

**Do Introductory Political Science Courses Contribute to a Racial Political Efficacy Gap?**  
**Preliminary Findings from a Panel Survey of a Large Public University**

Miguel Centellas  
University of Mississippi

Cy Rosenblatt  
University of Mississippi

**Abstract**

This paper examines whether completing an introductory-level political science course affects students' political efficacy using data from a panel survey of students at a flagship public university. Our original intention was to measure difference in political efficacy across gender and race, and hoping that any "efficacy gap" could be closed by the end of the semester. Instead, our main finding surprised us: We found that completing an introductory-level course had little impact on *internal* political efficacy, when controlling for other factors. However, we found an important racial divergence on *external* political efficacy: By the end of the semester black students became less likely to believe they could influence political decisions, even as their white peers reported gains in external efficacy. This raises questions about the "civic" function of the undergraduate political science curriculum—particularly regarding racial political inequalities.

Civic education is among many potential goals of an undergraduate political science curriculum. While few of us describe ourselves as “teaching civics,” a significant part of what we do serves that function. This is most pronounced in introductory American government courses, where significant attention goes to familiarizing students with the theory and practice of America’s political system. American political science has a history of involvement in civic education, going back to John Dewey (1916) and interest in social reform during the Progressive Era. A recent phase began in 1996, with the formation of the APSA Task Force on Civic Education (Ostrom 1996). Interest in civic education is also reflected in efforts to foster and improve students’ “engagement” across college and university campuses (Youniss 2011).

Many discussions of civic education focus on “knowledge acquisition” (Galston 2001; Niemi 2005). In the tradition of John Dewey, civic education proponents argue that increasing “political literacy” improves an individual’s political efficacy, which in turn improves the health of our democracy (Gutman 1999; Westheimer and Kahne 2004; Feith 2011; Campbell et al 2012). Traditionally, civic education includes a broader appreciation of how the political system works and how individuals can effectively participate. Studies show that improvements in knowledge acquisition are associated with deliberate instruction in civics (Niemi and Junn 1998) and discussion of controversial topics (Hess 2009). Research on political socialization has long explored the relationship between childhood and early adult education and individuals’ political attitudes—including political efficacy (Easton and Dennis 1967; Meyer 1977; Luskin 1987). Such studies find that education positively impacts individuals’ political efficacy. Some have argued that political efficacy should be a goal of civic education (Kahne and Westheimer 2006; Pasek et al 2008).

However, studies also highlight inequalities in the benefits of civic education. Studies by the National Center for Education Statistics found that students who are poor, whose parents have less education, and are African-American or Hispanic do less well on civic-political knowledge tests (NCES 1999; 2007). Although service learning and extra-curricular programs are an increasing component of civic education (Baldi et al 2001; Kahne and Sporte 2008), students from lower socioeconomic status and ethnic minorities have fewer opportunities to participate in such programs (Conover and Searing 2000; Kahne and Middaugh 2008). If civic education is an important component of political science curriculum in the twenty-first century, we must grapple with ways in which social and economic inequalities affect how students acquire the benefits of such an education.

This study empirically tests the relationship between political efficacy and a “standard” political science curriculum instrument: the introductory-level course. To our knowledge, this is the first such attempt. Specifically, we wanted to know whether completing an introductory political science course had any measurable effect on individual students’ political efficacy, controlling for demographic and socioeconomic factors. Our data comes from a Fall 2011 non-anonymous panel survey of students enrolled in introductory-level courses at a flagship public university in the South. In addition to questions about political efficacy, we asked about demographic characteristics, political attitudes, and behavior. We were surprised by two findings: First, although our data showed significant differences in *internal* political efficacy at the start of the semester, it showed no significant difference in measures of *external* political efficacy across student subpopulations at the start of the semester. Second, our data showed a statistically significant and sizeable *divergence* in external political efficacy between white and

black students at the end of the semester. This last finding is both intriguing and problematic, and we discuss its implications in our conclusion.

We care about the relationship between political science education and political efficacy for several reasons. If political efficacy is important for the continued health and vitality of American democracy, then it is an important public concern. Moreover, if political science has a “useful” function—which we believe it both does and should—one of these is preparing active, engaged citizens. If political science courses are failing in this mission, we should be concerned. And we should be especially concerned if political science curriculum has negative effects on individuals’ attitudes about politics—and particularly if what we teach contributes to a *racial* gap in political efficacy.

