |
| 19 | 1.96 | 25 | 0.889 | 19 | 1.81 | 16 | 0.981 | -0.15 |
| 22 | 1.96 | 28 | 0.962 | 22 | 1.81 | 27 | 0.962 | -0.15 |
| 31 | 1.84 | 31 | 0.934 | 31 | 1.68 | 19 | 0.885 | -0.15 |
| 35 | 2.33 | 30 | 0.884 | 35 | 2.17 | 12 | 0.937 | -0.17 |
| 33 | 2.18 | 33 | 0.950 | 33 | 2.00 | 23 | 0.953 | -0.18 |
| 36 | 1.71 | 28 | 0.854 | 36 | 1.52 | 21 | 0.873 | -0.19 |
| 25 | 1.77 | 30 | 0.971 | 25 | 1.54 | 13 | 0.877 | -0.23 |
| SL_B | 2.14 | 28 | 0.970 | SL_B | 1.81 | 32 | 0.896 | -0.33 |
| 24 | 1.92 | 25 | 0.954 | 24 | 1.59 | 17 | 0.870 | -0.33 |
| 44 | 2.12 | 33 | 0.992 | 44 | 1.78 | 23 | 0.902 | -0.34 |
| 17 | 2.43 | 14 | 0.852 | 17 | 2.07 | 14 | 0.917 | -0.36 |
| 10 | 2.00 | 24 | 0.978 | 10 | 1.60 | 15 | 0.910 | -0.40 |
| Total | 1.95 | 1276 | 0.925 | Total | 1.99 | 921 | 0.920 | 0.04 |

Degree of Interest in Present Political Campaign and Presidential Winner

The survey took place during the 2004 presidential election period with the first survey at the beginning of September and the last survey during the end of November after the elections. Obviously, real world events may have affected student interest levels independent of class impacts.

The two levels of interest questions focused on how much students cared who won the presidential election and their general interest in the political campaigns this year. The highest levels of interest responses were scored as a five and the lowest as a one so that the aggregated interest scores ranged from 10 to 2. If a respondent stated he or she was only somewhat interested in the political campaigns and did not know if they cared who won the presidential election, there would be a score of 6.

Overall Semester Change in Non Service versus Service Learning Classes

The service classes had more than a ten- percent rise in political interest and this was a larger change than in the non service classes.

| Interest in Presidential Winner & Political Campaigns | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----|---------|-----------------|--------------|----|---------|--------|----------------|--|
| Beginning of semester | | | | End of semester | | | | | | |
| Class | Sum of Means | N | Average | Class | Sum of Means | N | Average | Change | Percent change | |
| Non Service | 298.61 | 41 | 7.28 | Non Service | 321.1 | 41 | 7.83 | 0.55 | 7.5% | |
| Service | 29.02 | 4 | 7.26 | Service | 32.45 | 4 | 8.11 | 0.86 | 11.8% | |

Class Variations

Six of the classes started with fairly high levels of interest with means of 8.00 and over. Sixteen classes started with low levels of interest, i.e. below 7.00. Some classes had significant gains in political interest and a number of classes did not. Seventeen of the 45 classes had increases of 10 percent or more. Three of the service classes were included in these 17. Service class SL_B with a 26 percent increase had the overall third highest level of increase. Conversely, one of the service classes did not have a significant change on this variable and this fact again raises a question about implementation differences among the service learning classes.

Interest in Political Campaign and Presidential Winner: Beginning and End by Class

| Classes sorted high to low on change | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| Beginning | | | | End of Class | | | | |
| course | Mean | N | Std. Dev. | course | Mean | N | Std. Dev. | change |
| 6 | 7.59 | 39 | 1.983 | 6 | 9.42 | 31 | 0.807 | 1.83 |
| 7 | 6.85 | 20 | 2.700 | 7 | 8.62 | 13 | 1.981 | 1.77 |
| SL_B | 6.61 | 28 | 2.409 | SL_B | 8.34 | 32 | 2.336 | 1.74 |
| 10 | 7.96 | 24 | 2.074 | 10 | 9.40 | 15 | 1.056 | 1.44 |
| 35 | 7.20 | 30 | 1.846 | 35 | 8.58 | 12 | 2.021 | 1.38 |
| 18 | 6.56 | 25 | 2.399 | 18 | 7.85 | 13 | 2.577 | 1.29 |
| 14 | 8.08 | 25 | 1.913 | 14 | 9.29 | 17 | 1.359 | 1.21 |
| 36 | 6.89 | 28 | 1.969 | 36 | 8.10 | 21 | 2.189 | 1.20 |
| 24 | 7.80 | 25 | 1.958 | 24 | 8.94 | 17 | 1.391 | 1.14 |
| 29 | 6.71 | 34 | 2.481 | 29 | 7.81 | 26 | 2.980 | 1.10 |
| 2 | 8.00 | 13 | 2.236 | 2 | 9.10 | 10 | 2.183 | 1.10 |
| 11 | 7.58 | 26 | 2.212 | 11 | 8.64 | 14 | 2.307 | 1.07 |
| 4 | 7.50 | 26 | 2.232 | 4 | 8.54 | 13 | 1.854 | 1.04 |
| 27 | 7.16 | 32 | 2.216 | 27 | 8.14 | 28 | 1.957 | 0.99 |
| 31 | 6.29 | 31 | 2.735 | 31 | 7.21 | 19 | 2.720 | 0.92 |
| 1 | 8.11 | 27 | 2.006 | 1 | 9.00 | 17 | 1.414 | 0.89 |
| 13 | 7.30 | 33 | 2.257 | 13 | 8.15 | 20 | 2.560 | 0.85 |
| 23 | 6.64 | 28 | 2.231 | 23 | 7.48 | 21 | 3.043 | 0.83 |
| SL_D | 7.57 | 14 | 2.027 | SL_D | 8.33 | 9 | 3.041 | 0.76 |
| 42 | 6.42 | 31 | 2.292 | 42 | 7.10 | 29 | 2.992 | 0.68 |
| SL_A | 7.54 | 24 | 2.206 | SL_A | 8.21 | 19 | 2.440 | 0.67 |
| 3 | 8.11 | 28 | 1.833 | 3 | 8.69 | 16 | 2.213 | 0.58 |
| 40 | 6.77 | 35 | 2.197 | 40 | 7.21 | 28 | 2.378 | 0.44 |
| 8 | 8.16 | 32 | 2.230 | 8 | 8.59 | 27 | 2.024 | 0.44 |
| 41 | 6.85 | 34 | 2.298 | 41 | 7.28 | 25 | 2.424 | 0.43 |
| 30 | 6.97 | 33 | 2.257 | 30 | 7.36 | 25 | 2.531 | 0.39 |
| 43 | 7.17 | 29 | 2.221 | 43 | 7.55 | 22 | 2.632 | 0.37 |
| 38 | 6.82 | 34 | 2.208 | 38 | 7.17 | 24 | 2.531 | 0.34 |
| 12 | 7.51 | 35 | 1.931 | 12 | 7.82 | 22 | 2.702 | 0.30 |
| 44 | 7.36 | 33 | 2.044 | 44 | 7.65 | 23 | 2.673 | 0.29 |
| 22 | 7.54 | 28 | 2.349 | 22 | 7.81 | 27 | 2.271 | 0.28 |
| 25 | 8.27 | 30 | 1.741 | 25 | 8.54 | 13 | 2.106 | 0.27 |
| SL_C | 7.30 | 23 | 2.324 | SL_C | 7.56 | 16 | 2.529 | 0.26 |
| 34 | 6.65 | 34 | 2.569 | 34 | 6.88 | 25 | 2.833 | 0.23 |
| 37 | 7.14 | 36 | 2.282 | 37 | 7.35 | 31 | 2.288 | 0.22 |
| 19 | 7.72 | 25 | 1.792 | 19 | 7.75 | 16 | 2.769 | 0.03 |
| 21 | 7.40 | 25 | 2.198 | 21 | 7.40 | 20 | 2.393 | 0.00 |
| 33 | 7.55 | 33 | 2.293 | 33 | 7.52 | 23 | 2.695 | -0.02 |
| 26 | 6.84 | 31 | 2.267 | 26 | 6.81 | 16 | 2.482 | -0.03 |
| 5 | 7.85 | 20 | 1.843 | 5 | 7.75 | 16 | 2.671 | -0.10 |
| 28 | 6.56 | 27 | 1.948 | 28 | 6.43 | 21 | 2.821 | -0.13 |
| 39 | 6.47 | 32 | 2.615 | 39 | 6.07 | 29 | 2.853 | -0.40 |
| 45 | 7.22 | 32 | 2.282 | 45 | 6.71 | 21 | 2.883 | -0.50 |
| 20 | 7.27 | 30 | 1.760 | 20 | 6.60 | 25 | 2.693 | -0.67 |
| 17 | 7.79 | 14 | 2.225 | 17 | 6.79 | 14 | 3.093 | -1.00 |
| Total | 6.09 | 1099 | 1.591 | Total | 7.80 | 921 | 2.518 | 1.71 |

