Civic Education and the Development of Participatory Norms[1]

Diana Owen
Georgetown University

Suzanne Soule
Center for Civic Education

Paper prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., September 2-6, 2010.

Political socialization and civic engagement research has supported persistent concerns about American young people's failure to take part in the political life of the nation. Studies have documented declining levels of political knowledge, interest, civic responsibility, efficacy, participation, and voting among young adults since the 1970's. Organizations seeking to address this concern have proliferated over the past quarter century along with school-based programs that aim to improve civics instruction.

While much of the research on youth political socialization and engagement paints bleak picture, the 2008 presidential election brought to light some positive developments. Young people participated in the campaign in record numbers and in novel ways. They were at the forefront of innovations, such as the use of social networking and digital videosharing for campaigning. Turnout among 18 to 29 year olds reached 49%, the second highest rate since 1972. There are a number of explanations for this increased activation, including young people's belief that they could influence the outcome of the campaign, enhanced outreach to youth by candidates, parties, and independent political organizations, and technological developments creating a more open communications environment. The preparation provided by civic education programs may offer another plausible, if partial, explanation for the increase in electoral participation. A critical mass of younger citizens has gone through civic education programs prior to reaching voting age. They may have acquired the necessary knowledge of how the system works which forms the basis for the development of a sense of civic duty as well as other norms of participation. Thus, the current generation of young people may be better prepared and more inclined to take part in politics than its predecessors. It may be the case that the enhanced predispositions toward engagement may extend beyond the electoral arena to additional areas of civic and political life.

This study examines the extent to which civic education contributes to the politicization of American citizens. It addresses the following research question: Does civic education and participation in extracurricular activities at the precollege level influence the development of norms of participation? Specifically, this research will evaluate the extent to which formal civics instruction and participation in extracurricular activities correlates with the development of a sense of civic duty. This paper uses data from the Civic Education and Political Engagement Study (CEPES), an original survey employing a national probability survey designed by the authors. The CEPES is unique in that it provides extensive batteries of questions related to civic education as well as standard and new items related to political socialization, political norms, attitudes, values, and behaviors, and political media and technology use.

Civic Duty and Civic Education

Civic duty has been conceptualized in various ways by scholars and practitioners. On the one hand, civic duty has been defined as "a political responsibility citizens feel they have based on some emotional or symbolic tie to the larger community" (American National Election Studies, 1992). A number of studies have demonstrated such feelings of duty are important motivators for traditional and institutionalized political participation (Blais, Gidengil, Nevitte ,and Nadeau, 2004; Putnam, 2000; Dalton, 2009). This view of civic duty is more focused on individual responsibility and promotes traditional and formal avenues for political participation by an individual; voting, obeying the law, and serving on a jury are examples. Another perspective frames civic duty in terms of society's responsibility towards other citizens. In this conception, avenues of formal political participation are less important and responsibility to improve the lives of others in ones community becomes more central. Dalton (2009) characterizes this outlook as "participatory citizenship" whereby individuals actively take part in

the organization and administration of collective action to improve social and community problems. Activities following from the social responsibility perspective links civic duty to more informal or non-traditional activities such as protesting, boycotting, organizing food drives, and administering voter registration drives.

The National Standards for Civics and Government, a voluntary guide that states may use when developing standards and benchmarks for civics instruction, posits that "the well-being of American constitutional democracy depends upon the informed and effective participation of citizens concerned with the preservation of individual rights and the promotion of the common good" (Center for Civic Education,1994: 1). *The Standards* suggest that by 12th grade, students should be able to evaluate, take, and defend positions on issues regarding the civic responsibilities of Americans. They should be able to evaluate the importance of a range of civic duties, including obeying the law, being informed and attentive to public issues, monitoring the adherence of political leaders and governmental agencies to constitutional principles and taking appropriate action when this is lacking, assuming leadership roles, paying taxes, registering and voting knowledgeably, serving as a juror, serving in the military, and paying taxes (Center for Civic Education, 1994). Yet, despite the important role attributed to civic duty, scholars have neglected to design good measures of civic duty or develop a consensus on how it may be fostered, including through the schools (Campbell, 2005).

Studies have demonstrated a link between an individual's sense of civic duty and willingness to participate in politics. A study of the motivation of activists revealed that 93% cited "civic gratification" as a reason for voting (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995). Items employed under the category "civic gratification" included: "My duty as a citizen," "I am the kind of person who does my share," "The chance to make the community or nation a better place

to live" (Verba et al., 1995: 97-132). Other studies have begun to examine how civic duty plays a role in citizens' decisions to stay informed. Civic duty has been shown to function as an intervening variable between education and news media use, whereby respondents with a higher sense of civic duty used media to stay politically informed (Poindexter and McCombs, 2001).

Civic Education

The goal of our study is to examine the connection between civic education and individuals' development of a sense of civic duty taking into account the classroom environment, instructional methods, and curriculum-based activities. For decades, scholars and practitioners have debated the most effective instructional methods for civic education, or even if civic education is effective at all. A 1968 study from Langton and Jennings traced the rise and implementation of civics courses in the United States dating back to 1915. The study employed a national probability sample to evaluate the impact U.S. government and civics courses had on youth political orientations. Their findings suggested that such coursework led to little, if any, increase in youth civic engagement or political participation. Only with drastic measures to "change goals, course content, pedagogical methods, timing of exposure, teacher training, and school environmental factors" could formal civics instruction contribute to the political socialization of young people (1968: 867). Studies of college-level political science courses revealed similar findings (Somit et. al, 1958; Robinson et.al., 1966). Such doubts about the effectiveness of civic instruction helped set a precedent for education policy in which civics classes or civics-oriented curricula were short-changed and prioritized lower than those classes that focused on literacy and basics of math, science, and marketable skills (Torney-Purta, 2002). These trends are most notably evidenced in the congressional recommendations found in *A Nation At Risk* (1983) and the omission of required civics testing in the No Child Left Behind Act (2002).

