



12-2021

Critical Political Thinking: An Analysis of Undergraduate Students' Higher-Order Thinking Skills and Preferred Political Values, Labels, and Leadership Traits

Maya Mingo

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, mmingo@vols.utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), and the [Educational Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mingo, Maya, "Critical Political Thinking: An Analysis of Undergraduate Students' Higher-Order Thinking Skills and Preferred Political Values, Labels, and Leadership Traits. " PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2021.

https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/7022

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Maya Mingo entitled "Critical Political Thinking: An Analysis of Undergraduate Students' Higher-Order Thinking Skills and Preferred Political Values, Labels, and Leadership Traits." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in School Psychology.

Merilee McCurdy, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

R. Steve McCallum, Sherry M. Bell, Karee Dunn, Merilee McCurdy

Accepted for the Council:

Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

Critical Political Thinking: An Analysis of Undergraduate Students' Higher-Order Thinking
Skills and Preferred Political Values, Labels, and Leadership Traits

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Maya Ailene Mingo

December 2021

Copyright © 2021 by Maya Ailene Mingo
All rights reserved.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my committee Chair, Dr. Merilee McCurdy for her guidance and assistance during my dissertation process. Her support and encouragement were nothing short of heroic, and I will value her investment into my professional development and the completion of this project for the rest of my life.

I would also like to express my respect and gratitude for Dr. Robert Williams who has imparted to me not only the merits of scientifically based decision making, but also the virtue of always taking the stairs. I am grateful for his mentorship over the years and for his invaluable contribution to this study.

Next, I thank my committee members, Dr. Steve McCallum, Dr. Sherry Bell, and Dr. Karee Dunn, not just for their participation in this project, but also for all of the positivity and support they have offered to me throughout the years. Dr. Dunn afforded me my first opportunity to teach an undergraduate course, and I almost completely owe my growth in the areas of doctoral-level research writing and navigating the peer review and journal publication processes to Drs. McCallum and Bell. I am grateful to them for their influence and, especially, for their patience with me during my dissertation journey.

I also extend thanks to my cohort members: Kendall Hauck Jordan, Peter Ignacio, Kala Taylor, and Victoria VanMaaren. Their friendship and support were invaluable. I would also like to thank the members of my research team who helped to conceptualize and collect data for this study: Hsin-Hui Chang, Kendall Hauck Jordan, Peter Ignacio, Alex Price, and Janet Schwartz-Micheaux.

I extend my most heartfelt and sincere gratitude to Dr. ValaRay J. Irvin for her inspiration, to Dr. Catrice Tolbert for her influence, to Dr. Susan Thornton for her example, and to Dr. Joycelyn Harrison for her support.

Thank you to my closest friends Kendall Hauck Jordan, Nicholy Johnson, Candice Meyers, Keyo Johnson, Corey Harrison, Christopher Critchlow, and Leslie Manadier for their continual love, prayers, laughter, support, and optimism. I am able to function properly in this world because of them! Thank you to my cousins and friends, Azza and Akash Jayaprakash, for always having my back and always being supportive. Finally, thank you to my dear friend and brother, Rodney Goldsmith, for supporting me in ways that only he can.

Last, but absolutely not least, I would like to thank my parents, my grandparents, my siblings, and all of my aunts, uncles, and cousins who have loved and supported me since the day I was born and to whom I owe the majority of my successes. I dedicate this accomplishment to all of you.

Abstract

Survey data were collected to determine the extent to which 103 students enrolled in an entry-level, multi-section educational psychology course at a large, southeastern United States university prioritize the personal characteristics and political values of people in politics and to determine whether or not those preferences bear any relation to their self-reported political labels or their critical thinking abilities, as operationalized by the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal Form S (WGCTA; Watson & Glaser, 1994).

Participants' preferred political values were markedly incongruent with their preferred political labels, particularly amongst those who self-identified as Conservative. However, label congruence between respondents' families and close friends was statistically significantly related ($p < .009$) and ($p < .001$), respectively. The relation between preferred political labels and the region of the country in which the participants were raised was insignificant ($p > .05$). Overall performance on the critical thinking measure was considered to be poor ($M = 20.04$, $SD = 24.12$). However, additional analyses revealed that relatively higher critical thinking scores were more associated with those participants whose preferred political labels and values were congruent; lower scores were most associated with students without label-value congruence. Support for Public Education, National Security, Truthfulness, Respect for Others' Views, High Moral Conduct, and Gender Equality in the Workplace were identified as values and characteristics most consistently preferred by the respondents across political categories.

