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Civic engagement assessment: Considerations is measuring college students’ political participation

The State Council for Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV) recently added civic engagement (CE) as a core competency, which is an area of knowledge and/or skills considered essential to the success of all undergraduates, regardless of their discipline or institution (State Council for Higher Education in Virginia, 2017). This elevation in the status of CE has prompted many institutions to create or reconsider their definition of CE, CE programming, and corresponding assessment plans. An important consideration in defining CE is whether the description will include both political and non-political learning and experiences (Colby, 2008). For institutions choosing to include the political dimension in their definition, articulating what is meant by political participation is a necessary task, particularly for the purposes of assessment.

Because voting is the activity that comes most readily to mind when considering political participation, it is not surprisingly that many CE assessments include items related to voting. Of course, a comprehensive assessment of political participation considers activities beyond voting. As noted by Barrett (2012), political participation refers to any activity “that has the intent or effect of influencing either regional, national or supranational governance, either directly by affecting the making or implementation of public policy or indirectly by influencing the selection of individuals who make that policy” (p. 5).

The purpose of this paper is to provide guidance on how voting and other political participation behaviors might be assessed in a college student population. The first section of the paper addresses the assessment of voting behavior and highlights important differences among existing measures. Specifically, we weigh the advantages and disadvantages of measuring intentions to vote, self-reported voting behavior, and actual voting behavior. The second section of this paper delineates civic activities beyond voting and provides strategies to minimize socially desirable responses when these behaviors are assessed using self-report measures. Our third section concludes by considering questions about political activities beyond “Did you do the activity?” or “Do you plan to do the activity?” relevant in the assessment of a many political engagement initiatives.

Our university recently contended with these issues when creating political participation items for the James Madison University Political Engagement Scale version 3 (JMU-PES3). The JMU-PES3 was created through a collaboration between the Center for Assessment and Research Studies and the James Madison Center for Civic Engagement in order to assess (in part) the universities’ CE outcomes (https://www.jmu.edu/civic/reports/civic-engagement-learning-outcomes.pdf). Throughout the paper we share our decision-making process, the political participation items on the JMU-PES3, and results obtained from a random sample of over 1,000 first-year students obtained just prior to the start of classes in Fall 2018. By sharing what we have learned thus far we hope to help other institutions progress in their CE assessment endeavors.

Assessing Civic Participation: Voting

Existing civic participation surveys typically ask about voting in one of two ways: “Did you vote?” or “Do you plan to vote in the future?” Although the items are similar, they assess different

---

1 Instead of asking “Did you vote?” the Civic Engagement Quiz (http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/Final_Civic_Inds_Quiz_2006.pdf), a measure of civic engagement for young
things with the former question measuring self-reported voting behavior and the latter measuring intentions to vote. Deciding between these two alternatives might be dictated by the age of the respondents, with the assessment of voting intentions being the only possible option if some or all of the survey respondents are too young to vote (<18 years of age). Because some college students may be younger than 18, instruments that inquire about intentions to vote are appropriate for this population (e.g., Activism Orientation Scale, Corning & Myers, 2002, 2013; Political Engagement Project Survey²; Beaumont, Colby, Ehrlich, & Torney-Purta, 2006).

A relevant question when measuring intentions to vote is whether intentions are a good proxy for self-reported voting behavior. Research comparing intentions to vote in an upcoming election with self-reports of voting after the election suggests responses will not be identical, but aggregate results will not be too discrepant across approaches (Achen & Blais, 2015). The discrepancy, however, is dependent on age with younger respondents being more discrepant in their intentions and self-reports. Misalignment in responses to these questions occurs most often for respondents who say they intend to vote, but never actually do. Thus, results based on intentions to vote yield a somewhat inflated representation of voting behavior, particularly for younger respondents.

To avoid the possibility of inflated voter participation, our university decided to inquire about self-reported voting behavior. In creating our instrument, several features were carefully considered. First, to address the fact that some students may be younger than 18, we provided a way for respondents to convey whether they are eligible to vote. Second, we asked specifically about the previous election year because we felt simply asking, “Did you vote?” might be misinterpreted as meaning, “Have you ever voted?” Third, we specified the kind of election (e.g., local, state, national) so that we could distinguish participation by election type. The resulting voting behavior items on the JMU-PES3 are shown in Figure 1.