### **The Survey: Data and Methodology**

Our study relies on a two-part panel survey administered across introductory political science courses at [institution name], a flagship public university in the South. The survey was administered during Fall 2011 in two waves, during the first and last weeks of the semester. The surveys were not anonymous, allowing us to match individual responses across waves, as well as with individual students’ final grades in the course. Students had the option to participate in the survey, and filled out a consent form, which we retained on file. Because of the sensitive nature of the survey, we embargoed responses until all final grades were submitted.<sup>1</sup> To ensure strict confidentiality, individual student responses have never been shared with anyone other than the co-authors.

---

<sup>1</sup> Our study was approved by the university’s Institutional Review Board. It is filed as: “Collaborative Assignments and Effects on News Media Consumption and Political Efficacy” (Protocol 12-031).

The survey was distributed in all but two sections of three introductory courses: American Government (AG), Comparative Politics (CP), and International Relations (IR). In total, 1,317 students were enrolled in these courses during the semester, slightly more than 9 percent of the undergraduate student body. Both survey waves were distributed in paper form, using a standard Scantron (N° 16485) sheet.<sup>2</sup> The participation rate for the first survey wave was about 50 percent. By the end of the semester, the total enrollment dropped to 1,107 and the participation rate in the second wave of the survey was about 40 percent.<sup>3</sup> None of these courses are required for graduation, although all undergraduate students at [institution name] must take at least two social science courses. American Government is one of the most common courses taken by students to fulfill the social science requirement.

Table 1 presents a snapshot of our survey population for three demographic variables for which we have university-wide data for the same year: gender, race/ethnicity, and class standing. The table also shows the results of difference of binomial probability tests (two-tailed) between sample and population (university) measures. We are confident that our sample reflects the racial/ethnic composition at the university, although our sample is disproportionately male (except the IR subsample) and does not reflect the class composition of the university (not surprising given that these are 100-level, introductory courses).

[Table 1 here]

---

<sup>2</sup> We wish to thank the department chair, [name], for supporting this research project by providing the nearly 2,000 Scantron sheets needed, as well as the substantial copying cost for the necessary survey booklets.

<sup>3</sup> Participation rates vary based on whether students answer specific questions on the survey, which affects the *N* for various statistical models.

In addition to gender, race/ethnicity, and class standing, we asked students a battery of questions related to their socioeconomic background, attitudes, and behavior. Table 2 presents a snapshot of our sample characteristics across all three courses. The level of education for students' parents varied, but skewed towards highly educated parents (61.6 percent of fathers and 59.9 percent of mothers had a bachelors degree or higher). Type of hometowns was distributed around the middle of our rural-urban scale. Our students leaned conservative, with 50.3 percent describing themselves as "conservative" or "highly conservative" compared to only 14.4 percent describing themselves as "liberal" or "very liberal." Although there were differences between the classes (e.g. parents' level of education seemed lower in IR), none of these differences were statistically significant. We asked a series of questions about students' television viewing, news media consumption, and Internet and social media use. Our students were infrequent consumers of news media, and were more likely to consume news online, in newspapers, or on television than other formats. Students also reported spending more time online than watching television. Interestingly, students were less likely to post a news item to Facebook, Twitter, or other social media during a week than they were likely to receive a post from someone else. As with the other background characteristic variables, differences across classes were not statistically significant.

[Table 2 here]

There were some important differences between subpopulations. The level of parents' education for students in the IR subsample was significantly higher than for the rest of the

sample, but only at  $p < 0.05$  levels.<sup>4</sup> There were no significant differences in parents' level of education across gender. But there were highly significant differences in parents' level of education across race.<sup>5</sup> There was also a statistically significant difference in ideological identification between white and non-white students, but not between genders.<sup>6</sup> There were also significant differences in rural/urban background across race (but not gender), but only at  $p < 0.05$  levels.<sup>7</sup> Finally, there were gender differences across race. While white students in our sample were disproportionately male (61.9 percent to 38.1 percent), the black students in our sample were disproportionately female (43.9 percent to 56.1 percent). Binomial tests showed no significant gender difference between white students and the overall sample, while the gender difference was highly significant for black students ( $p < 0.001$ ). Because the larger size of our white sample, it's important to note that the black subpopulation closely reflected the university gender parameters, while the white subpopulation did not ( $p < 0.001$ ). There were no discernable differences in class standing, media consumption, or social media use across gender or race.