Table of Contents

Chapter I Introduction and Literature Review	1
Political Motivators	2
Theoretical Considerations	2
Candidates' Personal Traits and Likeability	3
Social Influences	8
Political Identity and Labels.....	10
Educational Influences on Political Thinking	14
Educational Quality and Attainment.....	14
Critical Thinking.....	16
Purpose of Study	17
Chapter II Methodology.....	20
Participants	20
Instruments	21
Identification Form	21
Critical Thinking Test.....	21
Political Leadership Survey	23
Principal Components Analysis.....	25
Cronbach's alpha	26
Procedures	26
Analysis Plan.....	27
Chapter III Results	30
Chapter IV Discussion	37
Principal Findings	38
Rankings	38
Label-Value Congruence	41
Critical Thinking Outcomes.....	43
Limitations and Implications for Future Research.....	45
Conclusion	46
References.....	48

Appendices.....	59
Vita.....	84

List of Tables

Table G1: Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants	77
Table G2: Overall Rankings	78
Table G3: Self-Identify as Conservative Rankings	79
Table G4: Self-Identify as Independent Rankings	80
Table G5: Self-Identify as Liberal Rankings	81
Table G6: Comparison Between Reported Political Identification and Political Identification by Preference Profile.....	82
Table G7: Group Rankings by Political Self-Identification and Political Preference Profile	83

Chapter I

Introduction and Literature Review

Voters are compelled to favor and support various political candidates for diverse and intricate reasons. Broadly speaking, doing so can be rewarding, as preferred governmental leaders are those who best appeal to their constituents' needs, values, and ideologies; and inasmuch as those preferences are central to likeability, shared political identities and agreeable personality traits are also powerful factors when evaluating electability (Holian & Prysby, 2014; Popa et al., 2018). Political scientists have extensively examined the many factors that influence political decision-making amongst the electorate and have identified several determinants, both practical and theoretical. Though whatever one's style of reasoning regarding electoral processes, the decision to vote or not to vote in support of one political candidate or another can be casual or complex, and often requires individuals to assess their principles, political orientations, and/or related social implications.

Of course, one might hope that voters' political decision-making would be the product of a marked degree of critical thought considering the potentially adverse societal ramifications associated with electing political leaders who lack the characteristics needed to effectively serve in government. Ideally, perhaps, voters would expend considerable effort researching and objectively analyzing candidates' personalities and stances on a variety of policy issues, evaluating their professional competencies, achievement records, and moral and intellectual fitness using critical thinking methods they might have learned in school with the end goal of endorsing those who are most qualified. However, as researchers continue to evaluate the strength of various political motivators and habits, several trends appear noteworthy. For example, voters are significantly influenced by their immediate social groups (Cohen, 2003), are

compelled to vote in relation to single or few policy concerns (Egorov, 2015), are influenced by their educational attainment and/or the quality of their civics instruction (Hillygus, 2005), do not always profess political labels that are congruent with their expressed political values (Coles et al., 2015), yet do tend to vote in alignment with their preferred political parties (Dalton, 2016), are often persuaded by partialities towards candidates' personal traits (Teven, 2008), and are commonly driven by self-interest and/or perceived altruism (Fowler, 2006; Miller, 1999). The primary focus of this study is to identify those values and personal traits that most influence the political thinking of undergraduate students enrolled at a large public university in the southeastern United States, the extent to which these values/traits are similar to those of family and friends, and to analyze the degree to which their capacities to think critically are associated with their reported political preferences.