Attention to Media Campaign News

Attention to news of government and politics is necessary to be an informed citizen. It is a reflection of the individual's sense of civic responsibility, the value placed on keeping up to date on political affairs and his or her level of interest.

Students were asked to indicate the amount of attention they paid to news about the presidential campaign on national TV, newspapers and the Internet. If they stated they gave a great deal of attention to all three they would receive a total score of 15. If they stated "some" to all three media sources they received a score of 9 and if they replied "none" to all they would receive a total score of 3.

Overall Semester Change in Non Service versus Service Learning Classes

Attention to the political news increased significantly in both the service and traditional classes. However, the 22 percent increase in the service classes was significantly larger than in the no service classes.

| Attention to Media News Political Campaigns | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----|---------|-----------------|--------------|----|---------|--------|----------------|--|
| Beginning of semester | | | | End of semester | | | | | | |
| Class | Sum of Means | N | Average | Class | Sum of Means | N | Average | Change | Percent change | |
| Non Service | 308.84 | 41 | 7.53 | Non Service | 351.98 | 41 | 8.58 | 1.05 | 14.0% | |
| Service | 30.55 | 4 | 7.64 | Service | 37.27 | 4 | 9.32 | 1.68 | 22.0% | |

Class Variations

The variation in class changes in attention to news about the presidential campaign suggests differential impacts of the classes.

Thirteen of the classes had 20 percent increases (+1.50 or more) in attention to the news and these large increases strongly suggest that the classes themselves affected the students. 21 classes had a 10 to 19 percent increase in attention to the news. The 11 classes that did not have a 10 percent change leaves open the question about a lack of class impact or distinctive students. Seven of these classes had above average interest to begin with and there might not have been much potential for average class change.

Three of the service learning classes had among the highest increases in attention to news of the presidential campaign. The fourth class also had a significant increase. Overall, the service learning classes did a very good job of drawing students' attention to the presidential race.

Attention to Political News: Beginning and End by Class

| Beginning of semester | | | | End of semester | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| Class # | Mean | N | Std. Dev. | Class # | Mean | N | Std. Dev. | Change |
| 30 | 7.21 | 33 | 2.881 | 30 | 9.48 | 25 | 2.931 | 2.27 |
| SL_D | 8.00 | 14 | 3.282 | SL_D | 10.11 | 9 | 2.759 | 2.11 |
| 14 | 8.68 | 25 | 2.704 | 14 | 10.65 | 17 | 2.572 | 1.97 |
| 6 | 7.74 | 39 | 2.731 | 6 | 9.65 | 31 | 1.976 | 1.90 |
| SL_A | 7.13 | 24 | 3.340 | SL_A | 9.00 | 19 | 2.906 | 1.88 |
| 27 | 6.84 | 32 | 2.567 | 27 | 8.71 | 28 | 2.070 | 1.87 |
| 7 | 7.35 | 20 | 3.407 | 7 | 9.15 | 13 | 2.544 | 1.80 |
| 20 | 6.50 | 30 | 1.852 | 20 | 8.28 | 25 | 1.948 | 1.78 |
| SL_C | 7.78 | 23 | 2.610 | SL_C | 9.50 | 16 | 2.989 | 1.72 |
| 10 | 8.63 | 24 | 2.901 | 10 | 10.27 | 15 | 2.187 | 1.64 |
| 40 | 6.43 | 35 | 2.240 | 40 | 7.96 | 28 | 2.631 | 1.54 |
| 43 | 7.34 | 29 | 2.553 | 43 | 8.86 | 22 | 2.416 | 1.52 |
| 11 | 7.77 | 26 | 2.889 | 11 | 9.29 | 14 | 2.644 | 1.52 |
| 28 | 7.56 | 27 | 2.063 | 28 | 9.05 | 21 | 2.312 | 1.49 |
| 13 | 7.06 | 33 | 2.179 | 13 | 8.55 | 20 | 2.665 | 1.49 |
| 38 | 7.74 | 34 | 3.097 | 38 | 9.17 | 24 | 2.297 | 1.43 |
| 23 | 7.14 | 28 | 1.900 | 23 | 8.38 | 21 | 2.500 | 1.24 |
| 5 | 7.90 | 20 | 2.954 | 5 | 9.13 | 16 | 2.778 | 1.23 |
| 21 | 6.88 | 25 | 2.279 | 21 | 8.10 | 20 | 1.804 | 1.22 |
| 22 | 7.29 | 28 | 2.386 | 22 | 8.44 | 27 | 2.778 | 1.16 |
| 12 | 7.17 | 35 | 2.895 | 12 | 8.32 | 22 | 2.056 | 1.15 |
| 34 | 6.68 | 34 | 2.519 | 34 | 7.76 | 25 | 2.385 | 1.08 |
| 29 | 6.71 | 34 | 2.316 | 29 | 7.77 | 26 | 2.717 | 1.06 |
| 44 | 7.76 | 33 | 2.958 | 44 | 8.78 | 23 | 2.255 | 1.03 |
| SL_B | 7.64 | 28 | 3.280 | SL_B | 8.66 | 32 | 2.026 | 1.01 |
| 3 | 8.43 | 28 | 2.631 | 3 | 9.44 | 16 | 2.502 | 1.01 |
| 35 | 6.33 | 30 | 2.218 | 35 | 7.33 | 12 | 2.741 | 1.00 |
| 37 | 6.69 | 36 | 2.303 | 37 | 7.68 | 31 | 2.522 | 0.98 |
| 2 | 7.54 | 13 | 2.025 | 2 | 8.50 | 10 | 1.841 | 0.96 |
| 4 | 8.15 | 26 | 2.292 | 4 | 9.08 | 13 | 1.498 | 0.92 |
| 31 | 6.29 | 31 | 2.673 | 31 | 7.21 | 19 | 2.507 | 0.92 |
| 42 | 7.58 | 31 | 3.117 | 42 | 8.48 | 29 | 2.899 | 0.90 |
| 26 | 7.55 | 31 | 2.942 | 26 | 8.44 | 16 | 1.750 | 0.89 |
| 25 | 8.60 | 30 | 2.824 | 25 | 9.46 | 13 | 2.989 | 0.86 |
| 36 | 6.64 | 28 | 2.670 | 36 | 7.38 | 21 | 2.906 | 0.74 |
| 41 | 7.24 | 34 | 2.571 | 41 | 7.96 | 25 | 2.406 | 0.72 |
| 1 | 8.11 | 27 | 2.900 | 1 | 8.82 | 17 | 2.186 | 0.71 |
| 17 | 7.57 | 14 | 2.209 | 17 | 8.07 | 14 | 3.540 | 0.50 |
| 33 | 7.73 | 33 | 3.054 | 33 | 8.22 | 23 | 3.162 | 0.49 |
| 19 | 8.56 | 25 | 2.347 | 19 | 8.88 | 16 | 2.527 | 0.32 |
| 8 | 9.34 | 32 | 2.497 | 8 | 9.56 | 27 | 2.359 | 0.21 |
| 39 | 7.75 | 32 | 3.172 | 39 | 7.76 | 29 | 2.214 | 0.01 |
| 18 | 6.84 | 25 | 2.718 | 18 | 6.85 | 13 | 2.672 | 0.01 |
| 45 | 8.00 | 32 | 2.817 | 45 | 7.95 | 21 | 2.578 | -0.05 |
| 24 | 9.52 | 25 | 3.687 | 24 | 9.18 | 17 | 2.942 | -0.34 |
| Total | 7.50 | 1276 | 2.759 | Total | 8.60 | 921 | 2.558 | 1.09 |