Interest in civics instruction among researchers has undergone a resurgence in the last two decades (Galston, 2001), particularly since the release of Niemi and Junn's *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn* (1998), which analyzed a sample of 4,275 12th graders from the 1988 U.S. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) civics data. This study found more promising results in regards to the potential for formal civics instruction to translate into a more engaged young citizenry. Niemi and Junn's contribution to the field was not simply to counter Langton and Jennings' findings, but to highlight the particular characteristics of effective civics curricula and evaluate the length and timing of civics coursework. Measuring civic knowledge, the results of their study suggested that in addition to the amount and recency of formal course work in civics or American government, the acquisition of political knowledge was influenced by the integration of current events into classroom discussions and the variety and breadth of topics covered. Niemi and Junn conclude that their results underscore how "schools and civics curricula influence civic knowledge to a substantial degree above and beyond individual motivation and family-socialization influences" (1998:148). Some scholars have criticized their study as using predictors that were more general than specific (Torney-Purta, 2002), but the study nonetheless fueled interest in the potential of classroom-based activities that could expand a young adult's civic capacity. The civic knowledge measured in their study is the type of knowledge that Delli Carpini and Keeter argue can vastly improve civic participation and engagement (1996).

Similarly, Kahne and Middaugh's (2008) model for high quality civic education is rooted in curricular support that go beyond textbooks. Their study found that making classroom civics more personal and engaging (e.g. meeting civic role models, discussing local issues of relevance to the students) "promoted commitments to civic participation among high school students" and

an increase in these types of activities could help to further offset the civic opportunity gap caused by differences in personal backgrounds and home environments (2008: 36-37). Most scholars seem to agree that current events, particularly when tailored to a student's interest, are a key component of a civics course. Current events can bolster civic knowledge and engagement, providing "nonduplicative civic knowledge" as opposed to other classroom approaches (Galston, 2001). The 2005 California Survey of Civic Education reported that in classes that continuously discussed current events, 61% of students said that they were interested in politics in contrast to 32% in classes that did not include current events discussions in their curricula (California Campaign for the Civic Mission of Schools, 2005).

Some scholars are insistent that when discussing current events, teachers should not shy away from controversial topics. Among their recommendations, Niemi and Junn encouraged discussion of political parties and interest groups in all their complicated and often messy capacities instead of promoting a naive, idealistic view of government and democracy. In tackling such territory, they argue that this approach would situate young adults in a "much better position to understand, appreciate, and participate in the political process" (Niemi and Junn,1998: 150). Discussing current events that involve social injustices can also compel students to take action in their community (Kahne and Middaugh, 2003). Hess (2009) suggests that these controversial issues should be carefully chosen and focused on public policy recommendations related to the issue at hand. She warns against letting the 24-hour news cycle dictate class discussions, which could lead to "quick, pseudo-discussions…which become a weak substitute for the more thorough and in-depth discussions of issues" that go beyond the day's headlines (2009: 72).

Additional modes of instruction that go beyond memorization of textbook material have been touted by scholars as exemplary models of classroom-based civic education—these include role-playing, mock elections, and mock trials (Niemi and Junn, 1998; Levine, 1996). But several studies have shown that such simulations of civic activities are often limited to select programs such as Advanced Placement classes or omitted due to strict curriculum guidelines (Kahne and Middaugh, 2009; Torney-Purta, 2002). The authors of *The Civic Mission of Schools* suggest that local governments play a proactive role in civic education by creating civic internship programs with their local school districts and ensure an additional experiential component of their civic education (CIRCLE, 2003). A study from Kahne and Middaugh (2003) examined one such program, the Frederick County Youth Service League, which puts high school students in internships at local government offices for a semester. Students worked on one local issue of their choosing such as curbside recycling and increasing affordable housing in their communities. Through pre- and post- program interviews with the students, surveys, and interviews, the authors found that "students linked their positive experiences [in the program] to their desire for continued participation" through an emphasis on commitment, their capacity to act, and connection to their community (Kahne and Middaugh, 2003: 58). Similarly, The Center for Civic Education's *We the People* program involves formal civic instruction, but culminates in simulated congressional hearings and a national final held in Washington, D.C. Several studies have shown that *We the People* students gained superior knowledge about key elements of early civics education and the program promotes greater amounts of political tolerance (Leming, 1996; Brody, 1994). Scholars also have found positive indications that students who take part in another Center for Civic Education program, *Project Citizen*, which integrates problem solving, collaborative thinking, and cross-disciplinary approaches into the curriculum, leave with a

greater sense of their own agency as a civic actor (Atherton, 2000; Tolo, 1998). *Project Citizen*'s student-driven curriculum adheres to Boyte and Farr's "public work" conception of citizenship (1997) as it allows students to work on local issues of their choosing and encourages students to make public policy recommendations for their communities. Boyte articulated this notion of a different type of civic culture within schools in his favorable analysis of the Public Achievement program, which includes students in "the visible effort of a mix of people to create some real outcome that makes a lasting difference in their community or the world" (2000, 70).

Scholars are paying an increasing amount of attention to service-learning and community-based learning programs that schools are instituting across the country. While some group community service with service-based learning (SBL) and community-based learning (CBL), they differ in that they SBLs and CBLs require an academic component and tie community and service outreach to classroom civics to foster strong civic identities (Farr 1997; Walker 2000; Hepburn, 2000). Studies show that those who take part in community and service learning participate and engage in community and political activities as adults at greater rates than those who do not (Youniss et. al, 1997). But both the duration of the experience and a reflective academic component, such as keeping and sharing a journal, is key so that students feel that they are at the helm and have ample opportunities to reflect on their role as a civic agent in these capacities (Hepburn, 2000; Galston, 2001). Reflecting in written form through journals and sharing such thoughts in student seminars can increase the civic knowledge gained and then retained in the program's aftermath (Hamilton and Zeldin, 1987). Battistoni (2000) insists that for a service learning program to be effective in a civics curriculum, students need to reflect beyond how they feel and examine the intricacies of the institutions and democratic power structures involved. He recommends, for optimal political socialization, that students "need to

critically examine their [service] experience as they would any other 'text' in a classroom setting" (Battistoni, 2000: 39). Kahne and Middaugh criticize SBL and CBLs that place too much emphasis on service and individual character, as they believe that such a focus on good deeds distracts students from learning "the economic and political obstacles to remedying social ills" --- a core component of democratic citizenry (2003: 36).

Extracurricular Activities

Political socialization research began with a relatively singular line of thought—parents and families were the main agents of political socialization for adolescents and teens. In the early 20th century, as civic education began to take hold in the nations' public schools, some of the focus on political socialization shifted to these institutions (Hess andTorney, 2005; Langton & Jennings, 1968). Inquiries into how to effectively teach the American youth the principles of good citizenship has led scholars to explore the role of extracurricular activities in encouraging political engagement.

