

HUSKY VOTER ENGAGEMENT PROJECT

Submitted by

Nate Blanchard

Joren Clowers

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts

University of Washington Bothell

Bothell, Washington

Summer 2018

Advisor: Camille Walsh

Co-Advisor: Tate Twinam

Second Reader: Bruce Kochis

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Abstract	2
Problem Statement	3
Research Question	5
Literature Review	6
Methodology	9
Secretary of State Data Results and Analysis	11
Survey Results and Analysis	22
Interview Results and Analysis	31
Recommendation	36
Limitations and Future Research	38
Conclusion	40
Appendix	42
References/Works Cited	51

Acknowledgements

It is impossible to conduct research of this magnitude without it impacting the researcher's family, friends, and loved ones – thank you, we are indebted to you for your unwavering support.

This project also owes a special thank you to: Salvador Salazar Cano, a co-researcher who had to resign from the project for another opportunity; the office of the Washington Secretary of State for which much information was derived; the volunteer-based Student Legislative Action Committee; and last but certainly not least, to our advisors: Camille, Tate, and Bruce.

Abstract

The Husky Voter Engagement Project has produced a report on voter engagement levels at the University of Washington Bothell campus for the 2016 Presidential Election and created a policy recommendation to increase the voter engagement of students. Campus voter turnout was analyzed by matching UW Bothell student information with publicly available Washington State Secretary of State voter registration data. Additionally, student surveys and interviews were conducted to assess student attitudes towards civic engagement generally. A holistic analysis of these different data collection methods led to a multi-pronged policy recommendation that includes integration of voter registration methods into classroom policy and the engagement of all students in policy-oriented courses related to their field of study.

Problem Statement

The National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement (NSLVE) “offers colleges and universities an opportunity to identify their student registration and voting rates *and*, for interested campuses, more closely examine their campus climate for political learning and engagement and correlations between specific student learning experiences and voting (Institute for Democracy & Higher Education: National Study of Learning, Voting and Engagement). NSLVE obtains student data through the National Student Clearinghouse, the nation’s largest degree and enrollment verification source. Institutions of Higher Education that have multiple campuses submit their data separately so that they can have campus-specific numbers.

The University of Washington submits their aggregated student data without separating information by campus. This means that the NSLVE findings include UW Seattle, UW Bothell, and UW Tacoma students with no way to conduct a campus-specific analysis. It is assumed that the different UW campuses, as well as individual universities more broadly, would have different voter turnout rates for numerous reasons. These include university structure, university campus climate, course offerings, and most importantly for a campus like UW Bothell, demographics. UW Bothell does not fit the framework of the “average” campus community, the campus is a majority-minority campus with 45% of incoming first-year students being the first in their families to pursue a college degree. Therefore, each of the three campuses is unable to use this data to inform themselves on how adjusting policy in different areas of their own university structure might improve voter turnout. Therefore, it was clear that the data

needed to be disaggregated to provide a report that specifically addressed voter turnout at UW Bothell.

The NSLVE indicated that young voters across the UW system turned out at a far lower rate than the national average in the 2016 presidential election. According to the U.S. Elections Project, the voter turnout for the 2016 presidential election was 60.2% nationwide (McDonald 2017). The NSLVE report showed that for UW students aged 18-29, the turnout was consistently below 56% (Institute for Democracy & Higher Education: National Study of Learning, Voting and Engagement, 2016).

Moreover, the report brought to light that students pursuing degrees in liberal arts and sciences turned out to vote in higher numbers when compared with the other major academic categories of business and science, engineering, technology, and mathematics (STEM), nursing, and others. The following is the breakdown by academic area: 56% turnout for biology and biomedicine, 42.8% for mathematics, 54.6% for physical sciences, 49.7% for computer science, 51.4% for engineering, 55.4% for business management and marketing; whereas social sciences had 58.5% turnout, liberal arts and sciences had 60.6% turnout and public administration and social service had 71.6% turnout.

According to The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, young people across the country have consistently been the least civically engaged and politically active segment of the population. Yet, they are a vital voting bloc that remains underutilized in elections. Nationwide, 46 million young people, ages 18-29, are eligible to vote, making up 21% of the eligible voting population (CIRCLE). In the years prior to the 2016 election, the average turnout of 18 to 35-year-old individuals

in Presidential Elections was 46% compared to 72% for individuals ages 71+(Khalid 2016). According to the Census Bureau; nationwide in 2016 voters 65 years and older reported the highest turnout at 70.9 percent, the 45-64 age group turned out at 66.6 percent, 30 to 44-year-olds turned out at 58.7 percent, and 18- to 29-year-olds turned out at the lowest rate, 46.1 percent. According to The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, “In 2008, the youth vote made the difference for Barack Obama in Indiana, North Carolina, and Virginia— meaning that if you subtracted all the under-30 votes, the states would have flipped from Blue to Red” (CIRCLE). Differing levels of youth voter engagement has the potential to influence everything from local school board elections to the presidential election.

At UW Bothell, anecdotally, it is a common sentiment that the student body does not feel represented by their leadership, both on campus and politically. One of the solutions to this problem is empowering traditionally non-voters to engage politically so officials begin to reflect their values. Right now, the people that are elected are representative of the values of people mostly over the age of 60. Regardless if the values may align, the truth remains that a large portion of eligible voters are not contributing their voice. By increasing youth voter turnout, the candidates that are elected will better represent that younger subset of the population.

Research Question

The issue of disengagement afflicting the youth vote, and specifically universities like UW Bothell, fundamentally leads us to ask: Why do traditional college-aged students vote at a lower rate than their older peers? And, among these college

students, why is there a disparity in voter engagement by academic area? Further, what campus policy changes might increase voter engagement?

Literature Review

The 2016 NSLVE Executive Report guides our research and inspired the idea to produce a UWB specific report (Thomas, et. al, 2017). Particularly, its emphasis on categorizing college students by age and academic discipline spurred the research question into fruition. However, it provides little insight into the academia's current discussion on voter and civic engagement.

Voter engagement, as used in the research, falls under the sweeping definition of civic engagement. The term 'civic engagement' is made up of a diaspora of meanings and said meaning depends on the work of the definer (Adler, 2005). The Carnegie Corporation reported that there is no concrete definition nor consensus on the definition for civic engagement (Gibson, 2000). Adler points to four frameworks of civic engagement meant to address the lack of a single meaning: civic engagement as community service, civic engagement as collective action, civic engagement as political involvement, or civic engagement as social change. Since the elusive meaning of this term relies on the context of the research, we will be using the third framework: civic engagement as political involvement. Ronan writes:

"The Latin word *civis* has found its way into two words in our language, city and citizen. Civic engagement is about rediscovering politics, the life of the polis, the city where men and women speak and act together, as citizens. The word *civic*, when connected to engagement, implies work, work that is done publicly and

benefits the public, and is done in concert with others” (Ronan, 2004).

Now that civic engagement is thoroughly defined as the political umbrella that voter engagement falls under, the term’s practice on college campuses will be explored. Dr. Christian delineates civic engagement in college into three different sections: history of democratic education, service learning, and singular activity (Christian 2016). For research’s sake, the study is primarily focused on how singular activity affects civic engagement, but all three categories will be explored.

The history of teaching democracy in higher education has followed a long arc, initially preparing students in active citizenship, to instead chase their fortune, and now back to playing an active role in our democracy. Research universities were founded with the intent to provide a public good (Checkoway 2001). Leland and Jane Lathrop Stanford, founders of the famous research institution, stated that Stanford University’s mission would be to “promote the public welfare by exercising an influence on behalf of humanity and civilization” (Dorn 2011). Indeed, popular phrases in academia before the midpoint of the 20th century were “education for citizenship” and “knowledge for society” (Checkoway 2001). There was a blatantly clear understanding that with the education one received from an institution of higher learning, so too they received an obligation to play an active role in their democracy.

