ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT AMONG GENERATION Z UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

by

CASEY ANNE GRAHAM

(Under the Direction of Laura Dean)

ABSTRACT

Since its inception, educating students to be informed and engaged citizens has been one of the objectives of higher education in the United States. Efforts to achieve this goal have taken various forms, and the terminology used to describe this work (civic engagement, political engagement, democratic engagement) has been inconsistent. The purpose of this study was to identify attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement among Generation Z undergraduate students (born 1995 or later) at a large, public, research institution in the South, and to identify any correlations between attitudes and perceptions and self-reported intent to engage in behaviors associated with democratic engagement during the 2020 presidential election cycle. Data were collected using an instrument consisting of three scales from the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (Moely, Mercer, Ilustre, Miron, & McFarland, 2002) and an adapted version of the Political Engagement Project survey (Beaumont, Colby, & Ehrlich, 2018). T-tests and ANOVAs were utilized to analyze differences in attitudes and perceptions as well as self-reported intent to engage in specific behaviors based upon the demographics of class standing, school or college enrollment, gender identity, racial or ethnic identity,

political party affiliation, and political ideology. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to identify correlations between attitudes and perceptions and reported intent to engage in behaviors associated with democratic engagement. Responses indicated that participants did perceive democratic engagement to be important, but that some students, particularly women and those from minoritized racial/ethnic backgrounds, were not confident in their sense of political efficacy. This finding is consistent with previous research and demonstrates that "one size fits all" approaches to promoting democratic engagement are not likely to be effective. Attitudes and perceptions were also shown to correlate with reported intent to engage in behaviors associated with democratic engagement during the 2020 presidential election cycle. Implications for practice based on these results are discussed, with emphasis placed on intentional, collaborative, and interdisciplinary approaches to making democratic engagement relevant and attainable for women and those from minoritized racial/ethnic backgrounds. The importance of highlighting the role of social justice in democratic engagement is also discussed.

INDEX WORDS: Democratic engagement; civic engagement; political engagement; Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire, Political Engagement Project survey; Generation Z students

ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT AMONG GENERATION Z UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

by

CASEY ANNE GRAHAM

A.B.J., University of Georgia, 2010

M.Ed., Clemson University, 2013

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2020

ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT AMONG GENERATION Z UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

by

CASEY ANNE GRAHAM

Major Professor:	Laura Dean
Committee:	Diane Cooper
	Georgianna Martin

Electronic Version Approved:

Ron Walcott
Interim Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2020

DEDICATION

Dedicated in memory of my dear friend, Spencer Sweeting Klingeman. Not a day goes by that I don't think of your warmth and love and wish that you could be here to see me through this journey. Even in death, you remain a guiding light for all who had the unbelievable good fortune of knowing and loving you. I will spend the rest of my life striving to become half the daughter, sister, aunt, wife, and friend that you were; fully aware the no one and nothing can ever fill the void you left behind in a world that will always desperately need you.

February 2, 1988 – December 21, 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of writing this dissertation has been equal parts individual responsibility and team effort. No one could do it for me, and yet I never could have done it alone. The list of people to thank is endless, but I could not consider this process complete without mentioning those who have been instrumental in getting me to the finish line.

To my advisor, Dr. Laura Dean – it is no understatement to say that, in a very literal sense, I could not have done this without you. On countless occasions, you have affirmed my ability, restored my faith in myself, and given me the confidence and motivation to stay the course. You, Carrie Newcomer, and Glennon Doyle were all right – I can do this hard thing! Thank you, from the very bottom of my heart.

To my committee members, Dr. Diane Cooper and Dr. Georgianna Martin – thank you for your unwavering belief in me. Dr. Cooper - thank you for your patient guidance when statistics had me wrapped in a knot. Dr. Martin - thank you for being both the person who introduced me to this program and one of the people to sign off on my work as I graduate!

To the other faculty who have shepherded me through my coursework: Dr. Marian Higgins, Dr. Merrily Dunn, Dr. Jan Barham, Dr. Darris Means, Dr. Jason Umfress, and Dr. Jennifer Brannon – thank you for sharing your time and wisdom with me, and for putting up with my classroom antics. I am grateful for your support.

To “The Little Cohort that Could”: Corey, Darren, Ellen, Jeremy, Melissa, and Stephani – Can you believe it?! There are no six people who I would rather walk beside during the most intensely challenging three years of my life. There is a 100% chance that I would have quit had we not made a pact to get through this together. Stephani - I owe a particular debt of gratitude to you, both for telling me about this program and for your constant, selfless support when I was being extra needy, whiny, salty, etc. Who knew that three (long) years is all it would take to turn us from co-workers to lifelong friends? I love you all and I am so proud of us!!!

To the supervisors who have supported my education and allowed me to devote time and energy to school when I should have been working – thank you for showing me your true dedication to the importance of education. Katherine Logan and Dr. Jodi Johnson - thank you for supporting me as I started this program. Randy Beck and Bo Rutledge - thank you for taking a chance on me, for bringing me home to Athens, and for encouraging me to finish this journey.

To my friends (who shall not be named lest I forget someone and feel bad about it for the rest of my life) – thank you for listening to me whine, not disowning me when I had to flake out on you to stay home and write, and for acting like you were remotely interested in my research. I am eternally grateful to you for sticking by my side and cheering me on every step of the way. Here’s to no more cancelled plans, better moods, less crying, and zero talk about school!

To my family:

Mom and Dad – It has only been through my educational journey that I have come to truly understand how fortunate I am to have parents who prioritized

education as highly as you did. Your love has been endless, and your support has withstood every challenge I could throw at you. Love you forever, like you for always, as long as I'm living, my momma and daddy you'll be.

Rob and Rachel – thank you for always having my back, even during challenging times. I look up to both of you and I appreciate you being such good examples of the type of life I hope to provide for my own family someday. Even in the midst of our differences, I always hope to make you proud. I love you both with all my heart.

Jack, Ella, and Reese – is so many ways, this whole process has been for you. The topic of this dissertation has continually reminded me that the future belongs to those who come after us, and I will never stop fighting to create a world where you can be whoever you want, no matter what. I love you unconditionally and could not be prouder of the people you are – yesterday, today, and every single tomorrow.

Danny & Lana – thank you for your patience as I've spent the better part of our years as a family buried under textbooks and stress. Thank you for your endless encouragement, support, and love. And most of all, thank you for sharing with me the person who deserves more thanks than I'll ever be able to give…

To my husband, Dustin – there truly are not words to express my gratitude for all the sacrifices you have made to get our family to this day. You have my steadfast commitment that from this day forward, nothing comes before *us*. Thank you for all the meals you've cooked, toilets you've scrubbed, and groceries you've bought to support the

goal of getting me through school. As I sit here typing this, next to a plate of cheese and crackers you brought to me "just because," I can't help but think how lucky I am to be the object of your affection. The days have been long and the road has been rough, but without you as my co-pilot, I never could have achieved this goal. I loveth thou, and here's to having *so much fun* (with the Oogies!) from this day until our last.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Numerous foundational documents for the practice of student affairs place emphasis on the responsibility to educate students to become knowledgeable, responsible, and contributory citizens in our country's democracy (American College Personnel Association [ACPA], 2006; American Council on Education [ACE], 1949; National Association of Student Personnel Associates [NASPA], 1987; NASPA & ACPA, 1997). After World War II threatened the stability of democratic societies on a worldwide scale, ACE (1949) stated that higher education had "an urgent responsibility for providing experiences which develop in its students a firm and enlightened belief in democracy" (p. 4). In 1987, NASPA reaffirmed the notion that a college education should include an emphasis on democratic citizenship and laid out 12 assumptions and beliefs central to the practice of student affairs, many of which echoed the principles that formed the core of American democracy – that "all men are created equal" and are afforded the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" (The Declaration of Independence, U.S. 1776, para. 2). In 2006, ACPA's Statement of Ethical Principles & Standards listed the importance of educating college students for responsible citizenship as one of four essential principles for the ethical practice of student affairs. As higher education and student affairs have evolved and changed over the years, calls to consistently prioritize the advancement of democratic values on college campuses have persisted.

With the 1971 ratification of the 26th Amendment to the United States Constitution, the nation-wide voting age for federal, state, and local elections was lowered to 18 (O'Loughlin & Unangst, 2006). The 1972 presidential election was the first opportunity for the expanded electorate to exercise their right to vote for the country's top leader. Just over half of citizens aged 18-24 voted in the 1972 presidential election, and numerous analyses have shown that the voter turnout rate among young people has seen an overall decline ever since (File, 2014; Levine & Lopez, 2002). Additionally, rates of both voter registration and actual voting among traditional-aged college students have consistently remained lower than the general population, vacillating somewhere in the range of 30%-50%, as compared to roughly 50%-70% of older voters and the larger voting-age population (The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement [CIRCLE], 2013; O'Loughlin & Unangst, 2006). Research conducted by the Commission on Youth Voting and Civic Knowledge (2013) and McAvoy, Fine, and Ward (2016) showed that the civic education that students are receiving in their K-12 schools may not be sufficiently preparing students to reach voting age with a solid understanding of the American political system and the important role that they have to play as citizens in this democracy. Additionally, studies conducted by Kiesa et al. (2007), Levine and Dean (2012), and Seemiller and Grace (2016) showed that many Millennial and Generation Z students are averse to the activities that Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, and Corngold (2007) defined as "political engagement" (voting, petitioning elected officials, running for office, etc.). Instead, Millennial and Generation Z students have expressed a preference for engaging in direct acts of service that they view as (often intentionally) apolitical and choose to forego involvement in a political

system that they perceive to be divisive, untrustworthy, and generally apathetic towards young people (Dalton & Crosby, 2008; Howe & Foschnat, 2017).

Despite an overall and ongoing decrease in voter turnout among the country's youngest voters, there have been some encouraging signs of improvement. Voting rates among the 18-29-year-old demographic have been on the rise since the 2004 presidential election, and this was the only age group with an increased turnout from the 2012 to 2016 presidential elections (File, 2017). The National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement (NSLVE) also reported an increased voting rate from 2012 to 2016 (45.1% to 48.3%) among its college student participants (Thomas et al., 2017). However, recent data have shown that the "youth electorate… is increasingly loathe to identify strongly with either major [political] party" (CIRCLE, 2016, p. 1), a trend which may have a negative impact on campaign engagement and voter turnout in future elections. The Pew Research Center estimated that approximately 56% of the entire voting-age population participated in the 2016 presidential election, a figure which places the United States 26th out of 32 of the world's most highly developed, democratic nations when ranked by voter turnout rates (DeSilver, 2018). In 2007, the McCormick Tribune Foundation asserted that the United States' voter turnout rate ranked 139th of the world's 172 democratic societies. Voting is the fundamental building block of any democratic society, and these abysmal figures represent a real threat to the health and vitality of our nation's governing system. In 2012, the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement called upon institutions of higher education to renew their "embrace [of] civic learning and democratic engagement as an undisputed educational priority" (p. 2), stating:

> As a democracy, the United States depends on a knowledgeable, public-spirited, and engaged population. Education plays a fundamental role in building civic vitality, and in the twenty-first century, higher education has a distinctive role to play in the renewal of US democracy. (p. 2)

Purpose of Study

Within this context of low voter turnout rates and calls for higher education's full participation in democratic renewal, the purpose of this study was to identify attitudes and perceptions related to the importance of democratic engagement held by undergraduate students at a large, public, research institution in Georgia. While voting is perhaps the most important behavior associated with democratic engagement, behaviors such as petitioning elected officials, volunteering time and money to political campaigns, canvassing for candidates, attending legislative meetings, and other inherently political actions were considered to be democratic engagement within the scope of this study. Additionally, other types of behaviors that represent all four of the dimensions of political engagement (understanding, skill, motivation, and participation) identified by Colby et al. (2007) were considered in this study in order to provide a more expansive, inclusive framework for understanding the ways in which undergraduate students engage with democracy. Under this expanded framework, this study also focused on behaviors such as discussing politics with friends and family; becoming involved with community organizing; seeking information on specific causes or issues; participating in consumer activism (i.e., intentionally buying or *not* buying certain products or from certain brands for social or political reasons); and encouraging others to become informed and/or to participate in democracy through various channels.

If institutions of higher education are to adequately address the need for increased participation of college-aged voters, they must first seek to understand the degree to which different forms of democratic engagement are important to today's students. Identifying attitudes and perceptions surrounding the importance of any number of the behaviors associated with the expansive definition of democratic engagement is crucial before any meaningful interventions or educational experiences can be designed or delivered by colleges and universities. Additionally, this study sought to quantify students' level of intent to participate in the 2020 U.S. presidential election and define the various modes of participation in which students reported an intent to take part. Data were analyzed to identify any relationships between attitudes and perceptions of the importance of various forms of democratic engagement and reported intent to participate in the 2020 election in hopes of providing a "pulse check" on today's college students. Demographic information related to age, race/ethnicity, gender, academic class standing, and major was also collected, as well as political party affiliation and ideology identification, in order to further contextualize data and potentially identify response patterns related to certain demographic identifiers. This information will provide insight into the best ways to galvanize students to be informed, motivated, and participatory members of our democracy, now and over the course of their adult lives.

Instruments and Operational Definitions

The following instruments and operational definitions were utilized over the course of this study and provide context for the research questions.

Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire

Instrument developed by Moely, Mercer, Ilustre, Miron, and McFarland (2002) to "measure attitudes, skills, and behavioral intentions that might be affected by service-learning participation" (p. 15). The complete questionnaire consisted of 44 items which comprised six scales. Three of those scales (Civic Action, Political Awareness, and Social Justice Attitudes) were utilized to measure attitudes in the context of this study.

Political Engagement Project Survey

Instrument developed by Beaumont, Colby, and Ehrlich (2018) which was originally used as a pre-post survey to assess the effectiveness of 21 educational interventions administered as part of a large, national study from 2003-2005. The original survey was comprised of numerous scales, three of which were used for this study. The Internal Efficacy scale was used to measure attitudes, and the Perception of Effective Political Strategies: Public & Institutional Attention and Perception of Effective Political Strategies: Informing & Collaborating scales were used to measure perceptions.

Democratic Engagement

Largely synonymous with Colby et al.'s (2007) definition of political engagement, which involves actively using the mechanisms of democracy to address issues of power and policy. Democratic engagement is distinct from political engagement in that it accentuates the importance of collective action, utilizes a process and purpose framework, and places emphasis upon service done *with* (as opposed to *for*) the public (Kezar & Maxey, 2014; The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011; Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009). This study also used the term democratic (rather than political)

engagement in an intentional effort to avoid the divisive and partisan connotations of the word “political” in the current societal climate.

Presidential Election

A type of general election held on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November in an even-numbered year in which candidates for president of the U.S. appear on the ballot (typically held every four years) (General Election, 2019). For the purposes of this study, this definition also includes any other elected offices (federal, state, and local) that appear on ballots during the presidential election.

Presidential Election Cycle

Refers broadly to the period of time in which candidates announce intent to run for president of the U.S. (typically the spring before the election year); primary campaigns, debates, elections, caucuses, and nominating conventions occur (summer before the election year through fall of the election year); major party candidates take part in debates (fall of election year); and the general, nationwide election is held on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November of the election year (USA.gov, 2019). For the purposes of this study, this definition also includes similar processes and activities related to any other elected offices (federal, state, and local) that appear on ballots during the presidential election cycle.

Attitude

Based upon Doolittle and Faul’s (2013) definition of civic attitudes as “personal beliefs and feelings that individuals have about their own involvement in their community and their perceived ability to make a difference in that community” (p. 2).

Additionally, attitudes are understood to affect the behaviors in which individuals engage. ("Attitude," 2019).

Perception

Based upon a simplified Merriam-Webster definition of "a judgment resulting from awareness or understanding" ("Perception," 2019), this term is used to represent how individuals view or understand the importance of democratic engagement externally, which may or may not influence their individual behaviors.

In distinguishing attitude from perception, it may be helpful to consider that an individual student may have conflicting attitudes and perceptions about a form of democratic engagement: voting, for example. It is possible that a single student may feel that their vote doesn't matter and therefore they may opt out of voting (attitude) while simultaneously judging the act of voting, as a general concept, to be important to the functioning of democracy based on their awareness and understanding of how democracy works (perception).

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

- RQ1: As measured by the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire and adapted Political Engagement Project survey, what attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement are reported by undergraduate college students?
    - RQ1.1: Are there differences in reported attitudes and perceptions based upon the demographics of class standing, school or college enrollment,

gender identity, racial or ethnic identity, political party affiliation, or political ideology?

- RQ2: As measured by the adapted Political Engagement Project survey, in what types of democratic engagement do undergraduate students report an intent to participate during the 2020 U.S. presidential election cycle?
    - RQ2.1: Are there differences in the types of democratic engagement in which students report an intent to participate based upon the demographics of class standing, school or college enrollment, gender identity, racial or ethnic identity, political party affiliation, or political ideology?
- RQ3: As measured by the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire and adapted Political Engagement Project survey, is there a relationship between reported attitudes and perceptions of the importance of democratic engagement and reported intent to participate in the 2020 U.S. presidential election cycle?

Significance of Study

Numerous researchers have sought to demonstrate how service-learning opportunities contribute to civic engagement (Astin & Sax, 1998; Moely & Ilustre, 2014; Richard, Keen, Hatcher, & Pease, 2016), while others have advocated for practices outside of service-learning to effectively promote democratic engagement (Cone, Cooper, & Hollander, 2001; Howe & Fosnacht, 2017; Stroup, Bunting, Dodson, Horne, & Portilla, 2013). By describing the characteristics, attitudes, and beliefs of generations of college students, some scholars have contributed to an understanding of how students may think about politics (Levine & Cureton, 1998; Levine & Dean, 2012; Seemiller & Grace. 2016). However, few have sought to identify the attitudes and perceptions that

reflect just how important democratic engagement actually is to students, or how those attitudes and perceptions relate to their intention to actively participate in democracy. This study attempted to explore that gap in literature so that higher education can begin to more precisely target interventions and educational experiences that are relevant to what students think and feel. If the pattern of disengagement and consistently low voter turnout among college-aged individuals is to be interrupted, higher education professionals must gain a better understanding of the specific attitudes and perceptions that may be contributing to the continued and widespread choice to opt out of participating in the political process. Higher education is crucial to the maintenance of a democratic society through its foundational mission of promoting a "firm and enlightened belief in democracy" (ACE, 1949, p. 4), but we can only be successful if our methods are guided by and relevant to our students' experiences in a changing world. As noted by Kolb (2016),

> The heart of a vibrant democracy is educated, engaged citizens who are able to make choices for themselves, their families, their communities, and their country. In this respect, the success of American postsecondary education is critical to the success of American democracy. (p. 16)

Delimitations

The rates of low voter turnout and diminished participation in democratic processes that have been seen among America's youngest voters are not limited to those individuals who are enrolled in college. While seeking to understand the attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement held by today's college students is a necessary component of improving democratic outcomes, this study offers

no insight into the attitudes and perceptions of young people who are not enrolled in college. Additionally, data collected in this study represented a sample of students at one particular institution of higher education and may or may not accurately reflect the attitudes and perceptions of students on other campuses, both across the state and throughout the nation. It is also worth noting that this study was conducted in the lead-up to a highly-contested presidential election in an abnormally contentious and politically divisive period in our nation's history, and during a time when there was what many would consider to be a national political crisis underway (including a formal impeachment investigation of the sitting president). Given these contextual factors, the results of this study may reflect skewed or polarized attitudes and perceptions. Continued study will be necessary to evaluate the accuracy of the findings from this study over an extended period of time.

Chapter Summary

From its earliest days, the system of higher education in the U.S. has emphasized the importance of educating young people on both the importance and the mechanics of democratic engagement. Although there have been promising moments, historical data reflect an overall downward and depressed trend in the democratic engagement of America's youngest voters. In order for institutions of higher education to adequately respond to the demonstrated need for more and better support for its democratic mission, more work must be done to understand the attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement held by today's college students. This study focused on gathering data related to these attitudes and perceptions and examined the relationships between attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. While the scope of this study was limited,

it was intended to provide a framework for advancing understanding of the latest generation of undergraduate students on a national scale so that effective interventions can be designed and implemented by student affairs professionals and administrators.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents literature that will further contextualize the concept of democratic engagement and its connection to higher education. The first section covers terminology used across literature and clarifies what is meant by "democratic engagement" in this study. Then, democratic engagement is discussed within the higher education context, focusing on history and methods of teaching democratic engagement to undergraduate students. Finally, the concept of democratic engagement is applied to students themselves through an examination of generational trends and voting data.

Defining Democratic Engagement

Democratic engagement is a complex construct that lacks a clear, concise, and consistent definition. The terms civic engagement and political engagement are often used interchangeably, and literature on all of these terms often contains conflicting information. This section expands upon and provides further context for the brief operational definition provided in the Introduction to this study to clarify what democratic engagement is (and is not) before further exploring how it shows up on college campuses and is understood and perceived by undergraduate students.

Terminology

Engagement is a concept that has been described using numerous modifying terms: civic, political, and democratic being the most prevalent in literature. Each of these terms has been defined in slightly different, but distinct manners. Additionally, it is

common for one or more of these terms to be cited as elemental to the definition of another term, with scholars frequently offering inconsistent accounts of whether "A" is a component of "B" or vice versa. The individual concepts include some conflicting perspectives, but a synthesis of their commonalities yields a comprehensive definition of democratic engagement. In order to arrive at a synthesized, thorough, and inclusive definition, each term must first be examined on an individual basis.

Civic engagement. In general, the term civic engagement tends to be most closely associated with volunteerism and community service, often (but not always) in an apolitical context. Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, and Corngold's (2007) work distinguished civic engagement as a form of engagement that is focused on community and individual enrichment, which *can* ultimately lead to political engagement. Venters (2010) argued the opposite, citing political engagement as a component of civic engagement. Finley (2011) reflected extensively on the lack of a standardized definition of civic engagement but argued that "true civic engagement goes beyond apolitical involvement in community…and intentionally fosters forms of democratic skill-building" (p. 4). As described by Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011), civic engagement can be understood through the framework of activity and place, in which students simply take part in some form of service in a community. They expanded upon the frequently apolitical nature of this framework nothing that students "often will not be taught the political dimensions of their activities because questions of power typically are left out of… the way that 'service' is provided to communities" (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011, p. 19).

Political engagement. As the term suggests, political engagement is commonly described in a manner that emphasizes activities that are inherently "political" in nature.

While this term certainly implies a level of engagement with "direct political participation as well as electoral politics" (Venters, 2010, p. 3), Colby et al. (2007) asserted that political engagement should be understood broadly and "include direct, local, or non-conventional political activities" (p. 29), including the types of community-oriented activities that characterize civic engagement. Colby et al.'s (2007) definition of political engagement was built upon four components (understanding, skill, motivation, and participation), and is not limited to "selecting representatives, influencing their choices, and holding them accountable, but can occur at different structural levels… using many different strategies for political expression and influence" (p. 30). People who are politically engaged are not only capable of comprehending and navigating the political system, but also possess a committed political identity which drives them to routinely participate in both their communities and the political process, and feel that such actions are important to their sense of self (Beaumont, Colby, Ehrlich, & Torney-Purta, 2006).

Democratic engagement. The term democratic engagement adds a layer of complexity by underscoring the importance of collaboration, collective action, and shared responsibility in working toward the public good in a democratic society (Kezar & Maxey, 2014; The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012; Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009). In contrast to the activity and place framework used to characterize civic engagement, Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) used a process and purpose framework to describe democratic engagement which is "intentionally political in that students learn about democracy by acting democratically" (p. 21). In terms of the student experience, Saltmarsh and Hartley's (2011) distinction

can also be understood as work done *for* the public (civic engagement) versus work done *with* the public (democratic engagement). Additionally, by accentuating *democracy*, the terminology of democratic engagement echoes the American Council on Education's [ACE] (1949) foundational charge that higher education "develop in its students a firm and enlightened belief in democracy… and a deep sense of responsibility for individual and collective action to achieve its [democracy's] goals" (p. 4) and that "working with others in a spirit of mutual services is the highest expression of democracy" (p. 7).

