

2015

Consortium for Inter-  
Campus SoTL  
Research  
National Survey of  
Student Leaders

Arkansas Tech University Report



## Preface

Thank you for participating in the Consortium for Inter-Campus SoTL Research's inaugural project, the National Survey of Student Leaders. In appreciation of your efforts, we are providing the following summary report of student responses on your campus. We have also provided a similar summary of our overall findings – so that you can compare your own campus to broader patterns in campus life across the country. We hope that you will find these materials a useful benchmark for assessing the structure of student life on your campus.

This inaugural project was also designed to test the feasibility of sustaining a consortium dedicated to cross-campus collection of data assessing the effectiveness of our pedagogy and civic engagement efforts. Your willingness to participate in a successful project has not only confirmed that the Consortium for Inter-Campus SoTL Research can effectively facilitate such projects, but has helped to identify ways to improve Consortium procedures for future endeavors. Moving forward, the Consortium will be an important resource for teacher-scholars and administrators committed to advancing multi-campus research on teaching and learning. Hence we also hope that you will consider participating in upcoming Consortium projects and that you will consider submitting a proposed project for review when the Consortium completes its second planned pilot project and issues its first call for proposals.

To learn more about the Consortium, please visit our website: <http://tinyurl.com/Inter-Campus-SoTL>.

Sincerely,

J. Cherie Strachan & Elizabeth A. Bennion

Elizabeth A. Bennion  
Professor of Political Science  
Indiana University South Bend  
[ebennion@iusb.edu](mailto:ebennion@iusb.edu)

J. Cherie Strachan  
Professor of Political Science  
Central Michigan University  
[strac1jc@cmich.edu](mailto:strac1jc@cmich.edu)



INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
SOUTH BEND



College of  
Humanities & Social  
& Behavioral Sciences

Department of Political Science  
and Public Administration

## Contents

### Preface

### Introduction

### Arkansas Tech University Response Rate

### Demographic Information

- Table 1: Student Officers' Class Status
- Table 2: Student Officers' Gender
- Table 3: Student Officers' Age
- Table 4: Student Officers with International Status
- Table 5: Student Officers' Racial/Ethnic Identity

### Purpose of Organizations

- Table 6: Organizations' Purpose
- Table 7: Organizations' Most Important Function
- Table 8: Organizations' Intended Student Members
- Table 9: SGA Participation

### Basic Membership Information

### Elected and Appointed Executive Positions

### Federated Structure

- Table 10: Organizations with Federated Structures
- Table 11: Students Coordinating Activities with State Chapters
- Table 12: Students Coordinating Activities with National Chapters
- Table 13: Delegate Activities at State and National Conventions

### On-Campus Organizational Activities and Group Decision-Making Styles

- Table 14: Frequency of Organizational Activities
- Table 15: Frequency of Democratic Decision-Making Practices

### Perceptions of Organizational Influence

- Table 16: Groups Influencing Policies
- Table 17: Groups Undertaking Effective Volunteerism
- Table 18: Groups Coordinating Activities with Other Groups
- Table 19: Groups Influencing Others' Social Values and Lifestyle Choices

### Bridging and Bonding Social Capital

- Table 20: Indicators of Bonding Social Capital
- Table 21: Indicators of Bridging Social Capital

### **Diversity in Group Membership**

Table 22: Student Officers' Estimated Levels of Diversity in Group Composition

Table 23: Student Officers Desiring a "Greater Mix" of Diversity

Table 24: Student Officers Claiming to Have At Least One Member from Each Ethnic Group

Table 25: Student Officers Claiming to Have At Least One Member from Each Economic Class

Table 26: Formal Promotion of Diversity within Organizations

### **Requests for Assistance**

Table 27: Student Officers' Requests for Assistance

### **Political Interest, Participation and Efficacy**

Table 28: Student Officers' Trust in Others

Table 29: Student Officers' Political Interest

Table 30: Student Officers' Levels of Political Efficacy

Table 31: Student Officers' Likelihood of Participating in Political Acts

### **Conclusion**

### **Afterward**

### **Bibliography**

### **Appendix A: Open-Ended Comments**

### **Appendix B: National Data**

## Introduction

Many scholars and policy makers have been calling for higher education institutions to cultivate healthy civic and political engagement among current college students. Such calls (Bok 2006; Boyer 1987; Carnegie Corporation of New York 2003; Colby et al. 2003; Colby et al. 2007; Ehrlich et al. 2000; Galston 2001) were initially triggered by young citizens' seeming withdrawal from participation in public life, accompanied by poor youth turnout at the polls and a declining interest in politics overall. The rejection of explicitly political participation hit historic lows throughout the 1990s and early 2000s (Wattenberg 2012; Zukin et al. 2006). Elinor Ostrom, president of the American Political Science Association in the mid-1990s, responded to these patterns by calling for a renewed commitment to civic education within the discipline. She established the APSA Task Force on Civic Education (1998, p. 636). After considering the issue, members of this committee concluded that "levels of political knowledge, political engagement and political enthusiasm are so low as to threaten the vitality and stability of democratic politics in the United States."

Our students' rejection of the most traditional means of civic and political participation occurred despite the civic engagement movement's success in establishing service-learning experiences on campuses, increasing young people's concern about pressing public issues and increasing overall rates of youth volunteerism (Strachan 2015). Indeed, some observers have found the patterns described above reassuring because they think volunteerism and interest will eventually lead to more proactive civic and political engagement (Dalton 2008). Others, however, are deeply concerned that young Americans now seem to purposefully avoid more traditional means of civic and political collective action, turning to face-to-face volunteerism to address their public concerns instead. Young people are also apt to exchange traditional means of participation for political consumerism (which involves both boycotting and 'buy-cotting' products), but this form of collective action is designed to change business practices rather than government policies (Zukin et al. 2006). Critics are concerned that while volunteerism and political consumerism *are valuable in and of themselves*, robust democracies also require more purposeful civic and political efforts to influence public choices. In short, the concern is that volunteering can supplement activities (e.g. community problem solving, coordinated collective action, and voting) that are purposefully undertaken to change public policies and practices, but cannot entirely replace them. One of the most explicit critics of civic education and political socialization on college campuses (Boyte 1991, p. 765) has warned that college "appears to leave students without concepts or language to explore what is political about their lives." His fears seemed confirmed when more than half of graduating college seniors reported in the NSSE that their college experience had little or no effect on their plans to vote in the future (Kuh and Umbach 2004). Indeed, scholars have been surprised that increasing access to college education, an experience historically linked to higher levels of both civic and political engagement, has not been enough to counteract the generational decline in Americans' participation in public life (Putnam 2000).

Although today's youth are still far less likely to participate in civil society than their parents or grandparents were (CIRCLE 2011), targeted mobilization of young citizens in Obama's 2008 and 2012 campaigns helped to reverse the trend of low voter turnout patterns. Concerned scholars and pundits experienced a temporary respite – only to realize that this heightened interest in politics and voting was contextual. As many nationwide public opinion polls, as well as voter turnout in the most recent midterm, special, and primary elections, all indicate paying attention to current events, joining

community organizations, and turning out at the polls have not become ingrained habits for the youngest generation of American citizens (Harward and Shea 2013, pp. 22–4).