Unfortunately, a disconnect began to form between the intent of a university and those who executed its mission in practice. Administrators followed a path of commodification, turning an education into a product and the institution into a business (Dorn 2011). Professors followed suit, segmenting themselves into a narrow focus within their field of study, rather than a holistic view of how they impact their society

(Checkoway 2001). Further compounding the decline of democratic education is the disconnect students have developed between service work and politics while attending college (Checkoway 2001).

Harking back to the earlier explanation of different frameworks for civic engagement, students are falling into a trap of believing the four types of civic engagement are mutually exclusive. While one can be more relevant to a certain context, the others still maintain an impact: they are four interconnected ideas. Thus, a situation is created where a student attends a community space to provide service work, but simultaneously refuses to play a role in politics. All the while politics, and voting specifically, shapes the future of that community.

In summary, there is an extensive negative feedback loop that has developed at universities. Administrators, professors, and students play off each other's individual disconnect to rationalize their own further disconnect. Institutions of higher learning began with the noble goal of doing good for the public. This cause has decayed and will continue to decay so long as the cogs that make up a school can feed off each other's disengagement.

An approach that is utilized in universities to address the decrease in civic engagement is the practice of service learning (Dewey, 1916). Using college courses to place students into unfamiliar communities allows them to expand their understanding of society. Using this thoughtful pedagogical framework, two researchers noted that students: "become more knowledgeable about social justice issues...and the need for outreach programs in [the] communities" (Whitley 2014). While service learning appears to be the silver bullet for voter disengagement, the truth is more problematic. Several

fields of study either do not value work in a community, feel it does not align with their education mission, or do not gain any profit from the interaction. Therefore, the issue goes back to square one, where some disciplines are more engaged than others.

Singular activity refers to the effect that a specific academic experience can have on a student's civic engagement potential (Flores, Crosby-Currie, & Zimmerman, 2007; Fried, 2009). Fundamentally, a curriculum may have a profound effect on a student. It creates a situation in which a student can contextualize themselves with a community to promote engagement. Interdisciplinary courses had the most significant impact on a student's likelihood to be civically engaged (Emami & Davis, 2009; Palmer & Standerfer, 2004). Moreover, if a student is engaged on their college campus, they are much more likely to be civically engaged later in life (Ishitani & McKittrick, 2013; Johnson, 2004). The contemporary literature on civic engagement tells a story that aligns with our research question: a student's academic choices affect their level of voter participation.

Methodology

The design of this research is a mixed-methods approach comprised of a survey, qualitative interviews with survey respondents, and quantitative analysis of voter turnout data.

Initially a survey was sent to the entire student body of UW Bothell via campus-wide email. To increase the number of responses, the lead researchers partnered with UW Bothell's Student Legislative Action Committee to set up a table with laptops available to take surveys on the university's central promenade.

The goal of the survey is twofold: to identify the stated causes of civic, voter, or political engagement, and if there is a correlation between voter engagement and a student's area of study. The survey is comprised of six core sections (Appendix A).

- Section one covers voter characteristics; we asked the respondent to identify their academic category, age range, current year of college, and enrollment status.
- Section two is comprised of the first part of civic engagement questions. Respondents were asked to rate whether they strongly agreed or strongly disagreed, on a scale of one to five: the importance of civic education, civic education in primary school, the importance of civic engagement, volunteering is good for the community, and if volunteering develops a sense of civic duty.
- Section three asks the respondent to self-identify their race or ethnicity, gender, and if they are a first-generation college student.
- Section four is focus on voter engagement. The respondent is asked if they are a registered voter, if they voted in the 2016 election, and if they believe voting is important on a scale from one to five.
- Section five is centered on political engagement. The respondent is asked if they have signed a petition, if they have attended a demonstration, if they donate to political campaigns, or if they have ever contacted their elected officials.
- Section six simply asks if the respondent would like to volunteer for an interview.

Forty-six respondents volunteered to be interviewed of which only eight followed through. As part of the interviews, respondents were asked questions pertaining to each question area of the survey with one addition: university structure. This new section was

added after it was determined that there was a need to receive input on UW Bothell's existing resource expenditure on community engagement (Appendix B). The two lead researchers conducted the interviews. Each lasted roughly 20 minutes. The notes from the interviews were then condensed as a summary and attached in the data analysis portion of this paper.

Once Spring Quarter 2018 ended, the 2016 UW Bothell student directory obtained from the Registrar's office was matched with publicly available Washington State voter data provided by the Washington State Secretary of State's office. Specifically, our first step was to receive the list of registered voters and when they last voted from the Washington Secretary of State office. They provided a data set that included data on voter turnout in the November 8th, 2016 general election. Concurrently, the list of registered UW Bothell students for Autumn Quarter 2016 was obtained from the UW Bothell Registrar's office. The variables that were used to identify matches were first name, last name, and date of birth. This produced a data set of UW Bothell students who were registered to vote and when they last voted. The final step was to clean this data to ensure it was comprised of only students who were eligible to vote in the 2016 general election. All non-citizen students and students who turned 18 after November 8th, 2016 were dropped from the Registrar's office data.

Secretary of State Data Results and Analysis

Referencing table 1, UW Bothell's overall voter registration level is 68.73%. Table 2 indicates that out of 5,258 eligible students, 1,644 were not registered and 3,614 were registered. We see the following voter registration level by academic category: 65.66%

in the School of Business, 79.67% in the School of Education, 74.49% in the School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, 76.15% in the School of Nursing and Health Studies, 68.42% in the School of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, 63.33% for Pre-Majors, and 85.29% for students who fall into the Other category. Additionally, the specific number of registered and not registered students broken down by academic category has been attached as Table 2.

Table 1

Major	Registered		Total
	0	1	
Business	34.34	65.66	100.00
Education Studies	20.33	79.67	100.00
IAS	25.51	74.49	100.00
Nursing and Health St	23.85	76.15	100.00
Other	14.71	85.29	100.00
Pre-Major	36.67	63.33	100.00
STEM	31.58	68.42	100.00
Total	31.27	68.73	100.00

Pearson chi2(6) = 70.0215 Pr = 0.000

Table 2

Major	Registered		Total
	0	1	
Business	283	541	824
Education Studies	50	196	246
IAS	224	654	878
Nursing and Health St	114	364	478
Other	5	29	34
Pre-Major	608	1,050	1,658
STEM	360	780	1,140
Total	1,644	3,614	5,258

Analyzing for individual age also produces compelling results. Table 3 shows a breakdown of voter registration status by age. The numbers are: 58.08% of individuals aged 18 are registered to vote, 66.06% of individuals aged 19, 65.69% of individuals aged 20, 67.99% of individuals aged 21, 70.33% of individuals aged 22, 69.06% of individuals aged 23, and 62.76% of individuals aged 24.

Table 3

Age	Registered		Total
	0	1	
18	41.92	58.08	100.00
19	33.94	66.06	100.00
20	34.31	65.69	100.00
21	32.01	67.99	100.00
22	29.67	70.33	100.00
23	30.94	69.06	100.00
24	37.24	62.76	100.00

Upon aggregating the ages to age groups in table 4, we see that 18 to 21 year olds are registered at a rate of 64.68%, 22 to 24 year olds at 68.26%, 25 to 29 year olds at 72.22%, 30 to 39 year olds at 78.60%, 40 to 49 year olds at 79.59%, and 50+ year olds at 88.16%.