Political Motivators

Theoretical Considerations

Social scientists have long theorized that political decision-making in general is fundamentally self-serving. Adam Smith's Rational Choice Theory (RCT) posits that in any given scenario, rational individuals will appraise the value of their presented choices, and, as an act of self-interest, select the option that yields maximum personal benefit or pleasure (Smith, 1776). Downs (1957) later explored the political application of RCT when he argued that citizens are most compelled to engage politically when the expected benefit of doing so (i.e., their interest in the outcome and/or the belief that their vote would be pivotal) outweighs the cost (i.e., resources expended and/or dissatisfaction experienced supporting a weak or losing candidate). Thus, citizens are likewise compelled to vote for certain candidates not only when they perceive associated rewards, but also in instances when doing so averts loss.

Other variables also influence motivation to vote. For example, Harder and Krosnick (2008) discussed the strength of candidate preference as a motivator to vote during instances when people foster a strong dislike for the opposing candidate. Apparently, the greater the perceived disparity between a preferred and an undesirable candidate, the more inclined voters feel to vote on Election Day. Prospect Theory describes this occurrence, and poses that personal decision-making is not solely a product of self-interest, but that individuals also calculate the potentiality of risks under conditions of uncertainty when contemplating their choices (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). That is, voters' propensities towards risk taking (casting ballots) vary according to their valuation of possible gains as well as losses (Vis, 2011).

However, while various forms of egoism could very well lie at the root of political decision-making, self-interest is not all encompassing, as many voters seem to also be selflessly motivated. Altruism Theory involves the idea that human sympathy towards the wellbeing of others is a core psychosocial motivator that guides individuals' personal choices (Feigin et al., 2014). Thus, voter altruism is most likely to occur when voters hold the belief that their individual political choices might bear some influence on positively impacting society at large (Munsey, 2008). Of course, substantial research supports the contention that a single vote is unlikely to influence the outcome of a general election (Coate, 2006; Feddersen, 2004; Mulligan & Hunter, 2003). However, so-called altruistic voters are more inclined to disregard that reasoning, instead focusing on and incentivized by the sense of moral or relational satisfaction they gain from supporting candidates whom they perceive to be the most qualified to promote social welfare (Duffy & Tavits, 2008; Edlin et al., 2007; Opp, 2001).

Candidates' Personal Traits and Likeability

An abundance of research has also been conducted examining the role of political

leaders' personal qualities as they influence voter decision-making, with notable interest given to the importance of candidate-constituent personality congruence, charisma, and the Big Five personality dimensions: Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extroversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism/Emotional Stability (Digman, 1990; Caprara et al., 2002; Davis & Gardner, 2012). Gerber et al. (2011) discussed the stability of those five personality dimensions over the lifespan and voters' propensities to align with political parties as well as candidates who reflect those of the five traits with which they most strongly identify. For example, Conscientiousness and Emotional Stability tend to be more associated with certain political parties, and Openness to Experience and Agreeableness are more prevalent amongst members of others (Barbaranelli et al., 2007; Caprara et al., 1999).

In their examination of social identity and intergroup political leadership, Hohman et al. (2010) discussed voters' apparent needs and desires for "prototypical leaders." These are leaders who are able to invoke a sense of shared identity, commonality, and group cohesion amongst their constituents. Apparently, candidates with whom voters do not personally identify or who declare membership in "out-groups," or political parties different from their own, are perceived as being less trustworthy, less competent, and as potential threats to one's social identity, ideals, and norms. Caprara et al. (2002) surveyed 137 adult participants using a 25-item rating scale measuring the Big Five character traits to rate the personalities of their current political leaders as well as their own. Results revealed that the participants' self-reported personality scores were always more highly correlated with their ratings of the politicians belonging to their preferred political coalition. Thus, whether those similarities were valid or attributed, the pattern of agreement was statistically associated with shared political identity.

Further, the less distinctive (or, more centrist) political parties seem, with regard to

ideologies and policy-stances, the more salient personal attributes become in the minds of potential voters (Caprara & Zimbardo, 2004). However, a follow-up study (Caprara et al., 2006) compared five-factor model personality traits and personal values to respondents' voting choices; constituent values more powerfully predicted political party preference than reported personality traits. This outcome suggests that value congruence is more powerful than trait congruence when predicting voting habits. Authors of the study speculated that this result may be explained by the possibility that people tend to reference their values during scenarios when they are required to make thoughtful and intentional decisions such as voting, but may default to personal traits during instances when decisions are made spontaneously.