Given that early levels of civic and political interest/participation help to predict long-term adult engagement, it is increasingly important to identify effective ways to provide young people with these types of experiences. Professors who respond to such concerns are likely to focus on the substantive content of their courses as a way to shape student awareness of their civic and political obligations. Such efforts make considerable sense, as academics have a great deal of control over their classrooms, but often have very little say about what happens elsewhere on campus. Yet political scientists have long known that participation in civil society (i.e. clubs and voluntary associations) is one of the best predictors of long-term adult civic and political participation – but only when clubs and organizations are structured in ways that build students’ civic and political skills, efficacy and identities. Further, some organizations (i.e. those that facilitate interaction with diverse others) are much better at cultivating the broad trust in others and inclusive definitions of citizenship required to sustain democracy in a multi-cultural country like the United States. Other groups (that primarily facilitate interaction among those who are very similar) may actually undermine these desired outcomes. Even social scientists who understand the strong connection between associational life and healthy democracy, however, have done very little to study the structure of civil society on our very own campuses. Hence the National Survey of Student Leaders is the first attempt to systematically assess the quality of the learning experiences and political socialization that clubs and organizations provide on campuses across the United States.

The information provided in this report will help to establish a base-line assessment of the status of civil society on your own campus. In addition to providing summary statistics, we offer some suggestions for using the information to draw conclusions about whether current student life practices reflect robust civic and political learning experiences for your students. Some of these insights can only be inferred from understanding the specific context of your college campus. For example, we cannot expect high rates of ethnic/racial diversity within student groups on campuses where the student body is predominantly white. In short, campus context must be taken into consideration.

In addition, your familiarity with your own campus will likely help you to identify “pockets” of student organizations that are providing robust civic and political socialization to members – even in those cases where the summary statistics provided below do not appear robust. We would suggest that you use this familiarity to find ways to bolster these practices on campuses, so that even more students can benefit from such experiences.

### **Arkansas Tech University Response Rate**

We sent an invitation to participate to 98 of the presidents of student organizations on your campus, and 31 responded. When the student president for an organization did not respond after three prompts, we followed up by sending the questionnaire to secondary contacts, who were typically vice presidents or treasurers. After an additional three prompts to secondary contacts, another 11 officers on your campus responded, bringing your campus response rate up to 42.8%. Given that responses to internet questionnaires tend to be lower than other means of conducting survey research, this response rate is somewhat higher than expected for this type of survey research.

### Demographic Information

The questionnaire asked student organization officers on your campus to provide information about their basic demographic traits. The proportion of those in each demographic group serving as student life officers should roughly reflect each group’s proportion of the student body on your campus, with the exception of class status – where we may well expect to see more experienced students stepping into leadership positions. If any particular demographic group is under-represented, it may indicate that members of that group have fewer campus leadership opportunities than other types of students.

Your student officers’ class status is summarized below.

Table 1  
Student Officers’ Class Status

	Percentage
Freshman	2.6
Sophomore	5.1
Junior	30.8
Senior	61.5
Graduate	--

N = 39

The gender of your student officers is summarized below.

Table 2  
Student Officers’ Gender

	Percentage
Male	41.5
Female	58.5
Other	--

N = 41

The percentage of traditional and non-traditional student officers is summarized below. Meanwhile, the average age of student officers on your campus was 21.7 and ranged from a low of 19 to a high of 28.

Table 3  
Student Officers’ Age

	Percentage
Traditional (18-24)	87.5
Non-Traditional (Over 24)	12.5

N= 40

The percentage of international student officers on your campus is summarized below.

Table 4  
Student Officers with International Status

	Percentage
American	92.7
International	7.3

N = 41

Finally, your student officers' racial and ethnic identity is summarized below.

Table 5  
Student Officers' Racial/Ethnic Identity

	Percentage
White/Non-Hispanic	80.5
Black/African American	4.9
Hispanic or Latino	2.4
Asian or Asian American	7.3
Native American	--
Pacific Islander	--
Middle Eastern	--
Multi-Racial or Ethnic	2.4

N = 41

Again, if the percentage of students in each demographic category is not similar to their share of your student body composition, you may need to consider finding creative ways to engage these types of students in leadership opportunities.

### **Purpose of Organizations**

Participation in student life is linked to increased persistence and improved academic performance, especially among students who are at high-risk for dropping out of college (Pascarella and Terenzini 2005). Hence it is important to have a wide array of different types of groups that will appeal to a diverse student body. At least some campus groups, for example, should be dedicated to serving members from minority and marginalized groups, as these organizations provide a "safe space" for these students to gather (Fisher 2007). A rich array of different kinds of student groups is also a sign of healthy civic and political socialization, as overlapping memberships and activities that cut across groups help to promote interaction with diverse others. Such cross-cutting interactions should help students develop an inclusive definition of citizenship, and cultivate generalized trust in others (bridging social capital) in addition to trust in those similar to oneself (bonding social capital).

Similar to the overall nature of associational life in broader society, many student organizations are likely established to serve recreational (such as intramural sports and hobbies) or professional (such as career growth or mentoring) interests (Putnam 2000). Yet at least some organizations on campus should



have overtly civic and political agendas, to help students learn to connect the organizing skills they gain to the ability to influence public decision-making (Skocpol 2003). Responses to the following questions should provide insight into the array of groups on your campus, as well as whether some are providing explicit opportunities for civic and political leadership.

Student officers on your campus were asked to select the category that best described the purpose of their organization. (Please note, some campuses included residence hall associations and varsity sports among their list of registered organizations. Hence even though these types of campus units are often not categorized as student clubs, they are included on the list below). Responses are summarized below.

Table 6  
 Organizations' Purpose

	Percentage
Honors Society (ex: Pi Sigma Alpha)	2.5
Academic (ex: Spanish Club, Sociology Club)	22.5
Residence Halls Council (ex: groups that set policies in residence halls)	2.5
Intramural Sports (ex: Soccer Club, Intramural Basketball)	2.5
Varsity Sports (ex: university or college athletic teams)	--
Greek Fraternity or Sorority (ex: Delta Delta Delta, Sigma Tau)	10.0
Cultural/Ethnic (ex: Black Student Union)	5.0
GLBTQ (ex: Gay-Straight Alliance)	2.5
Religious/Spiritual (ex: Campus Bible Fellowship, Muslim Student Association, Hillel)	2.5
Service (ex: Alternative Spring Breaks, Habitat for Humanity)	15.0
Professional (ex: Public Relations Student Society of America)	15.0
Political (ex: College Democrats, Young Republicans, Young Americans for Freedom)	2.5
Special Interest (ex: Students for Life, Environmental Club)	10.0
Other	7.5

N = 40

In a similar question, we asked these student officers to identify their organization's most important function. Student officers on your campus prioritized the following functions for their organizations.

Table 7  
Organizations' Most Important Function

	Percentage
Help student to be successful in class	20.6
Help students prepare for a career or internship	20.6
Provide a religious or spiritual community	2.9
Sponsor social activities (dances, movies, etc.)	8.8
Provide opportunities to play a sport	2.9
Encourage volunteering in the community	23.5
Encourage political participation	2.9
Celebrate a common heritage of ethnic identity	5.9
Bring attention to an important issue in society	11.8

N = 34

Student officers were also asked to indicate the type of student members their organizations were intended to serve. While most student organizations enroll all types of students on campus, some are created to specifically serve the needs of particular demographic groups on campus. As indicated above, robust civil society will include a mix of both types of organizations. If your campus has a substantial minority population on campus, it may be of concern if none of the groups on campus provide them with a comfort zone on campus.

Table 8  
Organizations' Intended Student Members

	Percentage
All Students	67.5
Male Students	5.0
Female Students	7.5
GLBTQ Students	2.5
Students who identify with a specific racial, ethnic, or cultural group	2.5
Other	15.0

N = 40

On some campuses, student officers from certain types of groups automatically serve as representatives in the student government association. This practice provides student officers with experiences that provide more explicit political socialization, even if their student club or group is not overtly political. The percentage of student officers on your campus reporting such participation is summarized below.