Scholars dating back to De Tocqueville, have argued that one primary way people can become engaged in politics is through organizational membership (Tocqueville, 1840). Indeed, by the 1920s, it was considered legitimate policy to commit scarce school resources to extracurricular activities (Ziblatt, 1965). These activities assumed a more important position as the philosophy of the "democratic school" emerged (Judd, 1923). Since then, some studies have shown that participation in extracurricular activities can more effective than traditional classroom learning in encouraging political participation (Beck and Jennings, 1982; Eccles, 2003).

Some of the characteristics of extracurricular activities are conducive to their role as political socializers. First, many of these activities embody service learning opportunities which,

as the foregoing discussion indicates, can be effective in encouraging political engagement (Owen, 2000). Further, studies have shown that extracurricular activities are quite similar to adult voluntary organizations in their effect on politicization (Ziblatt, 1965). Both expose people to ideas and peer groups they might not normally have come in contact with, and provide a space for people to learn interpersonal and leadership skills (Langton, 1967). Researchers assert that organizational membership, in general, affects political attitudes, information about public issues, social networks, norms of participation, and civic skills (Olsen, 1982; Verba et al., 1995). These similarities suggest that in some ways the two serve similar functions in generating political engagement (Glanville, 1999). Much research has been done to show the association between participation in voluntary organizations and political involvement (Olsen, 1982; Verba & Nie, 1972).

The majority of scholarly work concludes that participation in extracurricular activities in high school is positively related to political engagement later in life (Glanville, 1999; Youniss et al., 1997; Ladewig & Thomas, 1987). Lewis investigated extracurricular activity at a Michigan high school, and found it to be positively associated with, "political efficacy, political-party appreciation, legitimacy of political institutions, and expectations of future political participation" (1962). Hanks and Eckland (1978) lend credence to this relationship, finding that the best predictor of adult membership in community organizations at age 30 is membership at age 15. These findings make sense in light of social capital theory, which implies that active involvement in social networks encourages participation. The theory purports that the wider people's social networks, the more likely they are to participate in politics. As people join associations, they expand their social networks, and increase their likelihood of participating in politics (Putnam, 1995).

Youniss et al. argue that, "civic engagement emanates from individuals whose developmental backgrounds make them more or less able and committed to partake in the renewal and continual reform of civil society" (Youniss et al., 1997). This statement begs further investigation into what exactly adolescents get from extracurricular activities that make them more suited and empowered to participate in politics. Ziblatt (1965) argues that extracurricular activities are supposed to teach the attributes of good citizenship. Scholars have identified two general categories of civic skills gained through extracurricular participation—practical and personal skills (Youniss et al., 1997). This framework is useful in analyzing how extracurriculars impart different types of knowledge that come together to prepare students for participation later in life. The most basic practical knowledge learned through extracurriculars is an introduction to the basic roles and processes, or organizational practices, required for adult civic engagement (Youniss et al., 1997). For example, adolescents learn about planning, articulating points of view, and how to coordinate and divide tasks based on talent and ability (Eyler, 1982). They gain experience working with a team on disparate parts of a project while sharing a common goal. While some extracurricular activities allow students to actually practice democratic governance, others simply provide insight and awareness into social and political processes (Beck and Jennings, 1982). Organizational associations often expose youth to explicit ideologies and provide a space for them to test their positions on different issues. This often leads to a space that encourages political discourse, allowing members to work on mutual understanding and compromise with people holding differing beliefs. These skills allow youth to learn how to manipulate social and political processes by gaining a practical understanding of how things get done (Ziblatt, 1965).

The personal skill set gained through extracurricular participation is perhaps even more important in preparing students for later political participation. Membership in associations facilitates engagement with prosocial peer groups, and aids in the development of interpersonal skills (Eccles, 2003). Members learn how to identify their own interests in relation to the collective interest, clearly an important skill for democratic participation (Glanville, 1999). In addition to these more cognitive skills, important emotional development also occurs as a member of a school group. For example, extracurricular participation is positively related to social trust, which in turn is associated with more positive attitudes towards politics (Ziblatt, 1965). Participation also builds stronger emotional and social connections to one's school and community, which then help them develop a sense of agency as a member of those communities (Eccles, 2003). By encouraging a sense of civic duty, or activism, youth are made to feel like important and valued members of their communities and society. This sense of personal and political efficacy is quite important, as numerous studies have shown a strong relationship between efficacy and participation (Abramson and Aldrich, 1982).

Another important element of the personal skills gained through extracurricular participation is the idea that membership fosters self-reflection and self-understanding among adolescents. Erikson (1968) argued that the development of political commitment is a key aspect of identity formation in adolescents. Further studies show that extracurricular participation helps to incorporate civic involvement into youn people's identities, and that self-reflection leads to a willingness to volunteer in the future (Youniss et al., 1997; Yates and Youniss, 1998). To illustrate this point, a study by Hart and Fegley (1995) shows that 15-17 year olds who engaged in sustained community service articulated a close connection between their activism and their sense of self-understanding.

Obviously, different forms of extracurricular activity foster different dimensions of civic skills. Some studies have differentiated between political and non-political extracurriculars (eg. student government vs. the football team). Interestingly, most find that non-political activities are just as important as the overtly political in developing many of these skills (Olsen, 1982; Putnam, 1993). Gordon and Babchuk (1959) categorize extracurriculars as either instrumental or expressive. Instrumental associations have some tangible outcome as their goal, while with expressive associations participation itself is the only outcome. In this case, studies show that participation in instrumental associations is a stronger predictor of political mobilization (Verba and Nie, 1972).

An examination of existing research on specific types of extracurricular activities will illuminate how influential they can be in fostering political engagement. One study of former 4-H members revealed that previous members were 1.99 times more likely to belong to a civics group than non-members. They were also 2.89 times more likely to be leaders or officers in these groups (Ladewig and Thomas, 1987). Similar results were found for people who were members of the Scouts and the YMCA, as they learned responsibility and critical thinking through their membership (Youniss et al., 1997). Another study focused on members of a community-based project dealing with urban expansion. Here, researchers found that participants were four times more likely to join voluntary associations than the control group who did not participate in the community project (Beane et al., 1981). Sports groups were found to teach fair play and teamwork, and one coach even said his team taught players the "crucibles of democracy" (Ziblatt, 1965). Drama groups help students learn to coordinate talents and to balance roles among a large group in order to achieve a common goal (Youniss et al., 1997). Extracurriculars, such as working on the school newspaper or yearbook, contribute to students' abilities to resolve

disagreements in a group and give them insight into the power of the collective (Youniss et al., 1997). Yates and Youniss (1998) discovered that involvement in community service at a soup kitchen fostered responsibility to community, the belief than an individual can enact change, and stimulated students to think about political issues.