In a comprehensive review of leader attributes literature, Zaccaro et al. (2004) found strong empirical evidence for the perspective that personalities of those who serve in leadership versus non-leadership roles are measurably stronger and differ primarily in the areas of general cognitive and problem-solving abilities, tacit knowledge (general and domain specific experience and expertise), social-emotional intelligence, motivation to lead, as well as Big Five personality orientations, and that these factors are positively related to leader effectiveness. A related meta-analytic study reported associations between transformational (*inspirational*) leadership styles and five-factor model personality traits, with extroversion being the strongest correlate (Bono & Judge, 2004).

Charisma is also a highly valuable leadership trait and has been the subject of much political research. In a literature review of 280 charisma-related articles, Antonakis et al. (2016) discussed the propensity of early researchers to characterize the trait as a mysterious but special spiritual quality that some leaders possess at birth. However, their research team proposed a more stable and crystallized definition, operationalizing it as “values-based, symbolic, and

emotion-laden leader signaling,” that can be used to emotionally arouse or signal people to action, and which can be learned and developed. In a follow-up meta-analytic study, Banks et al. (2017) adopted the same operational definition of charisma in their review of 76 related studies. Their study revealed small to moderate correlations between charisma, cognitive ability, and Big Five personality traits, with extroversion identified as the strongest correlate.

A 2019 PEW Research Center (PRC) survey revealed that though constituents of the opposition party reported being most highly motivated to vote in the 2020 presidential election by supporting any candidate whom they viewed as being able to unseat the sitting president, around 30% also cited potential candidates’ personal characteristics as being the most important factor in selecting their favored nominee in the presidential election, with honesty-good character, competence-intelligence, and an accepting-caring personality being their top three most important candidate traits (Pew Research Center, 2019). Another PEW survey (PRC, 2017) showed that 25% of respondents chose not to vote at all in the previous national election (2016), essentially because they disliked the candidates. In their analysis of Census Bureau data, researchers discovered that the percentages of nonvoters who cited disliking the candidates as their primary reason for not casting ballots remained relatively stable across demographic groups [Men (25%), Women (24%), Millennials (24%), Generation X (27%), Baby Boomers (27%), Less than High School Grads (23%), High School Grads (24%), Some College (26%), College+ (25%)].

Due to these factors, political candidates often expend significant effort in ensuring that potential voters find them likeable. The historical approach to achieving this has been through “hitting the campaign trail” and interfacing with the public in large or intimate venues within local community settings, giving voters opportunities to learn directly from candidates about

their political platforms and to gain exposure to their personalities. Politicians have often published memoirs or have hired biographical writers to chronicle their life stories (Egerton, 1992), and, as of late, have opted to utilize social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter to campaign in order to increase their name, policy, and personality recognition (Stieglitz & Dang-Xuan, 2013; Stier et al., 2018). Thus, considering the rise in and prevalence of media consumption over the past several decades (Opdycke et al., 2013), it is sensible that candidates would utilize as many of these platforms as possible to expose themselves to potential supporters and to pursue or build likeability. Television and radio exposure also are fast methods to growing exposure to wide audiences; and while political news shows commonly host politicians during their broadcasts, those appearances tend to focus conversations on more serious policy and governmental concerns as opposed to providing opportunities for humanization and good-natured amusement (Loeb, 2017).

Because of this, politicians might prioritize appearances on daytime or late-night entertainment talk shows, as hosts of these shows often engage guests in less serious conversations, tend to be more personable and lighthearted, and provide opportunities for candidates to display their personal qualities to their audiences (Baum, 2005). There is some evidence that voters tend to be parsimonious when evaluating candidates' personalities, and do not typically focus on a wide range of character traits, but only two or three, specifically Energy/Openness and Honesty/Trustworthiness (Caprara et al., 1997). Therefore, these entertainment show platforms may provide opportunities for audience exposure to potential voters who are not particularly interested in politics and who do not tune into political news shows, as well as opportunities to potently display those qualities of most influence during short allotments of time. Such appearances may also be of some benefit in influencing such voters,

both due to the human propensity to align ourselves with persons we like or with whom we identify, particularly when uncertain or when lacking additional knowledge (Hogg et al., 2007), and to take advantage of the power of first impressions.