Table 9  
SGA Participation

	Percentage
Yes	17.5
No	82.5

N= 40

In summary, the information described above should confirm that students groups on your campus serve the diverse array of student interests on your campus, with ample opportunities for participation that provides not only recreational activities, but also civic and political experiences.

### Basic Membership Information

Critics of campus life have expressed concern that student groups, reflecting deeper trends in associational life, are becoming “check-book” organizations, where students pay membership dues, but have little opportunity to participate in organizational decision-making (Levine and Cureton 1998; Skocpol 2003). In addition, they fear that student groups increasingly serve narrow demographic groups and interests, with fewer organizations capable of bringing students together in collective action across campus and beyond (Levine and Cureton 1998). Responses to the following questions should help to provide insight into whether these patterns have taken root on your campus.

Student officers were asked to report the number of members who regularly participate in organizational activities. On your campus, this number ranged from 0 to 120, with an average of 33.5 active members. According to respondents, these active members participated an average of 10.5 hours each month, with estimates ranging from 2 to 45 hours.

In comparison, student officers reported that the overall number of members (both active and inactive) ranged from 3 to 230, with an average of 38.1 nominal members.

Finally, respondents were asked to report the total number of students (beyond members) that they thought that they could mobilize across the entire campus. This estimate ranged from 4 to 300, with an average of 37.2 students.

Ideally, students on your campus should be actively engaged in organizational activities, and at least some student groups on your campus should be able to mobilize a substantial portion of the student body to engage in collective action in pursuit of an over-arching goal or in support of a popular cause.

### Elected and Appointed Executive Positions

Organizations that hold elections and have multiple executive positions provide democratic learning opportunities for more students. Student officers were asked to indicate the number of executive positions within their organizations, how frequently they turn over and whether they are elected or appointed. With the exception of 2 groups, all the student officers on your campus indicated that their

groups had at least 4 positions on their executive boards, and these positions almost always (from 95% to 97% of the time) turn over every year. Meanwhile, 80.6% of respondents indicated that these executive positions were elected by the full members, 13.9% indicated that they were appointed by group leaders or a faculty advisor, and 5.6% indicated that their group relied on a combination of elections and appointments to select group leaders.

### Federated Structure

Scholars of American associational life argue that a federated structure (with national, state and local chapters) provide civic organizations with improved ability to influence policies across geographic boundaries. They can, for example, influence policies across an entire state or promote similar policies in multiple states, as well as coordinating efforts to shape national policies. This ability bolsters civic and political efficacy, connecting members to persuasive efforts that extend beyond their local communities (Skocpol 2003). The following questions reveal whether any groups on your campus have a federated structure, as well as whether student delegates from your campus chapter actively participate in setting these organizations’ policies and priorities at the state and/or national level.

Table 10  
Organizations with Federated Structures

	Percentage
Affiliated with a State Organization	2.8
Affiliated with a National Organization	30.6
Affiliated with Both	13.9
Not linked to a State/National Organization	52.8

N = 36

Even with a federated structure, it is possible that these organizations function primarily as “check-book” organizations, with little opportunity for participation. Hence the officers with a federated structure were asked to summarize members’ active participation within these groups.

Table 11  
Students Coordinating Activities with State Chapters

	Percentage
A Few Times a Semester	16.7
Once a Semester	50.0
Once a Year	16.7
Less than Once a Year	16.7

N = 6

Table 12  
Students Coordinating Activities with National Chapters

	Percentage
A Few Times a Semester	18.8
Once a Semester	18.8
Once a Year	50.0
Less than Once a Year	12.5

N = 16

In addition, the officers serving these federated organizations often indicated that student delegates attended state and national conventions, where some had the opportunity to participate in the following activities.

Table 13  
Delegate Activities at State and National Conventions

	Percentage	N
Delegates help to develop policy for the entire organization	72.7	11
Delegates participate in deliberation at convention meetings	81.8	11
Delegates use parliamentary procedure at convention meetings	63.6	11
Delegates have the opportunity to vote on policy positions at convention meetings	81.8	11

A high proportion of organizations with a federated structure on campus suggests that student members may gain heightened levels of civic and political efficacy, especially if delegates from their campus chapter not only coordinate activities across geographic boundaries, but also if they send delegates to state and/or national conventions, where they have the opportunity to influence organizational policies and priorities.

### **On-Campus Organizational Activities and Group Decision-Making Styles**

To serve as a mechanism of political socialization, organizations must meet and undertake activities on a regular basis. Prior studies of civil society indicate that average Americans used to attend organizational meetings and functions quite regularly. These activities provided basic civic skills, such as using by-laws and constitutions to structure choices and engaging in deliberative decision-making in formal public settings. They also provided civic leaders with the opportunity to cultivate common civic identities by celebrating organizational values and priorities in ceremonies, speeches, and written material. The following summary reveals the extent to which student groups on your campus are engaging in these types of activities. The following table summarizes the frequency with which organizations on your campus undertake these types of activities.

Table 14  
Frequency of Organizational Activities

	Less than 1X/ Year or Never	1X/ Year	1X/ Semester	2X/ Semester	1X/ Month	2X/ Month	1/Week or More	N
Held a meeting open to all members	2.9	--	--	5.9	20.6	26.5	44.1	34
Required the membership to cast a vote	5.9	26.5	8.8	14.7	20.6	8.8	14.7	34
Held a meeting of the executive board	8.8	2.9	5.9	8.8	20.6	11.8	41.2	34
Assigned important tasks to a committee or subcommittee	8.8	5.9	11.8	8.8	17.6	29.4	17.6	34
Sponsored or co-sponsored an educational event or program	14.7	2.9	29.4	29.4	14.7	8.8	--	33
Sponsored or co-sponsored a social activity	36.4	12.1	21.2	12.1	15.2	3.0	--	34
Sponsored or co-sponsored a fundraising event for charity	32.4	11.8	26.5	14.7	14.7	--	--	34
Sponsored or co-sponsored a fundraising event for the group	23.5	14.7	29.4	23.5	5.9	2.9	--	34
Held a ceremonial ritual or event	61.8	8.8	14.7	5.9	8.8	--	--	34
Gave speeches that explain the group's values and priorities	23.5	8.8	41.2	8.8	14.7	2.9	--	34
Distributed materials that explain the group's values and priorities	26.5	8.8	29.4	17.7	11.8	5.9	--	34

Simply attending meetings and sponsoring events, however, is not enough to hone civic and political skills and to cultivate civic identity. Scholars argue that internal organizational dynamics matter a great

deal. Groups that mimic formal, deliberative decision-making procedures provide better training in a very important set of civic and political skills. The following table reveals the extent to which groups on your campus engage in various types of decision-making.