Student Assessments of Class Impacts

In the end of semester survey, students were asked if the class had changed their perspective about the importance of keeping up to date on political affairs, satisfaction with democracy or attention they paid to the political campaigns just conducted in the fall of 2004. Each of these subjects was also individually measured as part of the beginning and end of semester survey. (The students did not know how their answer to the end of semester question compared to their beginning of semester response.) The students' assessment responses allow an evaluation of the methodological meaning and validity of end of class student assessments of class impact. These types of questions are commonly found in the service learning outcome research.

Class Impact on Keeping Up to Date on Political Affairs

Assessment Change in Non Service versus Service Learning Classes

The students in the service classes were slightly more likely to state that their class increased the importance of keeping up to date. The 3.6 percent higher response is statistically significant but not a highly substantive difference.

| Class | Class Changed Importance of Keeping Up to Date | | | | Total |
|-------------|--|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| | Increased | No change | Decreased | No response | |
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Non-Service | 61.9 | 35.6 | 0.5 | 2.0 | 100 |
| Service | 65.5 | 31.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 100.1 |

Class Variations

As seen in the following table, the percent of students that stated the class had increased the importance they felt for keeping up to date varied from 100 percent of the students in class 13 to only 12.5 percent in class 26.

Among the service learning classes, class SL_D had the highest percent of students stating the class increased the importance. Interestingly, this class also had the largest change on this variable as measured by the beginning and end of semester surveys. The findings from Service class SL_A contain a contradiction. In the single self-assessment question, 68 percent stated the class had increased the value of keeping up to date. However, in the two time-period analyses there was in effect no change (3.46 to 3.53). The findings are contradictory and raise a question about the validity of the end of class student assessment for this class.

Service Learning Class Outcomes: Results Compared

| Student End of Term Assessment | | | | | Beginning & End Analysis | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------|
| Class | Increase | No change | Decrease | Total | Start Mean | End Mean | Change |
| SL_D | 77.8 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 100.0 | 2.86 | 3.78 | +0.92 |
| SL_A | 68.4 | 31.6 | | 100.0 | 3.46 | 3.53 | +0.07 |
| SL_B | 59.4 | 37.5 | 3.1 | 100.0 | 3.07 | 3.56 | +0.49 |
| SL_C | 56.3 | 43.8 | | 100.0 | 3.26 | 3.94 | +0.68 |

Comparison of the Student Assessment versus the Two Time Period Measure

The 10 Highest Rated Classes on Keeping Up to Date

The following table compares the ten classes with the highest increase in keeping up to date as measured by the student assessment versus the beginning and end analysis.

Only three of the highest student assessment classes can be found on the independent measure list (i.e., classes 7, 10, SL_D). The lack of a strong correspondence suggests that a factor, or factors, independent of a value change are affecting the single student assessment question.

| Student Self Assessment at End | | Beginning & End Analysis | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Course | Percent Increase | Course | Response Change |
| 13 | 100.0 | SL_D | 0.92 |
| 7 | 92.3 | 43 | 0.85 |
| 1 | 88.2 | 29 | 0.79 |
| 24 | 88.2 | 21 | 0.76 |
| 10 | 86.7 | 3 | 0.73 |
| 11 | 85.7 | 2 | 0.70 |
| 6 | 80.6 | SL_C | 0.68 |
| 8 | 77.8 | 30 | 0.67 |
| SL_D | 77.8 | 7 | 0.62 |
| 12 | 77.3 | 10 | 0.60 |

Comparison of the 10 Lowest Rated Classes

Four classes appear on both the student assessment and the beginning and end analysis as the lowest impact classes, again not a high correspondence. The responses in the lowest (class 26) do appear consistent, with the vast majority of students (81%) stating the class had no impact on keeping up to date and the beginning and end analysis indicated no change. On the other hand, among the 2nd and 3rd lowest classes in the student assessment, class 20 had the fourth highest increase as seen in the table above and class 20 had an above average increase of over 10 percent in beginning and end of semester means. These classes provide clear examples of conflicting results.

Comparison of the 10 Lowest Rated Classes

| Student Self Assessment at End | | Beginning & End Analysis | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Course | Percent Increase | Course | Response Change |
| 38 | 50.0 | 17 | -0.07 |
| 39 | 48.3 | 41 | -0.07 |
| 41 | 48.0 | 12 | -0.09 |
| 23 | 47.6 | 26 | -0.09 |
| 29 | 46.2 | 25 | -0.11 |
| 22 | 37.0 | 44 | -0.13 |
| 31 | 36.8 | 39 | -0.25 |
| 20 | 36.0 | 36 | -0.37 |
| 21 | 35.0 | 31 | -0.37 |
| 26 | 12.5 | 27 | -0.40 |

