

**Evaluation of the Student Voices Program in Seattle**

**March 2002**

**Center for Communication and Civic Engagement  
University of Washington**

**Report Prepared by Mike Xenos, Lance Bennett, and Adam Simon**

## **Overview of Seattle Student Voices**

Seattle Student Voices is part of the National Student Voices Project, an initiative of the Annenberg Public Policy Center (APPC) of the University of Pennsylvania with funding from the Annenberg Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts. The Student Voices program is a high-school civics curriculum enhancement aimed at building civic and political engagement among young people and increasing students' knowledge and understanding of local political processes and institutions. In Seattle, the project involved the participation of 35 teachers in 15 area schools, with thirty-two classrooms implementing the civic engagement curriculum and fifteen control classrooms using their normal civics curriculum. We were able to secure a good balance between public (8) and private (7) schools. Each of the teachers administering the Student Voices curriculum attended a full day of training by project staff. All classrooms were equipped with computers and provided with Internet access. In addition to engaging in Student Voices in-class curriculum activities, program participants accessed the Student Voices web site, which included candidate and issue information, on-line discussion forums for discussion of local political issues with other Seattle students and the mayoral candidates, as well as other curriculum related information. Students were made aware of their involvement in a city and nation-wide project, and geared many of their class activities toward public events that brought media attention to students, parents, and teachers from across the city. Participating classes attended a locally broadcast candidate forum with student questioners, received visits from candidates and their representatives in class, and developed community-oriented class projects, which were presented at a 'civics-fair' at the end of the program where awards were given to the best student presentations. Teachers participating in the control classrooms received no curriculum materials, but did

receive computers with Internet access. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the program nationwide, APPC has developed pre-test and post-test surveys tapping various outcome measures. In Seattle, these surveys were adapted to the local environment and administered to all students in both curriculum and control conditions.

*Overall we found that the Student Voices program, as administered during Seattle's 2001 mayoral race, significantly increased students' attention to, knowledge about, and engagement in local politics generally, and the 2001 mayoral race in particular. Similar to the results of program evaluations in other cities, these findings speak to the robust effectiveness of the curriculum in achieving its stated goals. As indicated in the analyses reported below, the most important features of the curriculum were the direct participation aspects, including classroom visits by candidates and campaign staff, click polls on issues posted on the project web site, and various in-class discussions and deliberations on local issues and the election.*

## **METHODOLOGY**

As indicated above, the basic evaluation strategy employed involved the comparison of pre- and post-test survey responses in both curriculum and control conditions. In Seattle, roughly two thirds of participating classrooms were established as curriculum classrooms, with the remaining third serving as control classrooms. Efforts were made to select the most similar and comparable class within the grade and course to serve as the control classroom(s) for each school. In all classes, students completed both pre- and post-test surveys, which were administered confidentially by assigning each student a survey identification number.

In all, approximately one thousand students participated in the Seattle program (in either curriculum or control conditions) at any given time. The analyses presented here, however, focus on the 858 students for which both pre- and post-test surveys were received.<sup>1</sup> This design allowed us to assess pre-post differences individually for each

---

<sup>1</sup> Initial aggregate level analyses using all surveys received appear consistent with the individual-level analyses reported here, given that they fail to control for demographic and other variables.

student, thus enhancing our ability to accurately identify the effects of the curriculum. Of the 858 student respondents, 556 participated in the Student Voices curriculum while 302 were in the control condition.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in accomplishing its broad goals of increasing political engagement and knowledge of local political processes and institutions among participants, we focused on the following outcomes:

- News media consumption
- Attention to and interest in news about local affairs and the mayoral election
- Discussion of politics and local issues
- Political knowledge
- Political cynicism/Trust in government
- Political participation

For each outcome variable of interest, we identified appropriate indicators among the survey items and subtracted pre-test values from post-test values, yielding net-change scores on each measure for each participant. For news media consumption, we chose seven indicators. Two of these, our national and local newspaper exposure measures, were compiled from responses to survey items asking respondents to identify how often they read a variety of national and local newspapers using a scale from 1 (never) to 4 (three or more times a week). The remaining five indicators tapped consumption of network television news, local television news, radio news, talk radio, and Internet news, in days per week. Three survey items were used to assess attention to and interest in news about local issues and the mayoral race. These items asked students how often they followed local affairs, how much attention they devoted to newspaper coverage of the mayoral election, and how closely they followed general news coverage of the campaigns and election. Generally, these responses came in the form of 4 to 5 point Likert scales; precise response options for these and all other items are presented in the Appendix. For assessment of political talk we used two items that asked students to rate how often they discussed local politics with family and friends using a scale of 0 (never) to 4 (every

day), and a general item asking students to estimate how often they talked with anyone about the election specifically using the same scale.