### **Measures of Political Efficacy**

Our dependent variables were external and internal political efficacy. Political efficacy is “the feeling that individual political action does have, or can have, an impact upon the political process ... the feeling that political and social change is possible, and that the individual citizen

---

<sup>4</sup> Wilcoxon rank-sum tests showed that fathers and mothers of students in IR sections were better educated than the overall sample ( $z = -2.029$ ,  $p < .05$  and  $z = -2.155$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

<sup>5</sup> Wilcoxon rank-sum tests showed that fathers and mothers of white students had higher levels of education ( $z = -8.478$ ,  $p < 0.001$  and  $z = -6.993$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

<sup>6</sup> Wilcoxon rank-sum tests showed that white students were significant more conservative ( $z = -7.469$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

<sup>7</sup> Wilcoxon rank-sum tests showed that black students were slightly more likely to come from rural areas than white students ( $z = -2.150$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

can play a part in bringing about this change” (Campbell, Gurin, and Miller 1954, 187). Political efficacy, along with other indicators of political behavior and attitudes were prominent in survey research of the behavioral revolution. The University of Michigan’s Center for Political Studies (CPS) began studying efficacy in 1952, and every round of the American National Election Studies (ANES) survey included questions about political efficacy. Most scholars distinguish between *internal* and *external* dimensions of political efficacy (Hensler 1971; Converse 1972; Bach 1974; Craig, Niemi, and Silver 1990). Internal political efficacy reflects a respondent’s ability to understand politics; external efficacy reflects belief that he or she can influence political decisions.

There is no consensus on how to measure political efficacy. Some prefer multi-item indexes that aggregate simple agree/disagree questions, such as those developed by Niemi, Craig, and Mattei (1991). We aggregated six regularly-used ANES questions to measure internal and external efficacy. We used the questions for internal efficacy used by Marcus and McKuen (1993) and Rudolph, Gangl, and Stevens (2000):

- “Voting is the only way that people like me have any say about how the government runs things” (item Q10)
- “People like me have no say about what the government does” (item Q11)
- “Sometimes politics and government seems so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on” (item Q12)

The questions we used to measure external efficacy below were also drawn from ANES, although these have been shown to be more problematic and questioned (Chamberlain 2012):

- “Public officials don’t care what people like me think” (item Q13)
- “Those we elect to Congress lose touch with the people pretty quickly” (item Q14)

- “Parties are only interested in people’s votes, but not their opinions” (item Q15)

Although some prefer multi-answer survey questions to tap into political efficacy, as used by the General Social Survey (GSS), the dichotomous (agree/disagree) format for questions remain in use by ANES and scholars using ANES datasets. Our research is consistent with that established methodological strategy.

Simple factor analysis showed that the six items loaded on two different factors, as expected.<sup>8</sup> However, covariance for external efficacy questions was smaller than for internal efficacy questions (Cronbach’s  $\alpha=0.30$  and  $\alpha=0.60$ , respectively, in first wave;  $\alpha=0.31$  and  $\alpha=0.61$  in second wave). Thus, are more confident in our external efficacy measures than in those for internal efficacy.

Following standard use of ANES questions, we created composite indexes for internal and external political efficacy. Because our questions were worded in the negative, a “disagree” answer was positively associated with efficacy and coded as “1” (affirmative answers, which were negatively associated with efficacy, were coded as zero). Adding answers produced four-point composite indexes ranging from 0 to 3, with a higher score associated with a higher level of political efficacy. Our data showed no statistically meaningful differences in aggregated internal or external political efficacy between start and end of semester, except for a very slight increase in internal efficacy in the American Government sections (but only at the  $p < 0.05$  level). This suggests that student who have completed an American government course are (slightly) more confident in their ability to *understand* politics. But, again, we are least confident in our internal efficacy measures and so we caution against reading too much into this particular finding without additional research.

---

<sup>8</sup> We should note that item Q11 loaded on both factors at a level higher than 0.20, but loaded at a higher level (0.31) for the internal efficacy factor.

However, we suspected there were important differences in political efficacy across race, gender, and social class, which likely intersected in different ways to not only shape differences in efficacy at the start of the semester, but also in how completing an introductory course affected student attitudes. Our findings established that race was a significant factor in how completing an introductory course in political science affected political efficacy. First, of course, we had to establish whether there existed differences in political efficacy at the start of the semester.