Student Assessment of Change for Importance of Keeping Up to Date

| Course | increased | no change | decreased | no response | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| 13 | 100.0 | | | | 100.0 |
| 7 | 92.3 | | | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| 1 | 88.2 | 11.8 | | | 100.0 |
| 24 | 88.2 | 11.8 | | | 100.0 |
| 10 | 86.7 | 13.3 | | | 100.0 |
| 11 | 85.7 | 7.1 | | 7.1 | 100.0 |
| 6 | 80.6 | 19.4 | | | 100.0 |
| 8 | 77.8 | 22.2 | | | 100.0 |
| SL_D | 77.8 | 11.1 | 11.1 | | 100.0 |
| 12 | 77.3 | 22.7 | | | 100.0 |
| 4 | 76.9 | 15.4 | | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| 18 | 76.9 | 15.4 | | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| 25 | 76.9 | 23.1 | | | 100.0 |
| 5 | 75.0 | 12.5 | | 12.5 | 100.0 |
| 30 | 72.0 | 24.0 | | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| 44 | 69.6 | 30.4 | | | 100.0 |
| SL_A | 68.4 | 31.6 | | | 100.0 |
| 34 | 68.0 | 28.0 | 4.0 | | 100.0 |
| 14 | 64.7 | 29.4 | | 5.9 | 100.0 |
| 3 | 62.5 | 37.5 | | | 100.0 |
| 19 | 62.5 | 37.5 | | | 100.0 |
| 42 | 62.1 | 31.0 | | 6.9 | 100.0 |
| 33 | 60.9 | 34.8 | | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| 40 | 60.7 | 39.3 | | | 100.0 |
| SL_B | 59.4 | 37.5 | 3.1 | | 100.0 |
| 36 | 57.1 | 42.9 | | | 100.0 |
| SL_C | 56.3 | 43.8 | | | 100.0 |
| 37 | 54.8 | 45.2 | | | 100.0 |
| 43 | 54.5 | 45.5 | | | 100.0 |
| 27 | 53.6 | 46.4 | | | 100.0 |
| 28 | 52.4 | 47.6 | | | 100.0 |
| 45 | 52.4 | 47.6 | | | 100.0 |
| 2 | 50.0 | 45.8 | | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| 17 | 50.0 | 50.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 35 | 50.0 | 50.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 38 | 50.0 | 50.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 39 | 48.3 | 44.8 | | 6.9 | 100.0 |
| 41 | 48.0 | 44.0 | | 8.0 | 100.0 |
| 23 | 47.6 | 47.6 | 4.8 | | 100.0 |
| 29 | 46.2 | 50.0 | 3.8 | | 100.0 |
| 22 | 37.0 | 63.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 31 | 36.8 | 63.2 | | | 100.0 |
| 20 | 36.0 | 64.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 21 | 35.0 | 65.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 26 | 12.5 | 81.3 | 6.3 | | 100.0 |
| Total | 61.0 | 36.6 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 100.0 |

Student Assessment of Class Impact on Their Satisfaction with Democracy

Assessment Change in Non Service verse Service Learning Classes

The students in the service classes were twice as likely to state that they thought the class decreased their satisfaction with democracy (18% to 9 %). There was no difference between the two types of classes on increased satisfaction.

| Class | Class Changed Satisfaction with Democracy | | | | total response |
|-------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----|-------------------|
| | increased | no change | Decreased | no | |
| | % | % | % | % | |
| Non-Service | 36.6 | 51.7 | 9.2 | 2.4 | 99.9 |
| Service | 36.4 | 44.8 | 18.0 | 0.8 | 100.0 |

Class Variation

In the students' assessment, the classes had much less impact on satisfaction with democracy in America versus the previous variable on the importance of keeping up to date on political affairs. This assessment corresponds to the beginning and end of semester analysis of this variable that found no overall change during the semester. The average percent of students stating their class increased their satisfaction was only 37 percent compared to 61 percent on keeping up to date. In only four classes did a majority of students state the class increased their satisfaction. Among these four classes was SL_A. The common student response to this question was that the class had no change on their attitude.

As with the previous variable the data is contradictory for class SL_A. The majority (58%) stated the class increased their satisfaction and this was the third highest increase among all the classes. However the mean responses as measured at the beginning and end of the semester were 4.04 and 4.00, in effect no change. Are the student evaluations for this class benefiting from a "halo effect" where positive student attitudes toward the class are resulting in what the students perceived as favorable evaluations for the class? The two methodologies for measuring democracy satisfaction did correspond for the other three service learning classes. The majority of students did not perceive the class increasing their satisfaction and that is what the beginning and end analysis found.

Service Learning Class Results Compared on Satisfaction with Democracy

| Class | Student End of Term Assessment | | | Beginning & End Analysis | | |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------|
| | Increase | No change | Decrease | Start Mean | End Mean | Change |
| SL_A | 57.9 | 31.6 | 10.5 | 4.04 | 4.00 | -0.04 |
| SL_B | 34.4 | 53.1 | 9.4 | 3.79 | 3.69 | -0.10 |
| SL_C | 31.3 | 50.0 | 18.8 | 3.74 | 3.75 | 0.01 |
| SL_D | 22.2 | 44.4 | 33.3 | 3.00 | 3.22 | +0.22 |

Comparison of the Student Assessment versus the Two Time Period Measure

The 10 Highest Rated Classes on Change in Satisfaction with Democracy

Only three of the classes (7, 12 and 43) appear on both top ten lists. This is not a good correspondence. Interestingly, though, the top rated class (number 7) is the same rank in both measures of this variable.

Comparison of the 10 Highest Rated Classes

| Student Self Assessment at End | | Beginning & End Analysis | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Course | Percent Increase | Course | Response Change |
| 7 | 69.2 | 7 | 0.50 |
| 10 | 60.0 | 20 | 0.49 |
| SL_A | 57.9 | 6 | 0.47 |
| 30 | 56.0 | 34 | 0.38 |
| 5 | 50.0 | 31 | 0.36 |
| 11 | 50.0 | 22 | 0.32 |
| 12 | 50.0 | 8 | 0.30 |
| 24 | 47.1 | 43 | 0.22 |
| 40 | 46.4 | SL_D | 0.22 |
| 43 | 45.5 | 12 | 0.21 |

Four of the classes with the lowest student assessment also appear on the beginning and end analysis. Class number 1 is second to the lowest on both lists. However, the large amount of inconsistency again suggests that something besides real attitude change is affecting the student assessment.

Comparison of the 10 Lowest Rated Classes

| Student Self Assessment at End | | Beginning & End Analysis | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Course | Percent Increase | Course | Response Change |
| 21 | 25.0 | 42 | -0.28 |
| 27 | 25.0 | 23 | -0.29 |
| 34 | 24.0 | 29 | -0.31 |
| 18 | 23.1 | 24 | -0.32 |
| SL_D | 22.2 | 21 | -0.34 |
| 22 | 22.2 | 4 | -0.38 |
| 41 | 20.0 | 13 | -0.41 |
| 4 | 15.4 | 26 | -0.41 |
| 1 | 11.8 | 1 | -0.45 |
| 26 | 0 | 39 | -0.50 |