We assessed political knowledge with three scale measures ranging from local to national in emphasis. First, we compiled a measure of candidate familiarity by summing the number of evaluations or responses (excluding neutral, 'don't know' answers, and non-responses) offered for six questions about the candidates and issues of the mayoral race. Second, a four-point scale was constructed based on whether students could identify at least one of Seattle's nine city council members, Washington State governor Gary Locke, and the US Senators representing Washington State. For national political knowledge, we used the five-item index recommended by Delli Carpini and Keeter (1996). We measured political cynicism using an index of trust in local government (comprised of agree/disagree responses to positive statements about local government) and one that tapped distrust of local government (responses to negative statements). Finally, we assessed political participation using questionnaire items concerning the likelihood of the respondent to volunteer for a political campaign in the future and their self-reported level of political involvement.

Evaluation of curriculum effects was then accomplished in two stages. First, each outcome variable was regressed on a dummy variable denoting program condition, controlling for demographic characteristics. Specifically, we controlled for age, gender, ethnicity, mother's educational attainment, private school attendance, and whether English is the language primarily spoken in the student's home. Table 2 reports the results of these regressions. In a second stage of the analysis, we explored the question of whether particular components of the program were individually influential on the outcome variables of interest. To get at this question we used a post-test survey item asking students to indicate what activities they took part in (if any) as part of the Student Voices curriculum. Using these responses we then regressed outcome variables on dummy variables representing the various components of the program, again controlling for demographic variables, in order to identify particular portions of the program that had the greatest effect on student learning and engagement. The results of these analyses are reported in Table 3.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Background

Before discussing general and specific curriculum effects, it will be useful to briefly report some background information on the student-participants and administration of the Seattle Student Voices program. Table 1 provides a basic demographic profile of student-participants. Based on simple t-tests, we are confident that there were virtually no significant differences in terms of these variables between the curriculum and control conditions, with the possible exception of mother's education. Though the difference on this variable achieves statistical significance, it is worth noting the small magnitude of difference.

Beyond simple demographics, we can also look to baseline levels of Seattle Student Voices participants on a few outcome variables, in comparison to a national sample of young people, as another way of conveying to the reader a sense of the local soil in which the seeds of the program were planted. For this we turn to the Project Vote Smart/Pew Charitable Trusts 1999 Survey, administered to a sample of 18 to 25 year olds (and an older comparison group) as part of an effort to assess youth civic engagement. Taking into account that the Project Vote Smart/Pew survey respondents were slightly older than our local high school students, we believe that a comparison of a handful of similar questionnaire items establishes that Seattle Student Voices participants are relatively typical of young people nationwide. For example, while more Seattle Student Voices participants report “never” paying attention to local politics and government (approximately 32% vs. 14%), the proportion of our students reporting “some” attention to these matters is roughly equal to that for Project Vote Smart respondents reporting “little” to “some” attention to local affairs (60% vs. 64%). Although markedly fewer Seattle Student Voices participants were able to correctly identify the Vice President of the United States (55% vs. 72% of Project Vote Smart respondents), on other national political knowledge items the rates of correct response were quite similar.<sup>2</sup> Another

---

<sup>2</sup> Whose responsibility is it to determine if a law is unconstitutional or not? Seattle Student Voices (SSV) 56.9%, Project Vote Smart (PVS) 62%. How much of a majority is required for the US Senate and House to override a presidential veto? SSV 55.3%, PVS 58%. Which party is more conservative? SSV 66%, PVS 57%.

similarity can be found in the overwhelming preference of young people to pursue information about politics and public affairs on the Internet. Although the formats of the survey items used in both cases prohibit a direct comparison, Seattle high school students appear to display a reliance on online news very typical of young people nationwide.