### **Differences in Internal and External Efficacy at the Start of the Semester**

Although we found small differences in internal and external political efficacy across subgroups, most were not statistically significant. We found no difference in internal or external efficacy across gender. There were also no statistically significant differences between white and black students in either internal or external efficacy.<sup>9</sup> Not surprisingly, we found that social sciences majors had higher levels of internal and external efficacy than students in other majors ( $t = -4.77$ ,  $p < 0.001$  and  $t = -2.41$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), but there were no differences between first-year and other students. AG students had lower levels of internal efficacy ( $t = 6.24$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ), but we found no difference in external efficacy across courses. In terms of background characteristics: One-way ANOVA tests found no significant relationship between either mother's or father's level of education and political. Although we found only a weak relationship between self-reported ideology and internal efficacy ( $F = 2.44$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), we found a strong relationship between ideology and external efficacy ( $F = 5.32$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ); more conservative students are more likely to think they understand and influence politics. Using pairwise (Pearson) correlation

---

<sup>9</sup> For these and all other subsequent tests we used two-group mean comparisons tests, after testing to ensure that group variances were not unequal. Because of small subsample sizes, we dropped all non-white and non-black respondents when making these comparisons.

tests, we also found a significant relationship between news media consumption and internal efficacy ( $r = -0.22$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), but not external efficacy.<sup>10</sup> We found no relationship between social media usage and efficacy.

We also used standard OLS linear regression (with jackknife estimation) to test for independent relationships when controlling for the effects of other variables (see Table 3).<sup>11</sup> Number of observations varies partly because of a flaw in our survey protocol: Students completed the questionnaire using a Scantron answer sheet. We instructed students to use the generic birth year and gender bubbles on the front side of the questionnaire, but many ignored these and only answered the questionnaire itself (which did not include a gender question). We used pairwise (rather than listwise) deletion of missing data across models. Overall, we again found no gender and racial differences in reported efficacy when controlling for other factors. Students who consumed more news media reported lower internal efficacy, as did students who enrolled in AG courses. Social science majors reported higher levels of internal efficacy. We also found that, when controlling for other factors, mother's education, hometown, and ideology had no effect on differences in levels of reported internal efficacy.

[Table 3 here]

---

<sup>10</sup> After using factor analysis to confirm that our five news media questions loaded on a single factor (Cronbach's  $\alpha=0.72$ ), we constructed a news media index.

<sup>11</sup> Jackknife estimation is a common procedure used, like the more popular "bootstrapping," whenever the assumptions underlying traditional regression models are in doubt. We used jackknife estimates to account for the relatively small sample size. A major advantage of jackknifing is that (unlike bootstrapping), no data imputation is necessary. Instead, the procedure uses Monte Carlo simulations to estimate a series of regression estimates using random subsamples of the data. See Shao and Tu 1995.

Our findings surprised us. External efficacy did not seem strongly related to any student characteristics (other than a weak correlations with social science majors). Internal efficacy also was not related to student background characteristics (other than a small gender effect). Interestingly, students were less likely to believe they understood politics (internal efficacy) if they consumed more news media.

### **Changes in Internal and External Efficacy at the End of the Semester**

Having established some baselines for the start of the semester, we measured changes in internal and external efficacy at the end of the semester by looking at the difference in efficacy index measures for each individual student (surveys were not anonymous). Because some students completed only one wave of the survey, and some students (across both waves) did not write their name, we could only match pre and post surveys for a maximum of 289 students. Incomplete survey completion (only 268 students completed all questions in both waves) reduces the N for different multivariate models. Difference of means tests between students who completed both waves of the survey and those who did not and/or were not identified showed only one (unsurprising) significant differences between the groups: student who completed both waves of the survey had higher grades than those who did not.<sup>12</sup>

We then tested for factors affecting the *change in efficacy score* by the end of the semester. In addition to most of the previous control variables, we included two others we thought might affect student attitudes about politics: individual student grade in the course and teacher evaluations. We hypothesized that students with higher grades were more likely to report improvements in internal efficacy (which has to do with “understanding” politics), but perhaps

---

<sup>12</sup> Average GPA for student who completed both waves of the survey was 2.86 (s.d. 1.05), compared to 2.32 (s.d. 1.23) for those who did not;  $t = -6.47$ ,  $p < 0.001$ .