Howe and Fosnacht (2017) utilized the term democratic engagement in their research, noting that it "encompasses participation in both civil society and polity" (p. 156). Their work was based upon Delli Carpini's (2006) definition of democratic engagement as "the combination of democratic awareness and democratic participation" (p. 44). Delli Carpini (2006) defined democratic awareness as "cognitive, attitudinal, and affective involvement in BOTH civil society and the polity" (p. 44) and democratic participation as "individual and collective actions designed to address public issues through the institutions of BOTH civil society and the polity" (p. 44). However, it should be noted that these definitions were derived from Delli Carpini's (2006) participation as an invited expert in a MacArthur Foundation online discussion on civic engagement in which Delli Carpini utilized these same definitions for civic and political engagement, awareness, and participation.

Synthesis

Although civic, political, and democratic engagement each have their own distinct definitions and connotations, a synthesis of their commonalities yields a comprehensive description of why engaging young people in these ways is so important. Galston (2001)

found that civic knowledge is foundational to the development of political interests, understanding the impact of policies and public issues, promoting consistent participation in the democratic process, and supporting democratic values and civil liberties. Individuals can gain civic knowledge through civic engagement (with its focus on community, activity, and place) and through political engagement (with its focus on individual political and electoral actions); however, democratic engagement (with its emphasis on purpose and process) can help to establish a direct tie between how community actions influence political outcomes, and how political outcomes in turn influence communities (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011). In essence, democratic engagement means that it is not enough to volunteer, nor is it enough to vote. Democratic engagement demands inclusive, collaborative, and deliberative participation in democratic society, recognizing that "every citizen has a moral responsibility to contribute his or her fair share to sustaining the public institutions and processes on which we all depend, and from which we all benefit" (Galston, 2004, p. 263).

Types of Democratic Engagement

Beaumont et al. (2006) contended that "voting and other electoral activities too often are studied in isolation from other important aspects of political engagement" (p. 265). Therefore, this study is designed to measure democratic engagement as a more broad, inclusive term, expanding the notion of which activities demonstrate engagement to better understand undergraduates' attitudes and perceptions about a wide variety of activities that are associated with democratic engagement. While information related to traditional forms of engagement (e.g., voting, donating resources like time and money to political parties or campaigns, contacting and/or interfacing with elected officials,

running for office) will be collected, additional behaviors will be considered democratic engagement for the purposes of this study. These include behaviors such as actively keeping up with politics and current events; discussing or sharing political opinions with friends, family, and co-workers; organizing or participating in protests, demonstrations, or groups associated with issues with policy implications; engaging with voter registration and get out the vote efforts; participating in public awareness campaigns; signing petitions; joining collective consumer efforts such as boycotts; displaying issue or candidate messages on clothing or personal effects; and otherwise trying to influence the political opinions of others (Beaumont et al., 2006; Colby et al., 2007). These forms of engagement have been identified because they not only demonstrate all four dimensions (understanding, skill, motivation, and participation) in Colby et al.'s (2007) definition of political engagement, but also represent the collaborative and inclusive components of Saltmarsh and Hartley's (2011) definition of democratic engagement. It is not enough to simply measure voting behaviors. If voter turnout rates are ever to improve, understanding, skill, motivation, and participation must be thoroughly investigated, as there is little doubt that these are pre-cursors and predictors of sustained participation in a deliberative democracy that "highlight the value of the processes as well as the outcomes" (Colby et al., 2007, p. 30).

Democratic Engagement in the Context of Higher Education

Higher education's tie to the advancement of democracy has long been established, but how institutional commitments to this mission have been expressed has varied over the years, largely in response to world and national events, economic forces, and student expectations and interests. This section will provide a brief overview of how,

why, and to what degree higher education has played a role in promoting the civic health of the nation.

Historical Overview

Since its earliest days, higher education in the United States has existed as a means of producing educated, responsible leaders for the nation (Thelin & Gasman, 2011). Although there is some dispute regarding whether his views represent our present-day understanding of democracy, founding father Thomas Jefferson is often credited with expressing (and acting upon) an adamant belief that education of citizens was key to the success of a fledgling nation (Carpenter, 2013). Jefferson's commitment to education culminated in the founding of the University of Virginia as "a public university designed to advance human knowledge, educate leaders and cultivate an informed citizenry" (University of Virginia, 2019, para. 1). Of course, early opportunities for higher education were restricted to privileged White men, and it was not until after the Civil War that previously excluded populations (particularly Black students and women) were able to access "education for active citizenship" (The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012, p. 17; Thelin & Gasman, 2011). Although partaking in higher education to further their intellectual, economic, and civic opportunities was now an option for these groups of citizens, it is important to note that it would be another century before *all* citizens were (ostensibly) afforded the rights to full participation in democracy through the electoral process.

John Dewey (1859-1952) was described by Westbrook (1991) as "the most important advocate of participatory democracy" (p. xv) among thought leaders of the 20th century. In particular, Dewey, who was considered a leader in the progressive education

movement, emphasized the inextricable link between the nation's system of education and the perpetuation of a continuously evolving democratic society (Gordon, 2016). Despite all of his theoretical work on the topic of democracy and education, Benson, Harkavy, and Puckett (2007) described a "Dewey Problem," which asks "what specifically is to be done beyond theoretical advocacy to transform American society and other developed societies into participatory democracies capable of helping to transform the world into a 'Great Community'?" (p. xiii). Despite the lack of a clear path forward, Dewey's work, and subsequent works inspired and informed by his research, continues to have an impact on how higher education's role in advancing democratic ideals is enacted on college campuses from generation to generation.

Post-World War II era. After the global threat to democracy that took place during World War II, President Truman appointed the President's Commission on Higher Education (1947) which was "charged with an examination of the functions of higher education in our democracy and of the means by which they can be best performed" (Letter of Appointment of Commission Members, para. 3). Reflecting upon the work of the commission, its Chairman emphatically argued that the prime objective of higher education in a democratic society is not merely to protect and enhance individual freedom, but rather the collective freedom of all (Zook, 1947). Language reflecting an increased, intentional emphasis on higher education's role in promoting and protecting democracy during the post-World War II period was also adopted in ACE's 1949 revision of *The Student Personnel Point of View*, which identified three new goals for the profession:

1. Education for a fuller realization of democracy in every phase of living;
2. Education directly and explicitly for international understanding and cooperation;
3. Education for the application of creative imagination and trained intelligence to the solution of social problems and to the administration of public affairs (p. 2)

The 1960s and 1970s. The presence and influence of democracy on college campuses was arguably at its most visible during the years of widespread student activism and unrest during the 1960s. As laws governing the rights of citizens began to evolve, students demanded that their own civil rights be respected by their colleges and universities, and the era of *in loco parentis,* which was characterized by unchecked institutional control over students, came to an end (Lake, 2013). During this time, many college students were active in expressing their concerns with the Vietnam War and resulting military draft, as well as their support of (or opposition to) various movements surrounding civil rights, women's rights, sexual norms, and societal expectations. Institutional responses to student activism tested and strained higher education's actual commitment to the principles of education for democracy as college campuses were increasingly portrayed as "battleground[s] in a protracted generational war between college students and the established institutions associated with adult society" (Thelin & Gasman, 2011, p. 16). Many institutions elected to proactively engage with their communities to address social, political, and economic challenges during this time period, thus deepening the role that higher education played in civic life through enhanced

community partnerships (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education [CAS], 2019).

The 1980s and 1990s. By the 1980s the fire of democratic engagement on college campuses was reduced to embers. A weakened economy and increasing view of college students as "customers" meant that institutional missions moved away from educating for democracy and toward educating for employment, and it seemed that fewer and fewer students were interested in the democratic purpose of postsecondary education (Hartley, 2009). In response, a new movement to promote civic engagement was promulgated through the establishment of numerous efforts, networks, and initiatives across the country (Hartley, 2009; Hollander & Hartley, 2000; Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005). For example, the Campus Outreach and Opportunity League (COOL) was founded in 1984 in a student-driven effort to provide structural supports for connecting students with opportunities for community involvement (CAS, 2019; "IMPACT National Conference History," n.d.). Similarly, Campus Compact was founded in 1985 by a coalition of three university presidents and the president of the Education Commission of the States to assist higher education institutions in establishing the types of support structures that would allow colleges and universities to contribute to the health and vitality of democracy (Campus Compact, 2019). Despite these efforts to strengthen higher education's connection to community and the advancement of democracy, Boyer (1996) argued that as the end of the 20th century approached, higher education had "become a private benefit, not a public good" (p. 14) and that "the campus is being viewed as a place where students get credentialed and faculty get tenured, while

the overall work of the academy does not seem particularly relevant to the nation's most pressing civic, social, economic, and moral problems" (p. 14).

The new millennium. In 1999, growing and widespread concern about the failure of colleges and universities to adequately impress the importance of democratic engagement upon students was captured in Campus Compact's publication of the *Presidents' Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education*. As the nation and the world prepared to enter the new millennium, the declaration, which was signed by the presidents of nearly 200 institutions of higher education, asserted that

> We have a fundamental task to renew our agents of our democracy. This task is both urgent and long-term. There is growing evidence of disengagement of many Americans from the communal life of our society in general, and from the responsibilities of democracy in particular. We share a special concern about the disengagement of college students from democratic participation. A chorus of studies reveals that students are not connected to the larger purposes and aspirations of the American democracy. Voter turnout is low. Feelings that political participation will not make any difference are high. Added to this, there is a profound sense of cynicism and lack of trust in the political process. (para. 1)

Concerns about the need for higher education to re-commit to and centrally re-orient its foundational democratic mission of producing informed and engaged citizens were echoed in the establishment of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities' (AASCU) American Democracy Project (ADP) in 2003 (CAS, 2019) and the Association of American Colleges & Universities' (AACU) Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) initiative in 2005 (AACU, 2019).

The past decade has seen a growing chasm of income inequality, increased political polarization, and "a decline in the culture and practice of democracy" (Campus Compact, 2015, para. 5). Within this challenging context, calls for a return to higher education's democratic mission have intensified. The report produced by the National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012) directly called for "the higher education community…to embrace civic learning and democratic engagement as an undisputed educational priority for all of higher education, public and private, two-year and four-year" (p. 2). The report also addresses the false choice made between educating for democracy and educating for employment in preceding generations, noting that failure to fully educate students on civic, political, and democratic dimensions threatens the national economy as well as our national ability to protect our hard-earned freedoms (The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012).

However, in order to achieve the goals of democratic engagement, colleges and universities must acknowledge that "taking a risk-averse approach to teaching about politics and public life does not serve students" (Melville, Dedrick, & Gish, 2013, p. 267). Beaumont et al. (2006) contended that many college campuses are resistant to directly addressing political issues due to concern that the individual political views of faculty and staff will "have the intended or inadvertent effect of steering students into particular political ideologies or party affiliations" (p. 264), but their research indicated that these concerns were unfounded. Research conducted by Stroup, Bunting, Dodson, Horne, and Portilla (2013) highlighted the importance of college instructors engaging in

political dialogue as a means to enhance students' deliberative skills and, ultimately, their engagement in democratic processes.

Present day. There are indicators that the political climate on today's college campuses is among the most polarized in our national history, which is largely considered to be a result of the contentious 2016 presidential election (Eagan et al., 2017). This polarization is accompanied by a record high level of students (46%) reporting that being informed about politics is important or essential to them, although it does not seem as though this interest in being informed is necessarily contributing to a significant increase in voter turnout among college-aged students (Eagan et al., 2017). Increased political interest and polarization are showing up on today's college campuses in the form of an ongoing debate about how to balance competing demands of free speech and protection from offensive speech (Tugend, 2018). The federal government has weighed in on the campus free speech debate through executive action and numerous state legislatures have taken action to outlaw designated free speech zones on college campuses (Bauer-Wolf, 2018; Haberman & Shear, 2019). Additionally, today's students are facing growing concerns over college affordability, expanded need for mental health services, and exposure to an increasingly diverse group of peers (Eagan et al., 2017). It is incumbent upon today's higher education professionals to continually engage students in meaningful interventions that allow them to contextualize their experiences within the larger concept of democratic engagement, especially as the nation prepares for another factious presidential election cycle.

Teaching Democratic Engagement

For many years, colleges and universities have relied upon service-learning activities as the primary form of civic engagement offered to students, but some scholars have cautioned that participation in service-learning activities does not automatically result in increased and sustained levels of democratic engagement (Bok, 2001; Finley, 2011; Galston, 2001; Howe & Fosnacht, 2017). Reflecting on the misconception that community service, by its very nature, leads students to meaningful democratic engagement, Bok (2001) argued:

> [But] working in a soup kitchen is never going to solve the problem of hunger in this country…. It takes political action through democratic processes with concerned citizens to solve problems like that…. community service is not a complement to citizenship and political participation; it's an alternative. (para. 6)

Similarly, Galston (2004) noted that while students participating in community service may "understand why it matters to feed a hungry person at a soup kitchen; they do not understand why it matters where government set eligibility levels for food stamps or payment levels for the Earned Income Tax Credit" (p. 263).

It is important to note that service-learning *can* translate into positive democratic outcomes under the right conditions. Walker (2000) emphasized that educators have a responsibility to help students comprehend and process their service-learning experiences in the context of the larger societal and political issues that surround them, and not just assume that exposure results in engagement. Critical reflection, in particular, has been highlighted as a crucial element to help students translate their involvement in service-learning into integrated, developmentally rich experiences (Ash, Clayton, & Moses,

2009; CAS, 2012). In order for service-learning to cross the threshold of democratic engagement, there must be deliberate effort on the part of faculty and staff who oversee service-learning activities to highlight the connection between social and political issues, and the role of citizens in influencing both through democratic processes (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Howe & Fosnacht, 2017; Walker, 2000).

In addition to well-conducted service-learning opportunities, colleges and universities have a variety of other pedagogical and experiential tools at their disposal to effectively educate and inspire students to become responsible, engaged citizens. Stroup et al. (2013) found that the implementation of a formalized curriculum aimed at engaging first-year students in productive political conversations resulted in increased student interest and efficacy in politics and a greater sense that their participation was important. Their curriculum specifically emphasized teaching skills related to "proactive information gathering, assessment, and dialogue" (p. 120) to support their political engagement (Stroup et al., 2013). Similarly, Hoffman (2015) studied the impacts of a year-long program designed to increase political efficacy, skills, ability, and knowledge. Through developing action plans for civic problems in their communities, analyzing case studies, attending local civic meetings (such as city council), learning about voting and then registering their peers, and exposure to guest speakers from a variety of political backgrounds and ideologies (with extensive written reflection on nearly all activities), the program studied by Hoffman (2015) was able to profoundly increase "students' general political knowledge and well as general political skills" (p. 275). In their extensive review of programs designed to promote political engagement, Colby et al. (2007) identified five key pedagogical strategies: "political discussion and deliberation, political

research and action projects, invited speakers and program-affiliated mentors, external placements, and structured reflection" (p. 18). They also concluded that ultimately "multiple, reinforcing learning experiences over the course of undergraduate education are the best way to educate for political engagement" (Colby et al., 2007, p. 297). Living-learning communities, study abroad experiences, undergraduate research, internships, student-moderated debates, and community placements are just a few examples of promising programmatic offerings for teaching democratic engagement (Colby et al., 2007; Howe & Fosnacht, 2017).

Student Attitudes Toward Democratic Engagement

Discerning the best methods to deliver effective citizenship education requires higher education professionals to understand who their college students are and how they think about politics (Hollander & Longo, 2008). It is difficult to draw distinct lines between generations, and the birth years used to define various generations vary between sources. Unless otherwise noted, this study utilizes the generational boundaries defined by Seemiller and Grace (2016): Baby Boomers (born 1946-1964), Generation X (born 1965-1980), Millennials (born 1981-1994), and Generation Z (born 1995-2010).

Generational Trends

In contrast to the politically engaged, activist-students of the Baby Boomer generation, Loeb (1994) and Levine and Cureton (1998) described Generation X students as much more cynical, apolitical, and skeptical of the value of democratic engagement after coming of age in an era characterized by economic instability, consumerism, and an emphasis on personal gain over collective good. As members of Generation X arrived on college campuses, *becoming well off financially* became the most commonly reported

priority in seeking a college degree, usurping *developing a meaningful philosophy of life* as the top priority for students from the Baby Boomer generation (Dey, Astin, Korn, & Riggs, 1992). Although there were high rates of student participation rates in volunteering and service activities in the 1990s, Generation X students seemed to "[turn] to service in retreat from major political institutions" (Kiesa et al., 2007, p. 10).

Millennial students grew up in world of increasing connectivity, volatility (especially with the growing prevalence of terrorist attacks), diversity, and division (Levine & Dean, 2012). Although Levine and Dean (2012) described these students as broadly politically disengaged, Kiesa et al. (2007) found that Millennial students demonstrated increased (although still anemic) interest and participation in politics as compared to Generation X. While some of this progress can likely be attributed to structural improvements made by colleges and universities to support civic engagement, societal influences such as contested high-profile political races and the impact of the global war on terrorism were also likely contributors to an increased awareness that participation in politics may actually matter after all (Kiesa et al., 2007). It is important to note that although the Millennial students involved in Kiesa et al.'s (2007) work did acknowledge the importance of engaging with the political system to address public issues, they remained dissatisfied with a system they believed to be inherently corrupt and inefficient, viewed voting as a largely symbolic act, and were "hungry for a particular kind of conversation that is serious and authentic, involves diverse views, but is free of manipulation and 'spin'" (p. 32).

Students from Generation Z are now arriving on college campuses and, much like the preceding generation, perceived gridlock and corruption in the American political

system has contributed to their preference for various forms of direct action in their communities and ambivalence about traditional forms of political participation (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Unlike all generations before them, members of Generation Z are digital natives. They were born into a world of connectivity, mobile devices, and constant access to information through the Internet (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). However, as noted by Seemiller and Grace (2016), this endless and immediate access to information often means that Generation Z students are prone to an "if it's online, it's true" (p. 27) attitude that diminishes critical examination of credibility and quality of sources, and allows students to self-select the types of information they receive. Additionally, students from this generation are accustomed to an on-demand, instant gratification lifestyle that is antithetical to the protracted pace of the democratic process (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). As the first few waves of Generation Z students reach voting age, more research will be needed to better understand how the digital native upbringing will translate into democratic engagement across multiple election cycles. This study aims to contribute to that body of knowledge.

Voting Data

Colby et al. (2007) used a broad definition of political engagement that included a wide variety of activities such as running for office, working on a campaign, petitioning elected leaders, discussing political issues with family and friends, organizing protests, and, the most foundational element of democracy, voting. While people with even some college experience have consistently been nearly twice as likely to vote as those with no college education, citizens under age 30, regardless of educational level, have had the lowest percentages of turnout for decades (The Center for Information and Research on

Civic Learning and Engagement [CIRCLE], 2013). After the national voting age was lowered to 18 in 1971, just over half of citizens age 18-24 voted in the 1972 election, and the participation rate for that age demographic has remained in a steady overall decline (File, 2014; Levine & Lopez, 2002). Some may blame this on apathy, but many college students have expressed frustration that voting seems to have become merely a symbolic gesture, incapable of provoking meaningful change (Kiesa et al., 2007). Hollander and Longo (2008) argued that many college students are not apathetic or disinterested in politics at all, but rather prefer to demonstrate their political views by engaging in what Mathews (1993) referred to as "politics that people don't call politics" (p. iv), which allows them to circumvent the current political system and create their own brand of participation that is much more direct and inclusive.

Ardoin, Bell, and Ragozzino (2015) and Richman and Pate (2010) contended that there may be barriers besides apathy and disillusionment contributing to low voter turnout among college students. Voter registration laws vary among different states and localities, and a lack of consistency in interpretation of these laws can leave students who attend college away from home unsure of where or how they should cast their ballot (Richman & Pate, 2010). Ardoin et al. (2015) pointed to North Carolina (a state largely governed by Republicans) as a place where efforts have been made to intentionally establish voter registration and identification laws specifically aimed at suppressing the (assumedly Democratic-leaning) college vote. O'Loughlin and Gordon (2012) and Richmond and Pate (2010) suggested that when college communities restrict the student vote, the overall turnout of college students is adversely affected, largely because

requiring students to go through the extra steps that are necessary to determine where and how they can vote causes them to simply opt out of voting.

Diminishing beliefs about the importance of voting coupled with efforts to stifle the college student vote mean that higher education institutions will need to engage in more targeted efforts to substantially impact their students' commitment to this key component of democracy. Cone, Cooper, and Hollander (2001) suggested a multi-faceted approach to improving students' political engagement outcomes by utilizing organized efforts to register students to vote, offering policy-focused service-learning opportunities, cultivating a campus culture that recognizes the educational nature of student activism, training faculty and staff to live out the moral and ethical principles of democracy in their work, and being willing to "empathize with and not resent our students' pessimism, ambivalence, and alienation from public life" (p. 7), among other practices.

Chapter Summary

The lack of clear, consistent terminology makes it difficult for colleges and universities to accurately describe the content and goals of their efforts to educate students on matters of civic, political, and democratic engagement (Finley, 2011). Delving into the commonly (and often interchangeably) used terminology provides a framework for understanding different categories of engagement, as well as the concepts and activities that are emphasized by each. While it is clear that education for citizenship has been identified as a mission of higher education since its earliest days in this country, the ways in which that mission has been prioritized and realized by individual colleges and universities have evolved over the course of history (Hartley, 2009; The National

Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012). Scholars have recognized that service learning is commonly employed as a means of citizenship education; however, taking part in service learning does not always translate into a deep, meaningful understanding and internalization of the fact that all citizens have a responsibility to fully engage in democratic society for the common good of the nation (Finley, 2011; Galston, 2004; Howe & Fosnacht, 2017). Democratic engagement must be understood in an expansive manner that moves beyond volunteering at a homeless shelter and showing up to vote on election day (Beaumont et al., 2006). Pedagogical strategies that emphasize collaboration, critical thinking, and inclusivity are promising methods of cultivating democratic values in college students (Colby et al., 2007). Just as each generation brings with it new experiences, ideals, technology, and culture, higher education professionals must facilitate the process by which democracy, through democratic engagement, may be "born anew every generation" (Dewey, 2008, p. 139).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to identify attitudes and perceptions related to the importance of democratic engagement held by undergraduate students at a large, public, research institution in the South. A quantitative, non-experimental survey design was utilized to achieve the goal of describing and better understanding the characteristics of a population by gathering data from a sample (Creswell, 2014; Johnson & Christensen, 2014). Utilizing a survey design allowed the researcher to gather information that could then be used to inform future practices in developing more meaningful civic and democratic engagement opportunities and educational experiences. Additionally, a survey design had the advantage of being a relatively quick and cost-effective method of utilizing a valid, reliable instrument to collect data from a potentially large sample. This was a descriptive, cross-sectional study, which was defined by Johnson (2001) as research in which data are collected at one point in time for the purpose of describing the characteristics of a specific population.

An overview of the site, participants, data collection, instrument(s), procedures, and analysis methods for this study is provided in this chapter. The following research questions guided this study:

- RQ1: As measured by the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire and adapted Political Engagement Project survey, what attitudes and perceptions about the

importance of democratic engagement are reported by undergraduate college students?

  - RQ1.1: Are there differences in reported attitudes and perceptions based upon the demographics of class standing, school or college enrollment, gender identity, racial or ethnic identity, political party affiliation, or political ideology?

- RQ2: As measured by the adapted Political Engagement Project survey, in what types of democratic engagement do undergraduate college students report an intent to participate during the 2020 U.S. presidential election cycle?
  - RQ2.1: Are there differences in the types of democratic engagement in which students report an intent to participate based upon the demographics of class standing, school or college enrollment, gender identity, racial or ethnic identity, political party affiliation, or political ideology?
- RQ3: As measured by the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire and adapted Political Engagement Project survey, is there a relationship between reported attitudes and perceptions of the importance of democratic engagement and reported intent to participate in the 2020 U.S. presidential election cycle for undergraduate college students?

