Service or Politics?: The Civic Identities of Boston College Undergraduates

Author: Liz Doherty

Persistent link:

Boston College

School of Arts and Sciences

Department of Sociology

SERVICE OR POLITICS?

THE CIVIC IDENTITIES OF BOSTON COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATES

an Honors Undergraduate Thesis

by

ELIZABETH DOHERTY

Advisor: Dr. Michael Malec

May 1, 2015

Service or Politics? The Civic Identities of Boston College Undergraduates
By Elizabeth Doherty
Thesis Advisor: Michael Malec

Abstract:

American universities provide undergraduate students with seemingly endless opportunities for civic engagement. According to a recent report released by Boston College, students volunteer more than 444,000 hours of community service throughout the year (Community Benefits and Service Programs). This honors thesis offers a critical exploration of students' attitudes towards civic engagement and how they make meaning of the change-making processes in which they choose to engage. The research was designed to explore how students feel about civic engagement divided into two main categories: service and politics.

Declining political participation has become a characteristic identifier of young adults today. How, then, does this generational trend fit into the civic engagement story of Boston College? By exploring students' civic and political attitudes, one can make sense of the decisions students make regarding how they can best produce social change in a democratic society, namely whether they select a service-oriented or political path.

First, this research aims to highlight the crucial intersections and interdependencies between involvement in both service and politics. In other words, the change-making capacity of either service or politics is limited when the two are considered mutually exclusive. Second, this research aims to assess whether students draw parallels Boston College undergraduates between service and politics. Ultimately,

this research aims to inspire undergraduates at Boston College and elsewhere to

develop civic identities, which incorporate service-oriented and political ideals.

Acknowledgments

First, the completion of this research project could not have been possible without the willing participation of so many Boston College undergraduates. I sincerely thank those who willingly signed on to interview or participate in a survey for my research. In addition, I was fortunate to have endless guidance, support, and teammates throughout my first formal attempt at the scholarly world and so I would like to express my appreciation to the following people:

To my family members who have taught me that politics should always be a way to improve peoples' lives.

To all close friends and fellow Boston College students who listened patiently to my "thesis talk" for a year.

To the Sociology department for instilling in me a desire to ask questions and to challenge norms.

To my fellow Honors program classmates who became more like teammates.
(We did it!)

To Lara Birk and Dave Harker for teaching some of my favorite classes at Boston College and for helping me grow my sociological interests and develop my thesis topic.

And, especially, to my advisor Mike Malec. For providing me both with expert instruction and well-timed pep talks, which gave me the peace of mind and confidence necessary to complete this project.

Service or Politics?

The Civic Identities of Boston College Undergraduates

An Honors Thesis by Liz Doherty

Chapter 1: Introduction

In the past academic year, Boston College students have organized and put on two "Rights on the Heights" rallies – one in the fall semester and one in the spring semester. While I did not make it to the one in the fall, I was fortunate to be able to be a part of a change-hungry and energetic crowd of Boston College undergraduates on March 20, 2015. Several students shared in their speeches their personal grievances regarding the Boston College administration's responses to political activism on campus. Students spoke of the administration's attitudes towards the LGBTQ community, sexual health, and, lest we not forget, the disciplinary action taken against those who participated in the die-in at St. Mary's in response to the Ferguson verdict. All of the students shared crucial and compelling points and consistently emphasized the need for these conversations to continue to emerge at Boston College, to critically examine the change-making that goes on here and to establish Boston College as a campus more receptive to activism as a means of making change.

While each student speaker shared a specific story pertaining to his or her inner sphere at Boston College and what frustrations had come up within this sphere, the opening speaker spoke more generally about the political campus culture. One speaker said, "BC is only supporting one side of the coin. We need volunteering *and* activism. We are asked to be men and women for others yet demanded to be men and women for BC." These few lines solidified my belief that a research study of civic identities at Boston College is necessary to better understand how undergraduate students see themselves fitting into a campus community and culture that most effectively inspires change.

When students get involved in organizations on campus – whether they are service-oriented or political in nature – they heavily weigh their decisions on a sense of *civic efficacy*, "a person's belief in his or her ability to engage in civic life" (Miller 2008:10). Therefore, a student's involvement in civic life is directly linked to a belief in his or her ability to engage (Miller 2008:10). Boston College students with an interest in civic engagement must (1) determine what social consequences or outcomes are most important to them, (2) determine the most effective ways to achieve these ends, and (3) ultimately choose whether or not to participate in service, politics, or both.

College students across the country routinely choose service-oriented civic engagement (apolitical) as a means to engage. Involvement in service on college campuses has been on an upward trend in recent years, growing by approximately 20 percent from 2002 to 2005 (Corporation for National and Community Service 2006). David Harker, in his recent work *Service, Politics, and Identity: On Realizing the Potential of Service Learning* (2014)*, reveals that by 2005, approximately 30 percent of college students volunteered (Corporation for National and Community Service 2006). Additionally, research shows that college students are twice as likely to volunteer than individuals of college age who are not enrolled in higher education, for whom the volunteer rate is about 15 percent. Similarly, college graduates volunteered at more than twice the rate of high school graduates (Corporation for National and Community Service 2006). Among those over the age of 25, the volunteer rate for college graduates was 46 percent as compared to 21 percent for high school graduates (Corporation for National and Community Service 2006).

There is an undeniable positive correlation, then, between education level and civic engagement. The next section clarifies how I operationalize the term "civic engagement," as it is a critical one to the progression of this paper. For now, it is enough to regard civic engagement as an umbrella term and concept defined by involvement in both (1) service and (2) politics. Similar to the national trend that college graduates tend to volunteer more frequently than those with high school education levels, college students also tend to vote more. Although studies have shown that people with higher levels of education have higher rates of political participation, little is known about voting behavior among students currently in college (HERI 2010). Instead, college students tend to be grouped into "young adult" categories of American voters aged roughly 18-29.

The Higher Education Research Institute (HERI), based in the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at the University of California Los Angeles, has addressed this gap in research. They have compiled a report using data from the 2009 Your First College Year (YFCY) survey and the 2009 College Senior Survey (CSS) to zero in on the voting behavior of college students specifically in the 2008 presidential election. Furthermore, they break down the sample of students according to selectivity of the institutions (high, medium, and low). What they have found supports the idea that education level and political engagement via voting are positively correlated: "In 2008, young people with at least some college experience were almost twice as likely to vote as those who had never been to college (62% vs. 36%; Kirby & Kawashima-Ginsberg, 2009)" (HERI 2010). Also, students at high selectivity institutions, who made up 51% of the YFCY sample and 65% of the CSS sample, were more likely to vote than were

students a lower selectivity schools. 80% of YFCY students and 84% of CSS students at high selectivity schools voted in the presidential election compared to 68% of YFCY and 75% of CSS students at low selectivity schools (HERI 2010).

Bearing in mind the national trend and positive correlation between education level and civic engagement (meaning involvement in service, politics, or both), married with the idea that students at higher selectivity schools tend to vote more, Boston College undergraduate students are a unique population for a research study that focuses on students' development of *civic efficacy*, and how this translates into their involvement and feelings towards both service and politics. As students of a highly selective and Catholic-Jesuit institution, where a "men and women for others" campus culture supposedly dominates, a large number of Boston College students engage in both service and politics. In Spring 2011, a study conducted by the Office of Institutional Research reported that 78 percent of seniors volunteered or performed community service work "frequently" or "occasionally" during the past year, a finding well above the 2005 national average of 30 percent (Boston College Office of Institutional Research 2011;Corporation for National and Community Service 2006).

A Boston College student writer for *College Magazine* effectively refers to this widespread interest in participation in service as a way for students to "do as the Jesuits do" (Healy 2014). BC students are able to engage in service in a number of ways including through student service organizations, service learning, and service and/or immersion trips. On December 11, 2014, Boston College was named to the 2014 President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll, which is the highest federal recognition colleges and universities can receive for community service, service

learning, and civic engagement. The Corporation for National Community Service

administers the award in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Education and the

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as the American Council

on Education, Campus Compact, and the Interfaith Youth Core (Boston College Public

Affairs). While the list of political organizations on campus is not quite as extensive, BC

students also have the opportunity to join partisan groups such as College Democrats

and College Republicans, non-partisan groups including Eagle Political Society, or

government-related clubs including Model UN.

Political participation tends to be a less visible and accepted form of civic

engagement at Boston College and this has been communicated largely through the

University's response to the Ferguson and Garner decisions. On December 9, 2014,

over 60 students and faculty members gathered at St. Mary's Hall to take part in a die-in

protest to raise awareness about police brutality and protest the recent deaths of

Michael Brown and Eric Garner (Denny 2014). Barbara Jones, the Vice President of

Student Affairs, asked that the students conclude their protests and leave immediately,

since the protests were preventing the Jesuits from moving into their new home at St.

Mary's. While it is true that the BC administration sent emails to the student body

offering outlets for support and guidance regarding the Ferguson and Garner decisions,

they released no indication of the University's views, opting for an apolitical approach to

a very political matter. This apolitical strategy and approach to potentially controversial

matters, in my four years, has appeared a common one, and not just an anomaly

related to the recent deaths of Michael Brown and Eric Garner. A Boston College

student publication, the *Gavel*, known as the "progressive student voice of Boston

College," summarizes what many students think of this: "Many students are frustrated with the lack of an official statement from BC on national matters." This view is echoed by some of the faculty as well. Reporting on the administration's handling of the die-in protest, Associate Professor of Sociology Shawn McGuffey, said, "I think the point of this is to make sure the University takes this seriously. Boston College and the student body here needs to be aware of that this is not just something that happened in Ferguson, this is not just something in Staten Island. It affects everyone, even those here at Boston College." Therefore, while Boston College has opportunities for students to become politically engaged via student organizations, political participation appears to be less engrained into the campus culture and somewhat discouraged by the administration.

At a time where more and more Americans pursue college degrees, college campuses will increasingly become sites responsible for the civic development of students. For Boston College, the inconsistent campus response to the Ferguson and Garner decisions as well as the growing activism seen through demonstrations, such as "Rights on the Heights" rallies, have proven this is a timely and relevant opportunity for an analysis of civic engagement on campus, which will hopefully correspond with a greater emphasis on establishing connections between service and politics. Ideally, students will increasingly be able to not only draw connections between service and politics but to attach meaning to their involvement in both. Hopefully the Boston College community in its entirety, including the administration, faculty, and students, will support these movements and processes in collaboration. This, in turn, will better equip students to participate fully and effectively in a democratic society.

Chapter 2: Key Concepts & Definitions

Before examining any literature concerning civic engagement on college campuses, it is necessary to first define the concepts to be explored. *Civic engagement* is a far-reaching concept, defined in slightly different ways by scholars in the fields of social science, political science, social psychology, and communication and media studies. In this study, the definition of civic engagement used by the Civic Engagement Initiative (CEI) in the School of Policy, Planning, and Development at the University of Southern California is adopted. Researchers here define civic engagement as follows: "We understand civic engagement to mean people participating together for deliberation and collective action within an array of interests, institutions and networks, developing civic identity, and involving people in governance processes" (Cooper 2005:534). This catch all phrase is defined by virtually any form of engagement in one's community: volunteering, partisan activism, lobbying, fundraising, and debating. As mentioned previously, *civic engagement* is broken down into two main categories: (1) service and (2) politics.