also external efficacy. We also hypothesized that professors who had higher evaluations might be more likely to affect students' political attitudes. Because our survey was not anonymous, we were able to match individual student grades with their survey responses. We converted their letter grades to the GPA point scale used by the university. Across 1,107 students, the average GPA was 2.45 (s.d. 1.21); there were no statistically significant differences in average GPA across courses. Our "teacher quality" measure was derived from the university's own teaching evaluation instrument, specifically the question used in the baseline assessment ("How would you rate the instructor's overall performance in this course?"). Measures range from 4 ("superior") to zero ("poor"). Across the 15 sections we collected surveys in, teacher evaluation scores ranged from 2.50 to 3.64 (mean 3.17, s.d. 0.28). The measure for each instructor's class evaluation score was then inserted into each of the student's data as a new variable ("teval").

[Table 4 here]

Internal and external efficacy scores improved slightly across the 15-week semester. Mean internal efficacy increased from 1.89 to 1.93 and mean external efficacy increased from 1.47 to 1.54; but neither were statistically significant. Our multivariate models (see Table 4) suggest that taking an AG course has a positive impact on students' self-reported internal efficacy, which fit our expectation (and hope)—but higher grades did not seem to produce higher reported internal efficacy scores. Race and gender seemed to have no effect on changes to internal efficacy in the multivariate models. Overall, our findings suggest that students' ability to better "understand" politics (based on self evaluation) does not seem to be affected by racial, gender, or other differences in individual student characteristics.

However, we did find a sizeable and significant reduction in change to *external* efficacy scores for black students. Simple difference of means tests confirmed this: For black students, the mean external efficacy measures at the start and end of the semester were 1.82 and 1.36, respectively; the difference was significant ( $t = 3.00, p < 0.01$ ). For white students, mean external efficacy measures at the start and end of the semester were 1.47 and 1.68, respectively; the difference was also significant ( $t = -2.95, p < 0.01$ ). No other factors seemed to correlate with changes in external efficacy scores in multivariate models.

These findings were surprising and troubling. Completing an introductory-level course in political science seems to have a *negative* impact on black students' perception of their ability to impact the political system. At the start of the semester, black students did not have statistically significant lower external efficacy than other students.<sup>13</sup> By the end of the semester, not only were differences in external efficacy between black and non-black students significant, measures of external efficacy for black students had dropped significantly. Thus, our findings suggest that black students—at least at our institution—were leaving introductory-level political science courses feeling more alienated from the political process.

Of course, an important caveat is that the regression models for change in reported political efficacy were not very robust. We had intended to replicate this study in 2015 in hopes that a larger sample size would help strengthen our study. Unfortunately, a “true” replication would have required following the same protocols—and we were unable to secure the funding support necessary to hand out more than 1,000 paper surveys in each of the two waves. We hope, however, that our findings raise interest among our colleagues, who may pursue their own replications or additional parallel studies.

---

<sup>13</sup> Levels of external efficacy were 1.35 (s.d. 1.119) for black students and 1.49 (s.d. 1.086) for non-black students;  $t(594) = 1.14, p = 0.128$ .

## Conclusion

Our findings raise concerns about the role of political science in civic education in the United States. On the one hand, we found evidence that completing an American Government course improved internal political efficacy, regardless of students' individual performance (grades). But we found that race plays a significant factor in how *external* political efficacy is mediated through political education. If external political efficacy is a measure of an individual's belief that he/she can effectively impact policy, or that government responds to citizens' demands, then the race gap in our data is a serious concern. Black students—even when controlling for other factors—came away with *less* external political efficacy at the end of the semester than what they had come in with at the beginning. Somehow, black students in our sample learned that government does not respond to them. If this is true more broadly (and we have no reason to think that political science courses were being taught in any significantly different way by our colleagues at our institution), then this has important consequences for how we teach political science.

## References

- Abramson, Paul R. 1972. "Political Efficacy and Political Trust Among Black Schoolchildren: Two Explanations." *The Journal of Politics* 34 (4): 1243-1275.
- American Council of Trustees and Alumni. 2015. *What Will They Learn? 2014-2015: A Survey of Core Requirements at Our Nation's Colleges and Universities*. Washington, DC.