Table 4

RECODE of Age (Age)	Registered		Total
	0	1	
1	35.32	64.68	100.00
2	31.74	68.26	100.00
3	27.78	72.22	100.00
4	21.40	78.60	100.00
5	20.41	79.59	100.00
6	11.84	88.16	100.00
Total	31.27	68.73	100.00

Pearson chi2(5) = 72.5932 Pr = 0.000

Since the UW NSLVE tri-campus report summarized the registration rate, it is not possible to calculate the specific registration differences between individual ages or age groups. However, an overall voter registration rate of 68.73% is 20.97% lower than the UW average of 89.7% (Institute for Democracy). It should be noted, though, that the analysis only accounts for UW Bothell students who are registered in the state of Washington. Washington residents make up 94% of the incoming first-year students, so the vast majority of the student body previously resided in the state. It is possible that there are students who are qualified as not registered, when in reality they are registered in a different state. NSLVE is able to use algorithms and databases that allow them to look at students that might be registered in a different state. When looking at a campus like UW Seattle, the total enrollment is 46,165, with only 61.3% residing in Washington State. But due to the fact that UW Bothell provides an education to mostly in-state students, the inability to look at non-resident registration rates does not negatively impact the research.

The second research question is interested in learning more about the disparity in voter registration amongst academic groupings. Conducting a linear regression with registration status as the dependent variable and the five UW Bothell schools as independent variables produced table 5. Overall, there is only a weak positive correlation between being registered to vote and a particular school. STEM had a near neutral correlation with a coefficient of 0.04 ($p=0.009$). IAS had a weak correlation coefficient of 0.107 ($p=0.000$). Business had an insignificant association with registration status ($p=0.336$). Nursing and Health Studies had a weak correlation coefficient of 0.123

($p=0.000$). Education Studies had the strongest correlation of the bunch with a coefficient of 0.159 ($p=0.000$).

Table 5

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	5,258
Model	13.4406631	5	2.68813262	F(5, 5252)	=	12.64
Residual	1116.53575	5,252	.212592489	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.0119
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0110
Total	1129.97642	5,257	.214947007	Root MSE	=	.46108

Registered	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
STEM	.0465037	.0176672	2.63	0.009	.0118686	.0811387
IAS	.1071679	.0191775	5.59	0.000	.0695719	.1447638
Business	.0188465	.0195869	0.96	0.336	-.0195519	.057245
NHS	.1237994	.023883	5.18	0.000	.0769787	.1706201
ES	.1590411	.0314618	5.06	0.000	.097363	.2207193
_cons	.6377069	.0112092	56.89	0.000	.6157322	.6596815

While not an academic school, it will prove useful to examine if Pre-Major status has a correlation to registration status. Table 6 illustrates that there is a near neutral correlation between Pre-Major status and if the student is registered to vote given a coefficient of -0.07 ($p=0.000$).

Table 6

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	5,258
Model	7.07197512	1	7.07197512	F(1, 5256)	=	33.10
Residual	1122.90444	5,256	.213642398	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.0063
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0061
Total	1129.97642	5,257	.214947007	Root MSE	=	.46221

Registered	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
PM	-.0789291	.0137186	-5.75	0.000	-.1058233	-.0520349
_cons	.7122222	.0077036	92.45	0.000	.69712	.7273244

This section of analysis will cover voter turnout among registered voters. Table 7 summarizes that 93.02% of registered voters did vote in the election. The breakdown by

academic category is as follows: 90.05% turnout for the School of Business, 92.74% for the School of Education, 90.81% for the School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, 91.17% for the School of Nursing and Health Studies, 92.86% for the School of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, 97.18% for Pre-Majors, and 92.91% for students who fall into the Other category.

Table 7

Major	Year_Last_Voted											Total
	2003	2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Business	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.23	0.45	0.45	4.98	0.23	2.71	0.90	90.05	100.00
Education Studies	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.56	0.56	0.00	3.35	0.00	1.12	1.12	92.74	100.00
IAS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.36	0.00	4.68	0.72	1.62	1.44	90.81	100.00
Nursing and Health St	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.32	0.00	4.10	0.95	2.52	0.32	91.17	100.00
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.57	0.00	3.57	0.00	92.86	100.00
Pre-Major	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.02	0.38	1.02	0.26	97.18	100.00
STEM	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.30	0.15	0.45	3.17	0.60	1.51	0.75	92.91	100.00
Total	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.27	0.24	0.17	3.27	0.51	1.69	0.74	93.02	100.00

When accounting voter registration levels by academic category, UW Bothell students are registered at lower rates than the UW tri-campus average. Yet, in terms of turnout among registered voters UW Bothell far surpasses the national average of 50.4% across collegiate institutions and the 75.3% UW average (Institute for Democracy). Indeed, it is profound to see that UW Bothell is closer to reaching 100% registered voter turnout than they are to the previous averages. However, overall voter turnout at UW Bothell is not as rosey.

Turnout among all eligible voters at UW Bothell is at 52.45% according to table 8. The breakdown by academic categories is as follows: 48.30% turnout for the School of Business, 67.48% for the School of Education, 57.40% for the School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, 60.46% for the School of Nursing and Health Studies, 54.04% for the School of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, 45.78%

for Pre-Majors, and 76.47% for students who fall into the Other category. Additionally, when considering voter turnout by age, the numbers continue to fall back to earth.

Table 8

Major	Year_Last_Voted											No_Vote	Total
	2003	2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016		
Business	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.24	0.24	2.67	0.12	1.46	0.49	48.30	46.36	100.00
Education Studies	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.41	0.00	2.44	0.00	0.81	0.81	67.48	27.24	100.00
IAS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.23	0.23	0.00	2.96	0.46	1.03	0.91	57.40	36.79	100.00
Nursing and Health St	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.42	0.21	0.00	2.72	0.63	1.67	0.21	60.46	33.68	100.00
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.94	0.00	2.94	0.00	76.47	17.65	100.00
Pre-Major	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.18	0.48	0.12	45.78	52.90	100.00
STEM	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.18	0.09	0.26	1.84	0.35	0.88	0.44	54.04	41.84	100.00
Total	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.15	0.13	0.10	1.84	0.29	0.95	0.42	52.45	43.61	100.00

Pearson chi2(66) = 217.4460 Pr = 0.000

Because the analysis showed a weak relationship between certain academic school and registration status, this next section will determine if that relationship remains for voter turnout. Table 9 shows that the weak relationships shown in table 5 are continued. The School of STEM has a near neutral correlation to voting in the 2016 election with a coefficient of 0.07 (p=0.000). The School of IAS has a weak correlation coefficient of 0.11 (p=0.000). Business has an insignificant association with voting or not voting in the 2016 general election. Education Studies has the strongest correlation coefficient at 0.210 (p=0.000). Nursing and Health Studies had a weak correlation coefficient of 0.140 (p=0.000).

Table 9

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	5,258
Model	18.686744	5	3.7373488	F(5, 5252)	=	15.18
Residual	1292.64836	5,252	.246124974	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.0143
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0133
Total	1311.33511	5,257	.249445522	Root MSE	=	.49611

vote_binary	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
STEM	.0764029	.0190096	4.02	0.000	.0391363 .1136695
IAS	.1100839	.0206346	5.33	0.000	.0696314 .1505364
Business	.0190617	.0210751	0.90	0.366	-.0222542 .0603777
ES	.2108488	.0338522	6.23	0.000	.1444844 .2772132
NHS	.1406545	.0256977	5.47	0.000	.0902764 .1910326
_cons	.463948	.0120608	38.47	0.000	.4403037 .4875923

Table 10 shows that Pre-Major students have a weak negative correlation to voting in the 2016 election given a coefficient of -0.09 ($p=0.000$). This result makes sense given the lower than average overall voter turnout among Pre-Major students.