Service is a contribution to society without monetary compensation (Gage and Thapa 2012). At the most basic level, service is defined as "community service" and operates on the idea that voluntary participants learn by doing. To take the concept one step further is to include a relatively new and increasingly popular form of service known as *service learning*. Community service and service learning of course fall under the same umbrella of service, and both are hands-on and community-based. The principle difference, however, is that service learning incorporates academic reflection, discussion, and coursework to potentially increase students' sense of efficacy,

understanding of social issues, and sense of civic responsibility (Leong and Leong 2013; Harker 2014).

Political participation is a bit more complex to divide into its many forms. David Harker, Director of Collaborative for Community Engagement at Colorado College, recently defended his Ph.D. dissertation *Service, Politics, and Identity: On Realizing the Potential of Service Learning*. In this work, he effectively divides political participation into two main facets in which students can engage: political consciousness and political activism (Harker 2014). In this study, I adopt a similar approach in the use of these terms to operationalize political participation, but define both political consciousness and political activism in slightly different ways. At the most basic level, political consciousness is based on a student's information access and level of awareness, whereas political activism is based more on *political outcomes*, such as voter turnout rates (Cho et al. 2007).

Political consciousness is measured by a number of factors including informational media use and interpersonal communication or deliberation (Lee et al. 2013; Landemore 2013). *Informational media use* refers to how students access news, and how informed they are about political issues. *Interpersonal communication and deliberation* refers to how students engage in informal political discussions, or basically how they "talk politics." The rationale for considering both informational media use and interpersonal communication and deliberation as primary forms of political consciousness is rooted in communication research which has found that, "News consumption and interpersonal political discussion work in concert to encourage participation" (McLeod et al.1996:674). In this view, well-fostered political

consciousness grows into political activism thus leading to more direct political outcomes. Generally, political consciousness and political discussion raises awareness about collective problems, fosters deliberation, increases tolerance, highlights opportunities for involvement, and encourages engagement in public life (Cho et al. 2007; Walsh 2004). In addition, information from various polls is considered an expression of political consciousness. For example, a 2013 Gallup poll reports over half of people favor less government involvement in addressing the nation's problems in order to reduce taxes (Jones 2013).

Political activism, on the other side of things, is based on more tangible and measurable *political outcomes*. Some examples of political outcomes include: voting, involvement in political campaigns, boycotts, protests, and demonstrations.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Frameworks

This study develops a theory I refer to as *civic education theory,* and is a combination of ideas developed from two principal works. The first of these is *Civic Engagement in Democracy: Service Learning and Other Promising Practices*, edited by Sheilah Mann and John Patrick (2000). The second is David Campbell's *Social Capital and Service Learning* (2000). Since both of these works primarily focus on service learning, they effectively address both service and politics in terms of participants' involvement as well as their attitudes, or what I conceptualize as *civic efficacy*. Both of these works emerge from an increasing national concern about civic and political apathy in the United States, especially among young Americans (Patrick 2000). In addition, these works rely on Robert Putnam's book *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (2000). Patrick refers to Putnam's work as the "latest and strongest case about the decline of civic engagement and political participation in the United States, the need for civic renewal, and the means to achieve it" (2000:1). What both of these works argue, and what is crucial to the progression of this work, is that civic education through service learning as well as participation in both nonpolitical (service) and political (politics) activities can correspond with increased political participation. In short, civic education is a means to promote interest in both service and politics.

Campbell's work specifically argues that a student's involvement in any form of civic engagement whether service or politics can correspond with increased access to social capital. Campbell defines social capital according to sociologist James Coleman (1988) and Robert Putnam (1993). Putnam frames social capital as: "Social capital

refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit" (Putnam 1995:67). Coleman developed his sense of social capital in the context of studying the academic achievement of high school students and concludes that a school is a functional community where people interact regularly and produces students that are rich in social capital. Specifically, Coleman understands social capital in a school community as a means to enforce norms such as recognizing the value of academic achievement and generalized reciprocity (Coleman 1988). The concept of *generalized reciprocity* is crucial to this study because it effectively corresponds with the development of civic efficacy among students. This norm of reciprocity is defined as: "Mutual expectations that a benefit granted now should be repaid in the future" (Putnam 1993:172). If students are convinced of this norm extending across all forms of civic engagement, both service and politics, then perhaps engagement in both will increase. I argue that a college campus – through service learning, more general forms of service, and political participation – is an ideal place to convince students of this.

Chapter 3A: Service and Service Learning Frameworks

This study frames service under the community service-learning (CSL) framework. The Carleton Initiative for Community-University Engagement Pedagogy Group developed this framework to promote service learning at Carleton University in Canada. While CSL specifically addresses service learning in particular, this paper utilizes as a meaningful and effective approach to frame all forms of service. CSL frames service learning as a "unique form of experiential learning that benefits both the student and the recipient of the service while ensuring that the outcomes are equally shared by both parties involved; a service is provided while at the same time learning is occurring" (Furco 1996:2). This approach finds that there is a correlation between CSL and increased personal awareness, social awareness, and student outcomes and academic performance. Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray (2001) argue, "Service-learning has a positive effect on students' personal interpersonal development, including a sense of personal identity, spiritual growth, moral development, the ability to work well with others, and leadership and communication skills" (Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray 2001:1). In other words, students are empowered and feel a sense of undeniable accomplishment when they actually see their actions correspond with tangible change. This point allows for this framework to be effectively applied to service learning programs as well as other forms of community service, since it heavily draws on the concept of students being able to see change for themselves, which could promote a sense of civic efficacy.

According to this framework, CSL increases social awareness and student learning outcomes and academic performance. In terms of social awareness, CSL

specifically enhances students' awareness of their community and its needs, working to help eliminate and/or transform stereotypical beliefs, reduce ethnocentrism, and increase understanding of social and cultural diversity (Eyler & Giles 1999). In the academic sphere, educators of higher institutions have found that CSL helps students retain more information learned in class, achieve higher course grades, and have greater satisfaction with the course (Davis 2010). By considering expected outcomes of service by way of the CSL framework, this study explores whether or not these potential benefits of service serve as primary motivations for participants, and how involvement in service contributes to career development and students' overall civic engagement during undergraduate years as well as post-graduation.

Chapter 3B: Political Frameworks

Critical-Deliberative Involvement Theory:

To frame the political aspects, this study implements critical-deliberative involvement theory, which explores how people engage in (1) political activism and (2) a reasoned exchange of arguments. The application of this framework effectively divides political participation into its respective sub-groups: political activism and political consciousness. This framework is a new interpretation of deliberative democracy theory developed by Diana Mutz. In deliberative democracy theory, Mutz distinguishes between participation and deliberation and argues they are inversely correlated (Mutz 2006). I argue, however, that they are positively correlated and that political consciousness can grow into political activism; political consciousness and political activism can and should go hand in hand. This is not to say Mutz does not stress the importance of deliberation and political talk (what I conceptualize as political consciousness). She notes, "Rather than examine deliberation per se, a large package of variables all rolled into one concept, I focus on one necessary, though insufficient, condition in almost all definitions of deliberation: that is, that people be exposed to oppositional political perspectives through political talk" (Mutz 2006:6). This study considers engaging in political discussions or a reasoned exchange of arguments, *deliberation*, as a form of political engagement, specifically in the realm of political consciousness.

Mutz basically concludes that a person will choose to engage civically by either deliberating or participating, and rarely both. She defines participation as partisan activism, providing examples such as voting, lobbying, and campaigning. Mutz argues,

"You can't have it both ways: Either people will be willing to engage in deliberative activities that expose them to dissenting views and they will hold more nuanced and informed views as a result, or they will be willing to vote, campaign for candidates, and generally be engaged in the political arena. But they won't be willing to deliberate and participate at the same time" (Mutz 2006:6).

The theory applied to this research is not Mutz's deliberative democracy theory because this study rejects the idea that political consciousness and political activism are inversely correlated. Instead, Hélène Landemore's interpretation of Mutz's deliberative democracy theory explores how to encourage and link deliberation and activism in the context of democratic society. Therefore, Landemore's interpretation of deliberative democracy theory, known as *critical-deliberative involvement theory*, takes a more valuable and practical approach to, first, understanding "how people disagree" and, second, encouraging them to disagree (deliberate) and participate in politics. Landemore offers an empirical exception to Mutz's idea that deliberation and activism do not mix: deliberations occurring in James Fishkin's Deliberative Polls (Landemore 2013).

James Fishkin expresses his democratic vision and aspirations – how he hopes to see society change shape: "Democracy gives voice to 'we the people.' We think it should include 'all' the people. And we think it should provide a basis for 'the people' thinking about the issues they decide. These two presumptions about democracy are often unstated" (Fishkin 2009:1). The piece about inclusion in this statement is what is most important for the progression of this paper. In order to understand how students feel about politics, it is necessary to get an idea of what they think of their levels of

inclusion. How much are they a part of politics? How much *can* they be a part of

politics? This piece might offer insight as to why students engage in one form of civic

engagement over the other, meaning politics vs. service.

Fishkin focuses on how to achieve deliberative democracy, how to include all

members of society under conditions where they are effectively motivated to think about

the issues (Fishkin 2009:1). "Effectively motivated" is a somewhat ambiguous and

complicated phrase, because it is not easy to motivate masses of people to participate

in any collective activity especially if it is even slightly controversial. Much of the

literature attributes people's unwillingness or lack of effective motivation to a notion of

"rational ignorance," the mental processes people undergo that renders them feeling

powerless in the realm of politics or, basically, that one opinion in millions has little to no

impact on political outcomes (Fishkin 2009; Mutz 2006). Another limitation in effective

motivation and deliberation is that even when people deliberate or discuss politics or

policy, they do so mostly with people like themselves who have similar backgrounds,

social locations, and outlooks. That said, if people know they have contrasting political

viewpoints, politics probably would not come up in conversation at all. It becomes a

question of, "Why put your relationships at risk by raising flashpoints of conflict?"

(Fishkin 2009:3). The highly partisan nature of our democracy makes having a mutually

respectful conversation with someone who disagrees difficult (Fishkin 2009).

Political Efficacy Theory: Grounded in Social Cognitive Theory:

This paper frames the political socialization of young adults by looking at political

efficacy grounded in social cognitive theory. Political efficacy is the "feeling that political

and social change is possible and that the individual citizen can play a part in bringing

about this change" (Campbell, Gurin, and Miller 1954:187). I use Albert Bandura's conceptualization of social cognitive theory: "Social cognitive theory accords a central role to cognitive, vicarious, self-regulatory, and self-reflective processes" (Bandura 2001:124). The "self-regulatory aspect" of Bandura's interpretation of social cognitive theory is particularly applicable to political efficacy:

> People are not only knowers and performers. They are also self-reactors with a capacity for self-direction. Effective functioning requires the substitution of self-regulation for external sanctions and demands. The self-regulation of motivation, affect, and action operates partly through internal standards and evaluative reactions to one's own behavior (Bandura 1991). The anticipated self-satisfaction gained from fulfilling valued standards and discontent with standard performances serve as incentive motivators for action. The motivational effects do not stem from the standards themselves, but from the evaluative self-investment in activities and positive and negative reactions to one's performances" (Bandura 1991:124).