The items in Figure 1 assess students’ knowledge of whether and what type of elections were held the past year, their knowledge of whether they were eligible to vote, and two behaviors: whether they registered and whether they voted. Because responses are sometimes collected via Scantrons (i.e., optical answer sheets), the response options had to capture whether there was an election, the respondents’ eligibility to vote during the election, whether they registered to vote, and whether they voted. These lengthy response options are avoided when the assessment is administered electronically and items are branched as shown in Figure 2.

¹ Adults, asks, “Do you vote in both national and local elections?” and provides the response options of (a) Yes, always, (b) Yes, usually and (c) No. This quiz is based on the Index of Civic and Political Engagement (Andolina, Keeter, Zukin, & Jenkins, 2003), which asks the question a little differently: with options ranging from never to always. These might be useful approaches if interested in the general frequency of voting behavior, not voting behavior in certain elections during a particular time frame.

² The Political Engagement Project Survey (PEPS) was created for use in the Political Engagement Project, a 2007 multi-institutional study of the effectiveness of 21 higher education programs and courses focused on promoting political understanding and involvement. This survey served as a model for the JMU-PES3, which contains many items from PEPS.
To pilot our assessment, items were administered using the format shown in Figure 1 to 1,016 incoming first-year students in August 2018 during a university-wide Assessment Day on the Friday prior to the start of classes. To clarify the kind of information that can be obtained with this assessment, we provide results here. Because the assessment is asking about elections during the past year and only local/state elections were held between August 2017 and August 2018, response A (A. There were NO elections of this type this past year) is the incorrect response to the local/state elections item and the correct response to the national elections item. Only 6% of incoming first-year students selected A (the incorrect response) to the local/state elections item; therefore, 94% of incoming-first year students realized there were local/state elections between August 2017 and August 2018. Less encouraging are national election results. Only 40% of incoming first-year students selected response option A (the correct response). Thus, 60% of incoming first-year students erroneously believed there was a national election between August 2017 and August 2018.

To ascertain whether students correctly identified themselves as eligible to vote only responses to the local/state election item were considered. After age on Election Day in 2017 was calculated using student birthdays, students were grouped by whether they were at least 18 years of age on Election Day (eligible to vote) or not. Students who were not US citizens were excluded from the analysis as were the students who were unaware of the local/state elections, resulting in a sample size of 939 and results based on this sample are shown in Figure 3. Based on age alone, 775 incoming first-year students were not eligible to vote in local/state elections on Election Day in 2017. Of those 775 respondents not eligible to vote, 68% correctly identified themselves as not eligible to vote, 13% claimed they were eligible but did not register, 12% claimed they were eligible, registered, but did not vote, and 7% claimed they were eligible, registered, and voted. Of those 164 eligible voters, 17% incorrectly identified themselves as not eligible to vote, 31% understood they were eligible but did not register, 18% understood they were eligible, registered, but did not vote, and 34% understood they eligible, registered, and voted. We are encouraged that so many incoming first-years correctly identified whether they were eligible to vote, but realize some students still lack knowledge about their eligibility. We are particularly encouraged that about one in three eligible voters actually voted in the local/state elections in November 2017, which was likely during their senior year in high school.

Improvements that could be made to the instrument were evident after pilot testing. One flaw with the instrument is the conditional nature of the response options. For instance, understanding whether a student identified themselves as eligible to vote (or indicated whether they had registered to vote and actually voted) was only possible for those students who conveyed there was an election of a certain type the past year. This flaw will be addressed in future versions by using separate questions. For instance, two questions will ask about elections (e.g., Was there a local or state election during the past 12 months?), other questions will ask about voter eligibility, registration, and voting (e.g., Consider the previous Election Day - the Election Day that took place during the past 12 months. Were you eligible to vote? Did you register to vote? Did you vote in local/state elections, if they occurred? Did you vote in national elections, if they occurred?).

Another obvious disadvantage is our reliance on self-report. Registration and voting rates are likely somewhat inflated by a subset of students who responded they engaged in these prosocial behaviors when in truth, they did not. Such issues with self-reports with respect to voting behavior
are well documented (e.g., Górecki, 2011). Andolina et al. (2003) offer two approaches to reduce socially desirable response behavior when inquiring about voting behavior: face-saving response options and normalizing inactivity. In the first approach respondents are given response options that allow them to indicate whether they have ever engaged in the activity and whether they have engaged in the activity in the past year. Because respondents can save face by saying they have engaged in the prosocial activity at some point in time, they should be more honest about engaging in the activity during the previous year. The second approach involves providing instructions that normalize inactivity. For instance, the instructions to our assessment could be modified to say “It is not surprising to see only 50% of eligible young adults vote in elections. Young adults do not vote for a variety of reasons – they may not have the time, they may not be registered, or might not be 18 and eligible to vote. Using the response scale below, please convey the extent of your involvement with elections during the past year.”