Site and Participants

This study was conducted on the main campus of a large, research-extensive, public, land-grant university located in the South. Total enrollment at the institution is approximately 38,600, nearly 30,000 of which are undergraduate students. Nearly all undergraduate students (94%) and a majority of graduate and professional students (77%)

are enrolled on a full-time basis. The institution is made up of 17 schools and colleges, three of which only offer graduate and professional degrees. The reported sex identities of the undergraduate population are approximately 43% male, 57% female. The average age of undergraduate students is 20 and nearly 89% of undergraduate students are residents of the state. Over 140 baccalaureate majors are offered, the most popular of which are Biology (approximately 2,500 students), Psychology (approximately 1,600 students), Finance (approximately 1,400 students), and Computer Science (approximately 1,100 students). The college of arts and sciences is the largest college within the university, enrolling nearly 9,500 undergraduate students within approximately 50 academic programs, which are divided into six divisions within the college.

The sample for this study was limited to undergraduate students who are part of Generation Z (born 1995 or later) and are registered (or eligible to register) to vote in U.S. elections in the state where the institution is located or any other U.S. state. In order to be eligible to register to vote, students must be citizens of the U.S., 18 years old by election day, and meet the residency requirements and voter registration deadlines of the state in which they are registered to vote (USA.gov, 2019).

Instrumentation

This study utilized two previously developed and tested instruments. Three scales from the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (CASQ) (Moely et al., 2002) and an adapted version of the Political Engagement Project (PEP) survey (Beaumont et al., 2018) were used to gather data related to students' attitudes, behaviors, and future intentions regarding democratic engagement. These two adapted instruments were

combined to make up the full questionnaire (Appendix A), which took approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire

The CASQ was developed by Moely et al. (2002) "to measure attitudes, skills, and behavioral intentions that might be affected by service-learning participation" (p. 15). Initially comprised of 84 items based on previous research on service learning, the instrument was eventually reduced to 65 items, and then ultimately the 44 items which make up its final iteration (Moely et al., 2002). Each item is measured on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from completely disagree (1) to agree completely (5) (Moely et al., 2002). Based upon factor analysis from two samples ($N = 761$ and $N = 725$), Moely et al. (2002) defined six reliable scales (Civic Action, Interpersonal and Problem-Solving Skills, Political Awareness, Leadership Skills, Social Justice Attitudes, and Diversity Attitudes) with internal consistencies ranging between .69 and .88. Moely et al. (2002) found that along with correlations between individual scales, there was a positive correlation among the Civic Action scale and all other scales, which suggests that the other attitudes measured by the CASQ may contribute to some the behaviors associated with democratic engagement.

The three scales from the CASQ that are most directly related to the definition of democratic engagement employed in this study were utilized for data collection. The Civic Action (CA) scale draws upon the Civic Responsibility Scale developed by Astin and Sax (1998) and measures intended community involvement in the future (Moely et al., 2002). The Political Awareness (PA) scale measures awareness of political issues both at the local and national levels, and in the Social Justice Attitudes (SJA) scale

respondents are asked to gauge their level of agreement with statements regarding social issues and the avenues for addressing them (Moely et al., 2002). The number of items and Cronbach's alphas for each scale are included in Table 1. The researcher obtained permission from Dr. Barbara Moely to utilize the CASQ for this study (Appendix B).

The CASQ has primarily been used to evaluate the impact of academically-oriented service-learning experiences on concepts such as civic development and self-efficacy (Gershenson-Gates, 2012); preferences for different types of community service (Moely, Furco, & Reed, 2008); academic performance, interpersonal skills, and commitment to community engagement (Simons & Cleary, 2005); socially responsible nursing (Johnson, 2013); and the "acquisition of political knowledge and the cultivation of democratic values" (Schamber & Mahoney, 2008, p. 75). In the context of this study, CA, PA, and SJA scales from the CASQ were used to explore the attitudes measured by each scale, as well as potential correlations between those attitudes and a variety of reported behaviors associated with democratic engagement, as measured by data from the second instrument that was used in the full questionnaire.

The Political Engagement Project Survey

The Political Engagement Project (PEP) survey was originally used as a pre-post survey instrument that was administered as part of a larger study of the effectiveness of 21 educational interventions administered on college campuses across the country from 2003-2005 (Beaumont et al., 2018). The quasi-experimental study also included qualitative data collected through phone interviews with students and faculty, student writing exercises, samples of student work, and a faculty survey to provide a thorough and accurate examination of these educational experiences as they occurred in their

natural environments (Beaumont, Colby, Ehrlich, & Torney-Purta, 2006). Data collected from the full PEP was then extensively documented and expounded upon by Colby et al. (2007) in an effort to share the success of the project and provide a template for how higher education professionals can incorporate demonstrably effective pedagogical strategies for teaching political engagement on their own campuses.

During the PEP study, Beaumont et al. (2018) administered the quantitative instrument to students via an online platform at the beginning and end of the various interventions in which they participated. Each of the complete PEP surveys took approximately 25-30 minutes to complete, and each survey asked students to respond to questions related to their political understanding, skill, motivation, and behavior, primarily using Likert-type scale responses to measure any changes in students' responses as a result of their participation in one of the 21 interventions included in the study (Beaumont et al., 2006). The researchers utilized exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis to develop over 12 scales, each of which contains multiple subscales. Three subscales were utilized for the purposes of this study to analyze students' attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement: Internal Efficacy (IE), Perception of Effective Political Strategies: Public & Institutional Attention (PIA), and Perception of Effective Political Strategies: Informing & Collaborating (IC). More information on the number of items and Cronbach's alphas for each of these subscales is included in Table 1. Another multi-item question from the PEP survey was used to collect descriptive data on the specific types of democratic engagement in which students reported an intent to participate during the 2020 presidential election cycle. While the

original PEP survey data analysis used scales associated with the items on this question, those scales were not utilized for the purposes of this study.

Although developed and tested as a pre-post survey instrument, the researchers did note that the pre-survey could be effectively administered on a one-time basis (Carnegie Foundation, 2007). The researcher obtained permission from Dr. Anne Colby, one of the principal researchers involved in the PEP study, to utilize and adapt the PEP pre-survey for a one-time administration (Appendix C). The adapted instrument was updated to include culturally relevant language given the significant shifts in technology that have occurred in the more than 15 years since the survey was developed. Additionally, some survey and demographic questions were removed (and others added) to better align the scope of the survey with the research questions being explored in this study. An inventory of the adaptations made to the original survey is included in Appendix D.

Table 1

Number of Items and Cronbach's Alphas for Scales Used

Scale	Items	α[a, b]
CASQ		
Civic Action	8	.86, .88
Political Awareness	6	.80, .79
Social Justice Attitudes	8	.70, .69
PEP Survey		
Internal Efficacy	5	.91, .89

Perception of Effective Political Strategies: Public & Institutional Attention	4	.72, .76
Perception of Effective Political Strategies: Informing & Collaborating	3	.73, .79

Note. CASQ=Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire; PEP=Political Engagement Project
[a]Cronbach's alphas shown for CASQ scales are for Sample 1 (N=760) and Sample 2 (N=718) as reported by Moely et al. (2002)
[b]Cronbach's alphas shown for PEP survey scales are for pre- and post-tests as reported by Beaumont et al. (2018)

Recruitment and Data Collection

After the study received approval from the site's Institutional Review Board, participants were drawn from a single stage, convenience sample of undergraduate students. In an effort to reach as many of the institution's undergraduate students as possible, the researcher sought permission from multiple offices within the institution's division of student affairs to send a recruitment email to subscribers of student listservs. The researcher sought to utilize listservs managed by offices within the division of student affairs because these offices tend to work with large, diverse cross sections of students unlike listservs managed by academic departments or more specific, topical listservs. Two offices within the institution's division of student affairs (the office of leadership and service and the office of multicultural affairs) agreed to send the recruitment email (Appendix E) via their listservs, and another office sent the recruitment email to advisors of student organizations. Operating under the assumption that some students would already have an interest in the topic of the study and therefore be more likely to complete the survey, the researcher also chose to directly contact student leaders of student organizations centered around politics, democracy, and governance (partisan and non-partisan) and asked if they would be willing to send the recruitment email to

their members. Two organizations agreed to participate, one organization declined, and three other organizations did not respond to the researcher's request. Additionally, the researcher sent the recruitment email directly to 2,000 unique, university-issued undergraduate student email addresses which the researcher obtained through an official process managed by the office within the institution's division of student affairs that manages assessment and research activities. The study was also approved for inclusion in the undergraduate research pool for a department within the university's college of education. Data collection began near the end of September of the fall 2019 academic semester through all of these channels. The recruitment email was sent again approximately two weeks after the initial email in an effort to recruit as many participants as possible. The survey remained open for a total of four weeks. Five gift cards to a local coffee shop ($10 each) were offered as participation incentives, and, in accordance with state law, information on how to enter the drawing for the gift cards without participating in the study was provided. Those who participated in the study had the option of providing their email address after completing the survey if they wished to be entered into the drawing for the gift cards.

Data were collected via a survey instrument delivered on the Qualtrics online platform. After following the link included in the recruitment email, the survey began with an IRB-approved informed consent document, which is included with the survey in Appendix A. Active consent was indicated by clicking a button indicating that the participant had read, understood, and agreed to the terms of the study to continue to the survey itself. The survey began by asking participants to indicate how they learned of the opportunity to participate in the study (results displayed in Table 2) and by verifying

eligibility for participation by asking for birth year and voter registration eligibility and status. Other basic demographic information including gender identity, race/ethnicity, academic class standing, program of study, political party affiliation, and political ideology were also collected. Given the exceedingly large number of majors offered by the institution, students were asked to identify which of the 14 schools and colleges that offer undergraduate degrees they were enrolled in, and they were able to select more than one option to account for those who may be pursuing more than one major or degree.

After completing the demographic questions, participants were then asked to complete one administration of the survey, which was completely voluntary and anonymous. No personally identifiable information was collected, other than the email addresses of students who choose to enter the drawing for gift cards. Email addresses were decoupled from survey submissions to ensure that responses could not be linked to individual participants.

Table 2

Reported Method of Recruitment

Method	Frequency	Percentage
Received Email Directly from Researcher	137	60.4
Departmental Undergraduate Research Pool	59	26
Email from Student Organization	17	7.5
Email from Listserv	7	3.1
More Than One Source	4	1.8

Another Source[a]	3	1.3

Note. N=227
[a]Other specified sources were: "My advisor," "Received an email from advisor," and "I received an email from <the name of a particular Student Affairs staff member>"

Data Analysis

At the end of the four week data collection period, data were downloaded from Qualtrics, cleaned (removing any submissions that did not meet the eligibility requirements or were incomplete), and loaded into the most current version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) data analysis software. The quantitative data were analyzed to answer the research questions guiding this study.

Research Question 1

RQ1: What attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement are reported by undergraduate college students? This question was examined using the descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation to allow the researcher to describe information related to the sample (Christopher, 2017). Attitudes were measured using the CASQ's CA, PA, and SJA scales and the PEP survey's IE scale. Perceptions were measured by the PEP survey's PIA and IC scales.

RQ1.1: Are there differences based upon class standing? Analyzed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine differences based upon the mean for each subscale for each class standing category.

RQ1.2: Are there differences based upon school or college? Analyzed using ANOVA to examine differences based upon the mean for each subscale for each school or college.

RQ1.3: Are there differences based upon gender identity? Analyzed using independent samples t-test based upon the mean for each subscale for the binary woman/man gender identities.

RQ1.4: Are there differences based upon race or ethnicity? Analyzed using independent samples t-tests to examine differences based upon the mean for those who identified as White and those who identified with any minoritized race or ethnicity category. Also analyzed using ANOVA to examine differences among multiple racial/ethnic identities.

RQ1.5: Are there differences based upon political party affiliation? Analyzed using independent samples t-test based upon the mean for each subscale for the two major political parties (Democrat and Republican).

RQ1.6: Are there differences based upon political ideology? Analyzed using independent samples t-test based upon the mean for each subscale for all conservative/conservative-leaning and liberal/liberal-leaning ideologies. Also analyzed using ANOVA to examine differences among liberal, moderate, and conservative political ideology identifications.

Research Question 2

RQ2: In what types of democratic engagement do undergraduate students report an intent to participate during the 2020 U.S. presidential election cycle? This question was examined through the use of means and standard deviations for each of the 20 types of behaviors in survey questions 43-62.

RQ2.1: Are there differences based upon class standing? Analyzed using ANOVA to examine differences based upon the mean for each type of behavior for each class standing category.

RQ2.2: Are there differences based upon school or college? Analyzed using ANOVA to examine differences based upon the mean for each type of behavior for each school or college.

RQ2.3: Are there differences based upon gender identity? Analyzed using independent samples t-test based upon the mean for each type of behavior for the binary male/female gender identities.

RQ2.4: Are there differences based upon race or ethnicity? Analyzed using independent samples t-tests to examine differences based upon the mean for those who identified as White and those who identified with any minoritized race or ethnicity category. Also analyzed using ANOVA to examine differences among multiple racial/ethnic identities.

RQ2.5: Are there differences based upon political party affiliation? Analyzed using independent samples t-test based upon the mean for each type of behavior for the two major political parties (Democrat and Republican).

RQ2.6: Are there differences based upon political ideology? Analyzed using independent samples t-test based upon the mean for each type of behavior for all conservative/conservative-leaning and liberal/liberal-leaning ideologies. Also analyzed using ANOVA to examine differences among liberal, moderate, and conservative political ideology identifications.

Research Question 3

RQ3: Is there a relationship between reported attitudes and perceptions of the importance of democratic engagement and reported intent to participate in the 2020 U.S. presidential election cycle? Inferential statistics were used to determine if any relationships existed between the variables. Specifically, the Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine if any relationships exist between attitudes (as measured by the CASQ's CA, PA, and SJA scales and the PEP survey's IE scale) and perceptions (as measured by the PEP survey's PIA and IC scales), and reported levels of intent to participate in 20 specific forms of democratic engagement during the 2020 election (as measured by the individual items in survey questions 43-62), as well as the strength and type (direction) of any relationships that were identified (Christopher, 2017).

Table 3

Survey Items Associated with Scales

Scale	Survey Items
CASQ	
Civic Action	9, 11, 14, 16, 21, 23, 25, 28
Political Awareness	12, 18, 20, 22, 27, 30
Social Justice Attitudes	10[a], 13, 15[a], 17, 19, 24[a], 26[a], 29
PEP Survey	
Internal Efficacy	31, 32, 33, 34, 35
Perception of Effective Political Strategies: Public & Institutional Attention	38, 39, 40, 41

Perception of Effective Political Strategies: Informing & Collaborating	36, 37, 42

[a]Reverse scoring used on these items

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis of each research question in this quantitative, descriptive study designed to better understand the attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement among Generation Z undergraduate students at a large, public, land-grant institution in the South. Six scales, three from the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (Moely et al., 2002) and three from the adapted Political Engagement Project survey (Beaumont et al., 2018), were used to measure attitudes and perceptions, and data were also collected on reported intent to participate in 20 behaviors associated with democratic engagement during the 2020 presidential election cycle. Statistical analysis was completed to gain insight into how different demographics may be related to attitudes, perceptions, and intended behaviors. Finally, statistical analysis was completed to identify any correlations between attitudes, perceptions, and intended behaviors. The research questions that guided this study are presented along with findings.

Participant Demographics

Participants from this study were drawn from a convenience sample of undergraduate students enrolled at the institution. Data collected occurred primarily during the third month of the fall 2019 academic semester and participants were recruited using a variety of methods to maximize potential responses. Recruitment emails were sent out via two departmental listservs managed by offices within the institution's

division of student affairs, as well as to student organization advisors, to student leaders of politically oriented student organizations, and directly to a list of 2,000 student email addresses provided by the office within the division of student affairs which oversees assessment and research. Additionally, the study was included in a departmental undergraduate research pool within the institution's college of education. In total, 230 individuals completed the survey, of which three were deemed ineligible to participate based upon responses to screening questions. A total of 227 usable submissions were used for data analysis. Self-reported demographics including year of birth, voter registration eligibility, class standing, gender identity, race/ethnicity, and school or college enrollment of the eligible respondents are listed in Table 4.

Table 4

Demographics of Participants

Demographic	Frequency	Percentage
Year of Birth		
1995	1	0.4
1996	9	4.0
1997	30	13.2
1998	70	30.8
1999	49	21.6
2000	44	19.4
2001	24	10.6

Voter Eligibility and Registration		
Eligible and Registered	193	85.0
Eligible but Not Registered	28	12.3
Eligible but Unsure if Registered	6	2.6
Class Standing		
Freshman/First-Year Undergraduate	39	17.2
Sophomore/Second-Year Undergraduate	36	15.9
Junior/Third-Year Undergraduate	77	33.9
Senior/Fourth-Year Undergraduate	61	26.9
Fifth-Year (or more) Undergraduate	14	6.2
Gender		
Woman	166	73.1
Man	56	24.7
Prefer Not to Answer	2	0.9
Non-Binary	1	0.4
Both Woman and Man Selected	1	0.4
Not Specified	7	0.4
Race/Ethnicity		
White/Caucasian	158	69.6
Asian or Asian American	19	8.4
Two or More Selected	18	7.9
Black or African American	16	7.0

Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish Origin	12	5.3
Multiracial	2	0.9
Middle Eastern or North African	1	0.4
Prefer Not to Answer	1	0.4
School or College Enrollment		
College of Arts & Sciences	95	41.9
College of Business	33	14.5
College of Family & Consumer Sciences	17	7.5
College of Journalism & Mass Communication	17	7.5
Two or More Schools or Colleges	16	7.0
College of Education	14	6.2
School of Public & International Affairs	12	5.3
College of Engineering	8	3.5
College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences	5	2.2
College of Public Health	4	1.8
School of Ecology	3	1.3
School of Social Work	1	0.4
School of Forestry	1	0.4
Other	1	0.4

Note. N=227

In addition to personal characteristics, respondents were also asked to provide demographic information related to political party affiliation and political ideology. These demographics are provided in Table 5.

Table 5

Political Party and Ideology of Participants

Demographic	Frequency	Percentage
Political Party Affiliation		
Democrat	99	43.6
Republican	61	26.9
Independent	41	18.1
Something Else (self-describe)[a]	14	6.2
Don't Know	12	5.3
Political Ideology on Scale of 1 to 6		
1 (Very Liberal)	27	11.9
2	63	27.8
3	56	24.7
4	53	23.3
5	25	11
6 (Very Conservative)	3	1.3

Note. N=227
[a]Self-described Political Party Affiliations included in Appendix F

Research Question 1

RQ1: What attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement are reported by undergraduate college students? Attitudes were measured using three scales from the CASQ and one scale from the PEP survey; perceptions were measured using two scales from the PEP survey. Means and standard deviations were calculated for each of the six scales used in the study and results are shown in Table 6 along with comparisons to means and standard deviations reported for the four scales used to measure attitudes. One-sample t-tests were utilized to determine that this study yielded significantly higher scores on the Civic Action and Political Awareness scales as compared to Moely et al.'s (2002) first and second samples, and a significantly higher score on the Social Justice Attitudes scale as compared to their second sample. The Internal Efficacy scale score from this study was significantly lower than Colby et al.'s (2007) pre- and post-tests. These comparisons are included to contextualize the meaning of the attitudes and perceptions reported by the participants in this study. As compared to previous studies, the participants in this study seem to report attitudes that imply that civic involvement, awareness about politics, and social justice are more important to them than the participants in previous research; however, they seem to simultaneously report attitudes that imply that they are less confident that their individual participation in democracy is as important or effective than participants in previous research.

Table 6

Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations

Scale	Range	This Study		Comparison	
		M	SD	M[a, b]	SD[a, b]
Attitudes					
CASQ Civic Action	1-5	4.22	.59	**4.03****, **3.98****	.65, .54
PEP Internal Efficacy	1-6	4.15	1.12	**4.30***, **4.60****	1.20, 1.00
CASQ Social Justice Attitudes	1-5	4.07	.60	4.03, **3.95****	.52, .52
CASQ Political Awareness	1-5	3.75	.71	**3.41****, **3.46****	.77, .74
Perceptions					
PEP Informing & Collaborating	1-6	4.83	.83	--	--
PEP Political & Institutional Attention	1-6	4.20	.92	--	--

**$p < .01$
*$p < .05$
[a]Means and standard deviations shown for CASQ scales are for Sample 1 (N = 760) and Sample 2 (N = 718) as reported by Moely et al. (2002)
[b]Means and standard deviations shown for PEP survey scales are for pre- and post-tests as reported by Colby et al. (2007)

Cronbach's alphas were also calculated for this study and are listed in comparison to previously reported Cronbach's alphas in Table 7. Alphas from this study were generally consistent with previous studies, which indicates that although the sample size of this study was smaller, the reliability of the scales remains steady.

Table 7

Comparison of Cronbach's Alphas

Scale	Items	This Study α	Comparison α^a	Comparison α^b
CASQ				
Civic Action	8	.86	.88	.87
Political Awareness	6	.80	.79	.82
Social Justice Attitudes	8	.70	.69	.79
PEP Survey				
Internal Efficacy	5	.91	.89	.88
Perception of Effective Political Strategies: Public & Institutional Attention	4	.72	.76	.71
Perception of Effective Political Strategies: Informing & Collaborating	3	.73	.79	.68

Note. CASQ = Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire; PEP = Political Engagement Project
[a]Cronbach's alphas shown for CASQ scales for Sample 1 (N = 760) as reported by Moely et al. (2002) and PEP survey scales for pre-tests as reported by Beaumont et al. (2018)
[b]Cronbach's alphas shown for CASQ scales for Sample 2 (N = 718) as reported by Moely et al. (2002) and PEP survey scales for post-tests as reported by Beaumont et al. (2018)

RQ1.1: Are there differences based upon class standing? A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run to determine if there were significant differences in average scales scores based upon-self reported class standing. No significant differences were found.

RQ1.2: Are there differences based upon school or college? One-way ANOVA was utilized to determine if there were any significant differences in average scale scores based upon school or college enrollment. To ensure that

post-hoc analyses could be run, this statistic was only run for the top seven schools and colleges in which respondents reported enrollment (N=204): College of Arts & Sciences (N=95), College of Business (N=33), College of Family & Consumer Sciences (N=17), College of Journalism (N=17), Two or More Schools or Colleges (N=16), College of Education (N=14), and School of Public & International Affairs (N=12).

School or college enrollment was significant on the Political Awareness scale, [F(6,197)=4.20, p=.001]. Post hoc analyses using the Tukey HSD test indicated significant scale score differences between students enrolled in Two or More Schools or Colleges (M=4.38, SD=.48) and those enrolled in the College of Arts & Sciences (M=3.68, SD=.68, p=.003), the College of Business (M=3.63, SD=.81, p=.006), the College of Family & Consumer Sciences (M=3.62, SD=.61, p=.021), and the College of Journalism (M=3.57, SD=.75, p=.011).

Social Justice Attitudes scale scores indicated a significant difference (p=.035) between respondents enrolled in the College of Arts & Sciences (M=4.18, SD=.55) and the College of Education (M=3.68, SD=.45), [F(6,197)=2.31, p=.035].

School or college enrollment was also found to be significant on the Internal Efficacy scale, [F(6,197)=7.18, p<.000]. Post hoc Tukey HSD analyses indicated significant scale score differences between students enrolled in Two or More Schools or Colleges (M=5.25, SD=.81) and those enrolled in the College of Arts & Sciences (M=4.08, SD=.99, p=.001), the College of Journalism (M=3.87, SD=1.11, p=.003), the College of Family & Consumer Sciences (M=3.82,

SD=1.21, p=.002), and the College of Business (M=3.70, SD=1.13, p<.000) as well as those enrolled in the School of Public & International Affairs (M=5.27, SD=.53) and those enrolled in the College of Arts & Sciences (M=4.08, SD=.99, p=.004), the College of Journalism (M=3.87, SD=1.11, p=.007), the College of Family & Consumer Sciences (M=3.82, SD=1.21, p=.004), and the College of Business (M=3.70, SD=1.13, p<.000).