This reinforces the role of efficacy in making social decisions, or in this context, political decisions, suggesting the belief in peoples' own ability to influence politics (i.e.: to feel *politically efficacious*) is an influential predictor in the extent to which students are politically engaged during their undergraduate years. This paper also uses this framework as an effective predictor in a students' future participation in our democracy in post-grad years. Some scholars argue that political efficacy can also be an outcome of political participation (instead of vice versa), which I certainly acknowledge. However, this paper addresses political efficacy as a predictor of political participation rather than an outcome since it aims to explore how students choose a form of civic engagement, presumably based on the fact that they choose a form they consider most effective.

Chapter 4: Literature Review

Robert Putnam proposed, "Perhaps the younger generation today is no less engaged than their predecessors, but engaged in new ways" (Putnam 2000:26). Civic engagement is undoubtedly being reshaped; people are participating in new ways and in ways to which they can link their own individual senses of civic efficacy. Several decades ago, in the 60s and 70s, civic engagement and citizen participation, in a political context, usually meant participation in government programs to provide opportunities for citizens to have a say in public policy processes. Now, however, there is more of a volunteerism focus and more attention to collaboration and deliberation (Putnam 2000).

Service involvement can be attributed to opportunity structures and an individuals' ability to be involved. In simpler words, young citizens make choices on whether to be involved in their communities based on opportunity structures provided by way of their upbringings. These opportunity structures either result or do not result in the development of civic skills in young individuals, thus translating or failing to translate into a civically engaged young citizen. In addition to opportunity structures, self-oriented motivations (enhancement, social, career, and understanding) encourage or discourage young citizens from choosing to engage. A more in-depth discussion of motivations will follow.

A major takeaway from the body of literature regarding civic development processes – or how young individuals develop civic skills – is that both the existence and development of justice dispositions determine how a young citizen chooses to engage. Max Neufeind, Patrick Jiranek, and Theo Wehner define a person's "justice

disposition" as the product of a person's combined sense of political responsibility and social responsibility. This cohesively ties into this study's focus on civic efficacy, as these scholars attempt to measure how responsible and committed young citizens tend to be in both political and service realms. On the other hand, they define self-oriented motivations as being divided into four categories: enhancement, social, career and understanding. Most studies find only moderate relationships between youth volunteering and forms of political involvement, meaning that volunteering does not always correspond with engagement in politics. Neufeind, Jiranek, and Wehner maintain that analyzing justice dispositions serve as an effective approach as to understanding why this moderate relationship seems to exist, namely why the correlation is not stronger. Generally, self-oriented motivations have been found to affect students' levels of volunteering more than motivations related to justice dispositions, perhaps providing reasoning as to why students select certain forms of engagement over others (Neufeind, Jiranek, and Wehner 2013).

Neufeind, Jiranek, and Wehner further define justice dispositions using the terms justice centrality (JC) and belief in a just world (BJW) as antecedents to young citizens' volunteering and political participation for three reasons. First, community psychology literature, including the work of Watts and Guessous (2006), points out that justice dispositions, particularly belief in a just world (BJW), might effectively explain the development of young citizens' critical consciousness, a process this paper refers to as a *civic development process*. Second, social psychological literature on justice-related beliefs argue that justice dispositions are related to pro-social behavior and civic engagement. Third, while scholars acknowledge that political science and sociology

approaches predict variance in civic engagement, they do not effectively explore reasons as to why only a moderate relationship exists between these two forms of civic engagement.

In order to address the first two components, outlined above, of this body of research concerning justice dispositions and civic engagement, exploring the intersection of justice beliefs and social commitment of young citizens is crucial. Scholars have found that in regard to non-spontaneous civic engagement, BJW and JC seem to come into play. For example, Montada et al. concluded that: "The willingness for continued commitment is 'not likely when subjects [deny] the existence of injustices and when they do not consider themselves responsible to intervene effectively' (Montada et al. 2007:288; Neufeind et al. 2013). This introduces the idea of personal social responsibility, which ties into efficacy, and presents it as essential for a young citizen to engage in any kind of long-term commitment in either and/or both service or political participation.

Neufeind et al. introduce the work of Moschner (1998) and Dalbert, Montada, and Schmitt (1987) as arguably the first to show that self-efficacy interacts with justice dispositions and civic skills. Along these same lines, Neufeind et al. include a description of the work of Mohiyeddini and Montada (1998), who showed that BJW and self-efficacy are linked in an experiment about victim blaming. They found that those high in self-efficacy blame victims less than people with low efficacy because those with high efficacy believe in their own abilities to make change or restore justice. Interestingly, this proved to be true even among people with an identical BJW (as a primary justice disposition). This is important for this study because it stresses the

validity of efficacy as a measurement to understand students' initial motivations for service and/or politics as well as their continued involvements in either (or both) forms of civic engagement.

Others have come up with varied conclusions concerning the impact of justice dispositions on civic engagement. Rubin and Peplau (1975) found a negative relationship between BJW and political participation. Moschner (1998) found that the effect of BJW and JC on volunteering was mediated by social responsibility. More specifically, Moschner's findings reveal a negative effect of BJW on the willingness to take social responsibility. Still other studies have found a positive effect of BJW including the experimental study of Zuckerman (1975), which presents BJW as positively related to voluntary pro-social behavior (Neufeind et. al 2013). All of these studies, however, contribute to the Neufeind et al. hypothesis that justice dispositions help explain variance in young adults' volunteering and political participation and that civic development processes do not rest only on demographics, skills, and opportunity structures. I consider this point worthwhile because it does not attribute a student's civic engagement exclusively to upbringing. Instead, it highlights justice dispositions as influential in shaping civic attitudes and political consciousness as well as service and political participation.

With this said, it is also important to consider the interactions between justice dispositions and factors associated with a person's upbringing including opportunity structures. Schmitt (1998) argued that justice dispositions interact with situational factors in generating a justice motivation (Neufeind et al. 2013). In other words, the development of justice dispositions does have a lot do with socio-economic status. I

argue that we see this come into play in the realm of political efficacy, which, as described previously, is grounded in social cognitive theory. Studies, including those of Abramson & Alrich (1982), Finkel (1985), and Kenski (2004), have known that internal political efficacy plays an important role in promoting both conventional and non-conventional forms of political participation. Neufiend et al. ultimately conclude: "Justice dispositions may contribute to the explanation of the moderate and varying relationship between volunteering and political participation, because, on the one hand, they serve as potential psychological triggers for both forms of civic engagement, whereas, on the other hand, volunteering is induced by motivations beyond justice" (Neufeind, Jiranek, and Wehner 2013).

Motivations for Service Engagement Literature:

Both a logical and critical place to begin in an exploration of civic engagement trends is with a discussion of college students' motivations to volunteer. Although there is no financial return for volunteering, research has shown that volunteers do in fact expect other considerations for the work that they do (Gage and Thapa 2012). Other considerations include the positive effects of service learning on college students and the effects of volunteerism during a person's lifespan (Gage and Thapa 2012). One way to go about assessing students' motivations is by implementing the Volunteer Function Inventory, a quantitative assessment which measures volunteering characteristics, scope of volunteerism, volunteer segments, and types of contributions (Gage and Thapa 2012).

Gage and Thapa are careful not to leave out the "other side" of the motivations piece, namely that many organizations are becoming increasingly dependent on a

volunteer force to support their missions and programs, while offsetting expenses (Gage and Thapa 2012). Volunteers are rising to meet this need. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010), approximately 27% (63 million) of American adults volunteered at least once between September 2008 and September 2009. Furthermore, 30% of women and 23% of men above the age of 16 volunteered (Gage and Thapa 2012). What stands out most from this compilation of statistics is Gage and Thapa's finding that more than 43% of college graduates (aged 25 years and above) volunteered combined with 19% of high school graduates and about 9% of those without a high school diploma (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010; Gage & Thapa 2012). This suggests an intimate relationship between a college education and an interest in volunteering.

Political Motivations & Political Efficacy:

Although political efficacy is previously defined in the theory section of this paper, it is useful to look at another interpretation of what the term means. Campbell, Gurin, and Miller conceptualize political efficacy as the "Feeling that individual political action does have, or can have, an impact upon the political process, namely that it is worthwhile to perform one's civic duties" (Campbell et al., 1955:187). One study was conducted in accordance with classical test theory and included four agree-disagree items as part of its original scale: (1) "People like me don't have a say about what the government does" (NO SAY); (2) "Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on (COMPLEX)"; (3) "I don't think public officials care about what people like me think (NO CARE)"; and (4) "Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the

government runs things (VOTING)" (Caprara et. al 2009:1002). This scale focuses primarily on how people see themselves in the context of politics, but in a less direct way it also addresses people's attitudes about the political system itself (Caprara et. al 2009). The concept of political efficacy is an extremely relevant and timely concept in political science literature, and also nicely ties into the idea that opportunity structures determine a person's level of political efficacy. Basically, a person's capacities and access to resources determines the extent to which he or she feels *a part of* our political system.

Much of the literature on political efficacy breaks the concept down into internal and external efficacy. Internal efficacy is conceptualized as the confidence of the individual in his or her own abilities to understand politics and to act politically. External efficacy constitutes the individual's belief in the responsiveness of the political system (Schulz 2007). Regarding the stability of political efficacy, some studies have shown that both internal efficacy and external efficacy are relatively stable over time (Schulz 2007;Finkel 1985). One particularly interesting and consistent finding is that external efficacy is more likely to be influenced by experiences with political participation than internal efficacy (Finkel 1985;Schulz 2007). This leads one to believe that confidence in one's own ability to act politically tends to be stronger than confidence in the political system itself. Similarly, Morrell (2003) finds internal efficacy has been associated with education, and motivation and political participation, but not with trust in government institutions. This finding is particularly relevant when it is considered among a collegiate population. Furthermore, the study of political efficacy is relevant to measuring not only political participation but also civic engagement in general (service, as well). The

discussion of external versus internal efficacy encourages discussion regarding

motivations for service and/or politics. It raises questions about how students make the

choices they do in deciding in what form of civic engagement to engage.

Political Outcomes vs. Political Consciousness:

Unsurprisingly, there exists a large collection of data that quantifies young adults'

political involvement by way of voting statistics, and so a large amount of scholarly

conversation on the matter uses election series data sets to explain trends. While this

literature is relevant in outlining broad, long-term trends among young adult citizens, it is

not as valuable when it comes to explaining year- to-year trends.   For example, one

specific organization, the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and

Engagement (CIRCLE) at the University of Maryland, meticulously monitors young voter

participation.   They report that "The 2004 election was a historic high [in] youth voter

turnout, and college students led the way with 77 percent of them going to the polls."