Table 10

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	5,258
Model	10.7907541	1	10.7907541	F(1, 5256)	=	43.61
Residual	1300.54435	5,256	.247439946	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.0082
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0080
Total	1311.33511	5,257	.249445522	Root MSE	=	.49743

vote_binary	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
PM	-.0974973	.0147639	-6.60	0.000	-.1264407 -.0685539
_cons	.5552778	.0082906	66.98	0.000	.5390248 .5715307

Data from table 11 shows that of all eligible voters, only 41.08% of students aged 18 voted, 50.91% of students aged 19, 49.12% of students aged 20, 51.69% of students aged 21, 48.92% of students aged 22, 49.69% of students aged 23, and 46.03% of students aged 24.

Table 11

Age	Year_Last_Voted												Total
	2003	2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	No_Vote	
18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	41.08	58.92	100.00
19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.91	49.09	100.00
20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.03	0.73	49.12	49.12	100.00
21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.29	1.03	0.29	51.69	46.70	100.00
22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.72	0.79	1.38	1.18	48.92	43.03	100.00
23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.63	4.06	0.31	1.88	0.31	49.69	43.13	100.00
24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.84	0.42	4.18	0.42	1.26	0.84	46.03	46.03	100.00

Upon aggregating the numbers to age groups, table 12 shows that 48.46% of eligible 18 to 21 year old students voted, 48.50% of 22 to 24 year old students voted, 56.81% of 25 to 29 year old students voted, 64.96% of 30 to 39 year old students voted, 68.88% of 40 to 49 year old students voted, and 77.63% of 50+ year old students voted. These numbers are again consistent with the UW tri-campus NSLVE report, but are slightly lower.

Table 12

RECODE of Age (Age)	Year_Last_Voted												Total
	2003	2004	2006	2008	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	No_Vote	
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.52	0.26	48.46	50.67	100.00
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.28	4.40	0.56	1.50	0.84	48.50	43.73	100.00
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.69	0.28	0.00	3.47	0.69	0.69	0.69	56.81	36.67	100.00
4	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.57	0.19	0.38	3.03	0.19	2.46	0.00	64.96	27.65	100.00
5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.57	0.51	0.51	0.51	68.88	26.02	100.00
6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.63	0.00	2.63	0.00	1.32	0.00	77.63	15.79	100.00
Total	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.15	0.13	0.10	1.84	0.29	0.95	0.42	52.45	43.61	100.00

Pearson chi2(55) = 400.3180 Pr = 0.000

The NSLVE stated that the UW tri-campus average voter turnout in 2016 was 55.4% for 18 to 21 year old students and 51% for 22 to 24 year old students. UW Bothell students turned out 6.94% less and 2.50% less for the age categories of 18 to 21 and 22 to 24 respectively. Additionally, the overall voter turnout of 52.45% is 15.15% less than the UW average of 67.6% (Institute for Democracy). This number could be influenced by the number of non-Washington State residence that vote in other states that is included in the NSLVE report.

Interestingly, when conducting a linear regression (see table 13) to explore if individual age or age group has a correlation to registration status, the data shows that it is not significant given p-values of 0.098 and 0.184 respectively. Additionally, in table 14, when running a linear regression to determine if individual age or age group had an impact on voting in 2016 the data suggests that age group was not significant ($p=0.448$). Individual age had a neutral correlation to voting in 2016 with a coefficient of 0.007 ($p=0.007$).

Table 13

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	5,258
Model	15.891182	2	7.94559102	F(2, 5255)	=	37.48
Residual	1114.08523	5,255	.212004802	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.0141
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0137
Total	1129.97642	5,257	.214947007	Root MSE	=	.46044

Registered	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
age_group	.0195812	.0147239	1.33	0.184	-.0092838 .0484463
Age	.0043274	.0026164	1.65	0.098	-.0008019 .0094566
_cons	.5443567	.0370245	14.70	0.000	.4717732 .6169401

Table 14

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	5,258
Model	24.9315826	2	12.4657913	F(2, 5255)	=	50.92
Residual	1286.40353	5,255	.244796104	Prob > F	=	0.0000
				R-squared	=	0.0190
				Adj R-squared	=	0.0186
Total	1311.33511	5,257	.249445522	Root MSE	=	.49477

vote_binary	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]
age_group	.0119996	.0158217	0.76	0.448	-.0190175 .0430167
Age	.0076011	.0028115	2.70	0.007	.0020895 .0131128
_cons	.3181741	.039785	8.00	0.000	.2401791 .3961692

When it comes to gender, table 15 shows that there is no association between a specific gender and registration status ($p=0.652$). However, it is still useful to know that

68.98% of female students and 68.53% of male students are registered to vote when targeting voter registration and voter outreach. Moreover, table 16 shows that there is no association between a specific gender and if the student voted in the 2016 general election ($p=0.413$). Nonetheless, 53.32% of all female students and 51.62% of all male students voted in the 2016 election.

Table 15

Gender	Registered		Total
	0	1	
	44.44	55.56	100.00
Female	31.02	68.98	100.00
Male	31.47	68.53	100.00
Total	31.27	68.73	100.00

Pearson chi2(2) = 0.8548 Pr = 0.652

Table 16

Gender	vote_binary		Total
	0	1	
	55.56	44.44	100.00
Female	46.68	53.32	100.00
Male	48.38	51.62	100.00
Total	47.55	52.45	100.00

Pearson chi2(2) = 1.7665 Pr = 0.413

Table 17 indicates that first generation college student status has a significant association with voter registration status ($p=0.000$). 70.75% of non-first generation college students were registered to vote, higher than the overall UW Bothell average. 63.76% of first generation college students were registered to vote, lower than the overall UW Bothell average. The gap becomes larger when considering overall voter turnout. Table 18 displays a 56.99% overall voter turnout for non-first generation college students and a 43.31% voter turnout for first generation college students ($p=0.000$).

Table 17

First_Gen	Registered		Total
	0	1	
N	29.25	70.75	100.00
NULL	23.64	76.36	100.00
Y	36.24	63.76	100.00
Total	31.27	68.73	100.00

Pearson chi2(2) = 49.3186 Pr = 0.000

Table 18

First_Gen	vote_binary		Total
	0	1	
N	43.01	56.99	100.00
NULL	36.12	63.88	100.00
Y	56.69	43.31	100.00
Total	47.55	52.45	100.00

Pearson chi2(2) = 130.2060 Pr = 0.000

Cross-referencing UWB student data with the voter data from the Secretary of State's office produced insights into voter engagement levels. Specifically, it has measured the influence of academic discipline, age, gender, and first generation college student status on registration status, turnout among registered voters, and overall voter turnout. The analysis will now shift gears into examining the survey results.

Survey Results and Analysis

The survey received 162 responses. After data cleaning, there were 160 usable responses for each question. While the study is particularly interested in the voter engagement disparity by academic discipline, the data report will begin with simple descriptives. Table 19 shows the breakdown of responses by each UW Bothell school or academic category. The data is heavily skewed towards IAS and STEM as they contribute 105 of the 160 responses. Table 20 shows that 143 respondents, out of 159

total, are full-time students. In Table 21, 120 of the 160 responses identified themselves to be in the age range of 18 to 21 or 22 to 24. Table 22 gives a rough breakdown of the ethnic identity of our respondents. 68 students identified as white or caucasian, 35 students as Asian, and 17 as Latinx. Lastly, in table 23 we see that 75 respondents identified as female and 71 respondents identified as male.