Regardless of whether face-saving response options or instructions normalizing inactivity are provided, it is doubtful that self-reports align exactly with actual voting behavior for all college students. For this reason, the gold standard for assessing voting behavior in college students is to acquire actual registration and voting rates. Such information for an institution can be acquired for free through the National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement (NSLVE; https://idhe.tufts.edu/nslve). Reports are provided to participating institutions after each national election (including midterms) that include the overall registration and voting rates and how such rates compare to all participating institutions. Rates are also reported for different voting methods and for a variety of different subgroups (e.g., age group, educational level, class year, gender, race/ethnicity, field of study). Although NSLVE provides our most accurate assessment of student voting rates, only aggregate results (not individual student data) are provided. For this reason, we continue to collect self-reports of voting behavior so that we can track how voting behavior changes over time, its relationship with other variables, and how it is affected by CE programming.

**Assessing Civic Participation: Beyond Voting**

To provide a comprehensive assessment of political participation, universities need to consider behaviors beyond voting. Inspection of existing assessments of political participation can inform the kind of behaviors to include. The creation of our own assessment shown in Figure 4 was informed by a review of the political participation items on the Political Engagement Project Survey (Beaumont et al., 2006), the Social Activism and Civic Engagement modules from the National Survey of Student Engagement (http://nsse.indiana.edu/), the National Civic and Political Health Survey (Lopez et al., 2006; this survey largely replicated one designed by Keeter, Zukin, Andolina, & Jenkins, 2002), and the Activism Orientation Scale (Corning & Myers, 2002; 2013). To minimize overreporting, we used both face-saving response options and instructions normalizing inactivity. Because research indicates vague response options like “rarely” and “always” are problematic (e.g., Schaeffer, 1991), we provided a time frame and frequency in the response options (e.g., I did this within the last 12 months once) when possible.

The results for each item for 1,016 incoming first-year students collected in August 2018 are shown in Figure 5. For 15 of the 21 items, 75% or more students report having never engaged in the activity. The most common activity for incoming first-year students during their year prior to starting college was non-political community service or volunteer work. The majority of students
reported (62%) participating in this activity during the previous year and one in five students participated quite frequently. About 40% of students reported boycotting or boycotting and 1 in 3 promoted a cause through social media or took part in a protest, march, or demonstration.

Absent from the set of political participation items in Figure 4 are two important behaviors: making an effort to stay informed about political issues and discussing political issues. Items assessing these behaviors exist on the JMU-PES3, but because engagement in these activities can be more frequent than those in Figure 4, we felt a different response scale was needed. The specific items we developed for these activities are shown in Figure 6. The response options capture the frequency of engaging in the behaviors in a given week and items are differentiated by whether the issue was at the local/community, state, national, or international/global level. Other CE assessments also include items addressing respondents’ frequency of staying informed and discussing issues (e.g., Political Engagement Project survey, Beaumont et al., 2006; the Civic Engagement module from the National Survey of Student Engagement, http://nsse.indiana.edu/).

Results for the items in Figure 6 based on the sample of incoming first-year students in August 2018 are shown in Figure 7. The most common response selected for this set of items was “once a month or less” (38%-64%), followed by “1-3 times per week” (19%-33%). The more extreme responses of “4-6” times per week” and “never” were selected by 5% to 26% of students, depending on the item. Students report staying informed about and discussing national and international issues somewhat more than state and local issues. For students who engage with national and international issues on at least a weekly basis, somewhat more report they stay informed about issues than discussed issues. The same discrepancy was not found for students who engage with state and local issues on at least a weekly basis.

One of the challenges in analyzing responses to our political participation assessment is how best to summarize the information. Reporting the percentage of students who endorse each response category for each item (as in Figure 5) yields a substantial amount of information and doesn’t capture similarities in responses across items. To simplify the presentation, items assessing similar activities could be grouped and/or respondents yielding similar patterns of responses across items could be grouped. Such approaches have been adopted in other studies (Brunton-Smith, 2011; Keeter et al., 2002; Lopez et al., 2006; Zukin et al., 2006) and we are currently investigating applying similar approaches with the JMU-PES3 items.