Student Assessment of Class Impact on Satisfaction With Democracy

| Classes Sorted High to Low on Increase Percent | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Course # | increased | no change | decreased | no response | Total |
| 7 | 69.2 | 23.1 | | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| 10 | 60.0 | 33.3 | 6.7 | | 100.0 |
| SL_A | 57.9 | 31.6 | 10.5 | | 100.0 |
| 30 | 56.0 | 28.0 | 12.0 | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| 5 | 50.0 | 31.3 | 6.3 | 12.5 | 100.0 |
| 11 | 50.0 | 42.9 | 7.1 | | 100.0 |
| 12 | 50.0 | 40.9 | 9.1 | | 100.0 |
| 24 | 47.1 | 29.4 | 23.5 | | 100.0 |
| 40 | 46.4 | 53.6 | | | 100.0 |
| 43 | 45.5 | 54.5 | | | 100.0 |
| 6 | 45.2 | 51.6 | 3.2 | | 100.0 |
| 3 | 43.8 | 50.0 | 6.3 | | 100.0 |
| 33 | 43.5 | 43.5 | 13.0 | | 100.0 |
| 44 | 43.5 | 52.2 | 4.3 | | 100.0 |
| 45 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 4.8 | 9.5 | 100.0 |
| 37 | 41.9 | 54.8 | 3.2 | | 100.0 |
| 14 | 41.2 | 35.3 | 17.6 | 5.9 | 100.0 |
| 2 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | | 100.0 |
| 23 | 38.1 | 57.1 | 4.8 | | 100.0 |
| 36 | 38.1 | 61.9 | | | 100.0 |
| 39 | 37.9 | 41.4 | 13.8 | 6.9 | 100.0 |
| 19 | 37.5 | 56.3 | 6.3 | | 100.0 |
| 38 | 37.5 | 58.3 | | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| 31 | 36.8 | 63.2 | | | 100.0 |
| 20 | 36.0 | 64.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 17 | 35.7 | 57.1 | 7.1 | | 100.0 |
| 42 | 34.5 | 48.3 | 10.3 | 6.9 | 100.0 |
| SL_B | 34.4 | 53.1 | 9.4 | 3.1 | 100.0 |
| 28 | 33.3 | 52.4 | 9.5 | 4.8 | 100.0 |
| 35 | 33.3 | 66.7 | | | 100.0 |
| SL_C | 31.3 | 50.0 | 18.8 | | 100.0 |
| 25 | 30.8 | 61.5 | | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| 29 | 30.8 | 50.0 | 15.4 | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| 13 | 30.0 | 25.0 | 40.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| 8 | 29.6 | 63.0 | 7.4 | | 100.0 |
| 21 | 25.0 | 70.0 | 5.0 | | 100.0 |
| 27 | 25.0 | 60.7 | 14.3 | | 100.0 |
| 34 | 24.0 | 72.0 | 4.0 | | 100.0 |
| 18 | 23.1 | 69.2 | | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| SL_D | 22.2 | 44.4 | 33.3 | | 100.0 |
| 22 | 22.2 | 77.8 | | | 100.0 |
| 41 | 20.0 | 72.0 | | 8.0 | 100.0 |
| 4 | 15.4 | 46.2 | 38.5 | | 100.0 |
| 1 | 11.8 | 29.4 | 52.9 | 5.9 | 100.0 |
| 26 | 0 | 87.5 | 12.5 | | 100.0 |
| Total | 36.7 | 51.9 | 9.1 | 2.3 | 100.0 |

Student Assessment that the Class Changed Their Attention to Political Campaigns

Assessment of Change in Non-Service versus Service Classes

The students in the non-service classes were more likely to state that their class increased their attention to the political campaigns this year.

| Class | Class Changed Attention to Political Campaigns | | | | total |
|-------------|--|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| | increased | no change | decreased | no response | |
| | % | % | % | % | % |
| Non-Service | 60.9 | 36.4 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 99.9 |
| Service | 56.7 | 42.5 | 0.8 | | 100 |

Class Variations

When the classes are sorted by the percentage of students stating that the class changed the amount of attention they paid to the political campaign this year, all of the top classes are non-service learning classes. Only one of the service classes (SL_C) is above the overall average percentage increase of 59 percent. The results from this question lead to the conclusion that the service classes did not do as good a job as the non-service classes. The beginning and end analyses have a totally different finding. In that analysis, three of the service classes are in the top ten and the overall average increase in attention is very significantly higher than the traditional classes.

Service Learning Class Results Compared on Attention to Political Campaigns

| Class | Student End of Term Assessment | | | Beginning & End Analysis | | |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------|
| | Increase | No change | Decrease | Start Mean | End Mean | Change |
| SL_C | 68.8 | 31.3 | 0 | 7.78 | 9.50 | 1.72 |
| SL_D | 55.6 | 44.4 | 0 | 8.00 | 10.11 | 2.11 |
| SL_A | 52.6 | 47.4 | 0 | 7.13 | 9.00 | 1.88 |
| SL_B | 50.0 | 46.9 | 3.1 | 7.64 | 8.66 | 1.01 |

There was a very large variation between the classes on the extent that the class increased students' attention to the political news. The range went from a high of 100 percent attention increase in class 11 to a low in class 26 of 13 percent. It seems more than a coincidence that class 26 has the lowest student assessment of change on all three of the questions – importance of keeping up to date, satisfaction with democracy and increase in attention to the news.

Comparison of the 10 Highest Rated Classes

Only two of the classes appear on the top ten lists for both variables. While the service classes had 3 of the highest measured gains, none of the classes were in the top ten on the student self-assessment. In most cases the student assessment of increase is supported by some degree of measured change for this variable. However, interpreting the percentage of students who reported an increase as reflecting an actual impact of the class on the students is not supported by the measurement of this variable at the beginning and end of class.

Comparison of the 10 Highest Rated Classes

| Beginning & End Analysis | | Student Self Assessment at End | |
|--------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Course | Change | Course | Percent Increase |
| 30 | 2.27 | 11 | 100.0 |
| SL_D | 2.11 | 6 | 93.5 |
| 14 | 1.97 | 1 | 88.2 |
| 6 | 1.90 | 5 | 87.5 |
| SL_A | 1.88 | 13 | 85.0 |
| 27 | 1.87 | 4 | 84.6 |
| 7 | 1.80 | 7 | 84.6 |
| 20 | 1.78 | 12 | 77.3 |
| SL_C | 1.72 | 18 | 76.9 |
| 10 | 1.64 | 24 | 76.5 |

Only two of the classes appear on both of the low change lists. The six lowest classes in the student assessment all had ten percent or more increases in the measurement of the beginning and end of term means. Class 41 is the first of the lowest student assessments with less than a measured ten percent increase from the start to the end of the term. This analysis again supports the idea, that on the variables measured, student's perception of change and actual change do not have a high degree of correspondence.

Comparison of the 10 Lowest Rated Classes

| Beginning & End Analysis | | Student Self Assessment at End | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Course | Response Change | Course | Percent Increase |
| 41 | 0.72 | 17 | 42.9 |
| 1 | 0.71 | 23 | 42.9 |
| 17 | 0.50 | 38 | 41.7 |
| 33 | 0.49 | 41 | 40.0 |
| 19 | 0.32 | 37 | 38.7 |
| 8 | 0.21 | 22 | 37.0 |
| 39 | 0.01 | 27 | 35.7 |
| 18 | 0.01 | 29 | 34.6 |
| 45 | -0.05 | 31 | 26.3 |
| 24 | -0.34 | 26 | 12.5 |

Student Assessment of Class Impact on Student Attention to Political News

| Course | increased | no change | decreased | no response | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| 11 | 100.0 | | | | 100.0 |
| 6 | 93.5 | 6.5 | | | 100.0 |
| 1 | 88.2 | 11.8 | | | 100.0 |
| 5 | 87.5 | | | 12.5 | 100.0 |
| 13 | 85.0 | 15.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 4 | 84.6 | 15.4 | | | 100.0 |
| 7 | 84.6 | 7.7 | | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| 12 | 77.3 | 22.7 | | | 100.0 |
| 18 | 76.9 | 15.4 | | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| 24 | 76.5 | 23.5 | | | 100.0 |
| 45 | 76.2 | 23.8 | | | 100.0 |
| 3 | 75.0 | 25.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 19 | 75.0 | 25.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 8 | 74.1 | 25.9 | | | 100.0 |
| 10 | 73.3 | 26.7 | | | 100.0 |
| 14 | 70.6 | 23.5 | | 5.9 | 100.0 |
| SL_C | 68.8 | 31.3 | | | 100.0 |
| 34 | 68.0 | 32.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 36 | 66.7 | 33.3 | | | 100.0 |
| 30 | 64.0 | 32.0 | | 4.0 | 100.0 |
| 25 | 61.5 | 30.8 | | 7.7 | 100.0 |
| 33 | 60.9 | 30.4 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 100.0 |
| 44 | 60.9 | 39.1 | | | 100.0 |
| 2 | 60.0 | 40.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 42 | 58.6 | 34.5 | | 6.9 | 100.0 |
| 40 | 57.1 | 39.3 | 3.6 | | 100.0 |
| SL_D | 55.6 | 44.4 | | | 100.0 |
| SL_A | 52.6 | 47.4 | | | 100.0 |
| 21 | 50.0 | 50.0 | | | 100.0 |
| SL_B | 50.0 | 46.9 | 3.1 | | 100.0 |
| 35 | 50.0 | 50.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 43 | 50.0 | 50.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 20 | 48.0 | 52.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 28 | 47.6 | 52.4 | | | 100.0 |
| 39 | 44.8 | 41.4 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 100.0 |
| 17 | 42.9 | 57.1 | | | 100.0 |
| 23 | 42.9 | 57.1 | | | 100.0 |
| 38 | 41.7 | 50.0 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| 41 | 40.0 | 52.0 | | 8.0 | 100.0 |
| 37 | 38.7 | 58.1 | 3.2 | | 100.0 |
| 22 | 37.0 | 63.0 | | | 100.0 |
| 27 | 35.7 | 64.3 | | | 100.0 |
| 29 | 34.6 | 61.5 | 3.8 | | 100.0 |
| 31 | 26.3 | 73.7 | | | 100.0 |
| 26 | 12.5 | 81.3 | 6.3 | | 100.0 |
| Total | 59.0 | 38.4 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 100.0 |