Finally, results from a brief exit-survey of teachers provide some background with respect to the administration of the program. By and large, these brief surveys indicate that the teachers found the curriculum to be helpful overall, and relatively easy to implement. On average, curriculum teachers devoted 1.3 days per week to program activities. There were, however, a few teachers who had trouble with some parts of the program and expressed an inability to administer all of the components. This variation underscores the importance of evaluating program components individually, in order to control for differences between curriculum classrooms.

### **Curriculum main effects**

A cursory glance at Table 2 suggests that in Seattle the Student Voices curriculum had a significant effect on at least one outcome variable in virtually all of the categories of interest with the exception of political cynicism/trust in government. For example, students in the curriculum condition report almost a day increase in network television news consumption per week than students in the control classrooms. We suspect that increases in local news consumption were suppressed by the fact that articles from the local papers were clipped and posted on the project web site, thus offering students a readily available substitute for local newspapers. This suggests that the increase in national television news consumption may be taken as a more meaningful indicator of the media effect of the project.

With respect to interest in and attention to local affairs and the mayoral race, we find significant increases in all three indicators among curriculum participants. Though the magnitude of the increase in the simple “interest” measure is rather small, the increases in attention to newspaper and general news coverage of local politics and the election are substantial. Whereas average responses to these items on the pre-test ranged in the “none” to “not very much” territory, post-test responses of students in the curriculum condition display an average response squarely in the “some” attention range,

as has been the case in other versions of the program. Although there appear to be no statistically significant curriculum effects on general political talk, discussion of the mayoral race was also markedly increased among curriculum participants. Perhaps the clearest effect of the curriculum, however, can be seen in the candidate familiarity index. Recalling that this scale was constructed by summing dummy variables representing six candidate or issue opinions, we can interpret the effect of the curriculum as helping students to form about two more opinions on average than control students. Specifically, students in the curriculum group went from an average of 1.2 opinions in the pre-test to an average of 3.9 after the curriculum and election. Additionally, another effect on political knowledge can be seen in ability of students receiving the curriculum to recall the names of officials representing the city of Seattle and the State of Washington. Finally, a modest but significant increase in self-reported political involvement (based on a scale ranging from 1 “not involved” to 3 “somewhat involved”) is also found in comparing students from curriculum classrooms to those from the control classes.

### **Effects of specific program components**

In addition to the above analyses, we also explored the effects of particular program components in a second phase of program evaluation. Looking over the cell entries in Table 3, which report coefficients for all aspects of the program found to be significantly related to at least one outcome measure, one can discern two distinct patterns regarding the program components found to be most effective in Seattle. First, it is clear that classroom visits by candidates and their representatives strongly influence news consumption and spontaneous political talk among program participants, among other outcome variables. Most strikingly, we see that these visits from mayoral hopefuls and their staff tend to result in over a day’s increase per week in network television news consumption and nearly a day per week increase in Internet news consumption respectively. Indeed, in this analysis, we find a significant relationship between candidate visits and students’ levels of general political talk with friends whereas the simple curriculum effect was found to be non-significant in the first phase of evaluation.

A second pattern is that classroom discussions appear to be the locus of political knowledge acquisition for students in the program. Although one might assume that all

curriculum classrooms featured some discussion of the campaign, only around 80% of students in the curriculum condition recall participating in them at the time of the post-tests. For these students, however, we find clear unique increases on our political knowledge measures. Specifically, in addition to finding significant and substantial effects of this aspect of the curriculum on candidate familiarity and recall of local officials, we again find a significant effect on an outcome variable for which no significant effects were found in the model for undifferentiated curriculum effects, in this case national political knowledge, which was uniquely increased among students discussing the campaign in class by around half a point on a five point scale. Moreover, we also find a significant unique increase in attention to general campaign news.

Beyond these general patterns, a number of other findings reported in Table 3 deserve comment as well. For example, the “click polls” feature of the Student Voices website and writing an Opinion-Editorial essay appeared to have significant effects on network news consumption and trust in local government, respectively. Additionally, forming a class ‘issues agenda’ led to unique increases in attention to local newspaper coverage of the mayoral race, presumably students were inspired to seek out information on the issues important to them in the local press, as well as a modest but discernable jump in self-reported political involvement. Finally, a close reading of Table 3 reveals three negative coefficients. The only one that seems strong enough to warrant attention is the negative relationship between class discussion and online news consumption. The most obvious explanation here is that in classrooms with access to only one computer, there is a time tradeoff between discussion time and computer time. The national project staff might consider guidelines for better integrating class discussion and deliberation activities and the uses of the computer.