RQ1.3: Are there differences based upon gender identity? Analysis using independent samples t-tests for gender binary of woman (N=166) and man (N=56) indicated significant differences at the .01 level on all scales except Political Awareness. Women scored significantly higher on the Civic Action, Social Justice Attitudes, Political & Institutional Attention, and Informing & Collaborating scales. Men scored significantly higher on the Internal Efficacy scale, and there was no significant difference based upon gender on the Political Awareness scale. Results are listed in Table 8.

Table 8

T-test of Scale Scores Based Upon Binary Gender Identity

	Woman		Man		
Scale	M	SD	M	SD	*t*-test
Attitudes					
CASQ Civic Action[a]	4.30	.55	3.99	.66	**3.49****
CASQ Political Awareness[a]	3.70	.72	3.89	.70	-1.74

CASQ Social Justice Attitudes[a]	4.13	.55	3.85	.69	**3.07****
PEP Internal Efficacy[b]	4.03	1.09	4.49	1.12	**-2.73****
Perceptions					
PEP Political & Institutional Attention[b]	4.34	.88	3.78	.93	**4.09****
PEP Informing & Collaborating[b]	4.97	.77	4.43	.91	**4.33****

Note. N=222
**$p < .01$
[a]Scale range is 1-5
[b]Scale range is 1-6

RQ1.4: Are there differences based upon race or ethnicity? Although the sample consisted of respondents representing multiple racial and ethnic identities, the available categories were initially collapsed into two categories to allow for valid statistical analysis: White (N=158) and Minoritized Racial/Ethnic Identities (N=69). The term "Minoritized Racial/Ethnic Identities" is consistent with the work of Davis and Museus (2019) who argued:

> unlike the term *minority,* using the term *minoritized* can disrupt deficit thinking in educational research because it gets at the contextual nature of oppression, systems and processes rooted in power that affect these populations, and reality that identities and experiences are not objective. (para. 8)

This grouping does not provide accurate representation of the racial/ethnic diversity present within the sample; however, the small sample size represented in some of the racial/ethnic groups prevented valid post hoc testing. Independent sample t-tests were used to identify significant differences on all scales except

Civic Action (Table 9). Those who identified as White scored significantly higher on the Political Awareness and Internal Efficacy scales while those who identified with any minoritized racial/ethnic identity scored significantly higher on the Social Justice Attitudes, Political & Institutional Attention, and Informing & Collaborating scales.

Table 9

T-test of Scale Scores Based Upon Binary Racial/Ethnic Identity

	White		Minoritized		
Scale	M	SD	M	SD	*t*-test
Attitudes					
CASQ Civic Action[a]	4.23	.59	4.19	.66	.393
CASQ Political Awareness[a]	3.84	.68	3.55	.75	**2.88****
CASQ Social Justice Attitudes[a]	4.00	.64	4.22	.45	**-2.98****
PEP Internal Efficacy[b]	4.29	1.13	3.85	1.04	**2.73****
Perceptions					
PEP Political & Institutional Attention[b]	4.08	.88	4.49	.93	**-3.21****
PEP Informing & Collaborating[b]	4.74	.81	5.02	.85	**-2.34**

Note. N=227
**$p < .01$
*$p < .05$
[a]Scale range is 1-5
[b]Scale range is 1-6

A second round of statistical analysis was also conducted with the Multiracial (N=2) and Two or More Selected (N=18) responses combined into one category and the Middle Eastern or North African (N=1) and Prefer Not to Answer (N=1) responses treated as missing data. Means for the five remaining racial/ethnic identity categories were compared using ANOVA: White (N=158), Multiracial/Two or More Selected (N=20), Asian or Asian American (N=19), Black or African American (N=16), and Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish Origin (N=12). Significant ANOVA results are presented in Table 10 and significant post-hoc Tukey analysis results, which indicate significant differences in scale scores based on racial/ethnic identity, are presented in Table 11.

Table 10

Significant One-Way Analyses of Variance of Scale Scores Based Upon Racial/Ethnic Identity

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
CASQ Social Justice Attitudes					
Between Groups	4	6.257	1.564	4.677	**.001****
Within Groups	220	73.584	.334		
Total	224	79.841			
PEP Internal Efficacy					
Between Groups	4	15.580	3.895	3.227	**.013***
Within Groups	220	265.518	1.207		

Total	224	281.098			
PEP Public & Institutional Attention					
Between Groups	4	14.497	3.624	4.652	**.001****
Within Groups	220	171.415	.779		
Total	224	185.912			
PEP Informing & Collaborating					
Between Groups	4	12.062	3.015	4.689	**.001****
Within Groups	220	141.477	.643		
Total	224	153.539			

Table 11

Significant Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons of Scale Scores Based Upon Racial/Ethnic Identity

Comparison	Mean Difference	Stand. Error	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound
CASQ Social Justice Attitudes				
Asian/Asian Am. & Black/African Am.	**-.586***	.196	-1.13	-.05
Asian/Asian Am. & Multiracial/Two or More	**-.546***	.185	-1.06	-.04
White & Black/African Am.	**-.419***	.152	-.84	-.00
White & Multiracial/Two or More	**-.378***	.137	-.76	-.00

PEP Internal Efficacy				
Asian/Asian Am. & White	**-.886****	.267	-1.62	-.15
PEP Public & Institutional Attention				
Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish & Asian/Asian Am.	**.946***	.325	.05	1.84
Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish & White	**1.027****	.264	.30	1.75
PEP Informing & Collaborating				
Black/African Am. & White	**.632***	.210	.05	1.21
Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish & Asian/Asian Am.	**.816***	.296	.00	1.63
Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish & Multiracial/Two or More	.800^	.293	-.01	1.61
Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish & White	**.757***	.240	.10	1.42

**$p < .01$
*$p < .05$
^$p = .053$

RQ1.5: Are there differences based upon political party affiliation?

Independent samples t-tests were utilized to compare scale scores based upon the binary Democrat (N=99) or Republican (N=61) political party affiliation. These groupings do not represent all the political party affiliations reported in the sample; however, these two political parties are the most clearly established, dominant parties in the current era and therefore any results from statistical analysis of differences between the parties has the most potential to have concrete implications for practice. Significant differences were identified on four of the six

scales as noted in Table 12. In all four instances, those who identified as Democrat scored significantly higher.

Table 12

T-test of Scale Scores Based Upon Binary Political Party Affiliation

Scale	Democrat		Republican		
	M	SD	M	SD	*t*-test
Attitudes					
CASQ Civic Action[a]	4.35	.56	4.09	.59	**2.82****
CASQ Political Awareness[a]	3.80	.41	3.81	.68	-.08
CASQ Social Justice Attitudes[a]	4.41	.39	3.51	.52	**12.43****
PEP Internal Efficacy[b]	4.33	1.06	4.07	1.22	1.42
Perceptions					
PEP Political & Institutional Attention[b]	4.49	.80	3.73	.85	**5.69****
PEP Informing & Collaborating[b]	4.99	.74	4.56	.86	**3.36****

Note. N=160
**$p < .01$
[a]Scale range is 1-5
[b]Scale range is 1-6

RQ1.6: Are there differences based upon political ideology? Responses were reported using a six-point Likert-type scale with 1 corresponding to "Very Liberal" and 6 corresponding to "Very Conservative." Data were analyzed using independent samples t-tests based upon the mean for each subscale for all liberal/liberal-leaning (responses 1-3 on the scale, N=146) and

conservative/conservative-leaning ideologies (responses 4-6 on the scale, N=81). As reported in Table 13, statistically significant differences were found at the .01 level on the Civic Action, Social Justice Attitudes, Political & Institutional Attention, and Informing & Collaborating scales. Those who identified as liberal/liberal-leaning scored significantly higher on all four scales.

Table 13

T-test of Scale Scores Based Upon Binary Political Ideology

	Liberal (1-3)		Conservative (4-6)		
Scale	M	SD	M	SD	*t*-test
Attitudes					
CASQ Civic Action[a]	4.29	.58	4.08	.58	**2.70****
CASQ Political Awareness[a]	3.76	.70	3.73	.73	.38
CASQ Social Justice Attitudes[a]	4.36	.42	3.55	.50	**12.96****
PEP Internal Efficacy[b]	4.23	1.05	4.02	1.22	1.33
Perceptions					
PEP Political & Institutional Attention[b]	4.43	.87	3.79	.86	**5.37****
PEP Informing & Collaborating[b]	4.95	.80	4.61	.83	**2.94****

Note. N=227
**$p < .01$
[a]Scale range is 1-5
[b]Scale range is 1-6

Data were also analyzed using ANOVA to examine differences on each scale among liberal (responses 1-2 on the scale, N=90), moderate (responses 3-4

on the scale, N=109), and conservative (responses 5-6 on the scale, N=28) political ideology identifications. Statistically significant differences were found on all six scales. On the Civic Action scale [F(2, 224)=5.121, p=.007], a post-hoc Tukey test revealed that those who identified as liberal (M=4.37, SD=.61) scored significantly higher (p=.008) than those who identified as moderate (M=4.12, SD=.56). On the Political Awareness scale [F(2, 224)=7.433, p=.001], there was a significant difference (p=.004) between those who identified as liberal (M=3.89, SD=.69) and moderate (M=3.57, SD=.71), as well as a significant difference (p=.009) between those who identified as moderate and conservative (M=4.01, SD=.60). Analysis of the Social Justice Attitudes scale revealed significant differences [F(2, 224)=77.493, p<.000] at the .01 level between all pairings of liberal (M=4.48, SD=.37), moderate (M=3.92, SD=.49), and conservative (M=3.33, SD=.60). Significant differences on the Internal Efficacy ([F(2, 224)=9.563, p<.000] scale were identified between those who identified as liberal (M=4.45, SD=.98) and moderate (M=3.83, SD=1.10, p<.000), as well as between those who identified as moderate and conservative (M=4.47, SD=1.26, p=.016). Additional significant differences were found on the scales used to measure perceptions: Public & Institutional Attention [F(2, 224)=11.640, p<.000] and Informing & Collaborating [F(2, 224)=4.742, p=.010]. On the Public & Institutional Attention scale, those who identified as liberal (M=4.53, SD=.79) scored significantly higher than those who identified as moderate (M=4.06, SD, p=.001) and those who identified as conservative (M=3.74, SD=.79, p<.000). Respondents who identified as liberal (M=5.01, SD=.76) also scored significantly

higher (p=.007) than those who identified as moderate (M=4.66, SD=.85) on the Informing & Collaborating scale.

Research Question 2

RQ2: In what types of democratic engagement do undergraduate students report an intent to participate during the 2020 U.S. presidential election cycle? Means and standard deviations were calculated for each of the 20 behaviors associated with democratic engagement. These behaviors are listed in Table 14 in descending order of means.

Table 14

Reported Intent to Participate in Behaviors Associated with Democratic Engagement

Behavior	Mean	SD
Vote in General Election	5.63	0.91
Vote in Primary Elections	5.22	1.24
Discuss Political Problems with Friends	4.70	1.31
Be an Active Member of Groups/Organizations	4.13	1.62
Non-Political Community Service/Volunteerism	4.10	1.63
Work with Others to Solve Problems in My Community	3.95	1.35
DO Buy Product or Service Because of Social/Political Values	3.93	1.60
NOT Buy Product or Service Because of Social/Political Values	3.82	1.72
Sign Written or Email Petition	3.56	1.60
Attend Campaign Event	3.29	1.66

Work with Political Group or Volunteer for Campaign	3.11	1.65
Assist with Voter Registration or "Get Out the Vote"	3.08	1.65
Take Part in Protest, March, or Demonstration	3.06	1.68
Wear Campaign Merch/Sticker on Car/Sign at House	3.00	1.74
Express Political Opinions on Social Media	3.00	1.80
Give Money to Political Candidate or Cause	2.61	1.63
Contact or Visit Public Official to Express Opinion	2.44	1.43
Contact Newspaper or Magazine to Express Political Opinion	1.93	1.23
Canvass for Political Candidate or Cause	1.91	1.30
Call Radio or TV to Express Political Opinion	1.81	1.15

Note. Scale range is 1-6

RQ2.1: Are there differences based upon class standing? ANOVA was utilized to identify any significant differences in reported intent to participate in the different behaviors associated with democratic engagement based upon class standing. Significance was only identified with one behavior: Assist with Voter Registration or "Get Out the Vote" (GOTV) Efforts [$F(4,222)=3.725$, $p=.006$]. Post-hoc Tukey analyses indicated that respondents who identified as third-year undergraduate students ($M=2.58$, $SD=1.58$) were significantly less likely to report an intent to participate in this behavior than first-year ($M=3.54$, $SD=1.83$, $p=.025$) or second-year ($M=3.61$, $SD=1.63$, $p=.016$) students.

RQ2.2: Are there differences based upon school or college? One-way ANOVA was utilized to determine if there were any significant differences in

reported behaviors based upon school or college enrollment. To ensure that post-hoc analyses could be run, this statistic was only run for the top seven schools and colleges in which respondents reported enrollment (N=204): College of Arts & Sciences (N=95), College of Business (N=33), College of Family & Consumer Sciences (N=17), College of Journalism (N=17), Two or More Schools or Colleges (N=16), College of Education (N=14), and School of Public & International Affairs (N=12). There were significant differences based upon school or college enrollment for seven of 20 behaviors. Significant ANOVA results are presented in Table 15 and significant post-hoc Tukey analysis results, which indicate significant differences in intended behaviors between individual schools or colleges, are presented in Table 16.

Table 15

Significant One-Way Analyses of Variance of Behaviors Based Upon School or College

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Discuss Politics with Friends					
Between Groups	6	33.594	5.599	3.390	**.003****
Within Groups	197	325.401	1.652		
Total	203	358.995			
Attend Campaign Event					
Between Groups	6	59.139	9.856	3.900	**.001****
Within Groups	197	497.857	2.527		

Total	203	556.995			
Work with Political Group or Campaign					
Between Groups	6	76.378	12.730	5.146	**.000****
Within Groups	197	487.283	2.474		
Total	203	563.662			
Give Money to Candidate or Cause					
Between Groups	6	49.653	8.276	3.259	**.004****
Within Groups	197	500.283	2.540		
Total	203	549.936			
Canvass for Candidate or Cause					
Between Groups	6	63.240	10.540	7.172	**.000****
Within Groups	197	289.505	1.470		
Total	203	352.745			
Active Member of Group/Organization[a]					
Between Groups	6	37.602	6.267	2.504	**.023***
Within Groups	197	493.084	2.503		
Total	203	530.686			
Assist with Voter Registration/GOTV					
Between Groups	6	42.202	7.034	2.645	**.017***
Within Groups	197	523.837	2.659		

Total	203	566.039

[a]No significance found in Tukey HSD comparison

Table 16

Significant Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons of Behaviors Based Upon School or College

Comparison	Mean Difference	Stand. Error	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound
Discuss Politics with Friends				
Fam/Consumer Science & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.505***	.485	-2.95	-.06
Arts and Sciences & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.264***	.394	-2.44	-.09
Journalism & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.505***	.485	-2.95	-.06
Business & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.674****	.433	-2.96	-.38
Attend Campaign Event				
Arts and Sciences & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.687***	.487	-3.14	-.24
Arts and Sciences & Two or More Schools	**-1.499***	.430	-2.78	-.22
Journalism & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.809***	.599	-3.59	-.02
Work with Political Group or Campaign				
Arts and Sciences & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.981****	.482	-3.42	-.55
Arts and Sciences & Two or More Schools	**-1.647****	.425	-2.91	-.38

Journalism & Public/Intl Affairs	**-2.186****	.593	-3.95	-.42
Journalism & Two or More Schools	**-1.853***	.548	-3.48	-.22
Business & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.803***	.530	-3.38	-.22
Business & Two or More Schools	**-1.470***	.479	-2.90	-.04
Give Money to Candidate or Cause				
Arts and Sciences & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.454***	.488	-2.91	.00
Arts and Sciences & Two or More Schools	**-1.434***	.431	-2.72	-.15
Canvass for Candidate or Cause				
Fam/Consumer Science & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.623****	.457	-2.98	-.26
Fam/Consumer Science & Two or More Schools	**-2.081****	.422	-3.34	-.82
Arts and Sciences & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.159***	.371	-2.27	-.05
Arts and Sciences & Two or More Schools	**-1.617****	.328	-2.59	-.64
Journalism & Public/Intl Affairs	**-1.505***	.457	-2.87	-.14
Journalism & Two or More Schools	**-1.963****	.422	-3.22	-.71
Business & Two or More Schools	**-1.648****	.369	-2.75	-.55
Active Member of Group/Organization[a]				
Assist with Voter Registration/GOTV Efforts				
Journalism & Two or More Schools	**-2.015****	.568	-3.71	-.32

**$p < .01$
*$p < .05$
[a]No significance found in Tukey HSD comparisons despite $p = .023$ in ANOVA

RQ2.3: Are there differences based upon gender identity? Independent samples t-tests were utilized to compare means for each behavior based upon the binary woman (N=166) and man (N=56) gender identities. Significant differences were found for five of 20 behaviors (listed in Table 17) and in all cases, those who identified as women indicated a higher level of intent to participate in each behavior than those who identified as men.

Table 17

Significant T-tests of Reported Behaviors Based Upon Binary Gender Identity

	Woman		Man		
Behavior	M	SD	M	SD	*t*-test
Sign Written or Email Petition	3.77	1.58	2.91	1.55	**3.55****
NOT Buy Something Due to Values	4.02	1.68	3.20	1.73	**3.14****
DO Buy Something Due to Values	4.12	1.58	3.36	1.55	**3.13****
Non-Political Community Service	4.33	1.58	3.36	1.57	**4.00****
Active Member in Groups/Organizations	4.24	1.59	3.71	1.68	**2.12***

Note. N=222, Scale range is 1-6
**$p < .01$
*$p < .05$

RQ2.4: Are there differences based upon race or ethnicity? Once again, responses were initially collapsed into two categories, White (N=158) and Minoritized Ethnic/Racial Identities (N=69), to meet necessary conditions for valid statistical testing. Means for each behavior were compared for the two

groups using independent samples t-tests and no significant differences were identified. Further analysis of the five condensed racial/ethnic identity categories was conducted using ANOVA. Significant ANOVA results are presented in Table 18 and significant post-hoc Tukey analysis results, which indicate significant differences in intended behaviors between individual racial/ethnic identities, are presented in Table 19.

Table 18

Significant One-Way Analyses of Variance of Behaviors Based Upon Racial/Ethnic Identity

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Discuss Politics with Friends					
Between Groups	4	24.829	6.207	3.787	**.005****
Within Groups	220	360.620	1.639		
Total	224	385.449			
Attend Campaign Event					
Between Groups	4	42.656	10.664	4.107	**.003****
Within Groups	220	571.184	2.596		
Total	224	613.840			
Protest/March/Demonstration					
Between Groups	4	30.474	7.618	2.797	**.027***
Within Groups	220	599.242	2.724		

Total	224	629.716			
Sign Written or Email Petition					
Between Groups	4	32.575	8.144	3.316	**.012***
Within Groups	220	540.314	2.456		
Total	224	572.889			
Work with Political Group or Campaign					
Between Groups	4	36.914	9.229	3.535	**.008****
Within Groups	220	574.348	2.611		
Total	224	611.262			
NOT Buy Something Due to Values					
Between Groups	4	69.780	17.445	6.486	**.000****
Within Groups	220	591.749	2.690		
Total	224	661.529			
DO Buy Something Due to Values					
Between Groups	4	45.247	11.312	4.727	**.001****
Within Groups	220	526.469	2.393		
Total	224	571.716			

Table 19

Significant Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons of Behaviors Based Upon Racial/Ethnic Identity

Comparison	Mean Difference	Stand. Error	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound
Discuss Politics with Friends				
Asian/Asian Am. & Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish	-1.294^	.472	-2.59	.00
Asian/Asian Am. & Multiracial/Two or More	**-1.211***	.410	-2.34	-.08
Asian/Asian Am. & White	**-1.002***	.311	-1.86	-.15
Attend Campaign Event				
Asian/Asian Am. & Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish	**-2.123****	.594	-3.76	-.49
Asian/Asian Am. & Multiracial/Two or More	**-1.589***	.516	-3.01	-.17
Asian/Asian Am. & White	**-1.125***	.391	-2.20	-.05
Protest/March/Demonstration				
Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish & Asian/Asian Am.	**1.838***	.609	.16	3.51
Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish & White	**1.410***	.494	.05	2.77
Sign Written or Email Petition				
Asian/Asian Am. & Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish	**-1.899****	.578	-3.49	-.31

Asian/Asian Am. & Multiracial/Two or More	-1.366[%]	.502	-2.75	.02
Work with Political Group or Campaign				
Asian/Asian Am. & Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish	**-1.851***	.596	-3.49	-.21
Asian/Asian Am. & Multiracial/Two or More	**-1.584***	.518	-2.96	-.11
NOT Buy Something Due to Values				
Asian/Asian Am. & Black/African Am.	**-2.066****	.556	-3.60	-.54
Asian/Asian Am. & Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish	**-2.482****	.605	-4.15	-.82
Asian/Asian Am. & Multiracial/Two or More	**-1.716***	.525	-3.16	-.27
Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish & White	**1.483***	.491	.13	2.83
DO Buy Something Due to Values				
Asian/Asian Am. & Black/African Am.	**-1.737****	.525	-3.18	-.29
Asian/Asian Am. & Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish	**-1.820***	.570	-3.39	-.25
White & Black/African Am.	**-1.196***	.406	-2.31	-.08
White & Hispanic/Latinx/Spanish	**-1.280***	.463	-2.55	-.01

**$p < .01$
*$p < .05$
^$p = .051$
[%]$p = .054$

RQ2.5: Are there differences based upon political party affiliation?

Independent samples t-tests were utilized to compare means for each behavior based upon the binary Democrat (N=99) or Republican (N=61) political party

affiliation. Significant differences were identified for 12 of the 20 behaviors (listed in Table 20). In all cases, those who those who identified as Democrat scored significantly higher than those who identified as Republican, although not all respondents within the sample identified with one of these two parties.

Table 20

Significant T-tests of Reported Behaviors Based Upon Binary Political Party Affiliation

	Democrat		Republican		
Behavior	M	SD	M	SD	*t*-test
Discuss Political Problems with Friends	5.09	1.08	4.39	1.31	**3.659****
Work with Others in My Community	4.19	1.35	3.72	1.30	**2.173***
Contact Public Official with Concerns	2.87	1.54	2.11	1.25	**3.379****
Express Political Opinion on Social Media	3.47	1.82	2.51	1.59	**3.429****
Attend Campaign Event	3.72	1.51	3.07	1.82	**2.346***
Take Part in Protest/March/Demonstration	3.87	1.50	2.11	1.37	**7.417****
Sign Written or Email Petition	4.19	1.39	3.02	1.52	**5.010****
Work with Political Group or Campaign	3.49	1.57	2.92	1.69	**2.191***
NOT Buy Something Due to Values	4.13	1.62	3.26	1.67	**3.255****
DO Buy Something Due to Values	4.31	1.50	3.70	1.59	**2.442***
Display Campaign Merch, Sticker, Sign	3.65	1.78	2.77	1.58	**3.156****
Assist with Voter Registration/GOTV	3.65	1.64	2.70	1.52	**3.621****

Note. N=160, Scale range is 1-6
**$p < .01$
*$p < .05$

RQ2.6: Are there differences based upon political ideology? Responses were reported using a six-point Likert-type scale with 1 corresponding to "Very Liberal" and 6 corresponding to "Very Conservative." Data were analyzed using independent samples t-tests based upon the mean for each behavior for all liberal/liberal-leaning (responses 1-3 on the scale, N=146) and conservative/conservative-leaning ideologies (responses 4-6 on the scale, N=81). As reported in Table 21, statistically significant differences (at the .05 level or less) were found for 12 of 20 behaviors. One additional behavior, Work with Political Group or Campaign, registered a *p*-value of .051 and therefore was extremely close to being statistically significant. Those who identified as liberal/liberal-leaning reported higher levels of intent to participate in all of the behaviors for which means differed at a statistically significant level.