Conclusions

The Value of Service Learning

Service learning and civic education are based on the belief that through the development of knowledge, skills and abilities, civic engagement can be fostered. To the extent that the actions of government and political leaders disillusion citizens, it is very questionable that civic education alone will fundamentally change cynicism and disillusionment.

It is clear from the findings that the classes studied varied greatly in their impact on students. The service learning classes were exemplary in fostering positive changes in some of the variable measured. The classes with a service component had significantly higher improvements than non-service classes on the following variables:

- ❖ Keeping up to date on political affairs
- ❖ Registering to vote
- ❖ Internal political efficacy
- ❖ Social trust
- ❖ Attention to media news on government and politics

The service classes had similar outcomes as non-service classes for:

- ✓ External political efficacy
- ✓ Political trust
- ✓ Satisfaction with democracy
- ✓ Interest in presidential winner and the political campaign

The lack of difference noted above is affected by the fact that the classes overall did not impact those four variables.

Individual service classes stood out for some of the variables studied.

Class SL_D had the highest increase in the value and importance of keeping up to date on political affairs followed by non service classes 43 and 29.

Class SL_B had the highest increase in voter registration.

Class SL_D had the second highest increase in reported attention to the news after the highest increase found in class 30.

Class SL_B had the third highest increase in the presidential campaign after non-service classes 6 and 7.

It can be concluded that the service component significantly increases the likelihood that a class will foster some of the values, beliefs and attitudes that underlie civic engagement.

Based on the variables measured in this research, it can be concluded that of the 45 total classes studied, service classes SL_B and SL_D had the greatest positive impact on the students relative to factors underlying civic engagement.

However, an individual class in a similar subject (e.g. US Government and Politics) can have comparable results. The outcomes measured were also outstanding in non-service classes number 43, 29 and 7.

Interpreting the Reported Satisfaction with Democracy

Given the student's negative attitudes about the responsiveness and efficiency of government, why did 72 percent state they were satisfied or fairly satisfied with the way democracy works in the United States? How does this level of satisfaction make sense when less than half of these same students believe they can trust the government to do what is right most of the time and when less than a third believe that government is run for the benefit of all the people? The findings in this research do not provide an answer to these questions so that only conjectures can be made.

The first possibility is that it is an illogical contradiction and if students were asked about it they would admit that is the case.

A second speculation is that student's view their government as very deficient but they are satisfied overall when you consider the alternatives.

A third interpretation would suggest that in the minds of these Americans the concept "democracy" in the survey question is multidimensional with government as one part. Yes, government cannot be trusted, government is largely run by a few big interests and elections lack the meaning they should but there are other considerations. Democracy goes far beyond the political. The broader meaning includes freedom of lifestyle, freedom of religion and the opportunity to make money and be successful. Students find government and political officials a disillusionment but they overall are satisfied because of a lack of constraints that serves the value of individualism. From this broad and individualistic perspective, student satisfaction with the way democracy works in the United States is not a contradiction at all.

A number of writers have argued that they are very concerned excessive individualism will undermine democracy in America because it erodes the citizens' sense of civic responsibility, commitment to civic engagement and concern for the common good over and above self-interest. (Putnam. 2000) (Ehrlich. 2000) This interpretation implies that civic education must challenge excessive individualism and develop the moral imperative of working for the common good.

Social Trust

The low level of social trust expressed by these students should also be noted. At the end of the term only 42 percent stated they believed most people would try to be fair and 43 percent believed that most people would try to take advantage of them if they had the chance. Future research is needed to explore in greater detail the meaning of social trust for civic engagement.

Low levels of social trust not only impede political behavior but all forms of civic engagement. Trusting and respecting others is necessary for coming together in common causes and such non-governmental efforts are very important for democracy in America.

The Methodology of End of Class Student Assessments

The findings in this research strongly urge caution in the use of end of class student assessments of service learning impacts. If those types of questions had been the only source of data for evaluation of the fall 2004 service learning classes, that data would have presented a largely different picture of class outcomes. By those measures the non service classes did as well or better than the service classes. However, it was very clear from the beginning and end of term measures that the service learning classes were exemplary, particularly class SL_D.

The research findings were significant when service classes were compared as a group to traditional classes and there were also significant findings when the individual service classes were analyzed separately. The fact that service class SL_D distinctively increased political trust and external political efficacy is striking and points out the need to research the outcome differences between service learning classes.

Service Learning and Civic Engagement

The research found that many of the classes in the study increased students' knowledge, skills and abilities about politics and government. Furthermore, students indicated that they were aware of these changes and, in general, believed they had a better understanding of government and politics.

However, what did not appear to change could be very significant for a student's future civic engagement. Specifically, there are low levels of political trust in government and elected officials. Students perceive that government is primarily run for the benefit of special interests. There is widespread belief that elections do not necessarily make government pay attention to what people think; an attitude undermining the worth and meaning of voting.

The research findings lend support to the conclusion that service learning classes have a unique learning value. Unfortunately, the findings did not provide reasons to encourage optimism that a service class can overcome existing distrust of government and disillusionment with elected officials. To the extent that a lack of trust in government and perception that voting is meaningless is a strong cause of civic disengagement, service learning education alone cannot be expected to foster a renewal of civic engagement.