### **Differences in Curriculum Effects: Testing Public-Private School Differences**

We also considered the possibility that the effects of the program may have been greater in some classrooms than others. Specifically, we hypothesized that students in students in public classrooms may have experienced weaker effects. To test the first hypothesis we revisited the analyses reported in Table 2, this time introducing an interaction term to the regression models representing private curriculum participation.

Testifying to the uniformity of curriculum effects across public and private education settings, the results of these analyses revealed virtually no significant difference between the effect of the curriculum in private and public schools. Overall, then, these findings suggest the absence of any systematic differences in curriculum effectiveness across different settings.

## CONCLUSION

Overall we found that the Student Voices program as administered during Seattle's 2001 mayoral race significantly increased students' attention to, knowledge about, and engagement in local politics generally and the 2001 mayoral race in particular. Similar to the results of program evaluations in other cities, these findings speak to the robust effectiveness of the curriculum in achieving its stated goals. While it is clear that the curriculum does not turn all students into political junkies, it is just as clear that the program does uniquely raise levels of political engagement in comparison to the traditional civics education curriculum administered in Seattle's secondary schools. Specifically, the visits by candidates and their staff, as well as the unique forum for student discussion of local politics provided by the program appear to have had the most impact on the young Seattle citizens involved in the program.

Finally, we believe that the findings reported here provide especially convincing evidence of the program's effects, given the proximity between administration of the program in Seattle and the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, which found the majority of our pre-test surveys were in the field. As the local campaign season progressed, and observers of the national scene reported temporary short-term increases in media consumption and trust in government officials among the general public, we worried that similar dynamics among our student participants could swamp effects of the program.<sup>3</sup> However, as the results reported above indicate, we were still able to detect unique differences in the

---

<sup>3</sup> To test this suspicion, we attempted to confirm the time and date of survey administration for each class as before or after the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>. Unfortunately, we were only able to obtain this confirmation for approximately 300 pre-test respondents. Based on this limited sample, however, we were able to detect significant 'September 11 effects' on media consumption, and political knowledge, suggesting that levels of these important outcome variables were artificially enhanced at the commencement of the program in Seattle.

expected direction between curriculum and control class participants on the outcome variables of interest. Indeed, whereas students in the control condition actually displayed net decreases in some media consumption and even political knowledge measures, students in the curriculum condition appear to have been insulated from these decreases and focused on the local political events at the center of the Student Voices curriculum.

**Table 1 - Demographic characteristics of program participants, by program condition.** N=858.

N=858	Curriculum	Control	p value
Age (years)	16.9	16.9	.160
Percent Male	49	44	.214
Percent White	65	59	.111
Mother's Education	9.1	8.8	.014
Percent Private School Students	46	45	.838
Percent Homes Where English is the Primary Language	84	89	.063

**Table 2 - Curriculum effects on outcome measures (pre-post differences).**

N=858. Cell entries are unstandardized  $\beta$  coefficients from OLS regression of outcome measures on curriculum participation, controlling for demographic variables listed in Table 1. Standard errors appear in parenthesis.

	Effect of Curriculum Participation (N=858, Unstandardized $\beta$ coefficients, Standard errors in parenthesis)	P value
<i>Media Exposure</i>		
National Newspapers	.003 (.032)	.914
Local Newspapers	.064 (.049)	.195
<b>Network Television News</b>	<b>.730 (.186)</b>	<b>.000</b>
Local Television News	.236 (.179)	.187
Radio News	-.563 (1.12)	.615
Talk Radio	-.197 (.176)	.263
Internet News	.161 (.192)	.401
<i>Attention to &amp; Interest in Local Affairs and Mayoral Election</i>		
<b>Interest in Local Affairs</b>	<b>.049 (.021)</b>	<b>.016</b>
<b>Attention to Newspaper Coverage of Mayoral Election</b>	<b>.680 (.080)</b>	<b>.000</b>
<b>Follow General News Coverage of Mayoral Election</b>	<b>.376 (.073)</b>	<b>.000</b>
<i>Political Talk</i>		
Talk with Family, Local Affairs	.150 (.085)	.078
<b>Talk with Friends, Local Affairs</b>	<b>.193 (.085)</b>	<b>.024</b>
<b>Talk About Mayoral Election</b>	<b>.398 (.122)</b>	<b>.001</b>
<i>Political Knowledge</i>		
<b>Mayoral Candidate and Issue Familiarity</b>	<b>1.925 (.180)</b>	<b>.000</b>