The power of first impressions can be advantageous depending on the ability of the politician to convey attractive traits. According to Koppensteiner and Stephan (2014) people tend to form first impressions of others based upon their physical appearances, body language, and a range of nonverbal cues, particularly when they interpret those cues as portraying personality traits similar to their own. However, whereas candidates may glean support from some less-politically engaged voters as a result of entertainment talk show appearances (Moy et al., 2005), more astute voters with well-established political identities often tend to engage in higher degrees of cognitive dissonance, discounting favorable information regarding candidates representing opposing parties and seeking and attending to primarily positive information reinforcing their predispositions to supporting a candidate from their own in-group or political party (Popa et al., 2018).

Social Influences

It is clear then that to some extent, political decision-making is just as much a product of voters' social contexts as it is of their inclinations to align themselves with persons who possess appealing personality traits. Tenets of evolutionary sociology also seem to factor into political decision-making and provide evidence that an inherent need for social belongingness, acceptance, and interpersonal desirability (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Kesebir, 2012) are important. In addition, voters tend to display tendencies that comport with and conform to the expectations and demands of the social groups to which they belong (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004; Fredman et al., 2015). This occurs because, according to social identity theory, human

beings develop a social identity *and* a personal one. One's social identity is largely rooted in the knowledge, value, and emotional importance derived from the relationships and commonalities shared amongst persons who identify within the same social categories (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992).

Social identity, then, can factor into one's political decision making. For example, young or new voters typically report "inheriting" their political labels, views, and ideologies from their parents (Achen, 2002), and even more so when children are raised in homes wherein their parents or caretakers were highly politically involved (Jennings et al., 2009). Similarly, identity politics refers to the propensities of members of various social groups (distinguished by age, gender, race, class, sexual orientation, etc.) to think and act politically in ways that are central to the general wants, needs, and/or injustices commonly experienced by those within their immediate and shared social groups (Crenshaw, 1991; Mucciaroni, 2011). That is, instead of valuating the perceived strengths and weaknesses of individual candidates and/or policies, a female, for example, might vote for a politician solely based upon shared gender; or, one might adopt certain political ideologies because they consider those perspectives to be most representative of concerns pertaining to their primary/most dominant group identity.

In addition, Swann et al. (2009) discussed the occurrence of identity fusion, the sense of a person feeling functionally equivalent with a larger group, and how that state of mind is not uncommon among social circles within which group members share the same ideals, experiences, or close social bonds (i.e., within families, intimate friendships, geographic regions, religions, and even political parties). They further proposed that, for some, this drive can be markedly intense, such that their ability to draw a distinction between their individual and group identities might become diminished or lost altogether. This could explain why partisans report

preferences for living in regions of the country that are more compatible with their political beliefs (Mummolo & Nall, 2016); why people are motivated to vote as a means of achieving or maintaining social acceptability (Doherty et al., 2017); why young people are most likely to vote for the first time when members of their household are habitual voters and/or when accompanied by a peer (Fieldhouse & Cutts, 2012); why differences in preferred political candidates can create dissension between families and friends (Whitesides, 2017); why people display propensities towards choosing romantic partners who hold similar political values (Huber & Malhotra, 2016); and why children often adopt the political persuasions of their parents (Iyengar et al., 2018).

Political Identity and Labels

Considering the above-mentioned socio-political factors and the extent to which facets of personhood, in general, are influenced by social contexts, chosen political labels, then, are predictable. In fact, they are often identical to those of our immediate families and close friends (Huber & Malhotra, 2016; McPherson et al., 2001) and, for many, serve as emblems of belongingness to preferred social groups and direct reflections of how we perceive ourselves as moral and political agents (Graham et al., 2009; Greene, 1999; Greene, 2004). Specifically, political identity encompasses one's conceptualization of how their own innate characteristics, beliefs, values, social alliances, and measures of civic engagement are politically meaningful within their country's cultural and/or governmental landscapes; and political labels are the descriptors (or symbols) we use to identify the ideological and/or political party classifications into which we categorize ourselves.