Bibliography

- Andolina, Keeter, Zukin & Jenkins. (2003). *A Guide to the Index of Civic and Political Engagement*. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE).
- Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda & Yee. (2000). *How Service Learning Affects Students*. University of California, Los Angeles. Higher Education Research Institute.
- Bahmuelier, Charles F. (1995). *National Standards for Civics and Government*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED380401).
- Billig, Shelley H. & Eyler, Janet. (2003). *Deconstructing Service-Learning Research Exploring Context, Participation, and Impacts*. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Billig, Shelley H., Meyer, Stephen & Hofschire, Linda. (2003). *Study of Civic Engagement on Three Campuses*. Denver, CO: RMC Research Corporation.
- Blackhurst, Anne E. & Foster, Joshua. (2003). *College Students and Citizenship: A Comparison of Civic Attitudes and Involvement in 1996 and 2000*. NASPA Journal, Vol. 40, No. 3, Spring 2003, pp. 153-174.
- Bok, Derek C. (2001). *Easing Political Cynicism with Civic Involvement*. Chronical of Higher Education, 3/16/2001, Vol. 47, Issue 27, p. B7, 4 pp. (EBSCO, Accession No. 4196195).
- Boyte, Harry C. (2003) *Putting Politics Back Into Civic Engagement*. Campus Compact Reader: Service Learning and Civic Education. Special Edition. Summer.
- Burns, Nancy & Kinder, Donald. (2000). *Social Trust and Democratic Politics*. Report to the National Election Studies Board, based on the 2000 NES Special Topic Pilot Study.
- Carpini, Michael X. Delli. (2000). *Gen.com: Youth, Civic Engagement, and the New Information Environment*. Political Communication, Vol. 17 Issue 4, (p. 341, 9p). (EBSCO AN: 3888183).
- Change. (November/December 2000). *Practicing What You Preach Gauging the Civic Engagement of College Graduates*. The National Center for Postsecondary Improvement (NCPI). The Landscape.
- Conway, M. Margaret. (1991). *Political Participation in the United States (Second Edition)*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc.
- Donovan, Carrie & Lopez, Mark Hugo. (2002). *Youth Voter Turnout in the States During the 1998 Midterm and 2000 Presidential Elections*. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE).
- Eberly, Don. (1998). *Civic Renewal vs. Moral Renewal*. Policy Review, 01465945, Sept/Oct 1998, Issue 91. (EBSCO)

- Ehrlich, Thomas. (2000). *Civic Responsibility and Higher Education*. Phoenix, Arizona: The American Council on Education Series on Higher Education and The Oryx Press.
- Eyler, Giles, Stenson & Gray. (2001). *At a Glance: What we know about the Effects of Service-Learning on College Students, Faculty, Institutions and Communities, 1993-2000: Third Edition*. Vanderbilt University.
- Eyler, Janet & Giles, Dwight E., Jr. (1999). *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Eyler, Janet S. (2000). *What Do We Most Need to Know About the Impact of Service-Learning on Student Learning?* MJCSL, Special Issue – S. Directions (2000).
- Flanagan, Constance A. & Faison, Nakesha. (2001). *Youth Civic Development: Implications of Research for Social Policy and Programs*. A Publication of the Society for Research in Child Development, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI. Social Policy Report, Vol. XV, No. 1.
- Galston, William A. (2001). *Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland, School of Public Affairs (pp. 217-234).
- Galston, William A. (2003, September). *Civic Education and Political Participation*. Phi Delta Kappan (pp. 29-33).
- Garman, Brian. (1995). *Civic Education through Service Learning*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED390720).
- Gottlieb, Karla & Robinson, Gail. (2002). *A Practical Guide for Integrating Civic Responsibility into the Curriculum*. Community College Press, Washington, DC.
- Gray, Maryann J., Ondaatje, Elizabeth H., Zakaras, Laura. (1999). *Combining Service and Learning in Higher Education: Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program*. RAND Publication, Santa Monica, CA.
- Harvard University: Institute of Politics. (2004). *The Political Personality of America's College Students: A Poll by Harvard's Institute of Politics*.
- Hepburn, Mary A., Niemi, Richard G., & Chapman, Chris. (2000). *Service Learning in College Political Science: Queries and Commentary*. American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.
- Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). (2005). Cooperative Institutional Research Program. CIRP Freshman Survey 2004. UCLA. www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/freshman.html
- Herring, Cedric. (1989). *Splitting the Middle Political Alienation, Acquiescence, and Activism Among American's Middle Layers*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Hunter, Susan & Brisbin, Richard A., Jr. (2000). *The Impact of Service Learning on Democratic and Civic Values*. American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.

- Kasser, Tim & Ahuvia, Aaron. (2002). *Materialistic Values and Well-being in Business Students*. European Journal of Social Psychology, No. 32, (pp. 137-146).
- Keeter, Zukin, Andolina & Jenkins. (2002). *The Civic and Political Health of the Nation: A Generational Portrait*. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE).
- Kirlin, Mary. (2003). *The Role of Civic Skills in Fostering Civic Engagement*. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE). Circle Working Paper 06.
- Lake Snell Perry & Associates, The Tarrance Group. (2004). *Findings from a Recent National Survey Among 15-25 Year Olds*. The Center for Democracy and Citizenship at The Council for Excellence in Government. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE).
- Lee, Lucy. (1997). *Civic Literacy, Service Learning, and Community Renewal*. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED405913).
- Levi, Margaret & Stoker, Laura. (2000). *Political Trust and Trustworthiness*. Annual Reviews Political Science 2000 3:475-507.
- Levine, Arthur & Cureton, Jeanette S. (1998). *When Hope and Fear Collide*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
- Levine, Peter and Lopez, Mark Hugo. (2002). *Youth Voter Turnout has Declined, by Any Measure*. College Park, MD: School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland.
- Lisman, C. David. (1997). *What Are We Trying to Evaluate in the Name of Service?* Campus Compact National Center for Community Colleges, Mesa, AZ.
- Long, Sarah E. (2001). *The New Student Politics: The Wingspread Statement on Student Civic Engagement (Second Edition)*. Providence, RI: Brown University. Campus Compact.
- Lopez, Mark Hugo & Kolaczowski, Jason P. (2003). *Civic Engagement Among Non-College Attending 18-25 Year Olds*. College Park, MD: School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland.
- Lopez, Mark Hugo. (2003). *Volunteering Among Young People*. College Park, MD: School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland.
- Macedo, Berry, Fung, Levinson & Karpowitz. (2004). Draft of *General Overview: Toward a Political Science of Citizenship*. American Political Science Association Standing Committee on Civic & Education and Engagement, Washington, DC.
- Mallory, Bruce L. & Thomas, Nancy L. (2004). *When Medium Is the Message: Promoting Ethical Action Through Democratic Dialogue*. Campus Compact Reader, Winter 2004. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, September/October 2003, Vol. 35, Number 5, (pp. 10-17).

- Metzger, Aaron. (no date). *Disaggregating Civic and Community Involvement in Middle-Class African American Adolescents*. University of Rochester, Rochester, NY.
- Morrell, Michael E. (2003). *Survey and Experimental Evidence for a Reliable and Valid Measure of Internal Political Efficacy*. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Volume 67:589-602.
- National Election Studies. (no date). *NES Contributions to Scholarship: A Review*. Downloaded July 28, 2004. <http://www.umich.edu/~nes/resources/papers/sapintro.htm>
- Patrick, John J. (1998). *Education for Engagement in Civil Society and Government*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED423211).
- Patterson, Thomas E. (2002). *The Vanishing Voter: Public Involvement in an Age of Uncertainty*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Pinkleton, Bruce E. & Weinstraub-Austin, Erica. (2001). *Individual Motivations, Perceived Media Importance, and Political Disaffection*. *Political Communication*, 18:321-334.
- Putnam, Robert D. (2000). *Bowling Alone*. New York. Simon and Schuster.
- Rahn, Wendy M. & Transue, John E. (1998). *Social Trust and Value Change: The Decline of Social Capital In American Youth, 1976-1995*. *International Society of Political Psychology*, Vol. 19, No. 3.
- Renner, Tanya & Bush, Michele. (1997). *Evaluation and Assessment in Service-Learning*. Campus Compact National Center for Community Colleges, Mesa, AZ.
- Robinson, John P., Shaver, Phillip R. & Wrightsman, Lawrence S. (1999). *Measures of Political Attitudes*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
- Schudson, Michael. (2003). How People Learn To Be Civic. In E.J. Dionne Jr., Kayla Meltzer Drogosz & Robert Litan (Eds.), *United We Serve: National Service and the Future of Citizenship* (pp. 14-21). The Brookings Institution Press.
- Southwell, Priscilla Lewis & Everest, Marcy Jean. (1998). *The Electoral Consequences of Alienation: Nonvoting and Protest Voting in the 1992 Presidential Race*. *Social Science Journal*; 1998, Vol. 35 Issue 1, p. 43, 9 pp., 3 charts. (EBSCO Accession No. 273915).
- Spiezio, K. Edward. (2002). *Pedagogy and Political*. *Liberal Education*, Fall 2002, Cedar Crest College (pp. 14-19).
- Torney-Purta, Judith & Henry Barber, Carolyn. (2004). *Strengths and Weaknesses in U.S. Students' Knowledge and Skills: Analysis from the IEA Civic Education Study*. The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE).
- Torney-Purta, Judith, Amadeo, Jo-Ann & Lehmann, Rainer. (2001). *Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age 14 in 28 Countries: Results from the IEA Civic Education Study*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED452142).
- Walker, Tobi. (2002). *Service as a Pathway to Political Participation: What Research Tells Us*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. *Applied Developmental Science* 2002, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 183-188.