These studies are not without their limitations. The central problem with studies looking at the relationship between participation in extracurricular activities and political engagement is the presence of factors that would likely select people into both extracurriculars and engagement, thus lessening support for their unique correlation. Some of these traits include self-efficacy, sociability, political interest, political awareness, leadership traits, socio economic status, academic aptitude, and GPA (Glanville, 1999; Hanks and Eckland, 1978). For example, Eyler (1982) found that political interest positively predicts extracurricular participation in high school, and Verba et al. (2006) show that people who are "psychologically engaged" in politics may also be more likely to join associations.

However, more recent studies have accounted for these factors and still find a positive association between extracurricular activities and political engagement. Glanville finds that personality traits and political attitudes only partially account for the association between extracurricular activities and some forms of political participation, indicating that extracurricular participation does play a role in developing political engagement (Glanville, 1999). Otto discovered that participation in extracurriculars in high school was the strongest predictor of membership in adult voluntary associations and adult political behavior when SES and educational achievement were controlled (Otto, 1976). Finally, Verba et al. (2006) found that of all the factors studied, the two strongest predictors of adult involvement with politics were participation in high school government, and high school membership in clubs or interest groups.

Hypotheses

Prior studies indicate that there is an association between the advancement of civic and political norms, attitudes, and behaviors and civic education and participation in extracurricular activities. However, the research on civic duty is far from extensive. We seek to shed additional light on the influence of civic education on the development of a sense of civic duty by examining both the amount and dynamics of civics instruction. We assume that the greater the amount and quality of civic education individual experience, the more like they are to develop a sense of duty to participate in the political life of the nation. Classroom instructional environments that incorporate current events and activities, like simulated hearings, debates, and visits from government leaders, will be more likely to leave and impression on students that they will carry beyond the classroom. Students who take part in community-based activities in conjunction with their civic education course will be more inclined to develop a sense of responsibility to take part in the civic and political affairs. Similarly, we expect that participation in extracurricular activities, particularly those associated with politics, like student government, and service, will be conducive to developing civic norms.

We propose that civic education is more favorable to imparting certain types of civic norms than others. Civics curricula and textbooks frequently include specific references to duties such as keeping informed about government and politics, voting, taking part in community affairs, and serving on a jury. Other responsibilities, such a serving in the military, may receive less attention, if any at all.

In this paper we test the following hypotheses specifying the relationship between civic education and participation in extracurricular activities and civic and political norms:

H_{1a}: Civic education is positively correlated with civic duty.

H_{1b}: Active and innovative approaches to civic education are positively correlated with civic duty.
H_{1c}: Participation in extracurricular activities is positively correlated with civic duty.

H_{2a}: Civic education is positively correlated with voter responsibility.
H_{2b}: Active and innovative approaches to civic education are positively correlated with voter responsibility.
H_{2c}: Participation in extracurricular activities is positively correlated with voter responsibility.

H_{3a}: There is no relationship between civic education and duty to serve in the military.
H_{3b}: There is no relationship between active and innovative approaches to civic education and duty to serve in the military.
H_{3c}: There is no relationship between participation in extracurricular activity and duty to serve in the military.

Data and Measures

Data

This research uses data from the Civic Education and Political Engagement Study which was designed to examine the influence of civic training on the development of political orientations and citizenship skills. The online survey was conducted by Knowledge Networks (KN) between May 14 and 28, 2010, and employs a national probability sample (n=1,228) drawn from KN's nationwide online panel.[2] The survey oversamples people age 18-30. For this analysis, the data were weighted to reflect the general U.S. population. Respondents were questioned about their civic education experience, attitudes toward civics instruction, political socialization, political knowledge, political norms, attitudes, and values, political participation, campaign activity and voting behavior, traditional media use, and new/social media use.[3]

Dependent Variables—Civic Duty

The dependent variables in this study measure various dimensions of civic duty, the sense of responsibility that citizens have in relation to government, politics, and society. For this study, nine civic duty items from the CEPES were incorporated into the analysis. (The

Appendix includes question wording and variable construction.) A general civic duty scale was constructed from four items indicating that the respondent feels that she has a responsibility to keep informed about public affairs, take part in government affairs, volunteer in the community, and serve on a jury. The sixteen point indicator is scored so that a high value equates with a strong sense of civic duty. (The civic duty scale reliability is .766.) A scale reflecting respondents' sense of responsibility toward voting was composed of four items—duty to vote, feeling guilty about not voting, and two items about the importance of turning out in local elections. A high value on this sixteen point indicator corresponds to a strong sense of voter responsibility (The voting responsibility scale reliability is .755.) Duty to serve in the military is a single indicator ranging from one to four; a high score indicates that the respondent believes it is his or her responsibility to serve the government through military service.

Civic Education Variables

A civic education index was constructed as a basic indicator of the amount of civics instruction people received. The survey asked respondents if they had taken a government, social studies, or civics class in junior high or high school.[4] Participants also indicated whether or not they had taken part in civic education program that went beyond the basic government, social studies, or civics curriculum to incorporate active and innovative learning features, such as field trips, interviews with civic leaders, debates, mock trials, and simulated elections. Survey respondents affirmed participation in approximately 35 different civic education programs. These programs differ in specific goals and instructional methods. More than twice as many survey respondents (75 cases or 6% of the sample) participated in We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution than in any other civics program. We the People, a program developed by the Center for Civic Education, has as its culminating activity a simulated congressional hearing

in which students demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of constitutional principles in front of a panel of judges. Other programs include Kids Voting USA, Model Congress/Model United Nations, Street Law, Close Up, and Project Citizen. Students who participate in some of these programs can be predisposed to high achievement and strong civic attitudes. Some may self-select into the program or are encouraged to take part by teachers and parents. However, others may be exposed to the program as part of the curriculum. The civic education index consists of three categories: 1) people who had no civic education at all (24% of the sample); 2) those who took a civics course only (64% of the sample); and 3) individuals who took a civics course and participated in a civic education program (12% of the sample).[5]

The survey includes items that tapped more specifically into the type of civics instruction the respondent had received. These variables measure the extent to which the class experience included lecture, textbook-based learning, current events-based learning, classroom activities, and community-based activities. Each item is measured using a five point indicator ranging from never to always. A thirteen point scale was constructed using the current events-based learning, classroom activities, and community-based learning items. A higher score on the civics classroom environment scale indicates a more interactive and engaging classroom setting.