The vast majority of United States citizens affiliates with or leans towards one of two major political parties: Democrats and Republicans. A political party is an organized group of

citizens who adhere to the same political ideals and goals, and who work together to elect like-minded politicians who can best represent and accomplish the interests and legislative objectives of their group members and constituents. Major goals and platform positions promoted by the Democratic Party include establishing a fairer economy; providing citizens with affordable, quality healthcare; reforming the criminal justice system; combating climate change; protecting voting rights, as well as immigration and education reform (Ember & Stevens, 2020). Major legislative goals of the Republican Party are somewhat different, at least traditionally, and include preserving the Constitution, balancing the national budget, growing America's economy, caring for veterans, securing national borders, putting Americans to work, and valuing the traditions of life, family, and religious liberty (Grand Old Party, 2020).

According to a 2017 survey (PRC, 2018a), 50% of registered voters identified as Democrats or those who leaned Democrat, 42% identified as Republican, or who leaned Republican; women were more likely than men to identify as Democrats (56% vs. 44%). White voters were more inclined to affiliate with the Republican Party than with the Democrats (51% vs. 43%), while African-American voters overwhelmingly identified with the Democratic Party (84%), with only eight percent affiliated with Republicans. The majority of Latino (63%) and Asian American (53%) voters also identified with or leaned towards the Democratic Party, with only 27% of Latinos and 12% of Asians aligned with Republicans. Higher educational attainment is also more characteristic of registered Democrats. Fifty-four percent of Democrats had obtained a 4-year college degree as compared to 39% of Republicans, and 63% of registered voters with at least some postgraduate education are affiliated with the Democratic Party. In contrast, Republican voters with only high school diplomas (47%) slightly outnumber Democrat voters (45%) with the same level of educational attainment.

Though most Americans align with one of these two parties, a third political party is important to mention: Independents. Laloggia (2019) reported that Independents comprise 38% of all registered voters. However, because most Independents lean toward one of the two major parties, only about seven percent are non-partisan, or true Independents. Independent-leaners also tend to be male and younger: 55% who are Republican leaning and 68% who are Democrat leaning are under the age of 50, compared to 45% of Republicans and 51% of Democrats under the age of 50. There are also more male Republican leaners (64%) and male Democrat leaners (51%) than male Republicans (51%) and male Democrats (40%). In general, Independents are much more likely than partisans to foster unfavorable views of both the Democratic and Republican parties (Greene, 2000). According to Laloggia, approximately ten percent of partisans viewed both parties pessimistically. However, about one fourth of Republican and Democratic leaning Independents viewed the major parties negatively, in addition to 37% of Independents who are non-partisan leaning. True Independents were also less likely to be politically engaged at all. In the November 2018 mid-term election, 48% of Democratic leaners and 54% of Republican leaners reported that they had casted votes as compared to 33% of non-leaners.

Notably, whereas political ideology is often conflated with political party affiliation, and while the two concepts do intersect in important ways, the two are not one and the same. One researcher defined political ideology as “a set of attitudes and values about the proper goals of society and how they should be achieved” (Tedin, 1987, p. 65). The most common political ideologies embraced in the United States today are the conservative and liberal viewpoints, which are typically discussed within the framework of right- and left-wing politics, respectively [38% of Democrats also identify as liberals and 33% of Republicans identify as conservatives

(PRC, 2014)]. Recognizing that political perspectives and sentiments vary through time and tend to be shaped by historical and current events that unfold from generation to generation, researchers set out to distinguish stable core dimensions of the conservative and liberal political ideologies.

Jost et al. (2003) analyzed meta-analytic data comprised of 88 publications that discussed and/or reviewed the ideological foundations of conservatism and identified “preserving traditionalism/maintaining social hierarchy” (i.e., opposing significant changes to social, political, economic, legislative, religious, and/or cultural practices) and “acceptance/justification of inequality” as core dimensions of conservatism (or right-wing ideology). In a subsequent study, Jost (2006) described liberals as those who highly prioritize attitudes and legislation that promote economic and social equality and as persons who tend to be less prejudicial towards disadvantaged and marginalized social groups (i.e., racial minorities, immigrants, women, and members of the LGBTQ community).