Table 21

Significant T-tests of Reported Behaviors Based Upon Binary Political Ideology

	Liberal (1-3)		Conservative (4-6)		
Behavior	M	SD	M	SD	*t*-test
Discuss Political Problems with Friends	4.90	1.27	4.36	1.32	**3.027****
Work with Others in My Community	4.12	1.36	3.63	1.27	**2.684****
Contact Public Official with Concerns	2.66	1.50	2.05	1.20	**3.375****
Express Political Opinion on Social Media	3.20	1.86	2.63	1.66	**2.374***
Attend Campaign Event	3.47	1.58	2.96	1.77	**2.202***

Take Part in Protest/March/Demonstration	3.59	1.60	2.10	1.38	**7.371****
Sign Written or Email Petition	3.95	1.51	2.86	1.52	**5.174****
Work with Political Group or Campaign	3.27	1.61	2.83	1.69	1.964^
NOT Buy Something Due to Values	4.12	1.64	3.27	1.74	**3.668****
DO Buy Something Due to Values	4.10	1.60	3.62	1.57	**2.175***
Display Campaign Merch, Sticker, Sign	3.18	1.83	2.67	1.54	**2.267***
Non-Political Community Service	4.26	1.59	3.81	1.67	**1.992***
Assist with Voter Registration/GOTV	3.36	1.69	2.58	1.47	**3.604****

Note. N=227, Scale range is 1-6
**$p < .01$
*$p < .05$
^ $p = .051$

Data were also analyzed using ANOVA to examine differences in reported behaviors among liberal (responses 1-2 on the scale, N=90), moderate (responses 3-4 on the scale, N=109), and conservative (responses 5-6 on the scale, N=28) political ideology identifications. Statistically significant differences were found on 18 of 20 behaviors. Significant ANOVA results are listed in Table 22.

Table 22

Significant One-Way Analyses of Variance of Behaviors Based Upon Political Ideology

Source	*df*	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Vote in Primary Election					
Between Groups	2	19.871	9.936	6.751	**.001****

Within Groups	224	329.671	1.472		
Total	226	349.542			
Vote in General Election					
Between Groups	2	5.506	2.753	3.437	**.034***
Within Groups	224	179.410	.801		
Total	226	184.916			
Discuss Politics with Friends					
Between Groups	2	27.586	13.793	8.591	**.000****
Within Groups	224	359.639	1.606		
Total	226	387.225			
Work with Others in My Community					
Between Groups	2	14.245	7.122	4.038	**.019***
Within Groups	224	395.121	1.764		
Total	226	409.366			
Contact Public Official with Concerns					
Between Groups	2	28.220	14.110	7.319	**.001****
Within Groups	224	431.841	1.928		
Total	226	460.062			
Call Radio or TV to Express Opinion[a]					
Between Groups	2	8.049	4.025	3.079	**.048***
Within Groups	224	292.805	1.307		

Total	226	300.855			
Express Opinion on Social Media					
Between Groups	2	93.941	46.970	16.362	**.000****
Within Groups	224	643.055	2.871		
Total	226	736.996			
Attend Campaign Event					
Between Groups	2	48.289	24.145	9.388	**.000****
Within Groups	224	576.099	2.572		
Total	226	624.388			
Protest/March/Demonstration					**.000****
Between Groups	2	134.749	67.374	29.973	
Within Groups	224	503.507	2.248		
Total	226	638.256			
Sign Written or Email Petition					
Between Groups	2	83.306	41.653	18.791	**.000****
Within Groups	224	496.518	2.217		
Total	226	579.824			
Work with Political Group or Campaign					
Between Groups	2	50.841	25.421	10.057	**.000****
Within Groups	224	566.181	2.528		
Total	226	617.022			

NOT Buy Something Due to Values					
Between Groups	2	44.443	22.222	7.962	**.000****
Within Groups	224	625.151	2.791		
Total	226	669.595			
DO Buy Something Due to Values					
Between Groups	2	28.175	14.088	5.721	**.004****
Within Groups	224	551.551	2.462		
Total	226	579.727			
Display Campaign Merch, Sticker, Sign					
Between Groups	2	109.359	54.680	21.094	**.000****
Within Groups	224	580.641	2.592		
Total	226	690.000			
Give Money to Candidate or Cause					
Between Groups	2	52.149	26.075	10.698	**.000****
Within Groups	224	545.957	2.437		
Total	226	598.106			
Canvass for Candidate or Cause					
Between Groups	2	23.653	11.827	7.347	**.001****
Within Groups	224	360.585	1.610		
Total	226	384.238			
Active Member of Group/Organization					

Between Groups	2	23.036	11.518	4.524	**.012***
Within Groups	224	570.259	2.546		
Total	226	593.295			
Assist with Voter Registration/GOTV					
Between Groups	2	59.617	29.809	11.946	**.000****
Within Groups	224	558.955	2.495		
Total	226	618.573			

[a]No significance found in Tukey HSD comparison

On all 18 behaviors, there was a significant difference between those who identified as liberal (1-2) and those who identified as moderate (3-4). Post hoc Tukey comparisons for these two groups are listed in Table 23. In all instances, those who identified as liberal reported higher levels of intent to participate in all 18 behaviors than those who identified as moderate.

Table 23

Significant Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for Behaviors Based Upon Liberal-Moderate Ideology Identification

Behavior	Mean Difference	Stand. Error	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound
Vote in Primary Election	**.616****	.173	.21	1.02
Vote in General Election	**.334***	.127	.03	.63

Discuss Politics with Friends	**.730****	.180	.30	1.16
Work with Others in My Community	**.522***	.189	.08	.97
Contact Public Official with Concerns	**.740****	.198	.27	1.21
Call Radio or TV to Express Opinion	.374^	.163	-.01	.76
Express Opinion on Social Media	**1.361****	.241	.79	1.93
Attend Campaign Event	**.989****	.228	.45	1.53
Protest/March/Demonstration	**1.400****	.214	.90	1.90
Sign Written or Email Petition	**1.247****	.212	.75	1.75
Work with Political Group or Campaign	**1.015****	.226	.48	1.55
NOT Buy Something Due to Values	**.943****	.238	.38	1.50
DO Buy Something Due to Values	**.755****	.223	.23	1.28
Display Campaign Merch, Sticker, Sign	**1.449****	.229	.91	1.99
Give Money to Candidate or Cause	**1.014****	.222	.49	1.54
Canvass for Candidate or Cause	**.693****	.181	.27	1.12
Active Member of Group/Organization	**.683****	.227	.15	1.22
Assist with Voter Registration/GOTV	**1.060****	.225	.53	1.59

**$p < .01$
*$p < .05$
^$p = .058$

In addition to the significant differences between liberal and moderate ideologies, liberal and conservative ideologies differed significantly on three of 20 behaviors. Those who identified as liberal (M=3.98, SD=1.48) were significantly more likely (p<.000) than those who identified as conservative (M=1.96,

SD=1.48) to report an intent to Participate in a Protest, March, or Demonstration [F(2,224)=29.973, p<.000]. Those who identified as liberal (M=4.31, SD=1.35) were also significantly more likely (p=.001) than those who identified as conservative (M=3.11, SD=1.66) to report an intent to Sign a Written or Email Petition [F(2,224)=18.791, p<.000]. Finally, those who identified as liberal (M=3.71, SD=1.70) were significantly more likely (p=.011) than those who identified as conservative (M=2.71, SD=1.78) to report an intent to Assist with Voter Registration or GOTV Efforts [F(2,224)=11.946, p<.000]. There were also two behaviors for which reported intent to participate differed significantly between those who identified as moderate and those who identified as conservative. A significant difference was found on Express Political Opinion on Social Media [F(2,224)=16.362, p<.000]. Those who identified as moderate (M=2.34, SD=1.45) were significantly *less* likely (p=.024) to report an intent to engage in this behavior than those who identified as conservative (M=3.29, SD=1.90). Similarly, for Wear Campaign Merchandise/Display Sticker or Sign [F(2,224)=21.094, p<.000], those who identified as moderate (M=2.28, SD=1.44) were significantly *less* likely (p=.003) to report an intent to engage in this behavior than those who identified as conservative (M=3.43, SD=1.79).

Research Question 3

RQ3: Is there a relationship between reported attitudes and perceptions of the importance of democratic engagement and reported intent to participate in the 2020 U.S. presidential election cycle? The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to identify any relationships between attitudes (as measured by the CASQ's CC, PA, and SJA scales and

the PEP survey's IE scale), perceptions (as measured by the PEP survey's PIA and IC scales), and reported levels of intent to participate in 20 behaviors associated with democratic engagement during the 2020 presidential election cycle. Significant correlations at the .05 level were identified between most of the behaviors and scales (Table 24). Thirteen behaviors were correlated with all six of the scales, five behaviors were correlated with five of the scales, one behavior was correlated with four of the scales, and one behavior was associated with three of the scales. All the correlations were positive, with the exception of one non-significant, weak negative correlation between the Social Justice Attitudes scale and the behavior of Call Radio or TV to Express Political Opinion (r = -.030). Strong positive correlations (r =.50 to 1.00) were identified between the Civic Action scale and the behaviors of Work with Others in My Community (r =.582), Non-Political Community Service (r =.590), and Be an Active Member of Groups/Organizations (r =.539). Strong positive correlations were also identified between the Internal Efficacy scale and the behaviors of Discuss Political Problems with Friends (r =.586), Attend Campaign event (r =.559), and Work with Political Group or Campaign (r =.513). Additionally, there was a strong positive correlation between the Political & Institutional Attention scale and the behavior of Take Part in a Protest, March, or Demonstration (r =.502). All other significant correlations were positive, but moderate or weak.

Table 24

Pearson's Correlation Between Behaviors and Scales

Behavior	CA	PA	SJA	IE	PIA	IC
Vote in Primary Election	**.255****	**.287****	**.150***	**.320***	.121	**.171****
Vote in General Election	.115	**.302****	**.146***	**.350****	.102	.048
Discuss Politics with Friends	**.280****	**.461****	**.284****	**.586****	**.295****	**.321****
Work with Other in Community	**.582****	**.310****	**.244****	**.340****	**.276****	**.353****
Contact Elected Official	**.333****	**.343****	**.180****	**.399****	**.302****	**.230****
Contact Newspaper or Magazine	**.237****	**.271****	.012	**.315****	**.198****	**.164***
Call Radio or TV	**.235****	**.282****	-.030	**.337****	**.177****	.115
Express Opinion on Social Media	**.291****	**.439****	**.233****	**.494****	**.328****	**.265****
Attend Campaign Event	**.368****	**.440****	**.234****	**.559****	**.275****	**.210****
Protest, March, Demonstrate	**.426****	**.316****	**.469****	**.396****	**.502****	**.298****
Sign Written or Email Petition	**.388****	**.285****	**.424****	**.348****	**.470****	**.322****
Political Group or Campaign	**.390****	**.394****	**.251****	**.513****	**.262****	**.238****
NOT Buy Something	**.311****	**.193****	**.227****	**.223****	**.327****	**.245****
DO Buy Something	**.265****	**.131***	**.190****	**.211****	**.289****	**.310****
Merch, Button, Sticker, Sign	**.183****	**.416****	**.174****	**.492****	**.271****	**.193****
Donate to Candidate or Cause	**.191****	**.382****	**.150***	**.465****	.096	**.154***
Canvass for Candidate or Cause	**.217****	**.329****	**.139***	**.460****	**.137***	.107
Non-Political Community Service	**.590****	**.160***	**.295****	.125	**.302****	**.331****

Active Member of Group/Org	**.539****	**.268****	**.291****	**.328****	**.287****	**.298****
Voter Registration/GOTV	**.330****	**.301****	**.263****	**.363****	**.315****	**.245****

Note. None/Weak Correlation: 0 to ±.29, Moderate Correlation: ±.30 to ±.49, Strong Correlation: ±.50 to ±1. 00
**Correlation is significant at .01 level
*Correlation is significant at .05 level

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the results of statistical analysis of data related to attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement collected from Generation Z undergraduate students (N=227) at a large, public institution in the south. Scales used to measure attitudes and perceptions indicated that in most instances, this sample scored on par with or slightly higher than comparison studies. Statistical analysis suggested that class standing had no impact on scores, but that school or college enrollment may have some impact on these scores. Analysis also showed that gender, race/ethnicity, political party affiliation, and political ideology did have an impact on attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement.

This study also gathered data related to reported intent to participate in 20 behaviors associated with democratic engagement during the 2020 presidential election cycle. Behaviors were ranked in order of those in which respondents were most likely to participate to those from which they would likely refrain. Statistical analysis showed that class standing had an impact on reported intent to engage in one behavior, and that school or college enrollment, gender, and racial/ethnic identity had some impact on reported intent to engage in some behaviors. Political party affiliation and political ideology had a clear impact on the reported likelihood of participating in many of the 20 behaviors.

Finally, statistical analysis of the data collected in this study indicated that there were correlations between attitudes and perceptions as measured by the six scales and reported intent to participate in the 20 behaviors associated with democratic engagement during the 2020 presidential election cycle.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter includes a summary of the study, limitations, and an explanation of the demographics of the respondents. The significant findings from each research question are also discussed, followed by implications for practice and suggestions for future research.

Summary of Study

The purpose of this study was to identify attitudes and perceptions related to the importance of democratic engagement held by undergraduate students at a large, public, research institution in Georgia. Additionally, this study sought to identify any relationships between those attitudes and perceptions and reported intent to participate in a variety of behaviors associated with democratic engagement during the 2020 presidential election cycle. This study was guided by three research questions:

1. What attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement are reported by undergraduate college students (and are there differences based upon class standing, school or college enrollment, gender identity, racial or ethnic identity, political party affiliation, or political ideology)?
2. In what types of democratic engagement do undergraduate students report an intent to participate during the 2020 U.S. presidential election cycle (and are there differences based upon class standing, school or college enrollment, gender identity, racial or ethnic identity, political party affiliation, or political ideology)?

3. Is there a relationship between reported attitudes and perceptions of the importance of democratic engagement and reported intent to participate in the 2020 U.S. presidential election cycle?

Data were collected through an online survey which was distributed via email. The survey consisted of elements from two previously tested instruments, the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (CASQ) (Moely et al., 2002) and an adapted version of the Political Engagement Project (PEP) survey (Beaumont et al., 2018). Additionally, participants were asked to provide demographic information related to their class standing, school or college enrollment, gender identity, racial or ethnic identity, political party affiliation, and political ideology. Participants were recruited through a variety of channels. The recruitment email was sent out via two student affairs departmental listservs, shared with advisors of student organizations, and distributed among the membership of two politically-oriented student organizations. Additionally, the recruitment email was sent to 2,000 unique, university-issued student email addresses and the survey was included in a departmental undergraduate research pool within the university's college of education. There were 227 usable survey submissions, but given the variety of recruitment methods used, it was not possible to determine an exact response rate. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics, t-tests, and ANOVAs were used to analyze the first and second research questions and the Pearson's correlation coefficient (a type of inferential statistic) was used to analyze the third research question.

Limitations

There were several limitations that are important to acknowledge when considering the findings of this study. While this study sought to identify and analyze attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors related to democratic engagement among Generation Z undergraduate students, it provided no insight into such concepts for young people who are not enrolled in college. Additionally, data collected in this study represented a sample of students at one particular institution of higher education and may or may not accurately reflect the attitudes and perceptions of students on other campuses, both across the state and throughout the nation.

The recruitment procedures for this study included targeted outreach to student organizations that were aligned with politics, democracy, and/or governance in some way, both partisan and non-partisan. This strategy was undergirded by the assumption that members of these organizations would have a pre-existing interest in some form of democratic engagement, which would translate to a higher likelihood of completing the survey. However, this strategy also presents a limitation in that responses from students who may have already been interested, motivated, and well-versed in democratic engagement could have skewed the data. Additionally, only one of the two student groups aligned with the two major political parties chose to actively participate in recruiting participants for this study. The College Republicans declined to participate in the recruitment process while the College Democrats agreed to send the recruitment email out to their membership. While there were more respondents who reported an affiliation with the Democratic party (N=99) than the Republican party (N=61), it is not possible to definitively link these results to recruitment methods.

Perhaps the biggest limitation of this study is the timeframe in which data collection occurred. This study was conducted in the lead-up to a highly contested presidential election in an abnormally contentious and politically divisive time period in the nation's history. In addition to these already unusual circumstances, data collection for this study coincided with major national events which eventually culminated in the impeachment of a sitting president for only the third time in the nation's history. A timeline of the key events which occurred during the general timeframe of data collection is included in Table 25. It is impossible to measure what impact, if any, that these national events had on participant responses, but it is important to acknowledge the larger political climate when considering the results of this study.

Table 25

Timeline of Key Events Preceding and Coinciding with Data Collection

Date	Event
August 28	Politico first reports administration withholding military aid from Ukraine
September 5	Washington Post reports Trump[a] sought Ukrainian intervention in 2020 presidential election
September 24	Trump[a] confirms that military aid was withheld from Ukraine Pelosi[b] announces support of formal impeachment inquiry
September 25	White House releases transcript of phone call with Ukraine
September 26	Whistleblower complaint is declassified and released
September 27	Data collection for this study begins

October 3	Trump[a] confirms hope that Ukraine would investigate Biden[c] and calls on China to do the same
October 17	Mulvaney[d] confirms (and then retracts) *quid pro quo* with Ukraine
October 25	Data collection for this study ends
Throughout Oct.	Multiple current and former government officials testify before Congress as part of the formal impeachment inquiry

Note. Timeline based upon Blake, Bump, and Uraizee (2019), All events occurred in the year 2019
[a]Donald Trump (R), sitting President, impeached by House of Representatives on December 18
[b]Nancy Pelosi (D-CA), Speaker of the House of Representatives
[c]Joe Biden (D), former Vice President and 2020 primary candidate for President
[d]Mick Mulvaney (R), Acting White House Chief of Staff and Director of the Office of Mgmt & Budget

Demographics

In total, 230 individual survey responses were submitted. Of those, 227 were usable based on the criteria for participating in the study. The reported demographics represented a diverse cross-section of the undergraduate student body based upon class standing; however, those who identified as women (N=166, 73.1%) were heavily over-represented when compared to the institutional breakdown of undergraduate students by sex (43% male, 57% female). Some of the racial/ethnic demographic data reported by participants tracked more closely with institutional data with nearly 70% (N=158) of the sample identifying as White, 7% (N=16) identifying as Black or African American, and 5.3% (N=12) identifying as Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish Origin (on par with the institutional figures of 69%, 7.7%, and 6% respectively).

As far as political ideology breakdown of the sample, 39.7% (N=90) of respondents identified as “Very Liberal” or “Liberal” (collapsed into one “liberal” category), 48% (N=109) of respondents identified as “Somewhat Liberal” or “Somewhat

Conservative" (collapsed into one "moderate" category), and 12.3% (N=28) of respondents identified as "Conservative" or "Very Conservative" (collapsed into one "conservative" category). These figures are somewhat consistent with the political ideology breakdown of young voters identified by CIRCLE in 2016 (37% liberal, 38% moderate, 26% conservative), although by these figures, those who identified as conservative were underrepresented while those who identified as moderate were overrepresented within the sample for this study. Interestingly, in both this study and the CIRCLE data, these political ideology identifications did not necessarily equate to the standard Democratic, Independent, and Republican political party affiliations (perhaps with the exception of the Democratic party). Of the 201 respondents who selected one of these three main party affiliations, Democrats (N=99) represented 49.3% (37% in CIRCLE data), Independents (N=41) represented 20.4% (27% in CIRCLE data), and Republicans (N=61) represented 30.3% (35% in CIRCLE data). In both cases, more people identified with a moderate ideology than a conservative ideology, but more people reported affiliation with the Republican party than remaining Independent. Liberal ideology and affiliation with the Democratic party appeared to be nearly in lock step.

Discussion of Significant Findings

This study used quantitative methods to identify and examine attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement held by Generation Z undergraduate students. Data were examined based on multiple demographic characteristics to identify any significant differences among attitudes, perceptions, and self-reported intent to engage in a variety of behaviors associated with democratic engagement during the 2020 presidential election cycle. Finally, inferential statistics

were utilized to examine any relationships between attitudes and perceptions and the behaviors in which students indicated an intent to engage. The significant findings related to each of the research questions are discussed in further detail in this section.

Research Question 1

The first research question sought to identify attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement among Generation Z undergraduate students and determine whether there were differences in these attitudes and perceptions based upon the demographics of class standing, school or college enrollment, gender identity, racial or ethnic identity, political party affiliation, or political ideology. All three of the scales from the CASQ were used to measure attitudes and the mean scores were 4.22/5 on Civic Action, 4.07/5 on Social Justice Attitudes, and 3.75/5 on Political Awareness. One scale from the PEP survey was used to measure attitudes (Internal Efficacy, M=4.15/6), and two scales from the PEP survey were used to measure perceptions: Informing & Collaborating (M=4.83/6) and Public & Institutional Attention (M=4.20/6). Scores on all six of the scales were on the higher end of each scale's range, indicating attitudes that are consistent with placing importance on community involvement and action, overcoming prejudice towards poor and racially diverse communities, being aware about political issues, and possessing the knowledge and skills necessary to participate in the exercise of democracy. These scores also indicate that students perceived that collective action and utilizing public and institutional pressure were important aspects of democratic engagement. The mean scores reported in this study on the CASQ Civic Action and Political Awareness scales were significantly higher than the scores from both samples reported by Moely et al. (2012), and the mean score on the CASQ Social Justice

Attitudes scale was significantly higher than the score from Moely et al.'s (2012) second sample. However, the mean score on the PEP Internal Efficacy scale was significantly lower than the pre- and post-test scores reported by Colby et al. (2007). This indicates that respondents in this study may not be as confident that they possess the skills, knowledge, and power to make a difference in the practice of democracy when compared to previous studies. Despite reporting a decreased sense of internal political efficacy, the higher scale scores for Civic Action, Political Awareness, and Social Justice Attitudes indicate attitudes that signal that democratic engagement, overall, may be more important to the respondents in this sample than in previous studies, which is consistent with the increases in young voter turnout reported by File (2017) and Thomas et al. (2017).

RQ 1.1 and 1.2. No significant differences in scale scores were found based upon class standing, and the few significant differences that were found among schools and colleges are relatively inconclusive given the larger number of categories, small number of respondents in many of those categories, and the fact that some categories had to be omitted to allow for valid statistical testing. Even so, it is worth noting that significant differences were found on three of the scales measuring attitudes (Civic Action, Social Justice Attitudes, and Internal Efficacy). In all cases, significantly higher scores were found among those students enrolled in the school of public and international affairs or in two or more schools or colleges. The school of public and international affairs is home to undergraduate degree programs in political science, criminal justice, and international affairs, and therefore the students enrolled in that school may be pre-disposed to valuing the importance of (and engaging in practices consistent with) democratic engagement.

RQ 1.3. Those who identified as women reported significantly higher mean scores on the Civic Action (M=4.30/5), Social Justice Attitudes (M=4.13/5), Public & Institutional Attention (M=4.34/6), and Informing & Collaborating (M=4.97/6) scales than those who identified as men. However, men had a significantly higher average score on the Internal Efficacy scale (M=4.49/6). Women's scale scores seem to indicate attitudes and perceptions that would suggest that democratic engagement is more important to them, which is consistent with many years of voting data that shows both the proportion and number of women who vote have exceeded men since 1980 (Center for American Women and Politics, 2019). However, the fact that the men in this sample scored higher on the Internal Efficacy scale also tracks with a longstanding deficit in political knowledge among women and reflects the historically gendered nature of interest in politics (e.g., statements such as "you know a lot about politics for a girl") as well as issues of power, privilege, access to education, and representation in government (Batista Pereira, 2019; Coffé & Bolzendahl, 2010). Simply put, it seems as though women may perceive democratic engagement, as a general concept, to be more important than men deem it to be while simultaneously reporting attitudes that may cause them to feel as though they are less qualified to actually participate in the processes of democracy.