Table 15  
Frequency of Democratic Decision-Making Practices

	Less than 1X/ Year or Never	1X/ Year	1X/ Semester	2X/ Semester	1X/ Month	2X/ Month	1/Week or More	N
Referring to constitution or by-laws to guide decision-making	17.6	20.6	23.5	8.8	11.8	5.9	11.8	34
Engaging the full membership in deliberations	18.2	6.1	6.1	12.1	18.2	18.2	21.2	33
Relying on the group's executive board	11.8	2.9	2.9	8.8	23.5	17.6	32.4	34
Using formal rules to guide discussions	50.0	5.9	2.9	2.9	11.8	2.9	23.5	34
Negotiating compromise among members who disagree	20.6	17.6	5.9	2.9	26.5	11.8	14.7	34
Relying on a faculty advisor	11.8	8.8	20.6	14.7	14.6	14.7	11.8	34

Not all of the groups on your campus will have high activity levels, nor will they all rely heavily on democratic decision-making. Some may rely on the advice of a faculty advisor or the decisions of an executive board more than they do on more engaged decision-making practices. Yet at least some should be providing robust learning experiences by providing an opportunity for members to engage in group discussion, deliberation, and decision-making. If the patterns presented in the tables above do not support this conclusion, you may need to provide additional mentoring or professional development workshops to encourage student members to deliberate.

### Perceptions of Organizational Influence

Scholars suspect that undertaking the types of activities and deliberative decision-making described above not only builds civic and political skills, but also bolsters self-efficacy or confidence in the ability to successfully undertake them. When members learn that their collective endeavors yield results, they can more easily imagine undertaking similar efforts in the future. Such efficacy is enhanced when their organizational activities stretch across geographic boundaries (Skocpol 2003). Hence student officers

CONSORTIUM FOR INTER-CAMPUS SOTL RESEARCH  
NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT LEADERS

were asked a series of questions intended to measure perceptions of their organizations' influence. They were asked to assess whether their organizations had successfully attempted to influence policies on campus, in the local community, or at the state/national level. They were also asked to assess whether their groups had undertaken successful volunteer efforts and persuasive social values/lifestyle campaigns at each of these levels, as well as whether their efforts required them to coordinate activities with other groups at each of these levels. Their responses are summarized in the tables below.

Table 16  
Groups Influencing Policies

	A Few Times/ Semester	1X/ Semester	1X/ Year	Less than 1X/ Year	N
On your campus	12.5	12.5	25.0	50.0	32
In your town or community	--	6.5	6.5	87.1	31
In your state or across the country	--	3.1	6.3	90.6	32
In more than one country or across the globe	--	--	6.3	93.8	32

Table 17  
Groups Undertaking Effective Volunteerism

	A Few Times/ Semester	1X/ Semester	1X/ Year	Less than 1X/ Year	N
On your campus	50.0	25.0	12.5	12.5	32
In your town or community	50.0	21.9	12.5	15.6	32
In your state or across the country	3.1	9.4	25.0	62.5	32
In more than one country or across the globe	--	--	6.3	93.8	32

Table 18  
Groups Coordinating Activities with Other Groups

	A Few Times/ Semester	1X/ Semester	1X/ Year	Less than 1X/ Year	N
On your campus	36.7	26.7	16.7	20.0	30
In your town or community	23.3	33.3	13.3	30.0	30
In your state or across the country	--	20.0	13.3	66.7	30
In more than one country or across the globe	--	--	3.3	96.7	30

Table 19  
Groups Influencing Others' Social Values and Life-Style Choices

	A Few Times/ Semester	1X/ Semester	1X/ Year	Less than 1X/ Year	N
On your campus	36.7	26.7	16.7	20.0	30
In your town or community	23.3	33.3	13.3	30.0	30
In your state or across the country	--	20.0	13.3	66.7	30
In more than one country or across the globe	--	--	3.3	96.7	30



The more frequently student officers indicate that their groups influence policies and social values, undertake effective volunteerism, and coordinate efforts with other groups – especially when these activities stretch across geographic boundaries – the more likely members are to feel confident undertaking the same types of activities for civic and political purposes in the future. Again, if the responses reported above indicate low levels of such activities among campus groups, you may consider providing additional mentoring, networking, or professional development workshops to enhance group members’ experiences.

### **Bridging and Bonding Social Capital**

Participating in associational life provides two types of beneficial side effects, often described as bonding and bridging social capital. Both refer to trust in others. Bonding social capital, however, provides members with a strong identity that emerges from participating in a close-knit community (Putnam 2000; Campbell 2006). Because members interact regularly, they learn that they can trust and rely upon one another. What is more, they develop a shared set of values and norms. Obviously, these outcomes are overwhelmingly helpful to the members of such close-knit groups. Even so, social scientists sometimes view bonding social capital with suspicion because it can also encourage the type of in-group prejudice and disdain for others that can undermine willingness to deliberate with those who are different.

Yet civil society also produces bridging social capital, which refers to trust in diverse others and which occurs when members of a group are dissimilar from one another. It can also occur when groups with different membership composition regularly interact with one another. Members of all the groups learn to trust, respect, and cooperate with those whose values and circumstances are different from their own.

The tables below summarize how strongly your student officers agreed with statements intended to measure the levels of both bridging and bonding social capital being cultivated within their groups.

Table 20  
 Indicators of Bonding Social Capital

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N
Members have a tight bond with one another.	--	3.0	63.6	33.3	33
Members feel obligated to help one another.	--	6.1	57.6	36.4	33
Members trust each other a lot more than they do others.	3.0	15.2	57.6	24.2	33
Members almost always agree with each other about important issues.	--	24.2	66.7	9.1	33
Members share important core values.	--	3.0	54.5	42.4	33

Table 21  
Indicators of Bridging Social Capital

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N
Members regularly interact with other student groups.	3.0	15.2	57.6	24.2	33
Members regularly interact with community groups off campus.	--	15.6	78.1	6.3	32
Members feel obligated to address broad social or political issues.	15.2	45.5	27.3	12.1	33
Members share a respect for differing views within the group.	--	3.0	45.5	51.5	33

Levels of bonding social capital can be important in helping students transition to and perform well in college. Further, it teaches students to cultivate the types of networks that can help them be successful long after they leave campus (Kuh et al 1991). Yet bridging social capital is essential in order for students not only to learn how to participate in a multicultural society, but also to cultivate inclusive definitions of citizenship that sustain liberal democracy in a diverse nation. Healthy campus civil society should cultivate substantial levels of both. If student groups are not working together with students different from themselves, your campus may wish to provide incentives for such cooperation by, for example, tying funding opportunities to activities jointly sponsored by several (diverse) student groups.

### Diversity in Membership Composition

A diverse membership is an additional way that group composition can bolster bridging social capital. In addition, long-standing research on overcoming discrimination indicates that on-going interaction with diverse others, especially in collective endeavors to achieve common goals, is the key to overcoming prejudice toward minority out-groups in society (Allport 1953). In short, group composition in campus civil society can help to bolster levels of bridging social capital, to overcome prejudice against minorities, and to build inclusive definitions of citizenship. Yet these outcomes often do not occur.

Some campuses simply lack enough overall diversity in the student body to sustain adequate interactions across demographic difference. On other campuses, students often prefer to cluster together with similar others in their on-campus groups. The following information should help you to assess whether student life is helping or hindering your own campus goals for diversity education and programming.

First, student officers were asked to assess the level of diversity within their groups on several dimensions of diversity. Their perceptions are summarized below.

Table 22  
Student Officers' Estimated Levels of Diversity in Group Composition

	Pretty Much the Same	Mixed	Very Different	N
Academic Major	48.5	36.4	15.2	33
Race/Ethnicity	36.4	57.6	6.1	33
Gender	21.2	78.8	--	33
Family's Income	6.1	81.8	12.1	33
Religious Affiliation	21.2	66.7	12.1	33
Political Party or Ideology	15.2	72.7	12.1	33

They were also asked to indicate if they would like to see a greater mix of student backgrounds on these same dimensions. Many student officers responded affirmatively, as indicated below.