Identification of State & Local Officials and Senators	.128 (.088)	.052
National Political Knowledge	-.131 (.132)	.321
<i>Political Cynicism</i>		
Trust in Local Government	.101 (.238)	.672
Distrust in Local Government	-.571 (.326)	.326
<i>Political Participation</i>		
Likelihood of Volunteering in a Future Campaign	.120 (.092)	.192
<b>Self-reported Political Involvement</b>	<b>.147 (.052)</b>	<b>.005</b>

Table 3 - Effects of various program components on outcome measures.

N=858, Cell entries are unstandardized  $\beta$  coefficients from OLS regressions of each outcome on curriculum components, controlling for demographic variables. Standard errors appear in parentheses. \*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Program Component	Network TV News Exposure	Local TV News Exposure	Online News Exposure	Interest in Local Affairs	Attention to Newspaper Coverage, Mayoral Election	Follow General News Coverage, Mayoral Election	Talk with Friends, Local Affairs	Talk About Mayoral Election	Candidate Familiarity	Local Officials	National Political Knowledge	Trust	Self-reported Political Involvement
Candidate visits	1.082 (.212)***	-	.510 (.220)*	-	.185 (.092)*	-	.239 (.098)*	.333 (.114)**	-	.230 (.101)*	-	-	.174 (.059)*
Visits by campaign representatives	.591 (.257)*	.519 (.253)*	.743 (.266)**	.056 (.029)*	.241 (.111)*	.251 (.100)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Using the Student Voices website to vote in "click polls"	.490 (.247)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Discussing the campaign in class	-	-	-1.007 (.310)***	-	-	.315 (.116)**	-	-	.750 (.216)*	.420 (.142)**	.551 (.175)**	-	-
Doing the class project	-	-	-	-.066 (.031)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Writing an Opinion-Editorial Essay	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.790 (.382)*	-
Forming a class 'issues agenda'	-	-	-	-	.215 (.102)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.135 (.065)*
Participation in the Citywide Candidate Forum, held at the University of Washington	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.281 (.110)*	-	-	-

## APPENDIX: QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS FOR OUTCOME VARIABLES

### Media Consumption:

Thinking about newspapers, tell us how often you read the following papers by **circling** a number between 1 and 4, below.

	Never	1or 2 Times a Month	1or 2 Times a Week	3or More Times a Week
A. New York Times	1	2	3	4
B. Washington Post	1	2	3	4
C. USA Today	1	2	3	4
D. The Wall Street Journal	1	2	3	4
E. Seattle Post-Intelligencer	1	2	3	4
F. Seattle Times	1	2	3	4
G. Seattle Weekly	1	2	3	4
H. The Stranger	1	2	3	4
I. Washington Free Press	1	2	3	4
J. Real Change	1	2	3	4
K. Seattle Medium	1	2	3	4
L. The Progress	1	2	3	4
M. Northwest Asian Weekly	1	2	3	4
N. Other – please specify:	1	2	3	4

How many days in the past week did you watch the **national nightly network news** on ABC with Peter Jennings, CBS with Dan Rather, NBC with Tom Brokaw, or on cable stations such as CNN, Fox News, Univision, or Telemundo?

How many days in the past week did you watch the **local news** about Seattle—either in the broadcasts that come on before the national news and then again at either 10 or 11pm, or in reports from regional cable news stations such as Northwest Cable News or Kong 6/16?

How many days in the past week did you listen to a **radio news broadcast** dealing with local events, issues or city politics for at least 5 or 10 minutes?

How many days in the past week did you listen to **talk radio shows** that invite listeners to call in to discuss local events, issues or city politics?

How many days in the past week did you use a **computer** to go online to get information about local events, public issues or politics?

## Attention to & Interest in Local Affairs and Mayoral Election

What about local affairs? Some people are very interested in city government and the upcoming race for mayor, while others are not that interested. Would you say you are very interested in the **upcoming race for mayor** of Seattle, somewhat interested, or not at all interested? Check one.

- Very interested
- Somewhat interested
- Not at all interested

How much attention have you paid to newspaper stories about the **upcoming mayoral election** in Seattle?