- Baldi, S., M. Piere, D. Skidmore, E. Greenberg, and C. Hahn. 2001. *What Democracy Means to Ninth Graders: US Results from the IEA Civic Education Study*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education.
- Chamberlain, Adam. 2012. "A Time-Series Analysis of External Efficacy." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 76 (1): 117-130.
- Conover, P. J. and Searning D. 2000. "A Political Socialization Peunrspective," In L. M. McDonnell, P. M. Timpane, and R. Benjamin, eds., *Rediscovering the Democratic Purpose of Edcuation*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 91-124.
- Craig, Stephen C., Richard G. Niemi, and Glenn E. Silver. 1990. "Political Efficacy and Trust: A Report on the NES Pilot Study Items." *Political Behavior* 12 (3): 289-314.
- Finkel, Steven E. 1985. "Reciprocal Effects of Participation and Political Efficacy: A Panel Analysis." *American Journal of Political Science* (1985): 891-913.
- Hess, D. 2009. *Controversy in the Classroom: The Democratic Power of Discussion*. New York: Routledge.
- Kahne, Joseph and E. Middaugh. 2008. "Democracy for Some: The Civic Opportunity Gap in High School." Circle Working Paper 59. <http://www.civicyouth.org>.
- Kahne, Joseph and S. Sporte. 2008. "Developing Citizens: The Impact of Civic Learning Opportunities on Students' Commitment to Civic Participation." *American Educational Research Journal* 20 (10): 1-29.
- Lizotte, Mary-Kate, and Andrew H. Sidman. 2009. "Explaining the Gender Gap in Political Knowledge." *Politics & Gender* 5 (2): 127-151.
- Mondak, Jeffery J., and Mary R. Anderson. 2004. "The Knowledge Gap: A Reexamination of Gender- Based Differences in Political Knowledge." *Journal of Politics* 66 (2): 492-512.

- National Center for Education Statistics. 1998. *NAEP 1998: Civics Report Card for the Nation*. Washington, DC: National center for Education Statistics.
- . 2007. *The Nation's Report Card: Civics 2006*.
- Nieme, R. and J. Junn. 1998. *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Niemi, Richard G., Stephen C. Craig, and Franco Mattei. 1991. "Measuring Internal Political Efficacy in the 1988 National Election Study." *American Political Science Review* 5 (4): 1407-1413.
- Rodgers Jr, Harrell R. 1974. "Toward Explanation of the Political Efficacy and Political Cynicism of Black Adolescents: An Exploratory Study." *American Journal of Political Science* 18 (2): 257-282.
- Shao, Jun and Dongsheng Tu. 1995. *The Jackknife and Bootstrap*. New York: Springer
- Verba, Sidney, Nancy Burns, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1997. "Knowing and Caring About Politics: Gender and Political Engagement." *The Journal of Politics* 59 (4): 1051-1072.
- Westheimer, Joel and Joseph Kahne. 2004. "What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy." *American Educational Research Journal* 41 (2): 237-269.
- Youniss, James. 2011. "Civic Education: What Schools Can Do to Encourage Civic Identity and Action." *Applied Developmental Science* 15 (2): 98-103.

*Table 1.* Gender and racial composition of survey and university student population (percent) at start of semester

	University	All Sections Surveyed	Individual Course Subsamples		
			American Government	Comparative Politics	International Relations
Female	52.5	*** 41.6	*** 41.6	** 40.2	44.2
Race/Ethnicity					
White	76.7	78.1	77.4	76.7	83.0
Black	16.0	15.2	16.2	14.7	11.6
Hispanic	2.7	3.5	3.0	4.7	4.5
Class standing					
First-year	34.7	*** 47.0	*** 61.1	*** 19.5	*** 19.6
Sophomore	20.9	*** 30.7	* 25.7	*** 36.2	*** 46.7
Junior	19.0	** 15.2	*** 9.2	* 26.2	* 28.0
Senior	25.4	*** 7.0	*** 4.0	* 18.1	*** 5.6
Total enrolled	13,951	1,316	997	170	149

Asterisks denote results of two-tailed binomial probability tests between relevant sample and university parameters using traditional conventions (\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ )

University demographic data comes from the 2011-2012 enrollment data from the Office of Institutional Research.