Even more impressive, 87% of the 70% registered American college students voted in

the 2008 presidential election (CIRCLE). Based on this, CIRCLE finds that because

college students were more likely to participate than many other groups in American

society, this could mark the beginning of a major trend toward greater participation of

the younger voter, particularly college students.

Political outcomes, conceptualized as the act of evaluating or making political

choices, are critical in evaluating political participation trends, but this kind of

quantitative research is somewhat limited because it does not focus on political

consciousness or civic development processes such as the development of efficacies

(Kuklinski and Hurley 1996). "Political scientists have given the act of understanding

politics… the act of interpreting or making sense of politics, far less attention than the act of evaluating or making political choices" (Kuklinski and Hurley 1996:730). The gaps in literature concerning deliberation and "making sense of politics" suggest a study on undergraduate civic efficacy is necessary to understand more underlying and perhaps more abstract trends in civic engagement.

That said, there is an extensive amount of literature which attempts to highlight the need for improving civic education to improve public awareness of the supposed political apathy and ignorance which are, according to many, endemic among young people (Claassen and Monson 2013). This body of literature is imperative to a case study of civic engagement at Boston College namely because correlational studies indicate that students who report on surveys that they were encouraged to express their political views in the classroom were more [politically] engaged" (Campbell 2008; Kahne and Sporte 2008). This suggests that promoting a politically focused campus culture could foster a sense of political responsibility and interests among students. That said, it is difficult to discern from this finding whether or not students had predisposed political interests which caused them to engage in political discussions in a classroom or if the classroom culture/dynamic encouraged them to develop political interests (Claassen and Monson 2013).

The concept of governance, namely a shift towards a "new governance," has been offered as a viable solution to a diminishing democracy characterized by declining levels of political engagement, especially among young people today (Skocpol, Lisa Bingham, Tina Nabatchi, & Rosemary O'Leary 2005). The concept of governance has been increasingly explored in several fields including political science, public

administration, international studies, policy making, and sociology (Lisa Bingham, Tina

Nabatchi, & Rosemary O'Leary 2005). The World Bank defines governance as follows:

"The World Bank views governance as 'the process and institutions a country is

exercised.' The World Bank conceives governance as including 'how governments are

held accountable, monitored and replaced,' with an emphasis on capacities of

governments to manage resources and respect the rule of law" (World Bank 2004;

Boyte 2005:4). Government and governance are not synonymous. Scholars such as

Lisa Bingham, Tina Nabatchi, and Rosemary O'Leary effectively explain the distinction

as follows:

> Government occurs when those with legally and formally derived authority and
> policing power execute and implement activities; governance refers to the
> creation, execution, and implementation of activities backed by the shared goals
> of citizens and organizations, who may or may not have formal authority and
> policing power (Rosenau 1992). As an activity, governance seeks to share power
> in decisionmaking, encourage citizen autonomy and independence, and provide
> a process for developing the common good through civic engagement (2005).

Specifically, Boyte explores a possible shift towards a new governance by

focusing on *civic agency* and meanings of democracy; he attempts to answer the

question of who is to address public problems and promote the general welfare (Boyte

2005). In other words, he aims to explore who is responsible for these civic duties.

Boyte calls for the need to "reframe democracy" in society, by focusing less on

government and more on governance. Governance, to be sure, extends beyond a

government and involves the collaboration of corporations, nonprofit organizations, and

public-private partnerships (Boyte 2005). Boyte does not argue for increased

participation in service or politics. Instead, he calls for a shifting paradigm from

democratic state to democratic society; he believes society should regard citizens not

as merely voters, volunteers, clients or consumers but "problem solvers and co-creators

of public goods" (Boyte 2005:5). To do this, governance must be politicized but kept

nonpartisan so citizens can negotiate diverse interests and views to most effectively

deliberate, produce social change, and create public value (Boyte 2005:5). In addition,

politics must be re-conceputalized and reoriented to be less partisan, less divisive, and

more philosophically oriented in order to empower citizens to participate in a

governance that will produce tangible change.

Chapter 5: Research Methods

The primary data collection method of this study consisted of nine in-depth and structured interviews with leaders of major service and political organizations on campus. The service organizations included: Boston College's service-learning program known as Pulse, Appalachia Volunteers, Arrupe, and 4Boston. The political organizations included: Boston College Democrats, Boston College Republicans, Model UN, and Eagle Political Society. In addition to the conducted interviews, the study utilized an electronic survey administered via email to Boston College undergraduate students, who were selected by way of convenience sampling. These interviews were intended to be complementary to the survey results, in an attempt to "give a voice" to some of the university-wide trends about service and politics which surfaced from the administered survey.

The analysis of both the open-ended survey responses and interviews required extensive coding. This coding process relied on both pre-set codes as well as emergent codes.

Selection of Participants:

Survey participants were selected by way of convenience sampling to access a representative sample of the undergraduate population at Boston College. All undergraduate students of Boston College were encouraged to participate in this study. However, the study aimed to measure political engagement with American politics – international students who are not U.S. citizens or permanent residents could not logically be incorporated into this study. This was the only exclusion criterion.

It was critical for my research to attract respondents who are both involved in service organizations and opportunities at BC and who are not. For this reason, I pulled my sample from the following "general" population settings: two core curriculum introductory sociology courses, three dormitory floors, one freshmen-only Courage to Know course, the Boston College Club Equestrian team, one Israel/Palestine service trip course taught by Eve Spangler, the Eagle EMS program, the Boston College Neighborhood Center Tutor Group, and two specific dorms on Boston College's campus: Vanderslice and 90. In total, 161 Boston College undergraduates participated in the study by responding to the survey. Overall, the response rate was approximately 24%. All participants were selected in order to create as representative a sample of Boston College undergraduates as possible, without having access to a Boston College list serv.

Interview participants in this study were also selected by way of convenience sampling. Eight different service organizations (see above) were contacted directly and asked to volunteer one representative for the study. The response rate for this was 100% and the Pulse program volunteered 2 representatives, culminating in 9 total interviews. Participants were chosen based on their leadership positions in major service and political organizations. The rationale for their selection was the assumption that leadership positions have given these particular students the opportunity to develop strong beliefs regarding service and/or politics based on their long-term and in-depth involvements in their respective organizations.

Limitations of the Selection of Participants and Sample:

There are limitations to this study's use of a sample population exclusive to Boston College. First, there is the obvious question of the extent to which any findings from this data can be translated into a larger context. The use of exclusively Boston College undergraduates as study participants raises some reasonable and valid doubt concerning how transferrable the results are in explaining any broader and larger societal trends. They are not fully transferrable. That said, a college campus a formative setting in which a primary objective is to prepare students for participation in a democratic society. Therefore, this study is best described as a "case study." Many of the trends that have emerged from this study, though, are similar to broader, generational trends or how civic engagement is changing within a national context, rather than a context limited to Boston College. In this way, the study is important because it holds Boston College undergraduates accountable and responsible for the shifting picture of civic engagement in American society. This study supports a move towards an "alternative sociology" in that it relies on a method developed and celebrated by standpoint theorists such as Dorothy Smith. Smith believes that we as sociological researchers and study participants tend to leave ourselves out of the picture as if we were not even there. This study firmly rejects this notion of leaving oneself out of the equation. In fact, this study renders this impossible; it localizes social realities and makes them difficult for Boston College undergraduates to ignore.

Secondly, Boston College's Catholic-Jesuit influence equates with a "men and women for others" mantra consistently emphasized in coursework and interwoven within the general campus culture. This could potentially instill a desire to serve or engage

more so than on other college campuses, thus compromising the transferability of this study to a greater societal context. However, a case study of a service-oriented culture like that of Boston College benefits the existing body of research on civic engagement because it explores how college students are prioritizing specific forms of service over others. In addition, in almost all cases, students' opinions on service vs. politics corresponded with the emergence of themes related to civic efficacy and how students feel they can best impact social change in their time spent during their undergraduate years at Boston College. The thoughts and reactions students develop here undoubtedly influence their decisions following graduation.

Description of Data Collection Instruments: Survey and Interview Guide:

The email survey (survey guide attached in appendices) administered to Boston College students is broken up into five sections.

- *Section One-* The first brief section addresses logistical information such as U.S. citizenship, class year, gender, major/minor, religious affiliation, and frequency of religious service attendance/practice.

- *Section Two-* The second section, "Civic Development Processes," focuses on civic development processes, defined as past volunteer experience (description, frequency, motivations).

- *Section Three-* The third section, titled "Service: Volunteering, Service Learning, Service Trips" discusses current service experience and motivations (description, frequency, motivations). In this section, there is also a question that asks the respondent to estimate the percent of the student body that is involved in service. This question reveals where

students place themselves in the greater context of the undergraduate community. In other words, do respondents see themselves as one of many who volunteers or one of many who do not? Perhaps respondents see themselves as a minority for not volunteering. This question gets at civic identity in a more subtle and, presumably, less conscious way for respondents. In many instances during the interviews, students admitted their potential biases that could skew their response. The most common bias reported in response to this question was the admitting of the interviewee that the "sphere" or "circle" they considered themselves to be a part of was particularly interested in service and/or politics. This section also asks about predicted future involvement in service.

- *Section Four-* This section, "Political Participation," addresses political participation and aims to question the respondent about political activism and political outcomes, rather than efficacy or political consciousness. Some examples of questions that aim to assess a respondent's political outcomes are: "Do you vote regularly?" and "In the last 12 months, which political activities have you participated in? Check all that apply." This section seeks for the respondent to describe their political involvements (descriptions, frequencies, motivations). It also asks those who vote regularly about what factors motivated them to vote (partisan opinion, parental opinion, peer opinion, independent research, etc).

- *Section Five-* Whereas the fourth section of the guide aims to explore political outcomes, the fifth, "Civic Attitudes," is geared towards

respondents' civic attitudes or efficacies, including political consciousness. Some examples of these types of questions include: "On a scale of 1-5 how confident do you feel in your general ability to debate political issues or engage in political discussions? 1=Not at all confident, 5=Extremely Confident" or "What form of civic engagement do you consider most likely to improve peoples' lives? A. Service B. Politics" The first question specifically aims to learn about the respondent's sense of internal efficacy, which is relevant to this paper because I argue that motivations have much to do with how students choose whether to engage in service, politics, or both.

The interview guide (attached in the appendices) is based on the survey guide and has the same aims. All dialogue from these interviews was recorded and transcribed using a laptop computer. The conducting of 9 interviews helped to further develop themes about civic engagement tendencies as well as civic attitudes and efficacies, which have emerged in the survey results.

Ethical Considerations for Sampling:

This study considered specific concerns so as not to make anyone feel uncomfortable in data collection. This mainly concerned avoiding "shaming" participants for not engaging in service and/or politics. Much of this comes from the assumption that that most Boston College undergraduates, and presumably college students in general, feel that "they should" engage in service, politics, or even both. Bearing this in mind, all survey and interview questions were straightforward and factual rather than invasive and potentially threatening.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved this project under the case number: 15.121.01. To protect subjects, respondents had the option of remaining anonymous while taking the survey. Respondents only offered identification information for the sole purpose of the opportunity to win compensation (one of two $50 American Express gift cards). As for the interviews, no names are included in this report, and the only identifiers used will be their leadership positions and roles in their respective service or political organization on campus.