Table 19

What school are you currently in?	Freq.
Business	19
Education Studies	3
IAS	56
Nursing and Health Studies	8
Other	1
Pre-major	24
Science, Technology, Engineering, or Mat	49

Tables 20 and 21

What is your enrollment status?	Freq.	What is your age range?	Freq.
Full-Time (12 or more credits)	143	18-21	84
Part-Time (11 or less credits)	16	22-24	36
		25-29	17
		30-39	16
		40-49	5
		50+	2

Table 22

Which race or ethnicity do you identify as?	Freq.
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian	1
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Latin	2
American Indian or Alaskan Native, Nativ	1
American Indian or Alaskan Native, White	2
Asian	35
Asian, Black or African American	1
Asian, Middle Eastern or North African	1
Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Island	1
Asian, White/Caucasian	4
Black or African American	7
Black or African American, Latinx	1
Choose to not disclose	3
Latinx	17
Latinx, White/Caucasian	4
Middle Eastern or North African	7
Middle Eastern or North African, White/C	1
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2
Other	1
White/Caucasian	68

Table 23

What is your gender? (self-identification)	Freq.
Agender	2
Agender, Androgynous, Bigender, Female,	1
Agender, Gender fluid	1
Androgynous	1
Bigender	1
Choose not to disclose	2
Female	75
Gender fluid	1
Gender fluid, Gender non-conforming	1
Gender non-conforming	1
Male	71
Male, Transgender	1
Other	1

Tables 24 and 25 begins to show the voter engagement landscape. 83.8% of the 155 responses indicated that they are registered voters. Moreover, table 26 shows the frequencies of registered voter by each academic category. Adjusting to include potential sample error, table 27 indicates that this data has been influenced by a bias. The voter registration levels by academic category are much higher than they were in 2016. Moreoever, it has a p-value of 0.145, meaning it is not an accurate sample of the

campus population. Additionally, table 28 indicates insignificant data for any correlation between voter engagement and age ($p=0.191$). This conclusion points to significant bias from the respondents of the survey, that those who would be willing to take a voter engagement survey were already engaged at some level. These results mean that the survey will not help to understand voter disengagement specifically in 2018. However, it may still be used to conduct a meta-analysis on the ways in which our respondents are civically or politically engaged.

Tables 24 and 25

Are you a registered voter?	Freq.	Did you vote in the 2016 election?	Freq.
No	25	No	54
Yes	130	Yes	104

Table 26

Are you a registered voter?	What school are you currently in?							Total
	Business	Education	IAS	Nursing a	Other	Pre-major	Science,	
No	2	0	4	2	0	7	10	25
Yes	16	3	51	6	1	15	38	130
Total	18	3	55	8	1	22	48	155

Table 27

What school are you currently in?	Are you a registered voter?		Total
	No	Yes	
Business	11.11	88.89	100.00
Education Studies	0.00	100.00	100.00
IAS	7.27	92.73	100.00
Nursing and Health St	25.00	75.00	100.00
Other	0.00	100.00	100.00
Pre-major	31.82	68.18	100.00
Science, Technology,	20.83	79.17	100.00
Total	16.13	83.87	100.00

Pearson $\chi^2(6) = 9.5470$ Pr = 0.145

Table 28

Are you a registered voter?	What is your age range?						Total
	18-21	22-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50+	
No	72.00	16.00	12.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Yes	47.69	23.85	10.77	12.31	3.85	1.54	100.00
Total	51.61	22.58	10.97	10.32	3.23	1.29	100.00

Pearson chi2 (5) = 7.4241 Pr = 0.191

To increase voter engagement it is useful to analyze what exactly people identify as causes for strong civic engagement. Table 29 shows a significant association between the feeling that volunteering helps develop a sense of civic duty and feeling that civic engagement is important ($p=0.000$). Running a linear regression on the same variables, in table 30 there is again a positive correlation ($p=0.000$). Table 31 shows a similar significant association between the feeling that voting is important and the feeling that volunteering helps develop a sense of civic duty ($p=0.000$). In table 32, the linear regression between the previous two variables confirm a positive correlation ($p=0.000$). In terms of meta-analysis, the above correlations are sufficient to reject the null-hypothesis that there is no relationship between volunteering, and feeling that civic engagement as well as voting are important. Essentially, the data is saying that for those students who are already engaged, they feel volunteering in a community is a critical reason for why they are engaged.

Table 29

Civic engagement is important.	Volunteering helps me develop a sense of civic duty.					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	50.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	100.00
2	0.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
3	14.29	14.29	28.57	42.86	0.00	100.00
4	0.00	7.55	20.75	56.60	15.09	100.00
5	0.00	4.49	14.61	24.72	56.18	100.00
Total	1.88	6.88	18.13	36.88	36.25	100.00

Pearson chi2(16) = 82.4239 Pr = 0.000

Table 30

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	160
Model	21.8953009	1	21.8953009	F(1, 158)	=	42.87
Residual	80.6984491	158	.510749678	Prob > F	=	0.0000
Total	102.59375	159	.645243711	R-squared	=	0.2134
				Adj R-squared	=	0.2084
				Root MSE	=	.71467

civ_engage	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
comm_duty	.3722899	.0568604	6.55	0.000	.2599854	.4845944
_cons	2.921744	.2336644	12.50	0.000	2.460235	3.383253

Table 31

I believe that voting is important.	Volunteering helps me develop a sense of civic duty.					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
1	66.67	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	100.00
2	0.00	0.00	66.67	33.33	0.00	100.00
3	5.56	11.11	33.33	50.00	0.00	100.00
4	0.00	3.57	25.00	46.43	25.00	100.00
5	0.00	7.41	12.96	32.41	47.22	100.00
Total	1.88	6.88	18.13	36.88	36.25	100.00

Pearson chi2(16) = 96.9074 Pr = 0.000

Table 32

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs	=	160
Model	20.521468	1	20.521468	F(1, 158)	=	29.66
Residual	109.322282	158	.691913177	Prob > F	=	0.0000
Total	129.84375	159	.816627358	R-squared	=	0.1580
				Adj R-squared	=	0.1527
				Root MSE	=	.83181

vote_impor~t	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
comm_duty	.360421	.0661807	5.45	0.000	.2297079	.491134
_cons	3.031571	.2719658	11.15	0.000	2.494414	3.568729

As mentioned earlier, though, there exists a disconnect between general community or civic engagement and direct political or voter engagement. Table 33 shows a significant association between feeling that civic engagement is important and whether or not the respondent has participated in a political demonstration ($p=0.002$). However, in aggregating respondent's rating of the importance of civic engagement, 63.40% of respondents have not participated in a political demonstration. This issue is further explained in table 34, again regardless of how students rated the importance of civic engagement, 67.95% have not donated to a political campaign, even though there is a significant association ($p=0.008$). Lastly, among the easiest forms of political engagement: contacting elected officials, table 35 indicates a significant relationship and that 59.48% of respondents have never contacted an elected official ($p=0.000$).

Tables 33 and 34

Civic engagement is important.	Have you participated in political demonstrations or protests?		Total
	No	Yes	
1	0.00	100.00	100.00
2	100.00	0.00	100.00
3	100.00	0.00	100.00
4	70.00	30.00	100.00
5	54.12	45.88	100.00
Total	63.40	36.60	100.00

Pearson chi2(4) = 16.7956 Pr = 0.002

Civic engagement is important.	Have you donated to any political organizations or political candidates?		Total
	No	Yes	
1	100.00	0.00	100.00
2	100.00	0.00	100.00
3	92.86	7.14	100.00
4	78.43	21.57	100.00
5	56.32	43.68	100.00
Total	67.95	32.05	100.00

Pearson chi2(4) = 13.8487 Pr = 0.008

Table 35

Civic engagement is important.	Have you contacted your locally elected representatives before?		Total
	No	Yes	
1	0.00	100.00	100.00
2	100.00	0.00	100.00
3	92.86	7.14	100.00
4	74.51	25.49	100.00
5	45.24	54.76	100.00
Total	59.48	40.52	100.00

Pearson chi2(4) = 22.6184 Pr = 0.000

In contrast, the same analysis was performed as above but on respondents who rated the importance of voting. Table 37 indicates that 108 of the 160 respondents stated that on a scale of 1, as not at all important, to 5, as very important, they would rate the importance of voting as a 5. However, in table 38, there is not a significant association between those who feel voting is important and those who have or have not participated in political demonstrations ($p=0.057$). At any rate, 63.40% of respondents indicated that they have not participated in a political demonstration. Moreover, table 39 finds a significant association and that 67.95% of respondents have never donated to a political campaign ($p=0.008$). Finally, again given the easiest form of political

engagement and given a significant relationship, 59.48% of respondents indicated that they have never contacted their local officials ($p=0.012$).