Table 23  
Student Officers Desiring "Greater Mix" of Diversity

	Percentage	N
Academic Major	36.4	33
Race/Ethnicity	60.6	33
Gender	42.4	33
Family's Income	12.1	33
Religious Affiliation	15.2	33
Political Party or Ideology	21.2	33

Student officers were asked to report if they had at least one active member from each of the following racial and ethnic groups, as well as from each of the following economic classes. The following list summarizes the percentage of student officers who responded affirmatively to each category.

Table 24  
Student Officers Claiming to Have at Least One Member from Each Ethnic Group

	Percentage	N
White/Non-Hispanic	100	32
Hispanic	59.4	32
Black or African American	46.9	32
Asian or Asian American	40.6	32
Native American	21.9	32
Pacific Islander	--	32
Middle Eastern	30.3	33
Multi-Racial or Ethnic	35.5	31

Table 25  
Student Officers Claiming to Have at Least One Member from Each Economic Class

	Percentage	N
Disadvantaged	42.4	33
Middle Class	93.9	33
Wealthy	66.7	33

Finally, student officers were asked to indicate whether their organizations promoted diversity in any of the following ways. The following list summarizes the percentage who responded affirmatively to each activity.

Table 26  
Formal Promotion of Diversity within Organizations

	Percentage	N
A statement on diversity is included in our by-laws or constitution.	70.0	30
Members are strongly encouraged or required to interact with diverse others.	70.0	30
Members with diverse backgrounds are explicitly recruited.	20.0	30
Members are strongly encouraged or required to attend diversity training or workshops.	37.9	29
Members are strongly encouraged or required to attend diversity events and programs.	43.3	30

The patterns summarized above should help you to determine whether student groups on your campus are facilitating the type of interaction among diverse others that can help to cultivate bridging social capital and respect for others in a multi-cultural society. If students officers on your campus seem reluctant to seek out interactions with diverse others, you may consider programming that facilitates interactions across different groups on your campus.

### Requests for Assistance

In addition to providing the assessment of campus associational life provided in the previous sections, it is important to provide students officers with an opportunity to provide insights and suggestions of their own. Hence student officers were asked to indicate whether they would like additional assistance with an array of different group activities. The responses of student officers on your campus are summarized below.

Table 27  
Student Officers' Requests for Assistance

	Percentage	N
Giving speeches	23.3	30
Running executive board meetings	10.0	30
Running meetings of the full membership	6.7	30
Using parliamentary procedure	16.7	30
Helping members to resolve conflicts	20.0	30
Seeking help from a faculty adviser/mentor	6.7	30
Recruiting new members	80.0	30
Attracting members from diverse backgrounds	40.0	30
Planning an event on campus	30.0	30
Coordinating activities with other campus groups	60.0	30
Coordinating activities with groups off campus	43.3	30

Student officers were asked an open-ended question providing them with the opportunity to explain anything else Arkansas Tech University could do to help make their student organizations a success. A copy of their verbatim answers is provided in Appendix A at the end of this document.

Combined, the closed-ended and open-ended answers should provide insight into ways to help student organizations and their executive officers to undertake activities that the students themselves believe are important.

### **Political Interest, Participation and Efficacy**

Finally, while the design of this particular research study does not allow us to establish a direct correlation between members' levels of political interest, participation, and efficacy, it does allow for assessment of these attitudes and behaviors among student officers. The well-established connection between participation in civic life and long-term adult civic and political engagement suggests that those serving in executive positions in campus groups should have elevated levels of social trust and political efficacy, while anticipating higher levels of political participation in the future. Several questions were included on the questionnaire to determine if such speculation about student leaders is accurate for your campus.

Given their likely involvement with their own group, and with other groups on campus, one would expect student leaders to have higher levels of generalized social trust in others. The following table reports how likely student officers were to agree with statements about how much they trust other people.

Table 28  
Student Officers' Trust in Others

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N
Thinking about human nature in general, most people can be trusted.	--	32.3	61.3	6.5	31
Most people will take advantage of you if given the chance.	--	61.3	35.5	3.2	31
Most people try to be helpful when they can.	--	3.2	77.4	19.4	31

Trust in other citizens is a prerequisite for stable, functional democracy (Putnam 2000). Without it, people are unlikely to respect those who disagree with them enough to engage in democratic, deliberative decision-making. They are also unlikely to be willing to enact (or to pay taxes to support) policies that provide benefits to those they deem untrustworthy, and therefore undeserving (Rothstein 2011; Uslaner 2002). Hence it is important that student officers, who are expected to step forward as civic and political leaders, believe that other people can be trusted, at least most of the time, to contribute fairly to the collective endeavors undertaken by a democratic society.

Similarly, if any students on campus are paying attention to political current events, it is likely to be student officers who are more broadly connected to public life through their engagement in associational life. The following table reports student officers' levels of interest in politics.

Table 29  
Student Officers' Political Interest

	Not at All Interested	Somewhat Interested	Strongly Interested	N
State and Local Politics	19.4	51.6	29.0	31
National Politics	22.6	45.2	32.3	31
International Politics	29.0	54.8	16.1	31

If student leaders on your campus are disinterested in politics, it could be useful to help them connect their endeavors to policy outcomes at the campus, local, state, national, and/or global levels. If students, especially student officers, are not making this connection, it seems unlikely that campus civil society is living up to its potential as a source of political socialization for current college students.

Another series of questions were posed in order to measure student officers' levels of internal, external and collective political efficacy, as even interested students who lack these types of efficacy are unlikely to undertake efforts to influence political decisions.

Table 30  
Student Officers' Levels of Political Efficacy

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N
<i>Internal Efficacy</i>					
People like me don't have a say about what government does.	13.3	63.3	20.0	3.3	30
Sometimes politics and government can seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.	13.3	46.7	23.3	16.7	30
I feel that I could do as good a job in public office as most other people.	16.7	30.0	40.0	13.3	30
<i>External Efficacy</i>					
Public officers don't care much what people like me think.	6.7	50.0	33.3	10.0	30
It would be difficult for someone like me to make a real difference in politics or government.	13.3	60.0	20.0	6.7	30
<i>Collective Efficacy</i>					
Politicians respond to citizens if enough people demand change.	3.3	6.7	60.0	30.0	30
Most people are willing to work together toward a common goal.	--	16.7	56.7	26.7	30
If you want to get things done as a citizen, working with others is the best way.	--	6.7	53.3	40.0	30
Dramatic change can occur in this country if people band together and demand it.	--	10.0	60.0	30.0	30
I know how to work with others to change public policies.	3.3	30.0	53.3	13.3	30

Finally, student officers were asked to estimate their likelihood of participating in common political acts in the future. Their anticipated future behavior is summarized below.

Table 31  
Student Officers' Likelihood of Participating in Political Acts

	Not at All Likely	Somewhat Likely	More Likely	Very Likely	N
Work with others to solve community problems	3.2	19.4	54.8	22.6	31
Volunteer regularly for civic organizations	--	16.1	51.6	32.3	31
Vote in national elections	13.3	20.0	10.0	56.7	30
Vote in local elections	16.1	19.4	9.7	54.8	31
Persuade others to vote for a candidate	38.7	19.4	19.4	22.6	31
Work for or donate money to a candidate or party	58.1	25.8	9.7	6.5	31
Contact an elected official	48.4	22.6	19.4	9.7	31
Attend a political rally or protest	48.4	22.6	12.9	16.1	31
Sign a petition about a political issue	16.1	22.6	25.8	35.5	31

While a certain amount of cynicism about politicians and the political process is normal - and can actually motivate people to participate in politics - student officers should have higher levels of political efficacy, as well as higher anticipated levels of political participation than their peers. If student leaders doubt their abilities and do not anticipate participating in politics in the future, it is unlikely that the groups they lead are cultivating these attitudes and behaviors among their members. Hence low scores on these last two charts may indicate that campus administrators and faculty on your campus may need to do more to help students recognize the connection between their organizational activities and the ability to wield influence in the political process.