Operationalization of Variables:

Interviews were analyzed using themes categorized according to the variables defined in this paper: service, politics, civic attitudes, political activism and outcomes, political consciousness, and efficacies. New themes also emerged through the analysis of interviews. The general goals of all themes, those based on pre-set codes as well as new and emergent codes, are to link service and politics and shed light on students' understandings of the interactional value that comes from this relationship.

Response frequencies (the number of respondents who selected each response choice) were calculated for an extensive number of questions. In some cases, this required re-coding. For example, for the question about how often the respondent attends religious services, the categories "More than once a week" and "once a week" were re-coded under a category of "Very often" to construct a general theme for this particular response and organize the data in a streamlined way. This survey also required numerous cross-tabulations (comparing one question to another to see relationships between responses).

Chapter 6: Results and Findings

Profile of Interviewees:

Of nine interviewees, five were leaders of major service organizations (two from Pulse, one from Appalachia volunteers, one from Arrupe, and one from 4Boston). Four were leaders of major political organizations (one from BC Democrats, one from BC Republicans, one from Eagle Political Society, and one from Model UN). 7 were seniors and 2 were juniors.

Profile of Survey Respondents:

Nearly two thirds of the 161 respondents were women (65%) while a third were men (35%). In terms of class year, the respondents were evenly distributed across all years with a slightly lower response rate from freshmen. Approximately 17% of respondents were freshmen, 27% were sophomores, 26% were juniors, and 30% were seniors. The chart below displays the exact breakdown of respondents based on class year and gender.

Sociodemographic Table 1: Gender/Class Year

		What is your class year?				
		Freshman	**Sophomore**	**Junior**	**Senior**	Total
What is your gender?	**Male**	8	13	16	19	56 (35%)
	Female	20	31	25	29	105 (65%)
	Total	28 (17%)	44 (27%)	41 (26%)	48 (30%)	161

The majority of respondents (71%) were enrolled in Boston College's College of Arts and Sciences. 14% of respondents were in Carroll School of Management, 4%

were in Connell School of Nursing, and 11% were in Lynch School of Education.

Among Arts & Sciences respondents, 16% were freshmen, 27% were sophomores,

27% were juniors, and 30% were seniors. The breakdown by school effectively reflects

the Boston College student body, as reported by a fall 2014 fact book released by the

university (Boston College Fact Book). This report provided the breakdown by school of

the enrollment (freshman) class of fall 2014. According to this report, 66% of freshman

students in fall 2014 were enrolled in the college of Arts & Sciences, 23% were in

Carroll School of Management, 4% were in Connell School of Nursing, and 7% were

enrolled in Lynch School of Education. Therefore, the sample of respondents in this

study effectually represents the actual breakdown by school, with the exception of a

slight discrepancy between Carroll School of Management students (14% in the survey

vs. 23% actual student body).

Sociodemographic Table 2: Breakdown by School at Boston College

	Response	Sample %	Population %
Arts & Sciences (A&S)	115	71%	66%
Carroll School of Management (CSOM)	23	14%	23%
Connell School of Nursing (CSON)	6	4%	4%
Lynch School of Education (LSOE)	17	11%	7%
Total	161	100%	100%

Campus Culture:

One of the primary objectives of this study was to analyze the ways in which Boston

College undergraduates perceive the campus culture. Every interviewee and every

survey respondent was asked to estimate what percent of students at Boston College

would identify as being involved in service. The mean for the interviewee responses

was approximately 51% while the mean for the survey responses (161 responses in total) was approximately 55%. This affirms how the BC student body perceives Boston College's campus culture as highly service-oriented, with both samples predicting over half of the undergraduate population would identify as being involved in service. One interviewee, a leader of Eagle Political Society, summarized the campus culture as follows: "It's 'go light the world aflame.' Or, you know, 'men and women for others'…There are a lot of just very service oriented programs here that are very public and a lot of people know about them…BC puts 110% into service I think." Similarly, a leader from BC Democrats reasoned, "I think there is a heavy involvement in service. It is definitely emphasized. We have special classes devoted to it like Pulse. I think it is definitely our social engagement of choice on campus rather than political."

A "Safe Place" for Politics:

The distinction between the Boston College focus on service versus politics seems, for the most part, largely agreed upon by students. In fact, the gravitation towards service over politics on campus has served as a motivation for four out of four Boston college political organization leaders to become involved and serve in leadership positions. Each one of the interviewees cited providing "safe place" as a primary mission or objective of their respective organizations. A leader of BC Republicans explained: "We give a lot of conservative-minded students a safe place to go. I get it from my club members a lot that they have to sit in class or sit other places and listen to things they don't agree with and they feel like it is best for them to keep their mouth shut so they don't say anything."

The fear that conservative students will not have a safe place is not a direct outcome of their conservative beliefs, however. Rather, this seems to stem from a concern that political discussions in general are not encouraged or even – to an extent – tolerated in the standard Boston College classroom (or other) setting. For example, a leader from BC Democrats echoed this need for a "safe space." She said, "The goals of the organization as a whole are "to foster a safe space for people to discuss issues, be liberals…because sometimes I think there are certain spaces on campus where that is difficult." With this, one can rule out the idea that certain partisan opinions are the source of the discomfort and lack of tolerance for politics the Boston College campus culture seems to offer. Similarly, a leader of the Eagle Political Society, a non-partisan group on campus, also described a need to fill this demand for a safe political space: "There really was a need for a political group on campus that was non-partisan. We were trying to bring a safe space to campus for people to talk about current events and topics that interest them."

Given this initial insight into what the campus culture is like at Boston College in terms of service and political participation, one might already be able to see there is not much overlap between the two forms of civic engagement. People tend to choose one over the other, and this choice tends to, overwhelmingly, be service. Of the 116 survey respondents who identified as participating in unpaid volunteering/service at Boston College, only 7% (N=8) of them identified as belonging to any political groups on campus whereas 93% did not (N=108). Of the 28 survey respondents who said they did not participate in volunteering or service at Boston College, only 18% (N=5) identified as belonging to any political group on campus and 82% (N=23) did not. From this finding,

the Boston College civic engagement "choice" seems to be service or nothing, rather than service or politics. Service and politics, then, seems to be out of the realm of possibility in the change-making decisions of current Boston College undergraduates,

Table 1. Service vs. Political Involvement at Boston College

		Do you participate in unpaid volunteering or service at BC?		
		Yes	**No**	Total
Do you belong to any political groups on campus?	**Yes:**	8 7%	5 18%	13 9%
	No	108 93%	23 82%	131 91%
	Total	116 100%	28 100%	144 100%

Chapter 6A: Service Characteristics

Approximately 77% of survey respondents reported having volunteered in high school and at Boston College while approximately 17% reported having volunteered in high school but not at Boston College. The following page includes Table 2: Past/High School Service Characteristics, a comprehensive table that reports students' past/high school service characteristics including: type of service, frequency of service, and motivations to serve. On page 47, one can find Table 3: Boston College Service Characteristic that displays and describes students' service participation at Boston College (type of service, frequency of service). 80% of survey respondents reported as engaging in service during their time at Boston College. Also on page 48, one can find a table on these Boston College undergraduates' motivations to serve.

Roughly 22% of respondents identified as being involved in service at Boston College and attending religious services once per week. 14% of respondents identified as being involved in service at Boston College and attending religious services once per month and an additional 2% identified as being involved in service and attending religious services more than once per week. In total, 38% of respondents identified as being involved in service at Boston College and regularly attending religious services, thus suggesting a fairly strong association between religion and volunteering. 17% of respondents identified as being involved in service at Boston College but not attending religious services.

Table 2. Past/High School Service Characteristics

Volunteer characteristics	Frequency	%
Volunteered in high school		
Yes	156	96%
No	54	4%
Type of Volunteering		
Service trip	40	27%
Service learning	45	30%
Community service	126	84%
Fundraising events for specific cause	81	54%
Homeless shelter	21	14%
Soup kitchen	39	26%
Mentoring	49	33%
Tutoring	79	53%
Frequency of Volunteering		
Everyday	2	1%
2-3 times per week	58	37%
4-5 times per week	5	3%
Once a week	36	23%
Once every other week	22	14%
Once a month	21	13%
Once a year	4	3%
Motivations to Serve		
Social component	10	7%
Enhance resume for college applications	58	39%
Help others	92	61%
Pursue potential career(s)	11	7%
Fulfill school requirement	40	27%
Fulfill athletic requirement	1	1%
Spread awareness about a cause	6	4%
Be a well-rounded person	27	18%
Travel	4	3%
School's service-oriented culture	9	6%
Learn about yourself	6	4%
Learn about others	17	11%
Feel good about yourself	9	6%
Religious motivations	7	5%

Table 3. Boston College Service Characteristics

Volunteer Characteristics	Frequency	%
Volunteer at BC		
Yes	126	80%
No	31	20%
Type of Volunteering		
Service trip	40	27%
Service learning	45	30%
Community service	126	84%
Homeless shelter	21	14%
Soup kitchen	39	26%
Mentoring	49	33%
Tutoring	79	53%
Frequency of Volunteering		
Everyday	4	3%
A few times per week	43	35%
Once a week	49	40%
Once every other week	9	7%
Once a month	11	9%
Once every six months	5	4%
Once a year	1	1%

Table 4. Boston College Students: Motivations to Serve

	Frequency	%
Social component	27	22%
Enhance resume	10	8%
Help others	80	65%
Pursue potential career(s)	24	20%
Fulfill school requirement	7	6%
Fulfill athletic requirement	2	2%
Spread awareness about a cause	3	2%
Be a well-rounded person	24	20%
Travel	1	1%
BC's service-oriented campus culture	15	12%
Learn about yourself	16	13%
Learn about others	22	18%
Feel good about yourself	9	7%

Chapter 6B: Political Characteristics

Approximately 48% of respondents – across all class years – consider

themselves politically engaged, while approximately 52% of respondents do not. 43%

respondents vote regularly and 57% of respondents do not. Of the respondents who

considered themselves politically engaged, 35% do not vote regularly which raises

some question regarding what criteria Boston College students consider necessary for

someone to be politically engaged. That said, 78% of respondents who do not consider

themselves politically engaged also reported not voting regularly.

Table 5. Political Engagement and Voting

		Do you consider yourself a politically engaged person?		
		Yes	**No**	Total
	Yes	48 65%	18 22%	66 43%
Do you vote regularly?	**No**	26 35%	63 78%	89 57%
	Total	74 100%	81 100%	155 100%

There was a significant relationship (X^2=28.76, p<.01) between regularity of voting and

whether or not respondents considered themselves politically engaged is. This

suggests that Boston College undergraduates consider voting a mandatory criterion for

a person to qualify as politically engaged.