Respondents were asked if they had ever taken part in a variety of activities in conjunction with their civics training. Among these activities are participating in debates, competitions to test civic knowledge, mock trials and hearings, writing a letter to government officials, and taking a field trip to a local, state, or federal government institution or historic site. The fourteen dichotomous items were combined to form a civic education activities scale that ranges from 0 to 14.

The survey asked respondents if they had participated in eighteen different types of extracurricular activities each represented by a dichotomous variable. Prior research indicates that the relationship of extracurriculars to politicization differs across types of activities. Therefore, we created four scales representing specific categories of extracurricular activities—political, media-related, service, and sports/ hobbies. The political activities scale (range 0 to 4) includes participation in student government, debate team or mock trial, a political campaign, or political internship. The media-related extracurricular activities scale (range 0 to 4) consists of participation in student newspaper, yearbook, radio or television station, and literary journal. A scale representing service extracurricular activities (range 0 to 4) takes into account participation in a community service organization, boy or girl scouts, 4 H Club or other agricultural organization, and church or religious groups. The final scale (range 0 to 5) includes participation in sports, hobby organizations, and other non-political organizations, including cheerleading, band, choir, glee club, drama, and language clubs.

Analysis

A series of Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models was analyzed to examine the influence of civic education and extracurricular activities on citizenship norms. The first set of models examines the relationship between the three civic education variables—the civic education index, the civic learning approaches scale, and the civics course activities scale—and the seven dependent measures—civic duty, military service, voter responsibility, political efficacy, trust in government, interpersonal trust, and patriotism. The civic education index was computed for the entire sample, and so it was incorporated separately into the OLS models along with controls for strength of party identification, strength of ideology, and demographic variables. The civic learning approaches and the civics course activities scales are relevant only

for respondents who had taken a social studies, American history, government, or civic education course. Because the correlation between these two measures was relatively high (Pearson's R=.392, p<.01), the variables were entered into the regression model as a block and the change in R^2 value, representing the percentage of variance jointly explained by the two indicators, was interpreted. The same basic model was run regressing the civic norms variables on the four scales representing political, media-related, service, and sports/hobby/nonpolitical extracurricular activities. The scales were entered into the model as a block and their joint effects were assessed. (The correlations between the extracurricular activities variables appears in the Appendix.)

Civic Duty

The results of the statistical analysis support the hypotheses that civic education is positively related to civic duty and that richer civic education experiences contribute to individuals developing a stronger sense of civic responsibility. As Table 1 depicts, the bivariate correlations between all three of the civic education indicators and civic duty are moderately strong and statistically significant. These relationships remain significant in the OLS regression analyses. The first model incorporates the civic education index, which has the highest beta coefficient (.183) of all the variables in the analysis. The greater the amount of civic education to which a person exposed in junior high and high school, the more likely they are to acquire a strong sense of civic responsibility. In the second model, the civic learning approaches and civic course activities scales (R^2=.075) jointly explain almost as much of the variance in the model as the entire set of demographic indicators (R^2=.080). These findings suggest that, among people who have taken a civic education class, those whose experience incorporated active learning elements, such as taking part in a debate or simulated hearing, used current events as a

curriculum element, or involved community action were more likely to develop a sense of civic duty.

The political identification variables are significant predictors of civic duty in both OLS regression models. Strength of partisanship is more strongly related to civic duty than strength of ideology. Age is the strongest demographic predictor in these models, as older people have a more robust sense of civic duty than younger people. Women score higher on the civic duty index than men. Higher levels of income and education are associated with a greater sense of civic duty, although the relationship is not statistically significant in the model that includes the learning approaches and course activities variables. The only indicator of race that is statistically significant in the bivariate analysis is the dummy variable for white. However, positive relationships emerge for whites, blacks, and Hispanics in both models; all but the coefficient for blacks in the civic education index model are statistically significant.

Table 1
OLS Regression Analysis of Civic Duty on Civic Education Variables

	Zero-Order Correlation	Beta Coefficient	R^2	Beta Coefficient	R^2
Civic Education Index	.220*	.183*	.049*		
Civic Learning Approaches	.214*			.175*	.075*
Civic Course Activities	.240*			.144*	
Party Identification	.222*	.172*	.058*	.161*	.049*
Ideology	.155*	.069**		.077*	
Sex	.131*	.102*	.075*	.068*	.080*
Age	.189*	.180*		.189*	
Education	.187*	.119*		.101*	
Income	.139*	.086*		.031	
White	.099*	.154*		.282*	
Black	-.031	.057		.101*	
Hispanic	-.036	.135**		.205*	
Model Statistics			.172*		.195*
n			1138		997

*p<.01 **p<.05

As Table 2 shows, there are positive correlations between participation in all four types of extracurricular activities and civic duty. The highest coefficient is for service activities (Pearson's R=.187) followed by sports and hobbies (.183), political activities (.174), and media-related activities (.116). The correlations for all four indicators are statistically significant. The OLS regression analysis reveals that the extracurricular activities variables (R^2=.062) explain nearly the same proportion of the variance in civic duty as the set of demographic controls (R^2=.065). The political identification variables—strength of partisanship and ideology—explain approximately 5% of the variance. The political and service activities variables are statistically significant in the regression analysis, while media-related activities and sports drop out. The pattern of relationships between the political identification variables as well as the demographic indicators and civic duty is the same as in the regression models that include the civic education variables depicted in Table 1.

Table 2
OLS Regression Analysis of Civic Duty on Extracurricular Activities

	Zero-Order Correlation	Beta Coefficient	R^2
Extracurricular Activities			
Political	.174*	.084*	.062*
Media-Related	.116*	.037	
Service	.187*	.076*	
Sports and Hobby	.183*	.045	
Party Identification	.221*	.153*	.046*
Ideology	.155*	.075*	
Gender	.131*	.108*	.065*
Age	.189*	.156*	
Education	.187*	.115*	
Income	.138*	.081*	
White	.099*	.194*	
Black	-.031	.083*	
Hispanic	-.036	.160*	
Model			.165*

n=1139			

*p<.01 **p<.05

Voting Responsibility

The relationship between civic education and voting responsibility is not as strong as for civic duty, although there is still support for our hypotheses. Table 3 demonstrates that the zero-order correlations between the three civic education variables are weaker than is the case for civic duty. The correlation coefficient for the civic education index (Pearson's R=.144) is slight larger than the coefficient for civic course activities (.139) and civic learning approaches (.109). These relationships remain statistically significant in the OLS regression analyses, although the civic education variables explain only approximately 2% of the variance in each model. The demographic indicators account for the lion's share of the variance in both models—15% and 14% respectively. Age is by far the strongest predictor of voting responsibility, as older citizens are more likely than younger people to feel that it is their duty to turn out in elections even at the local level. Voters with higher levels of education and income also are more inclined to have a robust sense of their responsibility to participate, although these factors are substantially less important than age. All three race dummy variables are statistically significant in the regression analysis, indicating a positive correspondence with voting responsibility. The bivariate correlation between sex and voting responsibility is weak, and it is not a significant predictor in the multivariate model. Strength of party identification has the second highest correlation with voting responsibility, and it remains significant in the OLS regression analysis. The relationship between strength of ideology and voting responsibility is less evident than for partisanship.