### Conclusion

The information provided above should help interested administrators and faculty members to establish a base-line assessment of the status of civil society on your campus. Along with these summary statistics, we have drawn from academic literature on the type of learning experiences and civic and political socialization that can occur within voluntary associations to explain why the organizational structures and activities assessed in this preliminary study of campus civil society are important. The tables in Appendix B summarize patterns across all 36 campuses that participated in the Consortium for Inter-Campus SoTL Research's inaugural project, which will allow you to compare campus-specific patterns to the broader trends occurring on multiple campuses.

It is important to keep in mind, however, that the implications of your campus-specific findings can only be fully understood when the entire campus context is taken into consideration. It may be hard to promote diversity in group composition, for example, if the overall student body is not diverse. Staff in the student life office may also be able to readily identify which campus groups are meeting the ideal



organizational structures and activities described above, and which are falling short. We hope that this report provides a catalyst for assessing whether the groups that make up campus civil society are promoting the civic and political engagement goals embedded in most of our mission statements. We also hope that more systematic assessment enables your campus to promote best practices for student organizations whenever possible.

## Afterword

This report provides information that should allow you to determine where your campus is meeting its civic education goals for student organizations and where it is falling short. If your campus is interested in learning more about how to use the data in this report to improve the quality of student life on your campus, please contact Drs. Bennion and Strachan. We offer campus consultations and additional advice on best practices, upon request.

## Bibliography

Allport, G. 1954. *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

American Political Science Association Task Force on Civic Education in the 21st Century. 1998. Expanded articulation statement: a call for reactions and contributions, *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 31:3:636–8.

Bok, D. 2006. *Our underachieving colleges*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, E. L. 1987. *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyte, H. 1991. Community service and civic education. *Phi Beta Kappan*, 72:10: 765-67.

Campbell, D. E. 2006. *Why we vote: How schools and communities shape our civic life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carnegie Corporation of New York and CIRCLE. 2003. *The civic mission of schools*. New York: Authors.

CIRCLE: The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement. 2011. Understanding a diverse generation, Youth civic engagement in the United States. Retrieved from: [http://www.civicyouth.org/wpcontent/uploads/2011/11/CIRCLE\\_cluster\\_report2010.pdf](http://www.civicyouth.org/wpcontent/uploads/2011/11/CIRCLE_cluster_report2010.pdf)

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

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T, Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. 2003. *Educating citizens: Preparing undergraduates for lives of civic and moral responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Dalton, R. J. 2008. *The good citizen: How a younger generation is reshaping American politics*. Washington, D. C.: CQ Press.
- Ehrlich, T, Ed. 2000. *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: The American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Fischer, M. J. 2007. Settling into campus life: Differences by race/ethnicity in college involvement and outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78:2: 125–161.
- Galston, W. A. 2001. Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4: 217-234.
- Harward, B.M. and Shea, D.M. 2013. Higher education and multiple modes of engagement, in A.R.M. McCartney, E.A. Bennion and D. Simpson (eds), *Teaching civic engagement: From student to active citizen*, Washington, DC: American Political Science Association, pp. 21–40.
- Levine, A., & Cureton, J. S. 1998. *When hope and fear collide, A portrait of today's college student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G.D., Schuh, J.H. and Whitt, E.J. 1991. *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and personal development outside of the classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G.D. and Umbach, P.D. 2004. College and character: Insights from the National Survey of Student Engagement, *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 112: 37–54.
- Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. 2005. *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Putnam, R. D. 2000. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rothstein, B. 2011. *The quality of government: Corruption, social trust, and inequality in international perspective*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Skocpol, T. 2003. *Diminished democracy, from membership to management in American civil life*. Norman, OK: The University of Oklahoma Press.
- Strachan, J. C. 2015. Student and civic engagement: Cultivating the skills, efficacy and identities that increase student involvement in learning and in public life. In J. Ishiyama, W. Miller, and E. Simon (eds), *Handbook of teaching and learning in political science and international relations*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Uslaner, E. 2002. *The moral foundations of trust*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wattenberg, M. P. 2012. *Is voting for young people?*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Pearson.

Zukin, C., Keeter, S. A., Jenkins, K., & Delli Carpini, M. X. 2006. *A new engagement? Political participation, civic life and the changing American citizen*. New York: Oxford University Press.

### **Appendix A, Open-Ended Comments**

Help our organization network with more organizations on campus.

Have another involvement fair for spring semester.

Consolidation of overlapping purposes of student organizations. Student involvement in major university decisions at least with student input. Allocation of office space for large student organizations, so that they may store materials, and work on projects for students. Compensating student leaders in some way as a reward for their efforts to improve the campus, and lives of students, whether monetarily, stipend, fellowship, or perks (reserved parking, priority housing, etc.)

Our organization is very prevalent on campus and the university does a great job encouraging our organization and providing us with almost anything we need to be successful.

Better communication. I know personally I have had many unreturned voicemails or emails.

Fund the organization by respect and appreciation. Also, afford any possible event to make the organization very active among other organizations.

Stop making policies and let students have fun without irrecoverable [sic.] consequences.

Not sure.

## Appendix B, National Data

### Methodology and Response Rate

The Consortium for Inter-Campus SoTL Research was launched to facilitate cross-campus data collection for research that assesses the effectiveness of classroom pedagogy and campus civic engagement efforts. The Consortium’s first project was designed to explore whether student organizations provide an on-campus version of civil society that offers an effective means of political socialization. To do so, an internet questionnaire, which had been previously pilot-tested at Central Michigan University, was administered to student officials representing 5,567 registered student organizations on 36 participating campuses. These 36 colleges and universities, including community colleges, regional public universities, small liberal arts colleges and large research-intensive universities, are scattered across every major geographical region of the continental United States, as well as 1 European country. An initial request to participate and two reminder prompts were e-mailed to the presidents of these student organizations, yielding 1,896 responses. For campuses that made additional contact information available, an invitation to participate and two reminder prompts were sent to a secondary contact (typically a vice president or a treasurer) when the presidents failed to respond. This follow-up effort yielded an additional 297 responses. Of the initial sample of 5,567 student officials, 2,193 answered the questionnaire, for an overall response rate of 39.3%. Given that responses to internet questionnaires tend to be lower than other means of conducting survey research, this response rate is somewhat higher than expected for this type of survey research. Introductory e-mails sent by members of each campus’ student life staff established this project’s credibility with respondents and helped to bolster the response rate.

### Demographic Information (Corresponding Campus Tables 1-5)

#### Student Officers’ Class Status

	Percentage
Freshman	1.1
Sophomore	10.3
Junior	25.0
Senior	50.2
Graduate	13.1

N = 2131

#### Student Officers’ Gender

	Percentage
Male	38.1
Female	61.6
Other	0.4

N = 2177

The average age of student officers in the national sample was 22.4 and ranged from a low of 18 to a high of 59.