Table 2. Social characteristics of sample populations

	All Sections	Individual Courses		
		American Government	Comparative Politics	International Relations
Father's level of education				
Did not complete high school	3.3	2.2	6.7	* 3.6
High school or GED	16.1	17.1	16.0	* 11.6
Some college	19.1	18.9	24.7	* 12.5
Bachelor's degree	33.2	33.9	26.0	* 39.3
Graduate degree	28.4	27.9	26.7	* 33.0
Mother's level of education				
Did not complete high school	2.9	2.4	6.0	* 0.9
High school or GED	12.7	12.2	16.7	* 9.8
Some college	24.4	25.8	22.0	* 21.4
Bachelor's degree	37.1	37.4	34.7	* 39.3
Graduate degree	22.8	22.2	20.7	* 28.6
Hometown				
Rural area	6.3	6.0	8.7	4.5
Small town	28.1	26.2	32.7	30.4
Small city	22.4	22.4	20.7	25.0
Suburb of a large city	26.9	28.2	22.7	26.8
Large city	16.3	17.2	15.3	13.4
Political ideology				
Very liberal	2.6	1.5	7.2	1.1
Liberal	11.8	10.4	15.2	12.9
Moderate	35.3	37.1	28.8	36.6
Conservative	41.5	42.1	40.0	40.9
Very conservative	8.8	8.9	8.8	8.6
Media consumption (medians)				
Television watching (daily)	1-2 hours	1-2 hours	1-2 hours	1-2 hours
Time online (daily)	2-4 hours	2-4 hours	2-4 hours	2-4 hours
Print newspaper reading	Weekly	Monthly	Weekly	Weekly
Television news	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly
Newsmagazine	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly
News radio	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly	Monthly
Online news	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly	Weekly
Social media usage (last week)				
Posted news item	29.9	28.8	33.1	30.2
Received news item	65.6	66.2	59.8	70.3

Table 3. Regression estimates of political efficacy at start of semester

	Internal Efficacy		External efficacy	
Black	-0.153 (0.110)	-0.131 (0.132)	-0.060 (0.139)	0.069 (0.183)
Female		-0.157 (0.083)		0.048 (0.109)
Mother's education	0.050 (0.039)	0.077 (0.046)	0.079 (0.045)	0.079 (0.051)
Hometown	-0.020 (0.030)	-0.039 (0.034)	-0.038 (0.039)	-0.029 (0.046)
Ideology	-0.031 (0.041)	-0.062 (0.047)	0.093 (0.052)	0.076 (0.061)
First-year student	0.073 (0.077)	0.123 (0.086)	0.187 (0.099)	0.187 (0.114)
American Government	*** -0.319 (0.085)	** -0.285 (0.094)	-0.079 (0.109)	-0.073 (0.123)
Social science major	** 0.228 (0.079)	** 0.303 (0.090)	* 0.226 (0.105)	0.182 (0.121)
News media consumption	*** -0.204 (0.055)	** -0.214 (0.064)	-0.032 (0.067)	-0.127 (0.080)
Prob > F	0.0000	0.0000	0.0123	0.0911
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.0928	0.1087	0.0194	0.0132
N obs	597	460	590	455

\*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001. Jackknife standard errors appear in parentheses.

Table 4. Regression estimates of change in political efficacy at end of semester

	Internal Efficacy		External efficacy	
Black	-0.170 (0.163)	-0.213 (0.180)	** -0.594 (0.189)	** -0.532 (0.197)
Female		0.090 (0.114)		-0.028 (0.141)
Mother's education	-0.013 (0.057)	-0.009 (0.059)	-0.027 (0.060)	-0.028 (0.061)
Ideology	-0.010 (0.061)	-0.005 (0.062)	0.065 (0.069)	0.071 (0.071)
First-year student	-0.011 (0.112)	-0.026 (0.117)	0.238 (0.137)	0.240 (0.145)
American Government	* 0.323 (0.126)	* 0.325 (0.131)	-0.140 (0.161)	-0.129 (0.167)
Social science major	-0.004 (0.105)	-0.003 (0.109)	-0.140 (0.147)	-0.139 (0.153)
Student grade	0.021 (0.052)	0.038 (0.053)	-0.041 (0.067)	-0.057 (0.070)
Teacher evaluation	-0.141 (0.218)	-0.143 (0.231)	-0.016 (0.295)	-0.017 (0.309)
Prob > F	0.2310	0.2794	0.0288	0.1113
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.0041	0.0034	0.0294	0.0168
N obs	286	274	269	258

\*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001. Jackknife standard errors appear in parentheses.