Table 3
OLS Regression Analysis of Voting Responsibility on Civic Education Variables

	Zero-Order Correlation	Beta Coefficient	R^2	Beta Coefficient	R^2
Civic Education Index	.144*	.135*	.021*		
Civic Learning Approaches	.109*			.111*	.023*
Civic Course Activities	.139*			.076*	
Party Identification	.217*	.138*	.049*	.132*	.039*
Ideology	.117*	.049		.032	
Sex	.078*	.038	.154*	.036	.140*
Age	.361*	.356*		.342*	
Education	.114*	.055		.068**	
Income	.124*	.128*		.100*	
White	.098*	.182*		.159*	
Black	.046	.159*		.135*	
Hispanic	-.090*	.105*		.083*	
Model Statistics			.218*		.203*
n			1139		1000

*p<.01 **p<.05

There is relationship between political, service, and sport/hobby extracurricular activities and voting responsibility, although none exists for media-related activities. As depicted in Table 4, the correlation is strongest for service activities (Pearson's R=.156) followed closely by sports and hobby activities (.152) and political activities (.137). In the OLS regression model, extracurricular activities explain slightly more than 4% of the variance in voting responsibility. The general trends that were evident in the analysis that included the civic education variables (Table 3) regarding the political and demographic indicators are apparent in this analysis. The demographic predictors have the greatest explanatory power in the model, accounting for 14% of the explained variance. As was the case in the model that included the civic education variables, age is the strongest predictor of voting responsibility. The bivariate correlation as well as the beta coefficient in the regression analysis indicate that strength of party identification is more strongly related to voting responsibility than is ideology.

Table 4
OLS Regression Analysis of Voting Responsibility on Extracurricular Activities

	Zero-Order Correlation	Beta Coefficient	R^2
Extracurricular Activities			
Political	.137*	.062**	.043*
Media-Related	.008	-.043	
Service	.156*	.063**	
Sports and Hobby	.152*	.059**	
Party Identification	.218*	.127*	.043*
Ideology	.117*	.054**	
Gender	.077*	.036	.138*
Age	.361*	.336*	
Education	.114*	.055**	
Income	.125*	.118*	
White	.099*	.201*	
Black	.046	.169*	
Hispanic	-.090*	.113*	
Model			.223*
n=1141			

*p<.01 **p<.05

Duty to Serve in the Military

The public's feelings about military service differ radically from their views about other civic duties. Only 19% of respondents to the CEPES strongly agreed that it is a citizen's duty to serve in the military, compared to 76% who strongly believed the duty to vote, 53% who felt they should serve on a jury, and 51% who concurred that it was their duty to keep informed about government and politics. At the same time, 55% of the sample felt that it was not their duty as citizens to serve in the military compared to less than 15% of respondents who felt that way about the duty to vote, serve on a jury, and keep informed about politics.

Given the general lack of support for the proposition that military service is a civic duty combined with the fact that military service is not emphasized in civic education courses to the same extent as other responsibilities, it is not surprising that our analysis revealed a weak to nonexistent relationship between civic education and duty to serve in the military as we hypothesized. The bivariate Pearson's correlation between the civic education index and

military service is -.019. Similarly, the civics course activities variable is correlated at -.066. The only positive correlation among these variables is for the classroom activities variable, and the relationship is relatively weak (.103). The analysis also revealed that the relationship between participating in extracurricular activities and duty to serve in the military was weak to nonexistent and generally negative (political activities (.013), service activities (-.058), sports and hobby activities (-.039), and media-related activities (-.083)). Our study included too few people who had participated in a military-related extracurricular like ROTC, so we could not analyze the influence of this type of activity which likely would be positive.

Among our control variables, age has the strongest correlation with military service (Pearson's $R=.334$, $p<.01$). Older people are substantially more inclined to believe that it is a duty to serve in the military than younger people. Men are more likely to believe that military service is a civic duty (-.130). There is a negative relationship between education and military service (-.144), as those with higher education are less disposed to view military service as a duty than those with lower levels of education. None of the other demographic variables or the political variables—strength of partisanship and ideology—have a relationship to military service.

Conclusion

As opposed to other environments that contribute to political socialization, the classroom remains, even when coupled with community outreach, a unique setting in which young people can at once gain knowledge, autonomy in their ideas, and confidence in their abilities to serve as civic actors (Morgan and Streb, 2001). Our study confirms this observation. We build upon past research by better specifying the relationship between civic education and the development of a sense of civic responsibility by taking into account the influence of the amount and quality of

classroom civics instruction on three broad dimensions of civic duty. We also have examined the association between four types of extracurricular activities and civic duty.

We find that the contribution of civic education to the development of norms of civic responsibility differs across types of duty. The strongest relationship exists between civic education and our general measure of civic duty which includes the responsibility to keep informed, take part in government affairs, volunteer in the community, and serve on a jury. The connection between civic education and voting responsibility is somewhat less robust. This finding is somewhat surprising given the emphasis that is placed on voting in many textbooks and classroom exercises. It may be the case that voting does not resonate with students as much as other forms civic engagement because they are not of age and cannot take part. Keeping informed and volunteering in the community are more immediately achievable for adolescents. We also find that there is no correspondence between duty to serve in the military and civic education. Military service is not addressed as frequently in the classroom as other duties, and also may be considered a controversial topic to be avoided by some educators.

The nature of person's civic education experience corresponds to their development of a sense of civic duty. At a base level, people who have taken a civics, government, American history, or social studies course have a more highly developed civic sensibility than those who have not. Those whose civic education included participation in an enlightened curriculum intervention or program that involved active engagement with the subject matter, such as *We the People*, have the strongest sense of civic duty. The approach to teaching civic education matters for successfully imparting civic norms. Our results support the findings of other studies that confirm the effectiveness of incorporating current events into the curriculum to develop habits of monitoring and engaging with public affairs. Further, pedagogies that integrate active learning

components, including community-based approaches, are more successful in conveying norms of civic duty and responsibility than purely lecture-based approaches.