Table 37

I believe that voting is important .	Freq.
1	3
2	3
3	18
4	28
5	108

Tables 38 and 39

I believe that voting is important.	Have you participated in political demonstrations or protests?			I believe that voting is important.	Have you donated to any political organizations or political candidates?		
	No	Yes	Total		No	Yes	Total
1	33.33	66.67	100.00	1	100.00	0.00	100.00
2	100.00	0.00	100.00	2	100.00	0.00	100.00
3	88.89	11.11	100.00	3	94.44	5.56	100.00
4	65.38	34.62	100.00	4	77.78	22.22	100.00
5	58.25	41.75	100.00	5	59.05	40.95	100.00
Total	63.40	36.60	100.00	Total	67.95	32.05	100.00

Pearson $\chi^2(4) = 9.1605$ Pr = 0.057

Pearson $\chi^2(4) = 13.6501$ Pr = 0.008

While the significance of the relationships differed, the percentages of those who who rated the importance of civic engagement and the importance of voting engagement, were exactly the same when compared to the variables of whether or not they have been in a political demonstration, if they have donated to a political campaign, or if they have or have not contacted their elected officials. This indicates that respondents identically rated the importance of civic engagement and the importance of voting, and had the same answers for the three political engagement variables. This

neat statistical find aside, it also paints a picture, that students are so to speak talking the talk but not walking the walk.

Overall, the survey was unable to address the core question of why voter engagement differs by academic category, but it does begin to tell how to solve the issue by increasing civic and political engagement. The study found that volunteering in a community is an essential way to develop a sense of civic duty. The survey also tells us that while students may be civically engaged and volunteering in communities, a majority are not politically engaged.

Interview Results and Analysis

To begin this section of analysis, each interview that was conducted with UW Bothell students will be summarized and its main themes brought to light. Eight twenty-minute conversations were held with volunteer respondents.

Respondent 1 is in the school of IAS, is part-time, and aged 31. They feel they are an engaged member of their community, which they would define as a neighborhood-sized area of Seattle. They have been active in past political campaigns as a doorbeller and organizer. Both parents vote regularly and they feel this contributed to their current levels of civic and political engagement. Other noteworthy experiences included a mock election in preschool as well as witnessing the political process that decided the 2000 Presidential election. In terms of voter engagement, they actively vote and choose to be informed through voter guides. At the University of Washington Bothell they partook in a community-based learning course, but did not find it

particularly useful. Instead, a talk on organizing political movements delivered by a speaker during their freshman year proved more inspirational to stay engaged.

Respondent 2 is a full-time business student who is aged 18. The general election of 2018 will be the first in which they are eligible to vote. They are actively engaged with their community through activities like donating blood, voter registration, and volunteering for non-profits in the Latinx community. Initially, their family did not approve of the individual attending protests, but they have since reversed their decision and now encourage the candidate to exercise their freedom to assemble. They would prefer to see the United States adopt a more community-based mindset instead of being so focused on profit. They share the same political values as their family members and often think of the intense political landscape. They are intending on becoming an active voter. The only UW Bothell experience that has influenced their voter or political engagement was a lobbying trip to Olympia sponsored by their student government.

Respondent 3 is a 19-year-old, full-time, Pre-Major. They feel that they are not civically engaged. Their family does not like to talk about politics because it ends in arguments. Their mother is an immigrant who struggled to obtain citizenship, but as a family they do not discuss it. They are sure, though, that there are diverse political affiliations within their close family. The interviewee feels like current politics is an all or nothing deal, which they do not like. Thus, they feel like they do not have a single political affiliation, but rather likes ideas from both the Democrats and Republicans. Religion has had an influence on their family's political views, particularly their mom's catholic faith. They follow political news often but does not like the partisanship which

they feel creates conflicting information or misrepresentation on controversial subjects. At UW Bothell they have not had a university resource impact them to make them more engaged. While they are not studying political science, they did enjoy a course on American Government.

Respondent 4 was held with a full-time business student who is aged 21. They feel civically engaged by volunteering in their community. Further, they try to work for businesses that promote civic engagement. However, their family is not politically active. They would describe their political values as progressive with traditional values. For example, while their family does not often discuss politics they know their family are first generation immigrants but are conservative on same-sex marriage. Nonetheless, they are an active voter but tend to focus on larger elections like for the President instead of for local judges. At UW Bothell they have taken courses on business policy and law, which they enjoyed.

Respondent 5 is a 31-year-old full-time STEM student. They are not civically engaged. They choose to only vote in the Presidential election because the local elections do not affect them. Their parents only vote Republican and as a family do not discuss other political options. They are a self-described liberal Democrat in the context of Indiana, their home state, but would say they are more moderate in the context of Seattle. They try to not think about politics often, but when they do follow political news they like to only focus on the facts. They tend to only follow headlines in news. Within the university they have not experienced any community engagement.

Respondent 6 is a 61-year-old full-time IAS student. They are highly civically engaged, having held an elected office, and heavily participating in at least seven major

political campaigns as well as voter registration efforts. While their parents were apolitical, other family members have expressed conservative views. Their immediate family now is mostly liberal, however they do not identify with any political party. Religion has had an active influence on their political views. They would say that they became an active voter around the age of 30. The UW Bothell campus created opportunities to increase their political engagement through visiting speakers and several policy or law courses.

Respondent 7 is a 33-year-old full-time IAS student. They would say that in the past they have been civically active through political organizing, but has since moved on because they feel it was not making a significant impact. Their family does not discuss politics. They grew up poor, having experienced what it is like to be at the bottom, and feels that it impacts their civic engagement level. They are now an active voter, exercising their position to help others. They place a heavy emphasis on gathering information and maintaining awareness, never turning a blind eye to a subject. At UW Bothell they have not taken a course with direct community engagement, but feel each course has had a conversation around relevant policy or social justice.

Respondent 8 is a full-time IAS student aged 40. They feel that they are civically engaged by being aware of prevalent issues in their community. They feel most connected to their similar-aged neighbors in a mixed-income area that is becoming more diverse. Their family was always into politics. Their father was very active and had a friend that would go to city council meeting. They agree with socialist policies like universal healthcare, fairness and equity, but would otherwise say they are politically in the middle ground. Both of their parents were teachers which meant that at a young age

they were active in demonstrations to support unions. They are a highly active voter because historically they would not have been allowed to vote. At UW Bothell they were enrolled in a community-based learning course that instilled the confidence to conduct political canvassing. Moreover, they appreciated other opportunities the school provided such as trips to the state capitol to lobby on legislative issues.

Common themes are found across the eight interviews. There is a strong association between the respondent's voter engagement and whether or not their family is politically engaged, i.e. discusses politics. Furthermore, if the respondent or their family has experienced a societal hardship they will be more likely to be politically engaged and an engaged voter. Age also has a positive association with voter engagement. This study did not test for the causes of this relationship, but as a person ages they become a more engaged voter. All respondents who were IAS students were active voters, but this is most likely due to a confirmation bias as the school-wide quantitative analysis confirmed the school of IAS is at a moderate level of voter engagement. Interestingly, our respondents who felt that their religion impacted their political views were split on what that impact is. One respondent reported that religion created more conservative political views while the other saw it as a reason to consistently provide service work to their community. Lastly, in terms of university systems, the only consensus is that students enjoyed courses that taught about their government system. The opportunity to understand the systems that make up their democracy were sought after through an academic framework as opposed to the extracurricular option of bringing speakers to campus or providing space for civic engagement organizations.