RQ 1.4. Similarly, significant differences were found in mean scores based upon racial/ethnic identity. In order to run valid statistical tests, racial/ethnic identity demographics were initially collapsed into two categories (White and Minoritized Racial/Ethnic Identities); therefore, the results of the statistical analysis do not provide a nuanced understanding of differences among multiple racial/ethnic identities. Despite

this limitation, statistical analysis showed that those who identified as White scored significantly higher on the Political Awareness (M=3.84/5) and Internal Efficacy (M=4.29/6) scales. Once again, these data points indicate societal issues of power and privilege as White communities have benefitted from disproportionate access to education, information, and representation, as well as the abundance of time and resources that are often necessary to become and remain politically aware and active. Those who identified with a Minoritized Racial/Ethnic Identity scored higher on the Social Justice Attitudes (M=4.22/5), Public & Institutional Attention (M=4.49/6), and Informing & Collaborating (M=5.02/6) scales, which reflects an understandable and historical orientation toward personally identifying with the plight of poor and marginalized communities and utilizing collective action to place pressure on institutions in the fight to advance social justice (e.g., boycotts, sit-ins, marches, and nonviolent civil disobedience during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s).

After further consideration, the researcher conducted a second round of statistical analysis using ANOVA. To ensure that valid post hoc analysis could be conducted, five racial/ethnic identity categories were included: White (N=158), Multiracial/Two or More Selected (N=20), Asian or Asian American (N=19), Black or African American (N=16), and Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish Origin (N=12). Results from this analysis revealed a more nuanced look at differences in attitudes and perceptions based upon racial/ethnic identity. Significant differences were found on four scales, and in all instances those who identified as Asian or Asian American scored lower than at least one other racial/ethnic identity. On the Social Justice Attitudes scale, Asian or Asian American students (along with White students) scored significantly lower (M=3.84/5 and 4.00/5, respectively) than

students who identified as Black or African American (M=4.42/5) and those who identified as Multiracial/Two or More Selected (M=4.38/5). On the Internal Efficacy scale, Asian or Asian American students scored significantly lower (M=3.40/6) than White students (M=4.29/6). On both the Public & Institutional Attention and Informing & Collaborating scales, students who identified as Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish Origin significantly outscored (M=5.10/6 and 5.50/6, respectively) their Asian or Asian American (M=4.16/6 and 4.68/6) and White (M=4.08/6 and 4.74/6) peers. Scores from the Informing & Collaborating scale also revealed that students who identified as Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish Origin scored significantly higher (M=5.50/6) than those who identified as Multiracial/Two or More Selected (M=4.70/6), and students who identified as Black or African American scored significantly higher (M=5.38/6) than those who identified as White (M=4.74/6).

Overall, these findings reflect how critical disaggregating data among racial/ethnic identities is to providing a fuller picture of how differences show up within an increasingly diverse student population. It is also important to note that numerous cultural and historical factors are likely contributing to the differences seen in this data, and those factors should not be taken for granted when conceptualizing ways to promote and teach the importance of democratic engagement to all students. The significantly lower scores seen among Asian or Asian American respondents is consistent with previous research showing that this group is consistently underrepresented among members of political parties, voters, and elected officials (Hsu, 2013; Le & Ong, 2018; Ong, Cruz-Viesca, & Nakanishi, 2008). The significantly higher scores reported by students who identified as Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish Origin could, in part, be

attributed as a reaction to the particularly hostile stance demonstrated by the current administration towards immigrants from Mexico and Central America. Data from this study, along with previous research, reinforces the need for interventions that are specifically tailored to the historical experiences and cultural norms of various groups in order to make significant inroads to see meaningful and sustainable changes in attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement.

RQ 1.5 and 1.6. Significant differences were also found in attitudes and perceptions based on political party affiliation and political ideology. Those who identified as Democrat and those who identified as liberal (as analyzed in a binary liberal/conservative manner using t-tests) scored significantly higher than those who identified as Republican and those who identified as conservative on the Civic Action (Democrat M=4.35/5 and liberal M=4.29/5), Social Justice Attitudes (M=4.41/5 and 4.36/5), Public & Institutional Attention (M=4.49/6 and 4.43/6), and Informing & Collaborating (M=4.99/6 and 4.95/6) scales, which could be a reflection of the political climate and power dynamics at the time of the study. Given that Democrats/liberals were in the minority in many key areas of government at all levels during the timeframe in which this research was conducted, it is logical that those who identify as Democrat/liberal would hold attitudes and perceptions that imply a heightened sense of importance for engaging in civic action, defending the rights of marginalized groups, calling attention to the areas in which those in power are falling short, and prioritizing the importance of being informed and sharing information with others, ostensibly in the hopes of changing the political power dynamics after the impending election. These results can also be seen as a reflection of the atypically polarized political climate, with

Democrats/liberals energized in opposition to the current presidential administration and what are perceived to be abnormally high stakes of the 2020 presidential election.

When mean scale scores were compared based on liberal, moderate, and conservative ideologies using ANOVA, significant differences were found between those who identified as liberal and those who identified as moderate on all scales. In all cases, those who identified as liberal scored significantly higher than those who identified as moderate. On two scales, Political Awareness and Internal Efficacy, those who identified as moderate also scored significantly lower than those who identified as conservative. This begs the question: are these students truly moderate, or is identifying as moderate a more socially acceptable way of conveying that democratic engagement is not very important (or perhaps overwhelmingly complex) to them? Or, has the abnormally polarized political climate (or perhaps something else) caused them to internalize a belief that it is bad to identify with what they perceive to be ideological extremes? It also worth noting that significant differences were only found between liberals and conservatives on two scales (Public & Institutional Attention and Social Justice Attitudes), and in both cases, those who identified as liberal scored higher. Moderates also scored significantly higher than conservatives on the Social Justice Attitudes scale, which is the only statistically significant instance in which those who identified as moderate reported a higher score on any of the scales. This seems to be a glaring indicator that the attitudes of those who identify as conservative may be prejudiced towards the poor and those from minoritized backgrounds, perhaps reflecting a belief that it is not the government's role to remove systemic barriers to prosperity, but rather the responsibility of the individual to find a way to rise above their circumstances.

Research Question 2

The second research question explored the types of democratic engagement in which students reported an intent to participate during the 2020 presidential election cycle, as well as any differences in behaviors based upon class standing, school or college enrollment, gender identity, racial or ethnic identity, political party affiliation, or political ideology. Survey respondents were asked to rate their likelihood of participating in 20 different behaviors associated with democratic engagement during the 2020 president election cycle on a scale of one to six, with one meaning that they "will certainly *not* do this" and six meaning that they "will certainly do this." The top five behaviors were Vote in the General Election (M=5.63), Vote in Primary Elections (M=5.22), Discuss Political Problems with Friends (M=4.70), Be an Active Member of One or More Groups or Organizations (M=4.13), and Participate in Community Service or Volunteer Activities for Generally Non-Political Organizations or Programs (M=4.10). The five behaviors with the lowest scores were Give Money to a Political Candidate or Cause (M=2.61), Contact or Visit a Public Official at Any Level of Government to Ask for Assistance or to Express Your Opinion (M=2.44), Contact a Newspaper or Magazine to Express Your Opinion on an Issue (M=1.93), Work as a Canvasser Going Door to Door for a Political Candidate or Cause (M=1.91), and Call in to a Radio or Television Talk Show to Express Your Opinion on a Political Issue (M=1.81). While it is encouraging to see that most respondents reported an intent to vote in the 2020 presidential election, aside from discussing politics with friends, all of the more "non-political" behaviors on the survey ranked higher than the behaviors that were more overtly political in nature. This finding would seem to suggest that Mathews' (1993) statement that many young people prefer to

engage in “politics that people don’t call politics” (p. iv) still rings true with Generation Z. Low interest in contacting print media, radio, or television is understandable given the contemporary media landscape, and because college students are not known for their high levels of disposable income, it also makes sense that there was little appetite for making financial contributions to candidates or causes. However, it is concerning to see such low interest in direct, person-to-person exchange of information via canvassing, especially considering that canvassing and other direct forms of political communication have been shown to lead to substantial increases in voter turnout (Aldrich, Gibson, Cantijoch, & Konitzer, 2016; Green & Gerber, 2004) and reflect a heightened sense of confidence in one’s own political efficacy.

RQ 2.1 and 2.2. When these behaviors were examined for differences based upon class standing, significant differences were found on only one behavior: Take Part in Voter Registration or “Get Out the Vote” Activities. Those who were classified as Junior/Third-Year students reported a significantly lower intent to take part in this activity (M=2.58) than those who identified as Freshman/First-Year students (M=3.54) and those who identified as Sophomore/Second-Year students (M=3.61). This finding begs the question: what is causing such a dramatic decrease in intent to participate in this behavior? The data were also analyzed to identify differences based upon school or college enrollment and, as with the first research question, even the significant differences that were found are inconclusive. In all cases where significant differences were found, respondents enrolled in the school of public and international affairs or two or more majors reported higher intent to engage in the behaviors than those enrolled in other schools or colleges. Again, this could very likely be attributed to the types of

majors that are available to students enrolled in the school of public and international affairs and potential heightened political efficacy and/or pre-disposition to engaging in practices consistent with democratic engagement.

RQ 2.3. Those who identified as women reported significantly higher intent to participate in five behaviors as compared to men: Sign Written or Email Petition About Political or Social Issue (M=3.77 vs. 2.91, respectively), NOT Buy Something or Because of Conditions Under Which the Product is Made or Conduct of the Company that Produces It (M=4.02 vs. 3.20), Buy a Certain Product or Service Because You Like the Social or Political Values of the Company that Produces or Provides It (M=4.12 vs. 3.36), Participate in Community Service or Volunteer Activities for Generally Non-Political Organizations or Programs (M=4.33 vs. 3.36), and Be an Active Member of One or More Groups or Organizations (M=4.24 vs. 3.71). These findings are almost entirely consistent with those of Coffé and Bolzendahl (2010) who found that women are "more likely to sign petitions, boycott/buy products for political reasons, and donate to or raise money for social or political groups" (p.330). Results from this study and the work of Coffé and Bolzendahl (2010) seem to be largely consistent with the fact that women drive 70-80% of all consumer purchasing decisions in the United States (Brennan, 2015) and tend to use their purchasing power to incorporate democratic engagement into busy lives that often involve professional careers *and* roles as caregivers. These behaviors, which tend to be less overtly political in nature, can also be seen as a manifestation of women's lower sense of political efficacy. Perhaps we would see increases in overtly political behaviors such as volunteering for a political campaign, canvassing, and assisting with

voter registration or get out the vote efforts if women felt more confident in their political knowledge, skills, and power.

RQ 2.4. When data were analyzed based upon the binary White and Minoritized Racial/Ethnic Identities categories, there were no significant differences in reported intent to engage in behaviors associated with democratic engagement. Upon further examination using ANOVA of five racial/ethnic identity categories, significant differences were found for seven behaviors: Discuss Political Problems with Friends; Attend Campaign Events; Take Part in a Protest, March, or Demonstration; Sign Written or Email Petition About Political or Social Issue; Work with a Political Group or Volunteer for a Campaign; NOT Buy Something Because of Conditions Under Which the Product is Made or Conduct of the Company that Produces It; and Buy a Certain Product or Service Because You Like the Social or Political Values of the Company that Produces or Provides It. In all cases, students who identified as Asian or Asian American reported lower levels of intent to participate in these behaviors than student who identified with at least one other racial/ethnic identity (see Table 19). Additionally, students who identified as Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish Origin were significantly more likely than White students to report an intent to Take Part in a Protest, March, or Demonstration (M=4.42/6 vs. 3.01/6, respectively) and NOT Buy Something Because of Conditions Under Which the Product is Made or Conduct of the Company that Produces It (M=5.17/6 vs. 3.68/6). White students were also significantly less likely to report an intent to Buy a Certain Product or Service Because You Like the Social or Political Values of the Company that Produces or Provides It (M=3.80/6) than students who identified as Black or African American (M=5.00/6) or Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish Origin (M=5.08/6).

Once again, these results reflect the importance of disaggregating racial/ethnic data to provide a fuller picture of how difference show up based upon culture and identity. The fact that students who identified as Asian or Asian American reported the lowest levels of intent to engage in all behaviors for which significant differences were found may be attributed to the fact that, compared to other racial and ethnic groups, Asian and Asian American individuals have often been viewed as "fitting neatly into American society and therefore into the American nation as a model minority" (Zhou & Bankston III, 2020, p. 233) and therefore have not always faced the same types of overt, systemic oppression faced by other minoritized groups, particularly in contemporary American culture. This may be especially relevant in the context of higher education due to the myth of the "model minority" and the speculation that Asian and Asian American students will automatically be successful in educational settings due to the presumption of their inherent intellect and ability (Zhou & Bankston III, 2020). It is important to note that the myth of the "model minority" is exactly that – a myth. Asian and Asian American students still face implicit and overt discrimination, and higher education administrators must find more effective ways of assisting all students in understanding the critical role that engaging with the democratic process plays in moving toward a more just, equitable society.

RQ 2.5 and 2.6. Significant differences were also found in reported intent to participate in certain behaviors based upon political party affiliation and political ideology. Those who identified as Democrat and those who identified as liberal (as analyzed in a binary liberal/conservative manner using t-tests) scored significantly higher than those who identified as Republican and those who identified as conservative on 11

of the 20 behaviors (as seen in Tables 20 and 21). On one additional behavior, Work with a Political Group or Volunteer for a Campaign, Democrats scored significantly higher than Republicans and scores from those who identified as liberal were *almost* significantly higher (p=.051) than those who identified as conservative. Those who identified as liberal also reported a significantly higher level of intent to engage in Community Service or Volunteer Activities for Generally Non-Political Organizations or Programs than those who identified as conservative. Once again, these results are likely a reflection of the current political climate and power dynamics as Democrats and liberals are energized in opposition to the political status quo and seek to utilize a variety of means available to them to ensure that they are able to regain the majority in many levels of the government during the 2020 presidential election cycle.

When mean scores for each behavior were compared based on liberal, moderate, and conservative ideologies using ANOVA, significant differences were found between those who identified as liberal and those who identified as moderate on 18 of 20 behaviors (as seen in Table 23). In all cases, those who identified as liberal reported a higher level of intent to engage in the behavior than those who identified as moderate. On two behaviors, Express Your Opinions on Political Issues or Candidates on Social Media Platforms and Wear Campaign Merchandise, Put a Sticker on Your Car, or Place a Sign in Front of Your House, those who identified as moderate also scored significantly lower than those who identified as conservative. These results, as with the results from research question one, call into question whether these students truly are moderate in the sense that their political views fall somewhere between liberal and conservative or whether moderate is more of a euphemism for disengaged, overwhelmed, or reticent to be

perceived as “radical” and therefore less interested in participating in the exercise of democracy.

Overall, those who identified as liberal and those who identified as conservative reported relatively comparable levels of intent to engage in most of the behaviors associated with democratic engagement, with three exceptions: Take Part in a Protest, March, or Demonstration; Sign a Written or Email Petition About a Political or Social Issue; and Take Part in Voter Registration or “Get Out the Vote” Activities. In all three cases, liberals reported a higher level of intent to participate, which again reflects their current minority status in government and discontent with the status quo. Students who identified as moderate also reported a higher level of intent to Take Part in a Protest, March, or Demonstration than those who identified as conservative. Although this difference was not found to be statistically significant, it is the only behavior in which those who identified as moderate did not report the lowest level of intent to participate.

Research Question 3

The third research question examined whether any relationships existed between reported attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement and reported intent to participate in any of the behaviors associated with democratic engagement in the 2020 presidential election cycle. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to analyze the data and revealed significant, positive correlations between all 20 of the behaviors and at least three of the scales (see Table 24). More specifically, 13 of the behaviors were positively correlated with all six scales, five behaviors were positively correlated with five of the scales, one behavior was positively correlated with four of the scales, and one behavior was positively correlated with three of the scales. Moderate

(±.30 to ±.49) positive correlations were identified between all six scales and at least two behaviors. Strong (±.50 to ±1.00) positive correlations were identified between the Civic Action scale and three behaviors (Work Together with Someone or Some Group to Solve a Problem in the Community Where You Live, Participate in Community Service or Volunteer Activities for Generally Non-Political Organizations or Programs, and Be an Active Member of One or More Groups or Organizations), the Internal Efficacy scale and three behaviors (Discuss Political Problems with Friends, Attend Campaign Events, and Work with a Political Group or Volunteer for a Campaign), and the Public & Institutional Attention scale and one behavior (Take Part in a Protest, March, or Demonstration).

These strong positive correlations speak to the validity of the scales. The Civic Action scale was designed to examine attitudes related to involvement in community in more apolitical contexts, which the associated behaviors demonstrate perfectly. The Internal Efficacy scale was designed to measure "political confidence, including the sense that they can understand important political issues, are well informed, and are well qualified to participate" (Colby et al., 2007, p. 144). It is little surprise that a well-developed sense of political efficacy would be necessary to engage in person-to-person conversations and to take an active role in overtly political events and processes. The Public & Institutional Attention scale examined perceptions of the effectiveness of garnering attention for an issue to bring about change, which is the purpose at the heart of public displays such as protests, marches, and demonstrations. This correlational data also suggests that when students report attitudes and perceptions that indicate that democratic engagement is important to them, it translates into behaviors that further the health of democracy. In essence, it confirms that if higher education can live up to its

charge to instill in students a "firm and enlightened belief in democracy" (ACE, 1949, p. 4), those beliefs will translate into action.

Implications for Practice

Findings from this study support the notion that today's higher education practitioners need to engage in new, different, and intentional practices to reach and educate today's undergraduate students about the importance of democratic engagement. One of the most alarming findings from this study is the continued lag in the reported internal efficacy of women and those from minoritized racial/ethnic backgrounds. As college campuses continue to see growth in the diversity of their student bodies (and as women continue to enroll in college at higher rates than men), it is imperative that student affairs staff be aware of this efficacy gap and actively design curricular and co-curricular opportunities to directly address it. Practitioners can also draw upon any number of the promising pedagogical and experiential tools described in literature and intentionally target these interventions at women and minoritized students. This is best achieved when campuses emphasize the need for collaborative, interdisciplinary approaches such as advisory committees, task forces, and working groups that are charged with examining issues from a variety of vantage points and providing insight and recommendations for improvements to curriculums, programs, and resources available to students. As discussed by Colby et al. (2007), it is essential that individuals possess a strong sense of internal political efficacy (described as the belief that you possess the skills, knowledge, and power to participate in democracy) if they are to truly internalize the importance of democratic engagement. In a country in which government is supposed to be representative of its people, the need for all citizens to participate in the democratic

process cannot be overstated if the government is ever to become truly reflective of the governed. College campuses are ideal incubators for developing that crucial sense of internal efficacy among those who are least represented in government - women and those from minoritized racial/ethnic backgrounds – but it will take intentionality, collaboration, and dedication among higher education professionals to bring this issue to the forefront of the educational mission.

After disaggregating data based upon racial/ethnic identities, it is very clear that a "one size fits all" approach to engaging students from minoritized racial and ethnic backgrounds simply will not work. In particular, this study found that students from Asian or Asian American backgrounds demonstrated attitudes and perceptions that imply that democratic engagement is not very important to them, and they were significantly less likely to report an intent to engage in many behaviors associated with democratic engagement. In response to this specific issue, as well as the general problem of students from minoritized backgrounds feeling less empowered to participate in the exercise of democracy, campuses could bring together culturally diverse, interdisciplinary committees to discuss the development and implementation of interventions and programming that are designed in such a way to recognize the historical experiences and cultural norms of different racial/ethnic groups, thereby making this topic more relevant to such diverse student populations. Institutional personnel who specialize in issues of diversity and inclusion could also be valuable resources for staff who work with programs on leadership, civic engagement, and experiential education in ensuring that students from under-represented and/or minoritized backgrounds have equal opportunities to 1) access these programs, 2) process and make meaning of their

experiences, and 3) apply what they have learned to the broader concept of democratic engagement and citizenship. As with most things on college campuses, intentionally breaking down "silos" will almost certainly yield better outcomes for students, regardless of the subject matter.

College campuses are also an ideal place to work on making social justice important to all political ideologies. The data from this study indicate that there is a sharp decline in attitudes about the importance of social justice among students who identify with more conservative ideologies. While there are extremely complex, historical issues of power and privilege undergirding this ideological divide (which warrant further study), the fact remains that social justice is both a driver and a result of widespread democratic engagement. At the very least, we all deserve to share the basic understanding that democracy, in its purest form, is designed to work for everyone, and that a common commitment to achieving this ideal also represents a common commitment to an important principle of social justice. Higher education professionals must be aware of this ideological divide and actively work to find ways to demonstrate the ways in which social justice shows up for and benefits everyone. Including a social justice lens in the formal curriculum is one way to do this. By examining everything from history to science with a social justice lens, students are able to see tangible ways in which the world has been shaped by who was (and who was not) afforded the opportunity to participate. Co-curricular experiences also offer a chance to emphasize the collective good of social justice by challenging students to examine who makes up their organizations and broader social networks - and what they do and do not know about the world as a result. Many civic engagement and service-learning opportunities already

have social justice elements inherent within them, but unless students are specifically asked to reflect upon these topics, some may take them for granted or overlook them entirely. Developing more robust processing exercises, such as critical reflection, can be instrumental in encouraging students to make connections between service, social justice, and engaged citizenship.

The results of this study also make it clear that more work must be done to engage "moderate" students and help them discover the importance of democratic engagement and improve their sense of efficacy, even if they do not identify with the binary Democrat/Republican or liberal/conservative viewpoints. Whether these students are relying upon a "moderate" identity to provide a more socially acceptable cover for being disengaged, feeling as though the whole concept is overwhelming complex, believing that choosing a side somehow radicalizes them in this highly partisan time, or something else entirely, it is imperative that higher education professionals find a way to remind them that opting out of democratic engagement is not a viable solution to the problems that this country, and the world, must face. This can be achieved in the classroom by, for instance, not shying away from the ways in which history and science are impacted by law and policy. Outside the classroom, more effort must be dedicated to making connections between community service and the decisions made at the local, state, and national level that have exacerbated and/or alleviated the problem at the heart of that community service. Whether these types of experiences lead students to pick an ideological side or remain somewhere in the middle is irrelevant – what matters is that they understand the importance of showing up for and remaining engaged in the

conversation, and truly believe that they possess the competency to be an integral part of that conversation.

Finally, the results from this study indicate that students from Generation Z, despite being arguably more aware of the stakes of politics than previous generations, are still more inclined to take part in the apolitical behaviors associated with democratic engagement than those behaviors with an explicitly political tilt. While apolitical community service and volunteerism are absolutely essential to robust democratic engagement, it is important that we not allow students to retreat to these activities as an alternative to political participation, but rather to see them as a complement to their duties as citizens (Bok, 2001). Adjusting course in this area will require that all higher education professionals (administrators, faculty, and staff) not shy away from encouraging students to engage in explicitly political activities. In order to do this, administrators must be steadfast in their commitment to protecting free speech on campus as a means of providing a space in which students can explore and develop their own beliefs. Many faculty members also have the opportunity to advance students' comfort levels with overtly political activities by incorporating them into class activities, discussions, and for-credit assignments. Student affairs practitioners can encourage overt political engagement by supporting programming designed to specifically engage students in political campaigns, voter registration and get out the vote activities, robust and respectful debate, and other opportunities that enhance students' comfort with person-to-person political communication. Given that service and volunteerism continue to be important outlets for students, it is also essential that more intentionality be devoted

to helping students process and reflect upon these activities and come to understand how their community involvement ties into democratic engagement.