Our study lends support to the notion that extracurricular activities are useful in conveying a sense of civic duty and voting responsibility, although not military service duty. It appears that the influence of extracurricular activities may be somewhat weaker than the effect of civic education, but this relationship requires further investigation. As other research has demonstrated, we find that particular types of extracurricular activities are more effective in developing civic norms than others. Participation in political and service activities has a greater correspondence with civic duty and voting responsibility than participation in media-related activities and sports/hobbies. The finding for media-related activities, which includes working on the student newspaper, radio station, and television station, is somewhat puzzling, as one might expect that these activities would generate a desire to keep informed. It may be the case that at the high school level journalism is more concerned with social events than political affairs.

This study marks the first step in an investigation that will delve further into the effects of civic education on the development of civic and political norms, attitudes, believes, identities, and behaviors. The Civic Education and Political Engagement study was fielded at a unique time in American political history, as the modes of participation and the requirements for participation are shifting to some extent. Translating core values that promote a sense of civic duty to support participation in a digital culture is a challenge that faces civic educators moving forward.

REFERENCES

Abramson, Paul R., and John H. Aldrich. 1982. "The Decline of Electoral Participation in America," *The American Political Science Review* 76(3), 502-521.

Atherton, Herbert. 2000. "We the People…Project Citizen." *Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy: Service Learning and Other Promising Practices* (Mann, Sheilah. and Patrick, John, eds). Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Battistoni, Richard M. 2000. "Service Learning and Civic Education." *Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy: Service Learning and Other Promising Practices* (Mann, S. and Patrick, J., eds). Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Beane, James, John Turner, and David Jones. 1981. "Long-term Effects of Community Service Programs." *Curriculum Inquiry, 11,* 143-155.

Beck, Paul A., and M. Kent Jennings. 1982. "Pathways to Participation." *The American Political Science Review, 76,* 94-108 .

Elisabeth Gidengil, André Blais, Neil Nevitte, and Richard Nadeau. 2004. *Citizens.* Vancouver: UBC Press

Boyte, Harry. 2000. "Civic Education as a Craft, Not a Program, in Sheila Mann and John J. Patrick, eds., *Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy: Service Learning and Other Promising Practices.* Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Brody, Richard A. 1994. "Secondary Education and Political Attitudes: Examining the Effects on Political Tolerance of the We the People Curriculum." Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.

David E. Campbell. 2006. *Why We Vote: How Schools and Communities Shape Our Civic Life.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Center for Civic Education. 1994. *National Standards for Civics and Government*. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education. http://www.civiced.org/index.php?page=912erica#15.

CIRCLE. 2003. *The Civic Mission of Schools*. New York, NY: The Carnegie Corporation.

Dalton, Russell. 2009. *The Good Citizen*, 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Delli Carpini, Michael X. and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Eccles, Jacquelynne S. et al. 2003. "Extracurricular Activities and Adolescent Development." *Journal of Social Issues, 59*(4), 865-889.

Erikson, Erik H. 1968. *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co, Inc.

Eyler, Janet 1982. "Test of a Model Relating Political Attitudes to Participation in High School Activities." *Theory and Research in Social Education, 10,* 43-62.

Galston, William A. 2001. "Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education." *Annual Review Political Science*. 4: 217-234.

Gordon, C. Wayne and Nicholas Babchuk. 1959. A Typology of Voluntary Associations. *American Sociological Review, 24,* 22-29.

Hamilton, Stephen and Sheperd Zeldin. 1987. "Learning Civics in the Community." *Curriculum Inquiry*: 17:408-420.

Hanks, Michael, and Bruce Eckland. 1978. "Adult Voluntary Associations." *Sociological Quarterly, 19,* 481-490.

Hart, Daniel and Suzanne Fegley. 1995. "Prosocial Behavior and Caring in adolescence: Relations to self-understanding and social judgment." *Child Development, 66,* 1347-1359.

Hepburn, Mary. 2000. "Service Learning and Civic Education in Schools: What Does Recent Research Tell Us?" *Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy: Service Learning and Other Promising Practices,* in Sheila Mann and John J. Patrick, eds. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Hess, Diana. 2009. "Principles That Promote Discussion of Controversial Political Issues in the Curriculum," in *Engaging Young People in Civic Life*, in Peter Levine and James Youniss, eds. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Hess, Robert D. and Judith V. Torney. 1967. *The Development of Political Attitudes in Children*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Glanville, Jonathan L. 1999. "Political Socialization or Selection? Adolescent Extracurricular Participation and Political Activity in Early Adulthood," *Social Science Quarterly, 80,* 279-289.

Judd, Charles H. 1923. *The Evolution of a Democratic School System (2010 Reprint)*. Hagerstown, MD: Hp Publishing.

Kahne, Joseph and Ellen Middaugh. 2008. "High Quality Civic Education: What Is It and Who Gets It?" *Social Education*. 72(1): 34-39.

Kahne, Joseph and Ellen Middaugh. 2009. "Democracy for Some: The Civic Opportunity Gap in High School," in Peter Levine and James J. Youniss, eds. *Engaging Young People in Civic Life*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Kahne, Joseph, Ellen Middaugh, and Marshall Croddy. 2005. "The California Survey of Civic Education. Report to Educating for Democracy: California Campaign of Civic Education." Published by the Constitutional Rights Foundation.

Kahne, Joseph and Joel Westheimer. 2003. "Teaching Democracy: What Schools Need to Do." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(1), 34-40, 557-66.

Ladewig, Howard, and John K. Thomas. 1987. *Assessing the Impact of 4-H on Former Members*. College Station, TX: Texas Tech University.

Langton, Kenneth P. 1967. Peer Group and School and the Political Socialization Process. *The American Political Science Review, 61*(3), 751-758.

Langton, Kenneth P., and M. Kent Jennings. 1968. "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the United States," *The American Political Science Review, 62*(3), 852-867.

Leming, Robert. 1996. "We the People…The Citizen and the Constitution." Calabasas, CA: The Center for Civic Education.

Levine, Peter. 2006. "The Civic Mission of Schools: Chief Findings and Next Steps," *Knowledge Quest*, 34(4): 18-21.

Lewis, Helen S. 1962. *The Teen-age Joiner and His Orientation Toward Public Affairs: A Test of Two Multiple Group Membership Hypotheses*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Political Science, Michigan State University.