All interviewees associated citizen responsibility with voting, and upheld the view

that voting is a necessary criterion for someone to be a full participant in politics. One

leader of Appalachia commented, "[Voting] is one of those things you should do even if

you don't think it's going to make that big of an impact. If you are informed enough with

the way you want things to go in the country you should vote because in terms of the way everything is set up, the most…tangible way you can change anything is by voting." Similarly, a leader of 4Boston spoke of the right to vote, "I don't take [the right to vote] lightly even though I don't necessarily know everyone I'm voting for. I think just expressing that I do get a say is nice." He went on to joke, "Sometimes my absentee ballot doesn't even make it on time but I still feel good that I filled it out." This emphasizes how engrained voting is into the minds of American citizens, especially among Boston College undergraduates.

Among Boston College undergraduates who vote regularly (N=66), 94% of respondents (N=62) selected "I feel it is my duty as an American citizen," 80% (N=53) selected "I want my voice to be heard" and 45% (N=30) selected "My family expects me to vote." Therefore, societal expectation, civic efficacy and agency, and familial/parental influence seem to be primary motivations for voting among Boston College undergraduates. By contrast, only 0.1% of respondents selected the following three reasons for voting: "My peers and/or friends vote," "My professors encourage me to vote," and "BC has a political climate which encourages me to vote."

Among Boston College undergraduates who consider themselves politically engaged (N=48), 56% voted in the midterm election of November 2014. Ninety-seven percent of respondents who consider themselves politically engaged voted in the presidential elections, demonstrating students' political engagement by voting in presidential elections and the lacking involvement in smaller scale elections. Boston College political organization leaders both challenge and sympathize with this view.

One potential explanation for a lack of interest in smaller scale elections is the difficulty of voting out-of-state. One leader of Model UN was particular forthcoming about the sympathy he feels for out-of-state voters at Boston College, "I will say living in Massachusetts it's really easy for me to vote as a college student. My parents hand me an absentee ballot. If that wasn't the case I'm not sure I would actually vote. It's easy for me but the barrier to vote if I were from another state might prevent me from doing so." Along similar lines, a leader of 4Boston, also a Massachusetts native, admitted, "If my mom hadn't mailed me an absentee ballot I probably wouldn't have voted. She mailed me a ballot, stamped, and said, 'Fill this out and send it back.' [Voting] is not easy." Other service and political organization leaders made similar comments on the difficulty of voting while at school: "I didn't vote in the midterms. My absentee got all messed up. Well, I just forgot to do it," "It's just that it's not convenient…I never have a ballot."

Table 6. Political Engagement and Midterm Elections

		Do you consider yourself a politically engaged person?		
		Yes	No	Total
Did you vote in the November 2014 midterm election?	**Yes**	27 56%	6 33%	33 50%
	No	21 44%	12 67%	33 50%

Table 7. Political Engagement and Presidential Elections

		Do you consider yourself a politically engaged person?		
		Yes	**No**	Total
Did you vote in the 2012 presidential election?	**Yes**	34 97%	31 69%	65 81%
	No	1 3%	14 31%	15 19%

In addition to the difficulties associated with voting out-of-state while at school, an ideologically based theme emerged concerning students' sense of civic efficacy when it comes to voting. One 4Boston leader explained, "I don't think I personally gain from voting. When I volunteer I know exactly what I'm going to get out of it. But when I vote I don't necessarily know that the person I vote for is going to be selected." Similarly, a leader of Arrupe discussed her reservations with the uncertainty of selecting a fitting candidate, "It's upsetting because I feel like you're never going to find the perfect candidate to run that I want to represent me. I vote for the person who I think is going to fulfill what I hope to see in the world."

The difficulty of voting and the uncertainty of selecting a candidate draw on a larger theme that has emerged in the research that concerns the effectiveness of service or politics. 83% of respondents expressed service/volunteering – over political participation – as the form of civic engagement most likely to improve peoples' lives. Interestingly, the majority of political organization leaders also cited service as more effective than politics is improving the lives of people. A leader of BC Republicans explained, "Service is giving a quick and direct benefit and government doesn't do things quickly or directly. When you engage in politics by voting different candidates

into office there is a long process before someone is helped directly so I think service is very important." Other leaders of BC organizations – both service and political organizations – cited similar concerns about the slow and indirect nature of politics with claims like, "Politics is very slow…change doesn't happen quickly. I think [with] service you can get right on the ground and talk to people directly. It is more tangible. It is more real. You can actually do something yourself. I think government provides great services but I think on the ground service is much more effective for change."

While the general consensus at Boston College seems to be that service is more effective than politics, there also seems to be an agreed upon distinction between what level of change each form of civic engagement produces and, because of this distinction, the belief that both forms are necessary for the most far-reaching change. One service leader described this, "I would say political participation is better in instituting change but service and volunteering can't be left out of the picture because you can't kind of just jump the gun and make a change without supporting people along the way." This communicates the previously discussed theme of the direct nature of service versus politics, while also surfacing the suggestion that a combination of both service and politics is ideal and most effective. Others agree that both service and politics are both necessary for a healthy democracy, but take on more critical views. For instance, one leader of a political organization described where she stood on the "service versus politics" issue as follows, "A criticism I have on service is that it does immediate good but doesn't address systemic issues really. For the most part. I think some organizations probably do but there is only so much you can do as a volunteer so I think it is a good activity but I don't feel like that is the same as choosing a candidate

who is going to draft a specific bill that addresses a certain systemic issue."

Interestingly, even those respondents who cited political participation as most likely to

improve peoples' lives predominantly selected service-oriented courses of action as the

most likely ones for them to take. Of the respondents who considered political

engagement most likely to improve peoples' lives (N=27), 67% responded that "working

directly with victims to help them cope and rebuild their lives" and "volunteering directly

with a non-profit to spread awareness of this problem in the U.S." would be the most

likely courses of action they would take, reinforcing a gravitation towards service as a

direct means of producing change and helping people.

Table 8. Student Approaches to Civic Engagement

		Which form of civic engagement do you consider most likely to improve peoples' lives?		
		Service/volunteering	Political participation	Total
Course of Action	**Work directly with victims to help them cope and rebuild their lives**	53 42%	8 30%	61 40%
	Sign a petition to prevent the posting of human trafficking ads online	17 14%	2 7%	19 13%
	Call or write a letter to a member of Congress to ask them to support a bill	4 3%	3 11%	7 5%
	Volunteer with a non-profit to spread awareness of this problem in the U.S.	50 40%	10 37%	60 39%
	Total	125	27	152

Ch. 7: Implications and Conclusion

Service is undoubtedly an integral part of many undergraduates' experiences at Boston College. Students view service as a way to meaningfully engage in their communities and make change. This thesis reinforces the idea of service as the preferred form of civic engagement within the Boston College community, as evidenced by higher rates of service as compared to politics as well as students' high estimates of what percent of undergraduates are involved in service. Student leaders of both service and political organizations largely agree that politics are "divisive, corrupt, and slow-moving" while service tends to be more "direct" and "tangible" in terms of its change-making capacity.

This thesis aimed to explore how students attach meaning to their involvement in service and/or politics. By attempting to understand more about these meaning making processes, this thesis investigated how undergraduates go about developing their civic identities. More specifically, the research question for this thesis asks why Boston College students choose service or politics as their primary means of civic engagement. In more cases than not, the answers to this question prompted the overarching and critical question: Why **not** both?

At the end of our interview, a leader of a Boston College political organization mused, "It is interesting because political participation is not considered service but it is volunteering. It is hours and hours of volunteering. I think it is an interesting distinction. I mean, my weekends were filled up with campaigning." This study has attempted to better understand what motivates students to serve and how these motivations translate into specific forms of civic engagement. In doing so, it aims to determine if politics and

54

service do or do not go hand-in-hand in the hearts and minds of the "future leaders" of our democracy. In striving towards each one of these objectives, I consider it a priority to encourage all forms of civic engagement without framing it as an "either-or" decision but rather a convincing case for people to strike a balance and participate in both to an extent with which they feel productive, comfortable, and successful.

Among those interviewees who were leaders of service organizations, each one expressed some kind of feeling of personal guilt for not engaging in politics by a lack of deliberation with friends. For example, one service leader explained how little he "talks politics" with his friends, "I feel like in my sphere no one ever brings it up. I never really had the opportunity to talk about it. But that is in part my fault because I don't bring it up either." Similarly, another service leader described whether or not she considered BC a political campus: "I guess I've never really reflected on this. Me and my friends don't really discuss politics. It is not really an issue that comes up." One leader raised an interesting point that Boston College itself is not an environment that fosters deliberation, at least not in a classroom setting: "I think it's more difficult because people don't really like to disagree at BC. There's a lot of 'Oh, I really agree with that' or 'Just to build on that point.'" This consistent finding suggests that the view that the possibility of a heightened sense of student political consciousness could translate into increased activism seems to be limited at Boston College.

In addition to feeling this personal guilt for not "talking politics" or deliberating with friends, many leaders – particularly service leaders – felt a certain sense of guilt for not being politically engaged in other ways (i.e. not being as informed as they "should" be, not voting regularly). One service leader also answered in response to whether or not

Boston College is a political campus: "As good as it should be? No. No it should be a much more active campus. Again, I take full blame for myself." Others made promises to be more politically engaged in the future with comments such as "I plan on voting in the future. Right now, it just never happens" or "If you're in college you do political engagement over service or service over political engagement – it doesn't mean that you can't become more attuned to [the other] in the rest of your life. I think they both inform each other."

Of particular interest in this thesis are how students do or do not draw potential parallels between service and politics. This research has attempted to critically examine the current civic engagement climate at Boston College as well as to inspire students to reflect on their own civic identities in order to establish meaningful connections between service and politics and develop well-rounded mindsets on how to successfully inspire social change.

Future Research

Future research would sample a larger population, perhaps drawn from multiple colleges throughout Boston or even the country. Alternatively, the end goal of another research project on civic engagement could be the establishment of a service-learning program meant to equip students with the skills necessary to engage in both service and politics. Much literature with this focus or end goal exists, but adding to this growing body of literature is something I view as advancing the field, as service learning is becoming increasingly popular among American college campuses and even high schools.

Boston College offers a unique opportunity to study civic engagement in the collegiate sphere, especially given the recent deaths of Michael Brown and Eric Garner. Political tensions are high, and the administration seems to be taking a passive and apolitical stance, potentially engraining a "service over politics" mentality in the thought processes of the student body or, potentially instilling a desire in BC students to reorient themselves to view political participation as both effective and crucial to implement change. In order to make sense of these recent national events and the ways in which college campuses, such as Boston College, address them, it is necessary to get an idea of how students are thinking about civic engagement. Only in this way can college campuses adjust their administrative responses, academic structures, and campus culture to fully prepare students to civically engage in democratic society, which requires both engagement service and politics.

References

Bandura, Albert. "Social Cognitive Theory of Mass Communication" *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research* (2): 121-153.

Bingham, Lisa, Tina Nabatchi, and Rosemary O'Leary. 2005. "The New Governance: Practices and Processes for Stakeholder and Citizen Participation in the Work of Government" Public Administration Review 65(5): 547-558.

"Boston College Fact Book" *Boston College Institutional Research.* Accessed April 22, 2015.

Boyte, Harry. 2005. "Reframing Democracy: Governance, Civic Agency, and Politics" *Public Administration Review* 65: 536-546.