**Other Questions about Political Activity**

This paper focused on considerations in assessing college student participation in various political activities. In essence, we reviewed issues to consider when asking college students: “Did you participate in the activity?” Of course, students could be asked this question (shown as Question 1 below) and many others, including:

1) Did you participate in the activity (self-reported behavior)
2) Do you know what the activity is? (knowledge)
3) Are you likely to do the activity in the future? (intentions)
4) How important do you feel it is for you personally to do the activity? (identity)
5) How central is it to your sense of self to do the activity? (agency)
6) Do you have the skill/knowledge to do the activity? (self-efficacy)
7) Do you feel confident in your ability to do the activity? (self-efficacy)
8) Do you think the activity is an effective means by which to address social/political issues? (effectiveness)

Question 2 assesses whether the student understands the activity. This information might be important if assessing programs where knowledge of political activities are an important learning outcome. Acquiring the answer to Question 2 is also important to ensure students understand the terminology used in assessments asking about their participation in these behaviors (e.g., Question 1). Question 3 assesses intentions, not actual behavior. As aforementioned, researchers using items like Question 3 should keep in mind that the measurement of intentions may yield inflated rates of participation for voting and other political behaviors (Persson & Solevid, 2014). Questions 4-7 address students’ political agency, identity, and self-efficacy. Question 8 addresses students’ perceptions about whether an activity is effective in influencing political decisions and outcomes.

As this list of 8 questions demonstrate, the assessment of political activity in college students goes beyond just measuring whether or not they engaged in an activity. Depending on the program being assessed, it may also entail assessing their knowledge of the activity, their confidence in completing the activity, how important they believe it is to do the activity, or how effective they perceive the activity to be in changing policies. For civic engagement programs where political activity is a desired outcome, it might be useful to review the list of 8 questions to consider how the program addresses political activities. For instance, does the program help students learn about the activity or feel more confident about doing the activity? Answer to these questions will help to articulate the learning and developmental outcomes of programs and guide their assessment.

Even if engaging in political activity is considered the ultimate outcome of a program, it may still be worthwhile to collect a wider array of variables, including political self-efficacy, knowledge, agency, and interest. Such variables may help understand what factors are associated with college students’ political participation. Theories of civic engagement and development (e.g., Metzger & Smetana, 2010) can inform which variables beyond political participation to collect and in an ideal situation, would serve as the foundation for CE programs. Even if programs are developed absent of theory, we encourage the use of theory and previous research to guide assessment so that we may more comprehensively how the college student experience helps transform students into citizens.

---

3 We currently include items from the Political Engagement Project survey (Beaumont et al., 2006) on the JMU-PES3 to assess these perceptions, but they are presented in a more general context, not in reference to specific political activities. For instance, one item on the political self-efficacy scale is “I consider myself well qualified to participate in the political process.” If the same question were asked about each political activity, it would allow us to understand if political self-efficacy differs or is stable across activities. Of course, the advantages of obtaining such information would have to be weighed against practical concerns, such as increasing the length of the assessment.

4 Also included on the JMU-PES3 are items from the Political Engagement Project survey that assess student’s perceptions of the effectiveness of 10 different political activities.


Voting behavior items on James Madison University’s Political Engagement Scale version 3 (JMU-PES3)

Use the following response scale to indicate your involvement with elections during the past year.

A. There were NO elections of this type this past year
B. There was an election of this type, but I was NOT eligible to vote
C. There was an election of this type, I was eligible to vote, but I did NOT register to vote
D. There was an election of this type, I was eligible to vote, I registered to vote, but I did NOT vote
E. There was an election of this type, I was eligible to vote, I registered to vote, and I voted

1. Local and state elections
2. National (Congressional and Presidential) elections

Branching of voting behavior items on James Madison University’s Political Engagement Scale version 3 (JMU-PES3)

1a. During the past year, was there a local/state election?
   No → End survey
   Yes → 2a. During the past year, was there a national (Congressional and Presidential) election?
   No → 1b. Were you eligible to vote this past year in the national election?
       No → End survey
       Yes → 1c. Were you registered to vote this past year in the national election?
           No → End survey
           Yes → 1d. Did you vote this past year in the national election?
               No → End survey
               Yes → 1b. Were you eligible to vote this past year in the local/state election?
                   No → End survey
                   Yes → 1c. Were you registered to vote this past year in the local/state election?
                       No → End survey
                       Yes → 1d. Did you vote this past year in the local/state election?
                           No → End survey
                           Yes → End survey
Figure 3
Voting information for Fall 2018 incoming first-years in the local/state elections in November 2017
Figure 4

Political engagement items on James Madison University’s Political Engagement Scale version 3 (JMU-PES3)