Student Officers' Age

	Percentage
Traditional (18-24)	84.6
Non-Traditional (Over 24)	15.4

N= 2193

Student Officers with International Status

	Percentage
American	93.1
International	6.9

N = 2160

Student Officers' Racial/Ethnic Identity

	Percentage
White/Non-Hispanic	70.2
Black/African American	7.0
Hispanic or Latino	7.1
Asian or Asian American	9.6
Native American	0.3
Pacific Islander	0.3
Multi-Racial or Ethnic	3.4
Other	2.0

N = 2156

**Purpose of Organizations  
(Corresponding Campus Tables 6-9)**

Organizations' Purpose

	Percentage
Honors Society (ex: Pi Sigma Alpha)	4.7
Academic (ex: Spanish Club, Sociology Club)	15.2
Residence Halls Council (ex: groups that set policies in residence halls)	1.0
Intramural Sports (ex: Soccer Club, Intramural Basketball)	4.1
Varsity Sports (ex: university or college athletic teams)	1.2
Greek Fraternity or Sorority (ex: Delta Delta Delta, Sigma Tau)	8.3
Cultural/Ethnic (ex: Black Student Union)	7.0
GLBTQ (ex: Gay-Straight Alliance)	1.0
Religious/Spiritual (ex: Campus Bible Fellowship, Muslim Student Association, Hillel)	5.7
Service (ex: Alternative Spring Breaks, Habitat for Humanity)	8.3
Professional (ex: Public Relations Student Society of America)	13.0
Political (ex: College Democrats, Young Republicans, Young Americans for Freedom)	2.9
Special Interest (ex: Students for Life, Environmental Club)	12.8
Other	14.7

N = 2051

Organizations' Most Important Function

	Percentage
Help student to be successful in class	13.1
Help students prepare for a career or internship	26.6
Provide a religious or spiritual community	6.3
Sponsor social activities (dances, movies, etc.)	10.7
Provide opportunities to play a sport	7.2
Encourage volunteering in the community	12.6
Encourage political participation	2.2
Celebrate a common heritage of ethnic identity	6.3
Bring attention to an important issue in society	15.0

N = 1629

Organizations' Intended Student Members

	Percentage
All Students	72.9
Male Students	4.8
Female Students	6.8
GLBTQ Students	0.8
Students who identify with a specific racial, ethnic, or cultural group	3.9
Other	10.9

N = 2057

### SGA Participation

	Percentage
Yes	20.5
No	79.5

N= 2052

### Basic Membership Information

Student officers were asked to report the number of members who regularly participate in organizational activities. Across all 36 campuses, this number ranged from 0 to 550 with an average of 26.1 active members. According to respondents, these active members participated an average of 11.5 hours each month, with estimates ranging from 0 to 600 hours. (Please note, a very small number of students estimated an impossible number of hours worked each month, which affects the accuracy of this average estimate.)

In comparison, student officers reported that the overall number of members (both active and inactive) ranged from 1 to 1,000, with an average of 67.1 nominal members.

Finally, respondents were asked to report the total number of students (beyond members) that they thought that they could mobilize across the entire campus. This estimate ranged from 0 to 1,000, with an average of 62.5 students.

### Elected and Appointed Executive Positions

Overall, 62.7% of respondents indicated that these executive positions were elected by the full members, 28.8% indicated that they were appointed by group leaders or a faculty advisor, and 8.5% explained that their group relied on a combination of other selection practices, which typically involved a combination of elections and appointments for selected group leaders.

### Number of Executive Positions and Annual Turn-Over Rate

Position	Groups with Position	Groups with Annual Turn-Over
1	97.8	87.0
2	95.0	90.0
3	90.6	91.9
4	81.0	93.5
5	59.1	95.0
6	42.5	96.3
	N = 1853	N ranges from 1801 to 582



**Federated Structure  
(Corresponding Campus Tables 10-13)**

Organizations with Federated Structures

	Percentage
Affiliated with a State Organization	3.0
Affiliated with a National Organization	26.7
Affiliated with Both	9.2
Not linked to a State/National Organization	61.1

N = 1845

Students Coordinating Activities with State Chapters

	Percentage
A Few Times a Semester	37.9
Once a Semester	23.0
Once a Year	18.7
Less than Once a Year	20.4

N = 235

Students Coordinating Activities with National Chapters

	Percentage
A Few Times a Semester	27.3
Once a Semester	19.4
Once a Year	28.8
Less than Once a Year	24.5

N = 670

Delegate Activities at State and National Conventions

	Percentage	N
Delegates help to develop policy for the entire organization	54.4	447
Delegates participate in deliberation at convention meetings	65.5	446
Delegates use parliamentary procedure at convention meetings	51.5	447
Delegates have the opportunity to vote on policy positions at convention meetings	57.8	446

**On-Campus Organizational Activities and Group Decision-Making Styles  
(Corresponding Campus Tables 14-15)**

Frequency of Organizational Activities

	Less than 1X/ Year or Never	1X/ Year	1X/ Semester	2X/ Semester	1X/ Month	2X/ Month	1/Week or More	N
Held a meeting open to all members	3.7	1.8	5.3	7.5	18.5	22.4	40.8	1738
Required the membership to cast a vote	23.8	29.2	17.7	8.0	7.6	7.2	6.5	1731
Held a meeting of the executive board	10.0	3.3	7.7	8.6	18.9	18.6	32.9	1724
Assigned important tasks to a committee or subcommittee	17.7	4.5	10.5	9.2	18.1	19.6	20.3	1717
Sponsored or co-sponsored an educational event or program	21.8	9.1	23.7	17.9	17.6	6.9	2.9	1718
Sponsored or co-sponsored a social activity	35.7	9.2	20.1	14.6	12.3	5.5	2.7	1724
Sponsored or co-sponsored a fundraising event for charity	41.7	13.6	21.7	11.1	7.6	2.9	1.3	1715
Sponsored or co-sponsored a fundraising event for the group	38.2	13.1	23.8	12.9	7.6	3.4	1.0	1719
Held a ceremonial ritual or event	56.1	18.9	13.7	6.1	3.4	1.1	0.7	1728
Gave speeches that explain the group's values and priorities	23.9	17.7	28.1	12.2	9.3	4.7	4.0	1727
Distributed materials that explain the group's values and priorities	23.6	17.3	28.8	13.7	8.2	5.0	3.4	1727

CONSORTIUM FOR INTER-CAMPUS SOTL RESEARCH  
NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT LEADERS

Frequency of Democratic Decision-Making Practices

	Less than 1X/ Year or Never	1X/ Year	1X/ Semester	2X/ Semester	1X/ Month	2X/ Month	1/Week or More	N
Referring to constitution or by-laws to guide decision-making	31.3	19.5	18.3	8.2	7.4	7.0	8.3	1705
Engaging the full membership in deliberations	19.0	12.2	15.8	9.0	14.7	13.4	15.8	1699
Relying on the group's executive board	8.7	3.7	7.5	6.0	15.6	17.8	40.9	1690
Using formal rules to guide discussions	64.6	4.9	5.5	3.2	5.9	5.4	10.6	1685
Negotiating compromise among members who disagree	30.7	7.8	11.3	8.7	14.1	12.5	14.9	1698
Relying on a faculty advisor	28.2	9.6	14.2	10.2	15.0	11.4	11.5	1703

**Perceptions of Organizational Influence  
(Corresponding Tables 16-19)**

Groups Influencing Policies

	A Few Times/ Semester	1X/ Semester	1X/ Year	Less than 1X/ Year	N
On your campus	16.2	14.7	14.8	54.3	1552
In your town or community	5.2	11.1	11.6	72.0	1545
In your state or across the country	4.0	7.1	7.7	81.2	1540
In more than one country or across the globe	3.0	3.4	4.5	89.0	1520