Recommendation

The research has produced insights that can be transformed into recommended changes in University of Washington and University of Washington Bothell existing policy. The first, and most practical, is submitting an individual data set for each UW campus in future National Student Clearinghouse data reports so that the National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement may create individualized reports for the three UW campuses.

The campus-wide analysis of voter engagement in the 2016 election revealed that once a UW Bothell student is registered that there is a 93% chance they will vote. Unfortunately, the overall voter engagement and registration levels are below average. Therefore, the university should confront this issue, knowing that they need to focus on the front end of voter engagement: registration. There are four avenues the university should concentrate their efforts.

The first is to implement more robust voter registration efforts in community engagement orientated courses. Particularly if a course is going to be engaged with a community partner, whether through a CBLR designation or otherwise, the professor should be mandated to provide a link to the Washington Secretary of State's online voter address update and voter registration page. The survey confirmed that there is an association between how respondents would rank the importance of civic engagement and the importance of voting. Increasing measures directed at bridging the gap between a course that is civically engaged and the students who are not voting will only increase voter engagement.

Currently UW Bothell asks students if they are a registered voter during the sign-up process for class registration. Based on the voter engagement and survey analysis, it clearly is not doing enough for the 18-21 age range. Therefore, 'Discovery-Core' courses, those that are pre-dominantly composed of students in the 18-21 age range should include a 'Voter 101' course module. This module should be as simple as a ten-minute conversation about civic engagement and why within that term voter engagement is important. This conversation can include or culminate in an online voter registration and address update link distributed to the students.

The third is to encourage voter awareness activity among Pre-Major students. There is a negative correlation between voting and Pre-Major academic status. However, there are consistent increases in voter registration and voter engagement levels from age 18 to 19 and 19 to 20. This indicates that there is some variable creating disengagement. According to our survey this disengagement can be countered by developing a sense of civic duty through volunteering opportunities. Further, according to the interviews, students may respond positively to an increase in information about American Government type courses. In practice, this may not mean simply repeating the requirement for these courses, but rather creating opportunities for interdisciplinary work with course material on the impact of government in their area of study.

The fourth core recommendation is to concentrate voter registration efforts on first generation college students during their academic orientation. First generation college students had significantly lower voter registration and voter turnout rates. While the qualitative reasons for this discrepancy have not been identified by this study,

certainly its impact has been made known. There is a convenient 'bottleneck' when students must attend academic orientation prior to their first quarter to engage the students as voters. Moreover, with the recent passage of a state law that allows for pre-registration of 17-year-olds, there is no reason not to spend ten minutes during orientation to solve the voter disengagement of these students at orientation.

Limitations and Future Research

In administering surveys, respondents had to choose to take the survey and their incentive was purely personal. This could be because they knew the researcher, the title of the study caught their eye, or they enjoy taking surveys. No matter why they took the survey, the individual was influenced by some amount of interest in civic engagement and voter participation more generally. Additionally, when administering a survey, respondents do not have the ability to communicate nuance within their answers. Answers are contained to a set of 'yes', 'no', 'I'm not sure', or a ranking of 1 as low to 5 as high.

When conducting the interviews, similar limitations were faced as discussed above. To be eligible for an interview, the respondent first had to choose to take our survey and then had to opt-in. This was evident in the average age of the interviewees being significantly higher than the age group we are targeting. Additionally, interviewers were limited by the interview script that we decided on. It was important to only address the questions as part of the script to ensure that you are using the same methodology with each subject. Because the interviewees that volunteered were not necessarily

“young” people, their interview responses were not representative of the population being analyzing.

When looking at the voter data, there are fewer limitations. One of them would be that the study is looking only at 2016 voter turnout, and many of the survey respondents and interviewees were not members of the campus community at that time in 2016. It would be difficult to contact people from our voter file that attended UWB at that time for both ethical reasons as well as the fact that most of those students are no longer on campus. But for this study, it is beneficial to compare the UW Bothell-specific data with other institutions nationwide to look at how our specific campus community compares to other campuses. While it would be difficult to conduct the study using turnout from the most recent local election, the overall voter turnout would be significantly lower because it is not a presidential election year, or even a midterm for that matter.

The analysis conducted in this study is only the starting point for the potential that can be done with this research. For example, the code that was developed to match the Secretary of State data with the UW Bothell data can be applied to datasets from different years. If data from other years was acquired, a study could be conducted looking at voter turnout in Presidential vs. Non-Presidential years. Additionally, by taking information from previous elections, a study could determine how much the voter turnout in 2016 was attributed to the “Trump effect” happening across college campuses.

This study also created a good framework for survey and interview questions but highlighted some areas where improvements could be made. Doing more direct outreach to solicit more survey results would have given more qualitative data to

analyze. While the survey got a decent number of respondents, it was not enough to really paint an accurate picture of civic engagement on campus. The same goes for the interviews, while the interviews provided some useful and interesting information, having more interviewees would have allowed the study to be more comprehensive and include more interviewees in the 18 to 24-year-old age range.

Conclusion

College-age voters traditionally have the lowest turnout rate amongst registered voters in both Presidential and non-Presidential elections. Due to this, the age of the average voter is over 65 years old, even though young people make the largest proportion of the eligible voting population. This report found that the University of Washington Bothell has an exceptionally high voter turnout among registered voters at 93%. Even so voter turnout in the 18 to 24-year-old age group is still below average. The demographic makeup, and specifically the higher than average age of enrolled students at UW Bothell contributes significantly to the high turnout rate overall, as was apparent in the average age of interviewees. The study showed that if you get people registered to vote, they will turn out on election day. To achieve this, there is clearly more outreach that can be done to the young people entering the campus that may not yet be civically engaged outside the classroom. With integration of civics education into First-Year courses and a more institutionally-backed voter registration drive, the University can play a large role in creating the habit of voting for young people that they will carry on throughout their adult lives. Additionally, the study found that first-generation college students both register and turnout in very low numbers. Forty-five

percent of incoming first-year students and 41 percent of incoming transfers are first-generation college students at UW Bothell. This subset of the campus population provides the most room for growth for voter turnout. By engaging these young people through increased civic education, the university can play a major role in helping students access democracy.

Appendix

Item A

Voter Characteristics

1. What school are you currently in?

Mark only one oval.

- Pre-major
- Business
- Education Studies
- IAS
- Nursing and Health Studies
- Science, Technology, Engineering, or Mathematics (STEM)
- Other

8/3/2018

Husky Voter Engagement Survey

2. What is your age range?*Mark only one oval.*

- 17 or younger
- 18-21
- 22-24
- 25-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50+

3. What year of school are you currently in?*Mark only one oval.*

- First year
- Second year
- Third year and beyond
- Other

4. What is your enrollment status?*Mark only one oval.*

- Full-Time (12 or more credits)
- Part-Time (11 or less credits)

Civic Engagement

For the following statements and questions, please indicate the level to which you agree or disagree.

5. Civic education is important.*Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree

6. Civic education should be taught in elementary, middle, and high schools schools.*Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree

8/3/2018

Husky Voter Engagement Survey

7. Civic engagement is important.

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

8. I consider myself an active member of my community.

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

9. Volunteering is good for the community.

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

10. I would like to volunteer more in the community.

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

11. Volunteering helps me develop a sense of civic duty.

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

Demographic Information

Please select the response that best fits you

8/3/2018

Husky Voter Engagement Survey

12. Which race or ethnicity do you identify as?*Check all that apply.*

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Latinx
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- White/Caucasian
- Choose to not disclose
- Other

13. What is your gender? (self-identification)*Check all that apply.*

- Agender
- Androgynous
- Bigender
- Female
- Gender fluid
- Gender non-conforming
- Male
- Transgender
- Choose not to disclose
- Other

14. Are you the first person in your immediate family to attend college?*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
- No
- I'm not sure

Voter Participation**15. Are you a registered voter?***Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
- No
- I'm not sure

8/3/2018

Husky Voter Engagement Survey

16. Did you vote in the 2016 election?*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
- No
- I'm not sure

17. Did you vote in any election since 2016?*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
- No
- I'm not sure

18. Are you planning on voting in the 2018 elections?*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
- No
- I'm not sure

For the following statements and questions, please indicate the level to which you agree or disagree.