Many people feel that they have little time to get engaged in societal and political issues. Have you been able to do any of the following things in the last 12 months and if so, how often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ve never done this</td>
<td>I’ve done this, but not within last 12 months</td>
<td>I did this within the last 12 months once</td>
<td>I did this within the last 12 months a handful of times</td>
<td>I did this within the last 12 months quite frequently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Work with a political group or volunteer for a campaign
2. Work as a canvasser for a political candidate or cause (going door to door, making phone calls, distributing materials)
3. Attend political meetings, rallies, speeches, or dinners in support of a particular candidate
4. Give money to a political candidate or cause
5. Contact or visit a public official - at any level of government - to ask for assistance or express your opinion
6. Contact a newspaper or magazine to express your opinion on an issue
7. Call into a radio or television talk show to express your opinion on a political issue
8. Wear a campaign button, put a sticker on your car, or place a sign in your house, apartment, or dorm
9. Promote a political or social cause via social media (e.g., facebook, twitter)
10. Write an editorial, blog, or thought piece to promote a political or social cause
11. Distribute material (e.g., brochures, pamphlets, stickers) to promote a political or social cause
12. Take part in a protest, march, or demonstration
13. NOT buy something or boycott it because of conditions under which the product is made, or because you dislike the conduct of the company that produces it
14. Buy a certain product or service because you like the social or political values of the company that produces or provides it
15. Participate in an activity for a cause that puts you at risk for disciplinary action (e.g., arrest, detainment, fines)
16. Join or originate written, e-mail, or online petitions about a political or social issue
17. Attend meetings of town or city government
18. Create a plan and organize others to address a social or political issue
19. Participate in community service or volunteer activities as a mechanism for taking political action
20. Participate in community service or volunteer activities for generally non-political organizations or programs
21. Deliberate acts of protest voting (e.g., spoiling the ballot, marking nothing on the ballot, selecting a “none of the above” or “blank vote” option)
**Figure 5**

*Results from the political participation items (Figure 3) on the James Madison University’s Political Engagement Scale version 3 (JMU-PES3)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>I have done this within past 12 mos. quite frequently</th>
<th>I have done this within past 12 mos. once or a handful of times</th>
<th>I have done this, but not within past 12 mos.</th>
<th>I have never done this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participate in community service/volunteer for non-political organizations/programs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy a certain product or service because you like social/political values of company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT buy something/boycott it</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote a political or social cause via social media (e.g., facebook, twitter)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take part in a protest, march, or demonstration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear a campaign button, sticker on your car, place a sign in your house/apart/dorm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend political meetings, rallies, speeches, or dinners in support of a particular candidate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in community service/volunteer activities to take political action</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join or originate written, e-mail, or online petitions about a political or social issue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with a political group or volunteer for a campaign</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in an activity for a cause that puts you at risk for disciplinary action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact or visit a public official to ask for assistance/express opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend meetings of town or city government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute material to promote a political or social cause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a plan and organize others to address a social or political issue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give money to a political candidate or cause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write an editorial, blog, or thought piece to promote a political or social cause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work as a canvasser for a political candidate or cause</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact a newspaper or magazine to express your opinion on an issue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate acts of protest voting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call into a radio or television talk show to express your opinion on a political issue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Some of the response options were combined to simplify the presentation of results.
Additional political participation items on James Madison University’s Political Engagement Scale version 3 (JMU-PES3)

Some people seem to follow what’s going on in government and public affairs most of the time, whether there’s an election going on or not. Others aren’t that interested. Consider the last 12 months and use the response scale below to convey how often you follow and discuss what’s going on in government and public affairs.

1. Made an effort to stay informed about local/community political issues
2. Made an effort to stay informed about state political issues
3. Made an effort to stay informed about national political issues
4. Made an effort to stay informed about international/global political issues
5. Discussed local/community political issues with friends, family, or coworkers in person or online
6. Discussed state political issues with friends, family, or coworkers in person or online
7. Discussed national political issues with friends, family, or coworkers in person or online
8. Discussed international/global political issues with friends, family, or coworkers in person or online

Results from the additional political participation items (Figure 5) on James Madison University’s Political Engagement Scale version 3 (JMU-PES3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4-7 times per week</th>
<th>1-3 times per week</th>
<th>Once a month or less</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay Informed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss with Others</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International/Global issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay Informed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss with Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay Informed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss with Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/community issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay Informed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss with Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Some of the response options were combined to simplify the presentation of results.