Burden, Barry. 2009. 2005. "The Dynamic Effects of Education on Voter Turnout" *Electoral Studies* 28: 540-549.

Campbell, Angus, Gerald Gurin, and Warren Miller. 1954. "The Voter Decides" *The American Political Science Review* 49(1): 225-228.

Campbell, David. 2000. "Social Capital and Service Learning" *PSOnline* (October): 641-646.

Caprara, Gian, Michele Vecchione, Cristina Capanna, and Minou Mebane. 2009. "Perceived Political Self-Efficacy: Theory, Assessment, and Applications" *European Journal of Social Psychology* 39:1002-1020.

Cho, Jaeho, Dhavan Shah, Seungahn Nah, Melissa Gotlieb, Hunseo Hwang, Nam-Jin Lee, Rosanne Scholl, and Douglas M. McLeod. 2007. "Campaign Ads, Online Messaging and Participation: Extending the Communication Mediation Model." Journal of Communication 57: 676-703.

Claassen, Ryan and J. Quin Monson. 2013. "New Media, Civic Learning, and Civic Action Among Young People." *ASPA Teaching and Learning:* 1-44.

Coleman, James. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital" *American Journal of Sociology* 94: 95-120.

"Community Benefits and Service Programs." *Boston College.* Accessed April 27, 2015.

Corporation for National and Community Service. 2006. "College Students Helping America: Executive Summary." Washington, DC. Accessed November 10, 2014.

Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. 2010. "College Students Registered to Vote Turned out at 87% in 2008." Accessed December 15, 2014.

Dalbert, C., Montada, L., & Schmitt, M. 1987. Glaube an eine gerechte Welt als Motiv: Validierungskorrelate zweier Skalen. *Psychologische Beiträge* 29: 596–615.

Davis, Kim. 2010. "The Influence of Community Service Learning on Student Engagement Retention, and Success." 1-6.

Denny, Grace. 2014. "BC Students Lead Die-In Protests." *The Gavel.* Accessed December 14, 2014.

Eyler, Janet and Giles, Dwight. Jr. 1999. "Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?" San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, Janet, Giles, Dwight and Schmeide, A. 1996. "A Practitioner's Guide to Reflection in Service Learning: Student Voices and Reflections." Nashville: Vanderbilt University.

Eyler, Janet, Giles, Dwight, Stenson, Christine, and Gray Charlene. 2001. "At A Glance: What We Know about the Effects of Service-Learning on College Students, Faculty, Institutions, and Communities 1993-2000" *Vanderbilt University* (3): 1-120.

Finkel, Steven. 1985. "Reciprocal Effects of Participation and Political Efficacy: A Panel Analysis" *American Journal of Political Science* 29(4): 891-913.

Fishkin, James. 2009. *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy & Public Consultation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Furco, Andrew. 1996. "Service Learning: A Balanced Approach to Experiential Education" *Expanding Boundaries: Service and Learning.* Washington, DC: Corporation for National Service: 2-6.

Gage, Richard, and Brijesh Thapa. 2011. "Volunteer Motivations and Constraints Among College Students: Analysis of the Volunteer Function Inventory and Leisure Constraints Models" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41(3): 405-430.

Harker, David. 2014. *Service, Politics, and Identity: On Realizing the Potential of Service Learning.* 1-248.

Healy, Meaghan. 2014. "Do as the Jesuits Do: How To Volunteer at Boston College." *College Magazine*. Accessed December 1, 2014.

Higher Education Research Institute. 2010. "Voting Behavior Among College Students." Los Angeles, CA.

Jarvis, Sharon, Lisa Montoya, and Emily Mulvoy. 2005. "The Political Participation of College Students, Working Students, and Working Youth." *CIRCLE: The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.* 37(August): 1-21.

Jones, Jeffrey. 2013. "Americans Remain Divided on Role They Want Gov't to Play" *Gallup.* Accessed September 30, 2014.

Kuklinski, James H. and Norman L. Hurley. 1996. "On Hearing and Interpreting Political Messages: A Cautionary Tale of Citizen Cue-Taking" Journal of Politics 56(3): 729-751.

Landemore, Hélène. 2013. "On Minimal Deliberation, Partisan Activism, and Teaching People How to Disagree" *Critical Review* 25(2): 210-225.

Lawson, Cody. 2012. "An Examination of Students' Perceptions Toward Civic Issues: A Comparison of 1957 and 2011" *University of Memphis* (May): 12-157.

Lee, Nam-Jin, Dhavan Shah, and Jack McLeod. 2013. "Processes of Political Socialization: A Communication Mediation Approach to Youth Civic Engagement" *Communication Research* 40(5): 669-697.

Leong, Sim Kee and Lee Wee Heong. 2013. "Developing Students' Positive Behavior (Responsibility, Care and Respect) through Community Service." 1-15.

Levin, Inés. "Political Participation is More than Just Resources: A New Approach to the Study of Civic Engagement" *California Institute of Technology:* 1-51.

Mann, Sheilah and John Patrick. 2000. *Civic Engagement in Democracy: Service Learning and Other Promising Practices.*

Marullo, Sam and Bob Edwards. 2000. "From Charity to Justice" *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(5): 895.

McLeod, J.M., Daily, K., Guo, Z., Evland, W.P. Jr., Bayer, J., Yang, S., et al. 1996. "Community Integration, Local Media Use and Democratic Processes." *Communication Research* 23: 179-209.

Miller, Christina R. 2008. "Service-Learning and Civic Efficacy among Youth with Disabilities" *Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations.* Paper 2412. http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/etd/2412.

Mohiyeddini, C., & Montada, L. 1998. "Belief in a Just World and Self-Efficiency in Coping with Observed Victimization" New York: Plenum, 41-54.

Montada, L., Kals, E., & Becker, R. 2007. "Willingness for Continued Social Commitment: A New Concept in Environmental Research." *Environment and Behavior* 39: 287–316.

Morrell, Michael. 2003. "Deliberation, Democratic Decision-Making and Internal Political Efficacy" *Political Behavior* 27(1): 49-69.

Moschner, B. 1998. Ehrenamtliches Engagement und soziale Verantwortung. In B. Reichle & M. Schmitt (Eds.), Verantwortung, Gerechtigkeit und Moral. Zum psychologischen Verständnisethischer Aspekte im menschlichen Verhalten: 73–86.

Mutz, Diana. 2006. *Hearing the Other Side: Deliberative Versus Participatory Democracy.* Oxford: Cambridge University Press.

Neufeind, Max, Patrick Jiranek, and Theo Wehner. 2013. "Beyond Skills and Structure: Justice Dispositions as Antecedents of Young Citizens' Volunteering and Political Participation" *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology.* Accessed online in Wiley Online Library.

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

Putnam, Robert. 2000. Bowling Alone: *The Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.

Putnam, Robert. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rubin, Z., & Peplau, L. A. 1975. "Who Believes in a Just World?" *Journal of Social Issues* 31: 65–89.

Stone, Deborah. 2010. *The Samaritan's Dilemma.* New York: Nation Books.

Vecchione, M., & Caprara, G. V. 2009. "Personality Determinants of Political Participation: The Contribution of Traits and Self-Efficacy Beliefs" *Personality and Individual Differences* 46: 487-492.

Vogelgesang, L.J. & Astin, A.W. 2000. "Comparing the Effects of Community Service and Service-learning" *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (7): 25-34.

Walsh, K. C. 2004. *Talking about Politics: Informal groups and Social Identity in American Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Yusop, Farrah and Ana-Paula Correia. 2013. "The Benefits and Challenges of Implementing Service-learning in an Advanced Instructional Design and Technology Curricula: Implications for Teaching Professional Courses" *New Educational Review*: 220-232.

Zuckerman, M. 1975. "Belief in a Just World and Altruistic Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 31: 972–976.

Appendix A. Survey Guide

Civic Identity at Boston College

1) Are you a U.S. Citizen?
    a. Yes
    b. No

    If No--"Thank you for your time, but this survey aims to measure the civic engagement behaviors of those students who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents of the U.S."

2) What is your class year?
    a. Freshman
    b. Sophomore
    c. Junior
    d. Senior

3) What is your gender?
    a. Male
    b. Female

4) What school are you in?
    c. A&S
    d. CSOM
    e. Connell Nursing
    f. Lynch

5) What is your major and minor?
    Major(s):_____
    Minor(s):_____

6) What is your religious affiliation?
    a. Roman Catholic
    b. Protestant
    c. Jewish
    d. Spiritual but no organized religion
    e. Other: _____
    f. None.
    g. Prefer not to answer.

7) How often do you attend religious services?
    a. More than once a week
    b. Once a week
    c. Once a month
    d. On religious holidays only

e. Occasionally/a few times per year
f. I do not attend religious services.

Section 1: Civic development processes

1) Did you participate in **unpaid** volunteering/service in high school?
   a. Yes
   b. No

   *If yes: What prompted you to volunteer?
   If no: What made you decide not to volunteer?

2) How would you best describe your **unpaid** volunteering/service experience in high school? Check all that apply.
   a. Service trip
   b. Service learning (classroom component, organized via school)
   c. Community service (i.e. raking leaves)
   d. Fundraising events for a cause
   e. Homeless shelter
   f. Soup kitchen
   g. Mentoring
   h. Tutoring
   i. Other: _____

3) How frequently did you engage in **unpaid** volunteering/service in high school?
   a. Every day
   b. 2-3 times per week
   c. 4-5 times per week
   d. Once a week
   e. Once every other week
   f. Once a monthHS
   g. Once every six months
   h. Once a year
   i. Other: _____
   j. I didn't volunteer/serve.

4) What motivated you to volunteer/serve in high school? Check the two that most apply.
   a. Social component
   b. Enhance resume for college applications
   c. Help others
   d. Pursue potential career(s)
   e. Fulfill school requirement
   f. Fulfill athletic requirement
   g. Spread awareness about a cause
   h. Be a well-rounded person

      i.   Travel
      j.   School's service-oriented culture
      k. Learn about yourself
      l.   Learn about others
      m. Feel good about yourself
      n. Religious motivations

Section II: Service: Volunteering, Service Learning, Service Trips

1) Approximately how frequently do you engage in volunteering/service at BC?
   a. Every day
   b. A few times per week
   c. Once a week
   d. Once every other week
   e. Once a month
   f. Once every six months
   g. Once a year
   h. Other: _____
   i. I don't volunteer/serve. (won't get next question)

2) Are you involved, or have you been involved in the past, in any of the following BC service organizations?
   a. PULSE
   b. 4Boston
   c. Arrupe
   d. Appalachia Volunteers
   e. Other service trip(s): _____
   f. Other organization(s): _____
   g. None

3) What motivated you to volunteer/serve at BC? Check the two that most apply.
   a. Social component
   b. Enhance resume for college applications
   c. Help others
   d. Pursue potential career(s)
   e. Fulfill school requirement
   f. Fulfill athletic requirement
   g. Spread awareness about a cause
   h. Be a well-rounded person
   i. Travel
   j. BC's service-oriented campus culture
   k. Learn about yourself
   l. Learn about others
   m. Feel good about yourself

n. Other please specify: _____

4) What percent of the BC student body would you estimate to be involved in service?