Watson, John J. (no date). *A Cross-Cultural Comparison of the Explanatory Power of Materialism and Life Cycle Stage for Important Possessions*. University of Canterbury.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Second Edition. G&C Merriam Co. 1958.

Westheimer, Joel & Kahne, Joseph. (2003, September). *Reconnecting Education To Democracy: Democratic Dialogues*. Phi Delta Kappan (pp. 8-14).

Winter, Nicholas. (2003). *Social Capital, Civic Engagement and Positive Youth Development Outcomes*. Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, DC.

Youniss, James & McLellan, Jeffrey A. (1997). *What we know about Engendering Civic Identity*. American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 40, No. 5, March/April 1997.

**Social & Political Attitudes
End of Class Survey
SLCC Fall 2004**

Course: _____
No.: _____ Section: _____

It is important for College faculty and staff to keep up-to-date on how their students view our society and the changes taking place. This student survey is one part of the on-going effort to listen to our students. You can help by being very straightforward in your responses. The SLCC Office of Institutional Research will aggregate the responses from all classes and your particular answers will be anonymous.

| Following are a few statements about public life. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of them. Please circle one answer number | | agree strongly | agree somewhat | neither agree nor disagree | disagree somewhat | disagree strongly | don't know |
|--|--|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------|
| 1 | I feel that I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing our country. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 2 | So many other people vote in the national election that it doesn't matter much to me whether I vote or not. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 3 | I think that I am better informed about politics and government than most people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 4 | Public officials don't care much what people like me think. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 5 | I feel that I could do as good a job in public office as most other people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 6 | People like me don't have any say about what the government does. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 7 | I consider myself well-qualified to participate in politics. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 8 | Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |

Indicate your thinking on the following: please circle one answer

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------|----------------|---------------|
| 9 | Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance or would they try to be fair? | take advantage | try to be fair | don't know |
|---|--|-------------------|----------------|---------------|

Indicate your thinking on the following: please circle one answer per question

| | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 10 | Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people? | can be trusted | you can't be too careful | don't know |
| 11 | Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are just looking out for themselves? | try to be helpful | just look out for themselves | don't know |

| People have different ideas about the government in Washington. These ideas don't refer to Democrats or Republicans in particular, but just to the government in general. We want to see how you feel about these ideas. | | |
|---|--|--|
| 12 | How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right? | 1. just about always 2. most of the time 3. only some of the time 4. never 8. don't know |
| 13 | Do you think that people in government waste a lot of the money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much? | 1. waste a lot 2. waste some 3. don't waste very much 8. don't know |
| 14 | 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? | 1. gov't run by a few big interests 2. gov't run for the benefit of all 8. don't know |
| 15 | How much do you feel that having elections makes the government pay attention to what the people think? | 1. a good deal 2. some 3. not much 8. don't know |
| 16 | Do you think that quite a few of the people running the government are crooked, not very many are, or do you think hardly any of them are crooked? | 1. quite a few are crooked 2. not very many are crooked 3. hardly any are crooked 8. don't know |
| 17 | Over the years, how much attention do you feel the government pays to what people think when it decides what to do? | 1. a good deal 2. some 3. not much 8. don't know |
| 18 | On the whole, are you satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, or not at all satisfied with the way democracy works in the United States? | 1. satisfied 2. fairly satisfied 3. not very satisfied 4. not at all satisfied 8. don't know |

| Please indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following: (Circle <u>one</u> answer number) | | essential | very important | somewhat important | not important |
|---|--|-----------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|
| 19 | Developing a meaningful philosophy of life | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20 | Keeping up to date with political affairs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21 | Being very well off financially | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22 | Becoming successful in a business of my own | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23 | Obtaining recognition from my colleagues for contributions to my field of work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 24 | Having administrative responsibility for the work of others | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25 | When you are older, owning more possessions than your parents do now (or did) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

| Indicate your thinking on the following: | | |
|--|---|--|
| 26 | Some people don't pay much attention to political campaigns. How about you? Would you say that you have been very much interested, somewhat interested or not much interested in the political campaigns so far this year? | 1. very much interested 2. somewhat interested 3. not much interested 8. don't know |
| 27 | Generally speaking, would you say that you personally care a good deal who wins the presidential election this fall, or that you don't care very much who wins? | 1. care a good deal 2. don't care very much 8. don't know |

| Indicate your thinking on the following: (Circle <u>one</u> answer number) | | a great deal | quite a bit | some | very little | none | don't know |
|---|--|--------------|-------------|------|-------------|------|------------|
| 28 | How much attention do you pay to <u>news on national TV news shows</u> about the campaign for President? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 29 | How much attention do you pay to <u>newspaper articles</u> about the campaign for President? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 30 | How much attention do you pay to <u>internet information</u> about the campaign for President? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Indicate your thinking on the following: please circle one answer per question | | |
| 31 | During the past 12 months, have you worked with other people to deal with some issue facing your community? | 1. yes 2. no 8. don't know |
| 32 | During the past 12 months, have you telephoned, written a letter to, or visited a government official to express your views on a public issue? | 1. yes 2. no 8. don't know |
| 33 | During the past 12 months, did you attend a meeting about an issue facing your community or schools? | 1. yes 2. no 8. don't know |
| 34 | Aside from a strike against your employer, in the past 12 months, have you taken part in a protest, march, or demonstration on some national or local issue? | 1. yes 2. no 8. don't know |
| 35 | In talking to people, we find that many are not registered to vote because they are too busy or move around often. Would official state records show that you are now registered to vote in your election district, or not? | 1. registered 2. not registered 8. don't know |

| | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|----|------------------------|
| 36 | Gender: 1 Male 2 Female | 37 | Age: (write in) |
|----|-------------------------------------|----|------------------------|

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 38 | Has this class changed your degree of satisfaction with the way democracy works in the United States? | 1. increased satisfaction 2. no change in satisfaction 8. decreased satisfaction |
| 39 | Has this class changed the importance (to you) of keeping up to date with political affairs in the future? | 1. increased importance 2. no change in importance 8. decreased importance |
| 40 | Has this class changed how much attention you paid to the political campaigns this year? | 1. increased attention to campaigns 2. no change in attention 8. decreased attention to campaigns |

In order to distinguish the responses of those who dropped the class would you please write your first name and the first letter of your last name (e.g. John D).

First Name _____ First Letter of Last Name: _____

THANK YOU!