Future Research

This study examined attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement among a small sample of undergraduate students at one institution, in one region, during a particularly contentious time. In order to further contextualize these findings, this study would need to be replicated on other types of campuses, in other parts of the country, and in different societal and political climates. As it stands, it is impossible to quantify the impact that the historic and unprecedented events surrounding the country's third presidential impeachment had on these results; therefore, further study is necessary to assess whether these results represent the abnormality of the times or new generational trends.

Aside from replication in different contexts, many other opportunities for further research have presented themselves based upon the results of this study. Many of the results leave room for deeper, qualitative study to provide insight into what the results of this study really mean. In particular, there is a tremendous opportunity to delve deeper into what students actually mean when they say that they identify with a moderate political ideology. Better understanding what they mean by this, and why they identify in this manner, could lead to insights into the best ways to meaningfully engage these students in the sorts of activities, educational experiences, and interventions that might help them clarify their beliefs, solidify their internal efficacy, and possibly lead to higher levels of engagement in behaviors associated with democratic engagement. There is also an opportunity for a post-election follow-up study that examines the types of behaviors

that students actually engaged in during the election cycle as compared to reported intent to engage in behaviors associated with democratic engagement.

Much research has been conducted on the gaps in political efficacy among women and those from minoritized racial/ethnic identities; however, the results of this study indicate that the gaps will continue to persist with this current generation of students. Continued research into the driving factors behind those gaps, as well as pedagogical and programmatic methods of closing those gaps, will be necessary in order to achieve lasting, equitable outcomes. This study also found evidence that Asians and Asian American students, as members of a large and diverse racial group, are less engaged (and perhaps even less interested) in democratic engagement, which is consistent with previous research. Although this phenomenon is documented, its persistence demonstrates the need for further research. Differences in attitudes and perceptions about democratic engagement based upon gender and racial/ethnic identities are perhaps the most complex issues illustrated in this study given the tremendously convoluted, historical origins of the problem and the multitude of factors that contribute to their continued existence.

On four of the six scales used to measure attitudes and perceptions, Democrats/liberals scored higher than Republicans/conservatives. The researcher assumed that these differences could largely be attributed to the fact that Democrats/liberals were pre-disposed to feeling a heightened sense of importance about democratic engagement due to their status as the minority party at most levels of government and their energized opposition to the current presidential administration. This conclusion could be examined in future research to see if scale scores for

Republicans are significantly higher than Democrats in a future scenario in which Republicans are in the minority and/or are energized in opposition to a Democratic presidential administration, or if perhaps there are other factors impacting the significant differences in scale scores based upon political party affiliation or political ideology.

Results related to differences in scores on the Social Justice Attitudes scale also present an opportunity for further study into the motivating factors for such stark differences based upon political party affiliation and political ideology identification. Although there is little doubt that some of these differences can be accounted for in the basic positional differences between the Democratic and Republican parties (communal good v. individual rights, government regulation v. free market, strong governmental social safety net v. limited governmental role), further research into how to make social justice more universally relevant and important in the context of democratic engagement could be instrumental in achieving positive outcomes in expanding access to participation in democracy.

In addition to the t-tests that were used to compare scale scores and reported intent to engage in behaviors associated with democratic engagement based upon the binary Democrat/Republican political party affiliation, the researcher also utilized ANOVA to examine differences based upon the additional political party affiliations of Independent, Don't Know, and Something Else. Few respondents selected the non-binary affiliations (N=41, 14, and 12 respectively); therefore, the meaning of the results from the ANOVAs were inconclusive, but they did indicate some significant differences (between those who identified with one of the two major political parties and those who did not) that may warrant future research. In particular, research into the attitudes and

perceptions about democratic engagement held by those who do not identify with one of the two major political parties could shed light onto ways to engage those individuals, as well as provide insight into why they do not feel compelled to affiliate with a major political party and what (if any) impact that has on their level of engagement with the political process.

There are also opportunities for further research into differences in reported intent to engage in specific behaviors associated with democratic engagement. For instance, there was a significant drop in interest in voter registration/get out the vote activities between students in the first two years of college and those in their third year. More research would be necessary to see if this finding was consistent on other campuses, in other regions, and in other political climates (and if so, why?). Finally, this study reinforces the need for more research on specific types of interventions and educational experiences that may heighten attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement among this generation of students. Results from this study indicate that those attitudes and perceptions are positively correlated with specific behaviors associated with democratic engagement; therefore, it is important to identify concrete steps that higher education professionals can take to ensure that more and more students feel that democratic engagement is increasingly important so that the number of students actively engaging in the associated behaviors will grow over time.

Conclusion

This quantitative, non-experimental study was designed to identify attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement among Generation Z undergraduate students at a large, research-extensive, public institution in the South. In

addition to identifying attitudes and perceptions, this study also examined the types of behaviors associated with democratic engagement in which students reported an intent to participate during the 2020 presidential election cycle and sought to identify any relationships between attitudes and perceptions and intended behaviors. Data were collected during the fall 2019 academic semester during a time in which key events culminating in the impeachment of a sitting president for only the third time in the nation's history were unfolding. The potential impact of these major intervening events must be acknowledged and considered when reviewing the significant findings of this study.

Overall, responses indicated that the participants in this study did perceive democratic engagement to be important, especially when compared to previous research. However, attitudes related to internal political efficacy suggested that the participants in this study did not feel as confident in their "sense that they can understand important political issues, are well informed, and are well qualified to participate" (Colby et al., 2007, p. 144) in the exercise of democracy as compared to previous research. This lag in internal efficacy was particular pronounced among respondents who identified as women and those from minoritized racial/ethnic backgrounds. Despite historical precedent for this type of finding, this study revealed this issue continues to be prevalent among the newest generation of college students, further supporting the need for pedagogical and programmatic interventions that are intentionally designed to close this gap. This study also revealed a stark difference in attitudes about the importance of social justice as related to democratic engagement between liberal/moderate ideologies and conservative ideologies. Although some of this finding can be attributed to differences in political

philosophies, this finding reveals an area that is ripe for further investigation if higher education is to promote social justice as universally relevant and important to expanding access to participation in democracy. Additionally, this study found that those who identified as Democrat/liberal seemed to demonstrate attitudes that indicate a higher level of importance placed upon both democratic engagement as a concept and as an exercise through reported intent to engage in associated behaviors. Finally, results from this study indicated that it is important to engage in further research to better understand the attitudes and perceptions of those who identify with moderate political ideologies. Data from this study suggest that the term "moderate" may be serving as a euphemism for disengaged, overwhelmed, reticent to be seen as ideologically extreme, or even something else that is yet to be identified.

This country has consistently struggled to engage young people in the democratic process (CIRCLE, 2013; File, 2014; Levine & Lopez, 2002; O'Loughlin & Unangst, 2006), which is emblematic of a larger struggle to keep citizens of all ages involved in the processes by which we elect our representatives (DeSilver, 2018; McCormick Tribune Foundation, 2007). Efforts to better understand young adults and find ways to make democratic engagement relevant and important to them are not novel; however, the abnormally tense and polarized political climate, coupled with high-stakes current events and impending elections, have highlighted higher education's failure to fully live up to its foundational charge to produce an educated and engaged citizenry. Now more than ever, we need to understand who our students are, how they think, and what they feel if we are to find effective ways of connecting their everyday lives to their duty as citizens of this country. This study attempted to shed light on the attitudes and perceptions about the

importance of democratic engagement among one group of students from Generation Z, but the need to continue this important work is only magnified by the results. The call for democracy to be "born anew every generation" (Dewey, 2008, p. 139) has been made. How will we answer?

REFERENCES

ACPA - College Student Educators International. (2006). *Statement of ethical principles & standards.* Retrieved from http://www.myacpa.org/sites/default/files/Ethical_Principles_Standards.pdf

Aldrich, J. H., Gibson, R. K., Cantijoch, M., & Kontizer, T. (2016). Getting out the vote in the social media era: Are digital tools changing the extent, nature and impact of party contacting in elections? *Party Politics, 22*(2), 165-178. doi:10.1177/1354068815605304

American Council on Education. (1949). *The student personnel point of view* (Rev. ed.). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/Student_Personnel_Point_of_View_1949.pdf

Ardoin, P. J., Bell, C. S., & Ragozzino, M. M. (2015). The partisan battle over college student voting: An analysis of student voting behavior in federal, state, and local elections. *Social Science Quarterly, 96*(5), 1178-1195. doi:10.1111/ssqu.12167

Ash, S. L., & Clayton, P. H., & Moses, M. G. (2009). *Learning through critical reflection: A tutorial for service-learning students* (Instructor version). Raleigh, NC: PHC Ventures.

Association of American Colleges & Universities. (2019). Liberal Education and America's Promise. Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/leap

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*(3), 251-263.

Attitude. (2019). In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary.* Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/attitude

Batista Pereira, F. (2019). Gendered political contexts: The gender gap in political knowledge. *The Journal of Politics, 81*(4), 1480-1493. doi:10.1086/704599

Bauer-Wolf, J. (2018, February 2). The death of college free-speech zones. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/02/02/experts-states-likely-keep-abolishing-free-speech-zones

Beaumont, E., Colby, A., & Ehrlich, T. (2018). *Political Engagement Project (PEP), 2003-2005* [United States]. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. Retrieved from https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/civicleads/studies/36977. doi:10.3886/ICPSR36977.v2

Beaumont, E., Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., & Torney-Purta, J. (2006). Promoting political competence and engagement in college students: An empirical study. *Journal of Political Science Education, 2*(3), 249-270. doi:10.1080/15512160600840467

Benson, L., Harkavy, I., & Puckett, J. (2007). *Dewey's dream: Universities and democracies in an age of education reform. Civil society, public schools, and democratic citizenship.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Blake, A., Bump, P., & Uraizee, I. (2019, December 3). The full Trump-Ukraine impeachment timeline. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from

https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2019/politics/trump-impeachment-timeline/

Bok, D. (2001). Universities and the decline of civic responsibility. *Journal of College and Character 2*(9), art. 3. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1301

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach, 1*(1), 11-20.

Brennan, B. (2015, January 21). Top 10 things everyone should know about women consumers. *Forbers.* Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/bridgetbrennan/2015/01/21/top-10-things-everyone-should-know-about-women-consumers/#45133d3d6a8b

Campus Compact (1999). *Presidents' declaration on the civic responsibility of higher education*. Retrieved from https://kdp0l43vw6z2dlw631ififc5-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/large/2009/02/Presidents-Declaration.pdf

Campus Compact (2019). History. Retrieved from https://compact.org/who-we-are/history/

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2007). *Educating for democracy*: Document supplement (VII.52.A. Notes regarding survey items). Stanford, CA: Author. Retrieved from http://archive.carnegiefoundation.org/educating_for_democracy/docs/index.html#VII

Carpenter, J. (2013). Thomas Jefferson and the ideology of democratic schooling. *Democracy & Education, 21*(2), 1-11). Retrieved from

https://democracyeducationjournal.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1084&context=home

The Center for American Women and Politics. (2019). *Gender differences in voter turnout.* Retrieved from https://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/sites/default/files/resources/genderdiff.pdf

The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. (2013). *The youth vote in 2012*. Retrieved from https://civicyouth.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/CIRCLE_2013FS_outhVoting2012FINAL.pdf

The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. (2016). *Young voters in the 2016 general election: Data and analysis of youth turnout, vote choice, and composition of electorate*. Retrieved from https://civicyouth.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/CIRCLE-Full-Exit-Poll-Analysis_Final.pdf

Christopher, A. N. (2017). *Interpreting and using statistics in psychological research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Coffé, H., & Bolzendahl, C. (2010). Same game, different rules? Gender differences in political participation. *Sex Roles, 62*(5-6), 318-333. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9729-y

Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T, & Corngold, J. (2007). *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Commission on Youth Voting and Civic Knowledge (2013). *All together now: Collaboration and innovation for youth engagement.* Retrieved from https://civicyouth.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/CIRCLE-youthvoting-individualPages.pdf

Cone, R., Cooper, D. D., & Hollander, E. L. (2001). Voting and beyond: Engaging students in our representative democracy. *About Campus, 6*(1), 2-8.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2012). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (8th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2019). *CAS professional standards for higher education* (10th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Dalton, J., & Crosby, P. (2008). Student voting and political engagement in college: Should higher education be doing more to promote civic agency? *Journal of College and Character, 10*(1), 1-8. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1059

The Declaration of Independence. (U.S. 1776).

Delli Carpini, M. X. (2006, September 29-October 13). MacArthur online discussions on civic engagement [Online discussion group]. Retrieved from http://ccce.com.washington.edu/wp-content/uploads/Civic_Engagement-Online_Discussions06.pdf

DeSilver, D. (2018, May 21). U.S. trails most developed countries in voter turnout. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/05/21/u-s-voter-turnout-trails-most-developed-countries/

Dewey, J. (2008). The need of an industrial education in an industrial democracy. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The middle works of John Dewey, volume 10, 1899-1924: Essays on philosophy and education, 1916-1917* (pp. 137-143). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dey, E. L., Astin, A. W., Korn, W. S., & Riggs, E. R. (1992). *The American freshman: National norms for fall 1992.* Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute. Retrieved from https://www.heri.ucla.edu/PDFs/pubs/TFS/Norms/Monographs/TheAmericanFreshman1992.pdf

Doolittle, A., & Faul, A. C. (2013). Civic Engagement scale: A validation study. *SAGE Open, 3*(3), 1-7. doi:10.1177/2158244013495542

Eagan, M. K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Zimmerman, H. B., Aragon, M. C., Whang Sayson, H., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2017). *The American freshman: National norms fall 2016.* Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute. Retrieved from https://heri.ucla.edu/monographs/TheAmericanFreshman2016.pdf

File, T. (2014). *Young-adult voting: An analysis of presidential elections, 1964-2012.* Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2014/demo/p20-573.pdf

File, T. (2017, May 10). Voting in America: A look at the 2016 presidential election [Blog post]. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/newsroom/blogs/random-samplings/2017/05/voting_in_america.html

Finley, A. (2011). *Civic learning and democratic engagements: A review of the literature in post-secondary education.* Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/CLDE/LiteratureReview.pdf

Galston, W. A. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science, 4*(1), 217-234. doi:10.1146/annurev.polisci.4.1.217

Galston, W. A. (2004). Civic education and political participation. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 37*(2), 263-266.

General Election, 11 C.F.R. § 100.2(b) (2019).

Gershenson-Gates, R. (2012). *The impact of service-learning on college students' civic development and sense of self-efficacy* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (Order No. 3515681)

Gordon, M. (2016). Why should scholars keep coming back to John Dewey? *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 48*(10), 1077-1091. doi:10.1080/00131857.2016.1150800

Green, D. P., & Gerber, A. S. (2004). *Get out the vote! How to increase voter turnout.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Haberman, M., & Shear, M. D. (2019, March 21). Trump signs executive order protecting free speech on college campuses. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Hartley, M. (2009). Reclaiming the democratic purposes of American higher education: Tracing the trajectory of the civic engagement movement. *Learning and Teaching, 2*(3), 11-30. doi:10.3167/latiss.2009.020302

Hoffman, A. H. (2015). Institutionalizing political and civic engagement on campus. *Journal of Political Science Education, 11*(3), 264-278. doi:10.1080/15512169.2015.1047101

Hollander, E., & Hartley, M. (2000). Civic renewal in higher education: The state of the movement and the need for a national network. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.). *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 345-366). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx.

Hollander, E., & Longo, N. V. (2008). Student political engagement and the renewal of democracy. *Journal of College and Character, 10*(1), 1-9. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1057

Howe, E. C., & Fosnacht, K. (2017). Promoting democratic engagement during college: Looking beyond service-learning. *Journal of College and Character, 18*(3), 155. doi:10.1080/2194587X.2017.1338581

Hsu, N. (2013). *Awakening the sleeping giant: Campaign strategies, political parties, and the puzzle of Asian American under-participation in electoral politics* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (Order No. 3616683).

IMPACT National Conference History. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.impactconference.org/about-the-conference/history/

Johnson, J. M. (2013). *Service learning: Providing the building blocks for a socially responsible nursing role* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database (Order No. 3590532)

Johnson, R. B. (2001). Towards a new classification of nonexperimental quantitative research. *Educational Researcher, 30*(2), 3-13. doi:10.3102/0013189X030002003

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Kezar, A. J., Chambers, T. C., & Burkhardt, J. C. (2005). Preface. In A. Kezar, T. Chambers, & J. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. xiii-xxii). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kezar, A., & Maxey, D. (2014). Collective action on campus toward student development and democratic engagement. In C. Broadhurst & G. Martin (Eds.), "*Radical academia"? Understanding the climates for campus activists* (pp. 31-41). New Directions for Higher Education: No. 167. doi:10.1002/he.20101

Kiesa, A., Orlowski, A. P., Levine, P., Both, D., Kirby, E. H., Lopez, M. H., & Marcel, K. B. (2007). *Millennials talk politics: A study of college student political engagement.* Medford, MA: CIRCLE & Charles F. Kettering Foundation. Retrieved from https://civicyouth.org/PopUps/CSTP.pdf

Kolb, C. (2011). Reforming American higher education: Implications for a vibrant work force and a health democracy. *Change, 43*(5), 14-16. doi:10.1080/00091383.2011.606359

Lake, P. F. (2013). *The rights and responsibilities of the modern university: The rise of the facilitator university* (2nd ed.). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Le, L. K., & Ong, P. (2018). Trajectory of Asian American nonpartisanship: Transitory, transitional, or end state? *New Political Science, 40*(2), 368-383. doi:10.1080/07393148.2018.1449068

Levine, A., & Cureton, J. S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college student.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, A., & Dean, D. R. (2012). *Generation on a tightrope: A portrait of today's college student.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, P., & Lopez, M. H. (2002). *Youth voter turnout has declined, by any measure* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from http://www.civicyouth.org/research/products/Measuring_Youth_Voter_Turnout.pdf

Loeb, P. R. (1994). *Generation at the crossroads: Apathy and action on the American campus.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Mathews, D. (1993). Foreward. In R. Harwood & J. Creighton (Eds.), *College students talk politics* (pp. iii-xiv). Dayton, OH: Charles F. Kettering Foundation. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED364149.pdf

McAvoy, P., Fine, R., & Ward, A. H. (2016). *State standards scratch the surface of learning about political parties and ideology* (Working Paper No. 81). Retrieved from https://civicyouth.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/State-Standards-and-Political-Ideology.pdf

McCormick Tribune Foundation (2007). *Civic disengagement in our democracy.* Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved from http://documents.mccormickfoundation.org/publications/civicdisengagement.pdf

Melville, K., Dedrick, J., & Gish, E. (2013). Preparing students for democratic life: The rediscovery of education's civic purpose. *The Journal of General Education, 62*(4), 258-276. doi:10.5325/jgeneeduc.62.4.0258

Moely, B. E., & Ilustre, V. (2014). The impact of service-learning course characteristics on university students' learning outcomes. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 21*(1), 5-16.

Moely, B. E., Furco, A., & Reed, J. (2008). Charity and social change: The impact of individual preferences on service-learning outcomes. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 15*(1), 37-48.

Moely, B. E., Mercer, S. H., Ilustre, V., Miron, D., & McFarland, M. (2002). Psychometric properties and correlates of the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (CASQ): A measure of students' attitudes related to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 8*(2), 15-26.

NASPA & ACPA. (1997). *Principles of good practice for student affairs.* Retrieved from https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/Principles_of_Good_Practice_in_Student_Affairs.pdf

NASPA. (1987). *A perspective on student affairs: A statement issued on the 50th anniversary of the student personnel point of view.* Retrieved from https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/A_Perspective_on_Student_Affairs_1987.pdf

The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieve from https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/crucible/Crucible_508F.pdf

O'Loughlin, M., & Gordon, C. (2012). *Democracy and college student voting* (4th ed.). Salisbury, MD: The Institute for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement. Retrieved from https://www.salisbury.edu/academic-offices/liberal-arts/pace/_files/Democracy-and-College-Student-Voting-Fourth-Edition.doc

O'Loughlin, M., & Unangst, C. (2006). *Democracy and college student voting* (3rd ed.). Salisbury, MD: The Institute for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement (PACE). Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.489.1986&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Ong, P., Cruz-Viesca, M. D., & Nakanishi, D. T. (2008). Awakening the new "sleeping giant"?: Asian American political engagement. *AAPI Nexus: Policy, Practice and Community, 6*(1), 1-10. Retrieved from http://www.aapinexus.org/2008/03/22/article-awakening-the-new-sleeping-giant-asian-american-political-engagement/

Patton Davis, L., & Museus, S. (2019, July 19). Identifying and disrupting deficit thinking. *Spark: The Online Magazine of the National Center for Institutional Diversity*. Retrieved from https://medium.com/national-center-for-institutional-diversity/identifying-and-disrupting-deficit-thinking-cbc6da326995

Perception. (2019). In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary.* Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/perception

President's Commission on Higher Education (1947). *Higher education for democracy: A report of the President's Commission on Higher Education.* New York, NY: Harper & Brothers.

Richard, D., Keen, C., Hatcher, J. A., & Pease, H. A. (2016). Pathways to adult civic engagement: Benefits of reflection and dialogue across difference in higher education service-learning programs. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *23*(1), 60-74.

Richman, J., & Pate, A. (2010). Can the college vote turn out?: Evidence from the U.S. states, 2000-08. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, *10*(1), 51-68.

Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (2011). Democratic engagement. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 14-26). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. (2009). Democratic engagement white paper. *New England Resource Center for Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/274

Schamber, J. F., & Mahoney, S. L. (2008). The development of political awareness and social justice citizenship through community-based learning in a first-year general education seminar. *The Journal of General Education, 57*(2), 75-99.

Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2016). *Generation Z goes to college.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Simons, L., & Cleary, B. (2005). Student and community perceptions of the "value added" for service-learners. *Journal of Experiential Education, 28*(2), 164-188.

Stroup, J. T., Bunting, H., Dodson, K., Horne, M., & Portilla, J. (2013). Promoting a deliberative and active citizenry: Developing traditional first year college student political engagement. *College Teaching, 61*(4), 116-126. doi: 10.1080/87567555.2013.809327

Thelin, J. R., & Gasman, M. (2011). Historical overview of American higher education. In J. Schuh, S. Jones, & S. Harper (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 3-23). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Thomas, N., Bergom, I., Casellas Connors, I., Gautam, P., Gismondi, A., & Roshko, A. (2017). *Democracy counts: A report on U.S. college and university student voting.* Medford, MA: Institute for Democracy & Higher Education, Tufts University's Jonathan M. Tisch College of Civic Life. Retrieved from https://idhe.tufts.edu/research/2016-nslve-national-report-democracy-counts

Tugend, A. (2018, June 5). Colleges grapple with where – or whether – to draw the line on free speech. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

University of Virginia. (2019). About the University. Retrieved from http://www.virginia.edu/aboutuva

USA.gov. (2019). Presidential election process. Retrieved from https://www.usa.gov/election

USA.gov. (2019). Register to vote and check or change registration. Retrieved from https://www.usa.gov/register-to-vote#item-212447

Venters, M. (2010). College students and political engagement: Reigniting the spark. *Journal of College and Character, 11*(2), 1-9. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1023

Walker, T. (2000). The service/politics split: Rethinking service to teach political engagement. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 33*(3), 646-649. doi:10.2307/420873

Westbrook, R. (1991). *John Dewey and American democracy.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Zhou, M., & Bankston III, C. L. (2020). The model minority stereotype and the national identity question: The challenges facing Asian immigrants and their children. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 43*(1), 233-253. doi:10.1080/01419870.2019.1667511

Zook, G. F. (1947). The President's Commission on Higher Education. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors (1915-1955), 33*(1), 10-28. doi:10.2307/40221180

Appendix A: Survey with Informed Consent

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

CONSENT LETTER

Attitudes & Perceptions about the Importance of Democratic Engagement

Researcher's Statement

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Before you decide to participate in this study, it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. This form is designed to give you information about the study so you can decide whether to be in the study or not. Please take the time to read the following information carefully. Please email one of the researchers if there is anything that is not clear or if you need more information. When all your questions have been answered, you can decide if you want to be in the study or not. This process is called "informed consent." You are welcome to print this form for your records.