Morgan, William and Matthew Streb. 2001. "Building Citizenship: How Student Voice in Service Learning Develops Civic Values." *Social Science Quarterly*, 82: 154-169.

Niemi, Richard G. and Jane Junn. 1998. *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Olsen, Marvin E. 1982. *Participatory Pluralism: Political Participation and Influence in the United States and Sweden*. Chicago, IL: Burnham Inc Pub.

Otto, Luther B. 1976. "Social Integration and the Status Attainment Process," *American Journal of Sociology*, 81:1360-1383.

Owen, Diana. 2000. Service Learning and Political Socialization. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 33 (3), 638-640.

Poindexter, Paula M., and Maxwell E. McCombs. 2001. "Revisiting the Civic Duty to Keep Informed in the New Media Environment," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*.

Putnam, Robert D. 1995. "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital." *Journal of Democracy, 6*: 65-78.

Putnam, Robert. 1993. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. [1840] 1945. *Democracy in America*. vol. 2. New York, NY: Random House.

Tolo, Kenneth W. 1998. "An Assessment of We the People…Project Citizen: Promoting Citizenship in Classrooms and Communities." Austin, TX: Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas.

Torney-Purta, Judith and Richardson, Wendy. 2002. "The School's Role in Developing Civic Engagement: A Study of Adolescents in Twenty-Eight Countries," *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4): 203-212.

Verba, Sidney, & Nie, Norman H. 1972. *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. New York: Harper and Row.

Verba, Sidney, Lehman Schlozman, Henry Brady. 2006. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Yates, Miranda and James Youniss. 1998. "Community Service and Political Identity Development in Adolescence," *Journal of Social Issues, 54* (3), 495-512.

Youniss, James, Jeffrey A. McLellan, and Miranda Yates. 1997. "What We Know About Engendering Civic Identity," *The American Behavioral Scientist, 40* (5), 620-631.

Ziblatt, David. 1965. "High School Extracurricular Activities and Political Socialization." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 361:20-31.

APPENDIX
Item Wording and Variable Construction

Civic Duty

It is my responsibility to keep informed about public affairs
I have a responsibility to take part in government affairs
I have a responsibility to volunteer in my community
I have a responsibility to serve on a jury when called

Civic Duty Scale
Range 1-16
Cronbach's alpha=.766

Voting Responsibility

It is my duty as a citizen to vote
I feel guilty if I do not vote
So many people vote in local elections, it doesn't matter if I turn out or not
A good many local elections aren't important enough for me to bother with

Voting Responsibility Scale
Range 1-16
Cronbach's alpha=.705

Military Service

It is my duty to serve my government in the military

Civic Education Index

Computed from the following variables:

Did you take a government, social studies, or civics class in junior high or high school?

Did you take part in any of the following civic education programs? (indicate yes/no for eleven programs including We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution, Project Citizen, Close Up, Kid's Voting USA, boys State or Girls State, Junior Statesmen of America, YMCA Youth and Government, Rotary Club-National Youth Leadership Forum, Model Congress/Model United Nations, Harvard CIVICS Program, Citizen Action Project)

Did you take part in any other civic education program? (23 additional programs were named by respondents)

Civic Education Index

	Percent	n
No Civic Education	24%	290
Civics Course Only	64%	787
Civics Course and Program	12%	148

Civics Classroom Environment

How often did your class experience include:
--Textbook-Based Learning
--Lecture
--Current Events-Based Learning
--Classroom Activities
--Community-Based Activities

1 Never
2 Rarely
3 Some of the Time
4 Most of the Time
5 Always

Civics Classroom Environment Scale (includes Current-Events Based Learning, Classroom Activities, Community-Based Activities):

Range 1-17
Cronbach's Alpha=.751

Civic Education Activities

Did you ever take part in any of the following activities:
--A debate
--A competition to test your civic knowledge
--A mock trial
--A hearing
--Deliver a speech
--Discuss current events that you cared about

--Write a letter to a government official
--Circulate a petition
--Attend a community meeting
--Meet with government or community leaders
--Take a field trip to a local, state, or federal government institution or historical site
--Community service
--Create civics-related information material, newsletter, videos, or website
--Other

Civic Education Activities Scale (includes all variables):
Range 0-14
Cronbach's Alpha=.805

Extracurricular Activities

Political Extracurricular Activities Scale (includes student government, debate team/mock trial, worked on a political campaign, held a political internship/externship)
Range 0-4
Cronbach's Alpha=.296

Media-Related Extracurricular Activitis Scale (includes student newspaper, literary journal, student radio/television station, student yearbook)
Range 0-4
Cronbach's Alpha=.533

Service Extracurricular Activities Scale (includes community service organization, Boy or Girl scouts, 4 H or other agricultural organization, church or religious organization)
Range 0-4
Cronbach's Alpha=.316

Sports, Hobby, and Nonpolitical Extracurricular Activities (includes sports, cheerleading, band, choir, glee club, drama, language club, hobby club)
Range 0-5
Cronbach's Alpha=.312

Correlations (Pearson's R) Between Extracurricular Activities Variables

	Political	Media-Related	Service	Sports/Hobby
Political	1.000			
Media-Related	.290*	1.000		

Service	.275*	.116*	1.000	
Sports/Hobby	.346*	.258*	,367*	1.000

ENDNOTES

[1]The authors recognize Rebecca Chalif and Kate House, graduate students at Georgetown University's Communication, Culture, and Technology Program, for their valuable research assistance with this project and contributions to this work.

[2] Information about the Knowledge Networks panel can be found at: http://www.knowledgenetworks.com/knpanel/index.html.

[3] The study was conducted by a research team at Georgetown University (principal investigator, Diana Owen), and funded by the Center for Civic Education.

[4] The fact that respondents relied on recall of their civic education experience is a potential limitation of this study. We sought to mitigate this pitfall by subjecting the instrument to rigorous pretesting of the items. The Georgetown University research team conducted an extensive survey and interview pretest on 288 subjects. A subsample of the survey respondents was interviewed to determine if they had difficulty answering any of the questions. The interview subjects ranged from young people to octogenarians, and included members of a senior citizens community in Florida. The subjects generally had little difficulty recalling their civics experience in some detail. A small number of items where recall was sketchy, such as whether their high school civics course had been required or was an elective, were eliminated from the study. The survey instrument was pretested further by Knowledge Networks on 50 subjects before the final version went into the field.

[5] Six respondents participated in a civics program, but did not take a civics course. These respondents were eliminated from the analysis because there were too few of them to analyze.