Groups Undertaking Effective Volunteerism

	A Few Times/ Semester	1X/ Semester	1X/ Year	Less than 1X/ Year	N
On your campus	39.3	23.1	13.9	23.7	1553
In your town or community	32.6	24.5	14.6	28.3	1549
In your state or across the country	9.3	12.2	13.2	65.4	1545
In more than one country or across the globe	3.8	4.2	8.2	83.8	1540

CONSORTIUM FOR INTER-CAMPUS SOTL RESEARCH  
NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT LEADERS

Groups Coordinating Activities with Other Groups

	A Few Times/ Semester	1X/ Semester	1X/ Year	Less than 1X/ Year	N
On your campus	39.7	27.6	16.7	16.0	1477
In your town or community	21.9	23.4	16.3	38.4	1467
In your state or across the country	7.8	12.5	12.6	67.1	1470
In more than one country or across the globe	2.6	3.6	6.4	87.4	1448

Groups Influencing Others' Social Values and Life-Style Choices

	A Few Times/ Semester	1X/ Semester	1X/ Year	Less than 1X/ Year	N
On your campus	31.3	15.1	9.5	44.0	1474
In your town or community	15.8	13.5	8.4	62.4	1470
In your state or across the country	7.6	6.3	7.7	78.5	1470
In more than one country or across the globe	3.8	2.9	4.3	89.0	1468

**Bridging and Bonding Social Capital  
(Corresponding Campus Tables 20-21)**

Indicators of Bonding Social Capital

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N
Members have a tight bond with one another.	1.4	14.5	52.0	29.7	1653
Members feel obligated to help one another.	2.1	13.8	57.6	26.5	1650
Members trust each other a lot more than they do others.	3.5	28.9	48.7	18.8	1648
Members almost always agree with each other about important issues.	4.1	32.7	52.7	10.5	1650
Members share important core values.	1.3	6.3	60.7	31.7	1649

Indicators of Bridging Social Capital

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N
Members regularly interact with other student groups.	33.8	14.5	52.0	29.7	1653
Members regularly interact with community groups off campus.	6.7	33.1	46.3	13.9	1645
Members feel obligated to address broad social or political issues.	11.1	38.2	35.3	15.5	1646
Members share a respect for differing views within the group.	0.8	2.9	54.5	41.8	1648

**Diversity in Membership Composition  
(Corresponding Campus Tables 22-26)**

Student Officers' Estimated Levels of Diversity in Group Composition

	Pretty Much the Same	Mixed	Very Different	N
Academic Major	33.6	41.6	24.7	1645
Race/Ethnicity	31.2	55.7	13.1	1645
Gender	26.7	63.7	9.6	1645
Family's Income	6.1	74.4	19.5	1628
Religious Affiliation	14.5	67.4	18.1	1622
Political Party or Ideology	13.3	70.7	16.0	1627

Student Officers Desiring "Greater Mix" of Diversity

	Percentage	N
Academic Major	38.7	1655
Race/Ethnicity	51.7	1655
Gender	40.7	1655
Family's Income	17.2	1655
Religious Affiliation	16.7	1655
Political Party or Ideology	17.5	1655

Student Officers Claiming to Have at Least One Member from Each Ethnic Group

	Percentage	N
White/Non-Hispanic	93.3	1602
Hispanic	60.6	1568
Black or African American	63.7	1571
Asian or Asian American	60.1	1577
Native American	13.2	1525
Pacific Islander	12.7	1525
Middle Eastern	31.8	1521
Multi-Racial or Ethnic	54.5	1541

Student Officers Claiming to Have at Least One Member from Each Economic Class

	Percentage	N
Disadvantaged	49.0	1598
Middle Class	85.1	1609
Wealthy	64.7	1602

CONSORTIUM FOR INTER-CAMPUS SOTL RESEARCH  
NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT LEADERS

Formal Promotion of Diversity within Organizations

	Percentage	N
A statement on diversity is included in our by-laws or constitution.	42.1	1497
Members are strongly encouraged or required to interact with diverse others.	58.0	1490
Members with diverse backgrounds are explicitly recruited.	18.0	1490
Members are strongly encouraged or required to attend diversity training or workshops.	21.8	1493
Members are strongly encouraged or required to attend diversity events and programs.	31.7	1483

**Requests for Assistance  
(Corresponding Campus Table 27)**

Student Officers' Requests for Assistance

	Percentage	N
Giving speeches	21.0	1474
Running executive board meetings	20.5	1475
Running meetings of the full membership	24.7	1475
Using parliamentary procedure	12.5	1475
Helping members to resolve conflicts	17.8	1475
Seeking help from a faculty adviser/mentor	20.3	1475
Recruiting new members	59.5	1475
Attracting members from diverse backgrounds	40.5	1475
Planning an event on campus	45.0	1474
Coordinating activities with other campus groups	46.6	1474
Coordinating activities with groups off campus	38.3	1474

**Political Interest, Participation and Efficacy  
(Corresponding Campus Tables 28-31)**

Student Officers' Trust in Others

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N
Thinking about human nature in general, most people can be trusted.	2.4	24.3	63.8	9.5	1508
Most people will take advantage of you if given the chance.	5.7	62.3	28.2	3.8	1507
Most people try to be helpful when they can.	0.5	10.1	72.4	17.0	1509

Student Officers' Political Interest

	Not at All Interested	Somewhat Interested	Strongly Interested	N
State and Local Politics	22.0	54.9	23.2	1516
National Politics	16.1	48.2	35.7	1514
International Politics	22.3	52.1	25.5	1515

Student Officers' Levels of Political Efficacy

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N
<i>Internal Efficacy</i>					
People like me don't have a say about what government does.	21.9	52.8	21.5	3.8	1435
Sometimes politics and government can seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.	20.9	36.3	37.2	5.7	1428
I feel that I could do as good a job in public office as most other people.	8.5	30.2	45.5	15.7	1432
<i>External Efficacy</i>					
Public officers don't care much what people like me think.	7.8	51.0	34.8	6.4	1428
It would be difficult for someone like me to make a real difference in politics or government.	12.4	49.0	32.6	6.0	1430
<i>Collective Efficacy</i>					
Politicians respond to citizens if enough people demand change.	3.0	14.9	60.8	21.2	1427
Most people are willing to work together toward a common goal.	2.4	19.1	66.0	12.4	1430
If you want to get things done as a citizen, working with others is the best way.	0.8	5.3	56.2	37.8	1428
Dramatic change can occur in this country if people band together and demand it.	1.1	10.0	54.1	34.7	1424
I know how to work with others to change public policies.	6.1	38.6	44.3	11.0	1420

CONSORTIUM FOR INTER-CAMPUS SOTL RESEARCH  
NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT LEADERS

Student Officers' Likelihood of Participating in Political Acts

	Not at All Likely	Somewhat Likely	More Likely	Very Likely	N
Work with others to solve community problems	4.0	24.2	35.3	36.5	1489
Volunteer regularly for civic organizations	6.4	22.8	33.6	37.2	1484
Vote in national elections	7.4	12.4	19.1	61.1	1482
Vote in local elections	10.2	18.3	23.9	47.5	1485
Persuade others to vote for a candidate	38.0	27.8	16.1	18.1	1484
Work for or donate money to a candidate or party	58.7	23.0	9.9	8.4	1481
Contact an elected official	46.1	29.2	13.1	11.6	1485
Attend a political rally or protest	45.6	25.7	15.1	13.5	1484
Sign a petition about a political issue	16.9	33.5	26.5	23.2	1485