- A great deal
- Some
- Not too much
- None

How likely are you to follow the campaigns of the candidates for mayor in the news?

- Very likely
- Somewhat likely
- Somewhat unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Don't know

### Political Talk:

Thinking about your family at home, how often, if ever, do you discuss problems affecting Seattle and its neighborhoods with your family?

- Every day
- 3 or 4 times a week
- Once or twice a week
- Rarely
- Never

What about people outside your family, for example, your friends and people in your class? How often, if ever, do you discuss problems affecting Seattle and its neighborhoods with these people?

- Every day
- 3 or 4 times a week
- Once or twice a week
- Rarely
- Never

Please think about the upcoming primary election for mayor (September 18, 2001). How often in the past week have you talked with other people about the election?

- Every day
- 3 or 4 times a week
- Once or twice a week
- Rarely
- Never

Political Knowledge:

Please rate how you feel about each person below with a number between 1 and 5: 1 is for people you dislike most, 5 is for people you like most, and 3 is for people exactly in between. If you come to a person whose name you don't recognize, just circle "DK" for "don't know."

	Dislike Most		Neutral		Like Most	Don't Know
A. Greg Nickels	1	2	3	4	5	DK
B. Mark Sidran	1	2	3	4	5	DK

Some people say that transportation issues (such as traffic congestion, the condition of roads and bridges, and public transit system development) are some of the most important issues facing Seattle and the Puget Sound region right now. Thinking back to the race for mayor of Seattle, which candidate do you think offered the best position on this issue? **Check one.**

- Greg Nickels
- Mark Sidran
- Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't Know

Some Seattle citizens have voiced concerns about police violence and racial profiling. Thinking back to the race for mayor of Seattle, which candidate do you think offered the best position on this issue? **Check one.**

- Greg Nickels
- Mark Sidran
- Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't Know

a. If the election for mayor of Seattle were held today, and you could vote, which one of the following candidates would you choose?

- Greg Nickels
- Mark Sidran
- Someone Else
- Don't Know

b. Which would be your second choice?

- Greg Nickels
- Mark Sidran
- Someone Else
- Don't Know

Here are a few questions about government at the federal, state, and city levels. Many people don't know the answers to these questions; so if there are some you don't know, leave it blank or check "don't know."

a. Who is on the Seattle city council? Write down as many city council members as you can think of.

- Don't know

b. Who is the governor of Washington State?

c. Who are the two U.S. senators who represent Washington State?

d. Do you happen to know what job or political office is now held by Dick Cheney? (Write the name of the job or political office below).

e. Whose responsibility is it to determine if a law is constitutional or not: the President, Congress, or the Supreme Court?

- President
- Congress
- Supreme Court
- Don't know

f. Which party is currently the majority party in the U.S. House of Representatives – the Republicans or the Democrats?

- Republicans
- Democrats
- Don't know

g. How much of a majority is required for the U.S. Senate and House to override a presidential veto?

- Fifty-one percent
- Two-thirds
- Three-fourths
- Don't know

h. Which political party is more conservative – the Republicans or the Democrats?

- Republicans
- Democrats
- Don't know

**Political Cynicism:**

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the appropriate number, 1 – 5 or by indicating that you don't know how you feel (DK).

	Strongly disagree	Some-what disagree	Neither agree Nor disagree	Some-what agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
A. The city government is generally run for the benefit of all the people.	1	2	3	4	5	DK
B. When city government runs something, it is usually inefficient and wasteful.	1	2	3	4	5	DK
C. Most city public officials are trustworthy.	1	2	3	4	5	DK
D. City officials don't care much what people like me think.	1	2	3	4	5	DK
E. Sometimes city politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't understand what is going on.	1	2	3	4	5	DK
F. People like me don't have any say about what the city government does.	1	2	3	4	5	DK
G. If I had a problem in my neighbor-hood, I know that someone in city government would try to do something about it	1	2	3	4	5	DK

## Political Participation/Engagement

How likely are you to volunteer your time to help a candidate get elected?

- Very likely
- Somewhat likely
- Somewhat unlikely
- Very unlikely
- Don't know

Some people are very involved in politics. Others are not involved in politics at all. Still others are somewhere in between. How would you describe **your** current level of political involvement?

- Very involved politically
- Somewhat involved politically
- Not involved politically