19. I believe that voting is important.*Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree

20. I always vote on or before election day.*Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree

21. Everyone should vote on or before election day.*Mark only one oval.*

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree

Civic Engagement Part 2

8/3/2018

Husky Voter Engagement Survey

22. Have you ever signed a petition?*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
 No
 I'm not sure

23. Do you volunteer in your community?*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
 No
 I'm not sure

24. Have you participated in political demonstrations or protests?*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
 No
 I'm not sure

25. Have you donated to any political organizations or political candidates?*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
 No
 I'm not sure

26. Have you contacted your locally elected representatives before?*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
 No
 I'm not sure

27. Compared to your peers, how often do you follow politics? (local, state, national).*Mark only one oval.*

- More than my peers
 The same as my peers
 Less than my peers

28. Compared to your peers, how often do you read or view news about politics?*Mark only one oval.*

- More than my peers
 The same as my peers
 Less than my peers

8/3/2018

Husky Voter Engagement Survey

29. Compared to your peers, how often do you volunteer in your community?*Mark only one oval.*

- More than my peers
- The same as my peers
- Less than my peers

Focus-Group Voluntary Participation

Continue being part of the solution! Help out by volunteering 45 minutes of your time in a focus-group that will provide critical information on why our classmates aren't out there voting. (There will be donuts!)

30. May we contact you regarding voluntary participation in an interview formatted focus-group?*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
- No

31. Email address if you would like to participate in a focus-group.

Thank You!

If you are interested in learning more about our research project, please email nateb3@uw.edu.

Register to vote or update your address here:

<https://weiapplets.sos.wa.gov/MyVoteOLVR/MyVoteOLVR>

Powered by



Item B

Interview Script

Hi, my name is _____ and I am a researcher with the Husky Voter Engagement Project. Thank you for volunteering your time to participate in this interview. Before we go any further, we want to ensure that your rights to privacy are protected. **Give interviewee the Consent Form.** Please take a moment to review the form, and feel free to ask me any questions.

Provide study Purpose Statement if interviewee did not read on Consent Form:

The Husky Voter Engagement Project will produce a report on voter participation levels at the University of Washington Bothell campus and create a policy recommendation to increase voter engagement. We will analyze campus voter turnout in the 2016 presidential election by matching UWB student information to the publicly available Washington voter registration data. The policy recommendation will be based off of interviews with students.

Now, let's dive into the conversation:

1. Voter Characteristics
 - a. Which UWB school are you a member of?
 - b. What is your age?
 - c. Full-time or part-time student?
2. Civic Engagement 1
 - a. Do you tend to vote?
 - b. How would you define 'civic engagement'?
 - i. How are you, in practice, civically engaged?
 - c. Have you participated in a voter registration campaign?
 - i. How has this experience influenced your future educational or career path?
 - d. What types of organizations do you think encourage the most civic engagement?
 - i. Which of these organizations are you affiliated with?
 - e. How do you define your community?
 - f. How large is your community?
3. Demographics
 - a. Describe your family's relationship with politics.
 - b. What do you identify as your political values/morals.
 - c. Do you share the same political values as your parents/other family members?

- d. Do your religious values influence your civic engagement?
 - e. How often do you think about the political landscape?
 - f. Did any childhood experiences influence your civic engagement today?
4. Voting Data:
- a. Do you tend to vote? (Why or why not?)
 - b. When voting, do you feel you are making an informed decision?
 - c. Did you choose to register to vote or did someone convince you? If someone convinced you, who were they?
5. Civic Engagement 2:
- a. How would you define 'being active in politics'?
 - i. How are you, in practice, active in politics?
 - b. Have you participated in a political demonstration before, why did you attend?
 - c. What type of news do you follow?
 - d. Do you follow the news to learn about current political events?
 - e. Do you engage politically through social media?
6. University Systems:
- a. Have you taken a class with a CBLR component? Did this influence your level of engagement?
 - b. Have you taken any politically oriented classes? Social justice? Policy-related?
 - c. Have you taken a class with a professor whose perceived political stance is different than your own?
 - d. Has any experiences through the university encouraged you to be more civically engaged? Study Abroad? Talks given on campus?

References/Works Cited

- Adler, R. P., & Goggin, J. (2005). What do we mean by “civic engagement”? *Journal of transformative education*, 3(3), 236-253.
- Checkoway, B. (2001). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 125-147.
- Christian, Emily. (2016). “DEVELOPING COLLEGE STUDENT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT”. College of Professional Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts
- "CIRCLE » Youth Voting". *Civicyouth.Org*, 2018, <https://civicyouth.org/quick-facts/youth-voting/>. Accessed 9 Aug 2018.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Dorn, C. (2011). From "liberal professions" to "lucrative professions": Bowdoin College, Stanford University, and the civic functions of higher education. *Teachers College Record*, 113(7), 1566-1598.
- Emami, Z., & Davis, J. (2009). Democracy, education and economics. *International Journal of Pluralism and Economics Education*, 1(1-2), 37-45.
- Flores, R. O., Crosby-Currie, C., & Zimmerman, C. (2007). Engaged pedagogies, civic development, and student well-being within a liberal learning context. *Peer Review*, 9(3), 11-13.
- Fried, J. (2009). Intentional democratic communities: Residential education for civic engagement. *Journal of College & University Student Housing*, 36(2), 56-67.
- Gibson, C. (2000). *From inspiration to participation: A review of perspectives on youth civic engagement.* New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

- Institute for Democracy & Higher Education: National Study of Learning, Voting and Engagement. (2016). 2012 & 2016 NSLVE Campus Report. Medford, MA.
- Ishitani, T. T., & McKittrick, S. A. (2013). The effects of academic programs and institutional characteristics on postgraduate civic engagement behavior. *Journal of College Student Development*, 54(4), 379-396.
- Johnson, D. I. (2004). Relationships between college experiences and alumni participation in the community. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(2), 169-185.
- Khalid, Asma. "Millennials Now Rival Boomers As A Political Force, But Will They Actually Vote?". *Npr.Org*, 2016, <https://www.npr.org/2016/05/16/478237882/millennials-now-rival-boomers-as-a-political-force-but-will-they-actually-vote>. Accessed 9 Aug 2018.
- McDonald, Michael. "United States Elections Project". *Electproject.Org*, 2018, <http://www.electproject.org/>. Accessed 9 Aug 2018.
- Palmer, D. L., & Standerfer, C. (2004). Employing civic participation in college teaching designs. *College Teaching*, 52(4), 122-127.
- Ronan, B. (2004). Testimony at the White House Conference on Aging Public Forum on Civic Engagement in an Older America, Phoenix, Arizona, February 25, 2004.
- Thomas, N., Bergom, I., Casellas Connors, I., Gautam, P., Gismondi, A., & Roshko, A. (2017). Democracy counts: A report on U.S. college and university student voting. Institute for Democracy & Higher Education, Tufts University's Jonathan M. Tisch College of Civic Life.

Whitley, M. A., & Walsh, D. S. (2014). A framework for the design and implementation of service-learning courses. *JOPERD: The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 85(4), 34-39. doi:10.1080/07303084.2014.884835