_____

5) Do you plan on continuing to engage in service post-graduation?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Maybe
    d. I don't know

Section III: Political Participation

1) Do you consider yourself a politically engaged person?
    a. Yes
    b. No

2) At what age did you register to vote?
    a. 18
    b. 19
    c. 20
    d. 21
    e. 22
    f. I am not registered to vote.

3) Do you vote regularly?
    a. Yes
    b. No

4) What factors motivate you to vote? Check three.
    a. I feel it is my duty as an American citizen
    b. I want my voice to be heard
    c. My family expects me to vote
    d. My peers and/or friends vote
    e. My professors encourage me to vote
    f. BC has a political climate which encourages me to vote
    g. I tend not to vote.

5) Did you vote in the November 2014 midterm election this past year?
    a. Yes
    b. No

6) How did you vote in the midterm election this past year?
   a. In person
   b. Absentee ballot
   c. Early voting
   d. Other: _____

7) What factor most influenced your votes in the November 4th election?
   a. Partisan opinion
   b. Parental opinion
   c. Peer opinion
   d. Independent research prior to election
   e. Coursework
   f. Experience with service
   g. Other: _____

If e or f is selected, follow up with open-ended: "What about your coursework or service experience shaped your political choices in the midterm election?"

11) Were you eligible to vote in the presidential election in 2012?
   a. Yes
   b. No

12) What factor most influenced your votes in the 2012 presidential election?
   a. Partisan opinion
   b. Parental opinion
   c. Peer opinion
   d. Independent research prior to election
   e. Coursework
   f. Experience with service
   g. Other: _____

If e or f is selected, follow up with open-ended: "What about your coursework or service experience shaped your political choices in the 2012 presidential election?"

8) In the last 12 months, which have you participated in? Check all that apply.
   a. Campaigning
   b. Lobbying
   c. Demonstrations or protests
   d. Voting
   e. Signing petitions
   f. Contacting government officials
   g. Other:_____
   h. None

For people who check yes to any of the above options, they will get a "frequency" question. I.e: How often have you participated in "campaigning" in the last 12 months?
a. Once
c. 2-3 times
d. 4-6 times
e. 6-8 times
f. About once a month
g. More than any of these options

If e, f, or g are selected:
"Could you elaborate on your routine political involvement?"

If h is selected--
9) Why do you tend not to engage politically? Check all that apply.
a. I'm too busy with other extra-curriculars
b. I'm too busy with school
c. I would rather participate in service-oriented organizations
d. I'm not interested in politics
e. I do not like politics
f. I do not trust the government and/or politicians
g. I don't see the point in participating
h. Other: _____

10) Do you belong to any political groups on campus? If yes, specify which.
a. Yes. I belong to: _____
b. No

Section IV: Civic attitudes

1) How do you typically get your news? Choose which one you use most frequently and the outlet you go to FIRST (ie: If you regularly log on Facebook and click a link that redirects you to the New York Times website, choose "Social Media" option).
a. Television newscast
b. Radio
c. Social Media
d. News websites
e. Email
f. Newspaper
g. Other: _____

2) How often do you check this news source?
a. Everyday

b. A few times a week
c. When a big event or issue is happening
d. Rarely

3) With which statement do you more strongly agree?

Active means: "The government should take active steps in every area it can to try and improve the lives of its citizens."

Passive means: "The government should only do those things necessary to provide the most basic government functions."

a. Active
b. Passive
c. No preference
d. I'm not sure

4) Consider the social issue of human trafficking in the United States. **Which course of action would you be most likely to take to combat this problem?**

a. Work directly with victims to help them cope and rebuild their lives
b. Sign a petition to prevent the posting of human trafficking ads online
c. Call or write a letter to a member of Congress to ask them to support a bill
d. Volunteer with a non-profit to spread awareness of this problem in the U.S.
e. Other: _____

5) Which form of civic engagement do you consider most likely to improve peoples' lives?

a. Service and volunteering
b. Political participation

6) On a scale of 1-5 how confident do you feel in your general ability to debate political issues or engage in political discussions? 1=Not at all confident, 5=Extremely confident

a. 1
b. 2
c. 3
d. 4
e. 5

7) On a scale of 1-5 how confident do you feel in your ability to debate political issues or engage in political discussions with friends? 1=Not at all confident, 5=Extremely confident

a. 1
b. 2
c. 3

    d. 4

    e. 5

8) On a scale of 1-5 how confident do you feel in your ability to debate political issues or engage in political discussions with people you do **not** consider yourself close with? 1=Not at all confident, 5=Extremely confident

    a. 1

    b. 2

    c. 3

    d. 4

    e. 5

Appendix B. Interview Guide 1

Interview Guide (Service/Volunteering Organizations)

Civic Identity at Boston College

Section I: Background Information
1) Are you a U.S. citizen and/or a permanent resident of the U.S.?
2) What is your class year?
3) What school are you in?
4) What is your major and minor?
5) Are you religious? What is your religious affiliation?
6) How often do you attend religious services?

Section II: Civic engagement
1) When did you first become involved in this organization?
2) What initially drew you to the organization? What would you describe as your primary motivation or motivations to join?
3) Did you do anything similar in high school? If so, describe. How often did you participate in this organization in the past (everyday, 2-3 times per week, etc)? Did this experience motivate you or influence you in any way to join this BC organization?
4) Would you say your attitude towards service has changed since high school? Or, have your motivations changed? What about from the time you first joined this organization?
5) Are you involved in any other organizations on campus? How much of your time does this (or these) constitute?
6) What initially drew you to these organizations? What continuously draws you to participate in them?
7) What percent of students would you personally estimate to be involved in service at BC?
8) Is BC a service-oriented campus? How so?

Section III: Operations of Organization
1) What are your responsibilities as a leader of this organization?
2) What are the goals of the organization as a whole? What about the mission statement or organization's initiatives do you align with the most?
3) How do you typically feel after engaging in service for this organization?
4) What are your personal goals in being a student leader in this organization?
5) Are you responsible for recruiting new members? How do you go about this? What qualities do you look for in a new member? (does not apply to PULSE students but does apply to PULSE council members)
6) Do you feel like you are making an impact? How so?
7) How do you measure the impact you make? Is it measurable? How so?

8) Does your organization incorporate any kind of reflection component with members? What ideals do these reflections emphasize? What is a typical agenda for a reflection like?
9) Do you think your coursework compliments your service participation? In what ways? How do your major and minor affect your service work? What about core coursework in general?
10) Do you plan on engaging in volunteer/service work post-graduation?
11) Has your involvement in this organization in any way shaped your career goals? How so?

Section IV: Political Participation
1) Do you consider yourself a politically engaged person?
2) How would you describe a politically engaged person? What kinds of things does a politically engaged person do and how often do they do them?
3) Do you vote regularly?
4) What factors motivate you to vote? Do these differ from the factors that motivate you to serve? How so?
5) Did you vote in the November 2014 midterm election this past year? If so, what factors most influenced your votes in the November 4th election?
6) Did you vote in the 2012 presidential election? What factor most influenced your votes in the 2012 presidential election?
7) Do you feel your involvement in service in any way shapes your political attitudes? How so?
8) To what extent do politics implement change? How effective are they?
9) How confident do you feel in your general ability to debate political issues or engage in political discussions? Do political issues come up in the work you do for this organization at all? What about in reflection?
10) Would you consider BC a political campus? Why or why not?

Section V: Civic attitudes
1) With which statement do you more strongly agree?

> **Active** means: "The government should take active steps in every area it can to try and improve the lives of its citizens."

> **Passive** means: "The government should only do those things necessary to provide the most basic government functions."

2) Which form of civic engagement do you consider most likely to improve peoples' lives: service and volunteering or political participation? Why?
3) Do you generally trust the government?
4) Are BC students more interested in service/volunteering or politics? How did you arrive at your decision? Is this a positive or a negative thing?

Appendix C. Interview Guide 2

Interview Guide (Political Organization)

Civic Identity at Boston College

Section I: Background Information
1) Are you a U.S. citizen and/or a permanent resident of the U.S.?
2) What is your class year?
3) What school are you in?
4) What is your major and minor?
5) Are you religious? What is your religious affiliation?
6) How often do you attend religious services?

Section II: Civic Engagement
1) When did you first become involved in this organization?
2) What initially drew you to the organization? What would you describe as your primary motivation or motivations to join?
3) Did you do anything similar in high school? If so, describe. How often did you participate in this organization in the past (everyday, 2-3 times per week, etc)? Did this experience motivate you or influence you in any way to join this BC organization?
4) Would you say your attitude towards politics have changed the time you first joined this organization?
5) Is BC a political campus? How so?
6) How would you describe a politically engaged person? What kinds of things does a politically engaged person do and how often do they do them?
7) Do you vote regularly?
8) What factors motivate you to vote? Do these differ from the factors that motivate you to serve? How so?
9) Did you vote in the November 2014 midterm election this past year? If so, what factors most influenced your votes in the November 4th election?
10) Did you vote in the 2012 presidential election? What factor most influenced your votes in the 2012 presidential election?
11) To what extent do politics implement change? How effective are they?
12) How confident do you feel in your general ability to debate political issues or engage in political discussions?

Section III: Operations of Organization
1) What are your responsibilities as a leader of this organization?
2) What are the goals of the organization as a whole? What about the mission statement or organization's initiatives do you align with the most?
3) How do you typically feel after an event and/or meeting for this organization?
4) What are your personal goals in being a student leader in this organization?

5) Are you responsible for recruiting new members? How do you go about this? What qualities do you look for in a new member? (Does not apply to PULSE students but does apply to PULSE council members)
6) Do you feel like you are making an impact? How so?
7) How do you measure the impact you make? Is it measurable? How so?
8) Does your organization incorporate any kind of reflection component or discussion with members? What ideals do these reflections or discussions emphasize? What is a typical agenda for a reflection/discussion like?
9) Do you think your coursework compliments your participation in this organization? In what ways? How do your major and minor affect your service work? What about core coursework in general?
10) How do you plan on continuing to be politically engaged post-graduation?
11) Has your involvement in this organization in any way shaped your career goals? How so?

Section IV: Service/Volunteering Participation
1) Are you involved in any service organizations on campus? How much of your time does this (or these) constitute?
2) What initially drew you to these organizations? What continuously draws you to participate in them?
3) In what ways does your involvement in service (if any), shape your political attitudes?
4) What percent of students would you personally estimate to be involved in service at BC?
5) Is BC a service-oriented campus? How so?

Section V: Civic attitudes
1) With which statement do you more strongly agree?

Active means: "The government should take active steps in every area it can to try and improve the lives of its citizens."

Passive means: "The government should only do those things necessary to provide the most basic government functions."

2) Which form of civic engagement do you consider most likely to improve peoples' lives: service and volunteering or political participation? Why?
3) Do you generally trust the government?
4) Are BC students more interested in service/volunteering or politics? How did you arrive at your decision? Is this a positive or a negative thing?