Principal Investigator:
Dr. Laura Dean
Department of Counseling and Human Development Services
College of Education
University of Georgia
ladean@uga.edu

Co-Investigator/Primary Researcher:
Casey Graham
Doctoral Student
College of Education
University of Georgia
casey.graham@uga.edu

Study Details

This study is being conducted to learn more about undergraduate students' attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement, and to fulfill part of the requirements of the co-investigator's doctoral dissertation.

In order to be eligible to participate in the study, you must be at least 18 years old, an undergraduate student, born in the year 1995 or later, and registered or eligible to register to vote. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a survey which asks questions about civic and political attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. Completion of this survey should take 15-20 minutes for most participants. Participation is not expected to result in any risk or discomfort.

Incentive

You may elect to enter a drawing for one of five (5) $10 gift cards to Jittery Joe's. You do not have to participate in the study to enter the drawing. Send an email to casey.graham@uga.edu to enter the drawing without participating in the study. If you are selected as a winner of one of the gift cards, your name will be provided to the investigator's departmental business office for tracking purposes.

If you are participating in this study to receive academic credit as part of the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services' (CHDS) research pool, you will receive 0.25 units (0.25 hours equivalent to 15 minutes) of credit. There are other studies in the CHDS research

pool that you can complete for credits or see your instructor for alternative non-research assignments for credits.

Privacy/Confidentiality
This research involves the transmission of data over the internet. Every reasonable effort has been taken to ensure the effective use of available technology to protect your privacy; however, confidentiality during online communication cannot be guaranteed. Your IP address may be recorded when you take this survey; it will not be retained after the data have been downloaded. Data from this survey may be used in publications, conference presentations, trainings, or presented through other similar media. Any information will be shared in aggregate form; individual responses will not be shared and only the research team and university research oversight board (if requested) will be able to access individual responses. You may be asked to provide some personally identifiable information (such as your name and email address) in order to enter the gift card drawing and/or be issued CHDS research pool credit, but this information will be separate from your survey response and cannot be linked to your answers.

Taking Part is Voluntary
Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty. If you decide to stop the survey, the information collected from you up to the point of your withdrawal will be deleted. Your decision to take part or not to take part in the research will not affect your grades or class standing.

If you have Questions
The main researchers conducting this study are Laura Dean, a professor, and Casey Graham, a doctoral student, at the University of Georgia. If you have questions, you may contact Casey at casey.graham@uga.edu. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a research participant in this study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chairperson at 706.542.3199 or irb@uga.edu.

CLICKING ACCEPT:
By clicking on the "begin survey" button, you indicate that you meet the entrance criteria listed above, that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, and that you understand the information in this consent form. You have not waived any legal rights you otherwise would have as a participant in a research study.

BEGIN SURVEY

How did you find out about the opportunity to participate in this study? (select all that apply)

- I received an email directly from the researcher
- I received an email from a student organization
- I received an email from a listserv to which I am subscribed
- I am enrolled in a course that requires participation in research and this study is one of my options
- Another source (please specify)

Please answer the following questions to confirm your eligibility to participate in this study.

1. In what year were you born? (YYYY)

2. In order to be eligible to register to vote, you must be a citizen of the United States and at least 18 years old. Which of the following describes you?

I am eligible to register to vote, and I am currently registered
I am eligible to register to vote, but I am not currently registered
I am eligible to register to vote, but I do not know if I am currently registered
I am not eligible to register to vote

Please answer a few basic demographic questions:

3. What is your current class standing in college?

Freshman/First-Year Undergraduate
Sophomore/Second-Year
Undergraduate Junior/Third-Year
Undergraduate Senior/Fourth-Year
Undergraduate
Fifth-Year (or more) Undergraduate
Graduate Student
Unclassified

4. In which school or college is your major? (select all that apply)

If you have an intended major please select that school or college even if you have not yet been admitted to that major. For example, if you intend to major in Marketing but have not yet been admitted, please go ahead and select Terry College of Business.

College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences
College of Education
College of Engineering
College of Environment and Design
College of Family and Consumer Sciences
College of Pharmacy
College of Public Health
Franklin College of Arts & Sciences
Grady College of Journalism & Mass Communication
Odum School of Ecology
School of Public & International Affairs
School of Social Work
Terry College of Business
Warnell School of Forestry & Natural Resources
Other (please specify) _____

5. What is your gender identity? (select all that apply)

- Woman
- Man
- Non-binary
- Prefer to self-describe
- Prefer not to answer

6. How do you identify yourself racially or ethnically? (select all that apply)

- American Indian or Native American
- Asian or Asian American
- Black or African American
- Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish Origin
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Multiracial
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White/Caucasian
- Other/Additional (please specify)
- Prefer not to answer

7. Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Democrat, Independent, Republican, or something else?

- Democrat
- Independent
- Republican
- Something else (please specify)
- Don't know

8. In terms of your political ideology, where would you place yourself on this 6-point scale ranging from extremely liberal (1) to extremely conservative (6)?

1 (extremely liberal)	2	3	4	5	6 (extremely conservative)

The questions in this section of the survey were developed by Moely et al. (2002). If a question asks what you plan to do in the future, it is okay to also consider anything you may already be doing.

Listed below are 22 opinion statements about public issues, politics, and your beliefs about the world in general. You will agree with some, disagree with some, and have no opinion about others. Please use the provided scale to indicate your degree of agreement with each item.

9. In the future, I plan to participate in a community service organization

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

10. Individuals are responsible for their own misfortunes

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

11. I plan to become involved in my community

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

12. I am knowledgeable of the issues facing the world

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

13. We need to institute reforms within the current system to change our communities

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

14. I plan to help others who are in difficulty

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

15. We need to look no further than the individual in assessing his/her problems

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

16. I plan to do some volunteer work

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

17. We need to change people's attitudes in order to solve social problems

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

18. I am aware of the events happening in my local community

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

19. In order for problems to be solved, we need to change public policy

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

20. I understand the issues facing this nation

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

21. I plan to become involved in programs to help clean up the environment

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

22. I am aware of current events

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

23. I plan to become an active member of my community

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

24. People are poor because they choose to be poor

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

25. I am committed to making a positive difference

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

26. I don't understand why some people are poor when there are boundless opportunities available to them

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

27. I understand the issues facing my city's community

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

28. I plan to participate in a community action program

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

29. It is important that equal opportunity be available to all people

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

30. I plan to be involved in the political process

Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree

---

The questions in this section of the survey were adapted from the work of Beaumont et al. (2018).

Please rate your level of agreement with the following five statements on a scale of 1-6 (1 = very strongly DISAGREE, 6 = very strongly AGREE):

31. I feel that I have a pretty good understanding of the political issues facing our country
1(very strongly DISAGREE) 2 3 4 5 6 (very strongly AGREE)

32. I believe I have a role to play in the political process
1(very strongly DISAGREE) 2 3 4 5 6 (very strongly AGREE)

33. When policy issues or problems are being discussed, I usually have something to say
1(very strongly DISAGREE) 2 3 4 5 6 (very strongly AGREE)

34. I think that I am better informed about politics and government than most people
1(very strongly DISAGREE) 2 3 4 5 6 (very strongly AGREE)

35. I consider myself well qualified to participate in the political process
1(very strongly DISAGREE) 2 3 4 5 6 (very strongly AGREE)

There are many ways people try to influence political decisions or outcomes. Seven examples are listed below. One a scale of 1-6, how effective do you think each is in influencing political outcomes?
(1 = Not at all effective, 6 = Very effective)

36. Raising awareness of issues through discussions
1 (not at all effective) 2 3 4 5 6 (very effective)

37. Working with community groups
1 (not at all effective) 2 3 4 5 6 (very effective)

38. Personally contacting influential people
1 (not at all effective) 2 3 4 5 6 (very effective)

39. Working with issue-oriented or interest groups
1 (not at all effective) 2 3 4 5 6 (very effective)

40. Participating in public protests or demonstrations
1 (not at all effective) 2 3 4 5 6 (very effective)

41. Working to get attention by the press, radio, and TV
1 (not at all effective) 2 3 4 5 6 (very effective)

42. Becoming informed about issues in order to influence others
1 (not at all effective) 2 3 4 5 6 (very effective)

The questions in this section of the survey were adapted from the work of Beaumont et al. (2018).

Below is a list of 20 things that some people do to express their views or take social or political action. On a scale of 1-6, to what degree do you expect you will do these things during the 2020 election cycle?
(1 = will certainly *not* do this, 6 = will certainly do this)

43. Vote in primary elections
1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

44. Vote in the general election

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

45. Discuss political problems with friends

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

46. Work together with someone or some group to solve a problem in the community where you live

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

47. Contact or visit a public official - at any level of government - to ask for assistance or to express your opinion

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

48. Contact a newspaper or magazine to express your opinion on an issue

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

49. Call in to a radio or television talk show to express your opinion on a political issue

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

50. Express your opinions on political issues or candidates on social media platforms (Facebook, Twitter, or others) or on a personal blog

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

51. Attend campaign events like speeches, rallies, and town halls

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

52. Take part in a protest, march, or demonstration

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

53. Sign a written or e-mail petition about a political or social issue

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

54. Work with a political group or volunteer for a campaign

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

55. NOT buy something or boycott it because of conditions under which the product is made, or because you dislike the conduct of the company that produces it

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

56. Buy a certain product or service because you like the social or political values of the company that produces or provides it

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

57. Wear campaign merchandise, put a sticker on your car, or place a sign in front of your house

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

58. Give money to a political candidate or cause

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

59. Work as a canvasser going door to door for a political candidate or cause

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

60. Participate in community service or volunteer activities for generally non-political organizations or programs

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

61. Be an active member of one or more groups or organizations

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

62. Take part in voter registration or “get out the vote” activities such as volunteering at voter registration drives or giving people rides to the polls

1 (will certainly *not* do this) 2 3 4 5 6 (will certainly do this)

---

63. Would you like to be entered into a drawing for one of five $10 Jittery Joe's gift cards?

Yes

No

---

64. Please provide your email address below to be entered into a drawing for one of five $10 Jittery Joe’s gift cards.

Your response has been recorded. Thank you for participating in this study.

If you have any questions, please contact Casey Graham at casey.graham@uga.edu.

References:

Beaumont, E., Colby, A., & Ehrlich, T. (2018). *Political Engagement Project (PEP), 2003-2005* [United States]. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. Retrieved from https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/civicleads/studies/36977/summary. doi:10.3886/ICPSR36977.v2

Moely, B. E., Mercer, S. H., Ilustre, V., Miron, D., & McFarland, M. (2002). Psychometric properties and correlates of the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (CASQ): A measure of students’ attitudes related to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 8*(2), 15-26.

Survey Flow

Block: Informed Consent (1 Question)
Standard: Screening (3 Questions)

Branch: New Branch
If In what year were you born? (YYYY) Text Response Is Less Than 1995
Or In order to be eligible to register to vote, you must be a citizen of the United States and at least 18 years old Response I am not eligible to register to vote Is Selected

EndSurvey: Advanced (Thank you for your time but you are ineligible to participate)

Standard: Demographics (7 Questions)

Branch: New Branch
If What is your current class standing in college? Graduate Student Is Selected
Or What is your current class standing in college? Unclassified Is Selected

EndSurvey: Advanced (Thank you for your time but you are ineligible to participate)

Standard: CASQ (23 Questions)
Standard: PEP Internal Efficacy & Perceptions (14 Questions)
Standard: PEP Behaviors (21 Questions)
Standard: Drawing (1 Question)

Branch: New Branch
If Would you like to be entered into a drawing for one of five $10 Jittery Joe's gift cards? Yes Is Selected

EndSurvey: Advanced (Please provide your email address)
EndSurvey: Advanced (Your response has been recorded; thank you for your time)

Branch: New Branch
If Would you like to be entered into a drawing for one of five $10 Jittery Joe's gift cards? No Is Selected

EndSurvey: Advanced (Your response has been recorded; thank you for your time)

Appendix B: Permission to Use CASQ

From: Moely, Barbara E <moely@tulane.edu>
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 5:33 PM
To: Casey Anne Graham
Subject: RE: Permission to Use CASQ
Attachments: CASQ Items Information.doc; CASQ PreTest Form.doc; CASQ PostTest Form.doc; Appreciation of Diversity Scale Revised.doc; Service-learning Course Quality.docx

Hi Casey – I am sorry to be slow answering your note! Yes, by all means, it is fine for you to use the CASQ in your research. I am attaching some files that may be useful.

The ITEMS INFORMATION file contains information about psychometric properties of the six scales in the CASQ. It also describes other measures used in initial validation of the CASQ scales, and several measures used to assess service-learning course quality and outcomes.

The PRETEST and POST TEST forms are given in separate files -- the consent forms were those approved at the time data were collected – investigators should revise and elaborate as necessary to fit guidelines from IRB's at their institutions. In order to show how we arranged the items in these forms, the pretest items are shown in different colors that correspond to the colors used in the ITEMS file.

After analyses were completed, we made changes in the Diversity Scale, as shown in the Appreciation of Diversity file attached. We haven't used this much, so I don't have much information about it. Perhaps it might be useful for your work.

We have tried to get at students' views of their service learning course, as shown in the measure of Service Learning Course Quality. This is important to take into account if you are doing a study of the impacts of a service learning experience. Not every course is planned or executed in the ideal fashion and it is important for interpretation of your findings to have an indication of the extent to which the course "worked" for students. See our 2014 article, referenced below.

We have published two articles reporting on the use of the CASQ scales:

Moely, B. E., Mercer, S. H., Ilustre, V., Miron, D., and McFarland, M. (2002). Psychometric properties and correlates of the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire (CASQ): A measure of students' attitudes related to service learning. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 8, 15-26.

Moely, B. E., McFarland, M., Miron, D., Mercer, S. H., & Ilustre, V. (2002). Changes in college students' attitudes and intentions for civic involvement as a function of service-learning experiences. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9, 18-26.

In more recent work, we used shorter versions of some of the CASQ scales in a longitudinal study of college students. The 2011 article describes the modified scales and several new ones:

Moely, B. E., & Ilustre, V. (2011). University students' views of a public service graduation requirement. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 17(2), 43-58.

Moely, B. E., & Ilustre, V. (2013). Stability and change in the development of college students' civic attitudes, knowledge, and skills. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 19(2), 21-35.

Moely, B. E., & Ilustre, V. (2014). The impact of service-learning course characteristics on university students' learning outcomes. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 21(1), 5-16.

Moely, B. E., & Ilustre, V. (2016). Outcomes for students completing a university public service graduation requirement: Phase 3 of a longitudinal study. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 22(2), 16-30.

I hope this information will be helpful in your work. Feel free to contact me if I can answer any questions.
– Barbara Moely

From: Casey Anne Graham
Sent: Saturday, July 13, 2019 7:26 AM
To: Moely, Barbara E
Subject: Re: Permission to Use CASQ

Hello, Dr. Moely -

I wanted to follow up on this email to see if I can obtain your permission to use the CASQ for my doctoral dissertation study. If you need any other information from me I will be happy to provide.

Thanks!
-Casey

Casey Anne Graham, M.Ed.
Associate Director of Student Affairs

From: Casey Anne Graham
Sent: Tuesday, July 2, 2019 9:07 PM
To: moely@tulane.edu
Subject: Permission to Use CASQ

Hello, Dr. Moely –

My name is Casey Graham and I am a doctoral candidate in the Ed.D. Student Affairs Leadership program in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. I am currently working on my prospectus and hope to conduct my dissertation research in Fall 2019. My dissertation will be focusing on attitudes and perceptions of the importance of democratic engagement among Gen Z undergraduate students. I came across your work on the Civic Attitudes and Skills Questionnaire and feel that it would be an excellent instrument for me to utilize during my research.

I am writing in hopes of receiving your permission to utilize the CASQ for my study, and to see if you happen to have an electronic version of the complete instrument that you may be able to share with me so that I can be sure that I am using the instrument exactly as written.

Thank you for your consideration!
-Casey

Casey Anne Graham, M.Ed.
Associate Director of Student Affairs

Appendix C: Permission to Use and Adapt PEP Survey

From:	Anne Colby
To:	Casey Anne Graham
Subject:	RE: Permission to Use PEP Survey
Date:	Wednesday, July 3, 2019 1:20:12 PM
Attachments:	image001.png Civic_Purpose_Project_Survey_FINAL 091511.docx Malin et al Human Development.pdf PEP Survey Final Version with Notes.doc

---

Dear Casey,
You have my permission to use and adapt the Political Engagement Project survey for your dissertation. I don't believe you need any further permission. I'm attaching it in case you don't have it yet. You might also find useful a survey my colleagues and I here at the Stanford Center on Adolescence did on civic purpose in high school seniors followed into their first year in college. Survey and journal article attached.

Good luck with it.
Anne Colby

From: Casey Anne Graham
Sent: Wednesday, July 3, 2019 8:59 AM
To: Anne Colby <acolby1@stanford.edu>
Subject: Permission to Use PEP Survey

Hello, Dr. Colby –

My name is Casey Graham and I am a doctoral candidate in the Ed.D. Student Affairs Leadership program in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. I am currently working on my prospectus and hope to conduct my dissertation research in Fall 2019. My dissertation will be focusing on attitudes and perceptions of the importance of democratic engagement among Gen Z undergraduate students. Your work has been influential in helping me conceptualize my dissertation and I am interested in adapting the Political Engagement Project survey for my study. I am writing in hopes of receiving permission to utilize and adapt the PEP pre-survey as a component of my research. If there is someone else I need to contact, I would appreciate it if you could point me in the right direction.

Thank you for your consideration!
-Casey

Casey Anne Graham, M.Ed.
Associate Director of Student Affairs

Appendix D: Adaptations to PEP Survey

Original PEP Survey	Adaptation(s)
Q1: What are the last 4 digits of your Social Security Number?	Not included
Q2: How much do you care about each of the following issues?	Not included
Q3: Imagine that the figure below is a diagram of you…. How important to your sense of who you are is each of the following characteristics?	Not included
Q4: What are the thing about this country that you are most proud of?	Not included
Q5: What are the things about this country that you are least proud of?	Not included
Q6: Please indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following:	Not included
Q7: If you or someone like you had a complaint about a local government activity and presented that complaint to a member of the local government council, how much attention do you think he or she would pay to the complaint?	Not included
Q8: If you or someone like you had a complaint about a national government activity and presented that complaint to a member of the national government, how much attention do you think he or she would pay to the complaint?	Not included

Original PEP Survey	Adaptation(s)
Q9: There are many ways people try to influence political decisions or outcomes. Here is a list of a few ways. How effective do you think each is in influencing political outcomes?	Question rephrased to "There are many ways people try to influence political decisions or outcomes. Seven examples are listed below. On a scale of 1-6, how effective do you think each is in influencing political outcomes? (1=very strongly DISAGREE, 6=very strongly AGREE)." Three non-scaled response items not included *(Working through political parties, Voting in elections, Giving money to a candidate or cause).*
Q10: Please use the following scale to respond to the statements below:	Question rephrased to "Please rate your level of agreement with the following five statements on a scale of 1-6 (1=very strongly DISAGREE, 6=very strong AGREE)." One non-scaled response item not included *(I believe I need to stand up for my political views).*
Q11: Working with others, how hard or easy would it be for you to accomplish these goals?	Not included
Q12: Some people seem to follow what's going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there's an election going on or not. Others aren't that interested. How often would you say you follow what's going on in the government and public affairs?	Not included
Q13: Listed below are some ways that people get news and information. In a typical week, on how many days do you do each of the following?	Not included
Q14: Please rate your knowledge of the following topics:	Not included
Q15: As far as you know, does the federal government spend more on Social Security or foreign aid?	Not included
Q16: Do you happen to know which party currently has the most members in the U.S. Senate?	Not included
Q17: Do you know the name of the current Secretary General of the United Nations?	Not included

Original PEP Survey	Adaptation(s)
Q18: Listed below are some general skills that people use in various situations. Please rate how well you can do each:	Not included
Q19: These are some political skills that people use. Please rate how well you can do each:	Not included
Q20: People have different understandings of citizenship. Below are some statements that could be used to explain what a good citizen is or does. Please rate how important you think each is for explaining what a good citizen is or does:	Not included
Q21: Below is a list of volunteer and community service work that some people have done. For each item, please indicate how often you have done it in the past 4 years.	Not included
Q22: We know that most people don't vote in all elections. Usually between ¼ to ½ of those eligible actually come out to vote. How often do you vote in local or national elections?	Not included
Q23: Below is a list of things that some people have done to express their view or take social action. For each item, please indicate how often you have done it in the past 4 years.	Not included
Q24: To the extent you are involved in these activities or would consider becoming involved, please indicate how much each of the following reasons influences you to participate in social or political action:	Not included
Q25: Do you belong to any of these kinds of campus or community groups, or have you belonged to them in the past 4 years?	Not included
Q26: Do any of these groups work on social or political issues?	Not included

Original PEP Survey	Adaptation(s)
Q27: Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Democrat, Independent, Republican, or something else?	Question moved to demographics section at beginning of survey.
Q28: We hear a lot of talk about liberals and conservatives. Here is a scale on which the political views that people hold are arranged from extremely liberal to extremely conservative. Where would you place yourself on this scale?	Question rephrased to "In terms of your political ideology, where would you place yourself on this 6-point scale ranging from extremely liberal (1) to extremely conservative (6)?" Moved question to demographics section at beginning of survey.
Q29: Below is a list of things that some people do to express their views or take social or political action. In the future, what do you expect that you will do?	Question rephrased to "Below is a list of 20 thing that some people do to express their views or take social or political action. On a scale of 1-6, to what degree do you expect you will do these things during the 2020 election cycle? (1=will certainly *not* do this, 6=will certainly do this)." Four response items removed *(Vote in every national election; Vote in every local election; Attend a speech, informal seminar, or teach-in about politics)* One response item changed from *Wear a campaign button, put a sticker on your car, or place a sign in front of your house* to *Wear campaign merchandise, put a sticker on your car, or place a sign in front of your house* Five response items added *(Vote in primary elections; Vote in the general election; Express your opinions on political issues or candidates on social media platforms (Facebook, Twitter, or others) or on a personal blog; Attend campaign events like speeches, rallies, and town halls; Take part in voter registration or "get out the vote" activities such as volunteering at voter registration drives or giving people rides to the polls).* Scales associated with this question not used in this study.
Q30-53: Background and Demographics	Largely not included. Demographic questions related to class standing, school or college enrollment, gender identity, and racial/ethnic identity included at beginning of survey.

Appendix E: Recruitment Email

Dear Student,

Perhaps you've heard there's a big election coming up. Does that excite you? Make your skin crawl? Or maybe you'd rather think about *anything* else? My name is Casey Graham and I'm a doctoral student in the College of Education conducting research on undergraduate student attitudes and perceptions about the importance of democratic engagement – and I want to know what you think!

I'm writing to invite you to participate in my study. All you need to do is complete a survey, which should take no longer than 10-15 minutes – and as a thank you for your time, you'll have the chance to win one of five $10 gift cards to Jittery Joe's! If you are enrolled in a course in the Department of Counseling & Human Development Services that requires participation in the departmental research pool, this study will offer 0.25 units of credit.

For more information and to complete the survey, please follow this link: INSERT LINK TO SURVEY

Please note that you may receive this recruitment email multiple times. *Please only complete and submit the survey one time.*

If you have questions about this research, please feel free to contact me at 706-542-5167 or casey.graham@uga.edu. If you have any complaints or questions about your rights as a research volunteer, contact the IRB at 706-542-3199 or by email at IRB@uga.edu.

Sincerely,
-Casey Graham

Appendix F: Self-Described Political Party Affiliations

An individual who generally aligns with the Republican party

Centrist

Communist

Conservative

Democratic Socialist

Ecosocialist

Free Thinker

I agree with individual candidates, not parties

I like to say right leaning moderate

Libertarian

Moderate

None of the above

Progressive

Socialist