It is important to note that conservative and liberal ideologies do not necessarily represent diametrical views, but different values. In fact, it may be advantageous to regard conservatives and liberals as distinctive groups, as opposed to those simply existing along an ideological spectrum comprised of a left, right, and middle. Research, however, has shown that self-identification as liberal or conservative is not always values based, but can be fluid, founded in one’s emotional reactions to one group or the other at any given point in time, and influenced by one’s positive or negative evaluations of various social reference groups (Conover & Feldman, 1981; Zschirnt, 2011). For example, a PRC (2018b) survey revealed that when asked to evaluate the opposing party’s ideological placement on a scale of 0 (very liberal) to 10 (very conservative), the majority of Republicans (55%) scored Democrats with a “0” rating, or as

“very liberal,” the most liberal rating possible on the scale. In comparison, 35% of Democrats rated Republicans with a score of “10,” or as “very conservative,” the most conservative rating possible.

In relation, studies have shown that there is often a significant degree of mismatching between self-identified ideology and the labeling of liberal/conservative policy positions. Classen et al. (2015) conducted a study measuring ideological incongruence between ideological labels and 14 policy positions. They determined that the most prevalent form of incongruence was the mislabeling of liberal issues as conservative, and that both conservative and liberal participants had a higher propensity to mislabel policy positions as belonging to their own ideological group when compared to members of the opposite group. Additionally, whereas liberals were about as likely to mislabel policies as conservatives, conservative participants were most likely to over-utilize the conservative label. Level of political knowledge, however, reduced instances of incongruence within both ideological groups. A related study sought, in part, to examine the relation between the self-reported political labels of undergraduate students in the southeastern U.S. and the degree to which they favored liberal versus conservative policy positions (Coles et al., 2015). It was found that though the majority of participants identified as conservatives (33% conservative, 20% liberals, 26% moderates, 21% undecided), those same students perceived liberal policies as more favorable than those they identified as conservative.

Educational Influences on Political Thinking

Educational Quality and Attainment

It is somewhat surprising that so many voting-aged adults, even those with at least some college education, remain apt to incorrectly pair political policy positions with related political labels, especially considering that higher levels of educational attainment have some bearing on

political identity with regard to conservatism versus liberalism. We know that the more post-secondary education one receives (particularly for those having attended graduate school), the stronger the likelihood that one will identify as “liberal” or “Democrat” (Kurtzleben, 2016). PRC (2016) reported that more than half of survey respondents (54%) who were identified as having at least some postgraduate education, reported having either consistently liberal (31%) or mostly liberal (23%) political values, as compared to 24% who reported preferences for consistently conservative (14%) or mostly conservative (10%) values. In contrast, 44% of those with a college degree but who had not attended graduate school identified as mostly or consistently liberal versus 29% categorized as mostly or consistently conservative.

One’s political acumen, however, cannot be singularly attributed to the extent of educational attainment he or she has achieved, but the quality of one’s civic/political education must also be taken into account. Despite the strong influence of higher education on political liberalism, empirical inquiry has also been devoted to examining the efficacy of various teaching practices within the field of political education, even prior to college enrollment. For example, McAvoy et al. (2016) analyzed the state curriculum standards for 8th through 12th grade history and social studies classes across all 50 states, and found the required teaching practices to be overwhelmingly subpar. Their findings indicated that only 43 out of 50 states actually required students to acquire knowledge of the major political parties, and even then engaged students in oversimplified lessons in the functions of partisan democracy; only eight states integrated lessons on political ideologies; and only 10 states required the incorporation of activities utilizing a structured controversy framework suitable for promoting critical political thinking [i.e., one’s inclination to frequently compare his or her political beliefs with evidence obtained from valid information sources, paired with a willingness to alter one’s political views and behaviors in

response to such newly acquired knowledge, despite pre-existing biases (Wyckoff, 2012)]. Accordingly, this dearth of high-quality political education within the United States could ultimately yield a citizenry even more scantily inclined to approach political matters as critical thinkers, not because they intrinsically lack the capacity, but more likely because they have not been adequately educated and/or trained to do so.

Critical Thinking

Critical thinking is scarcely a new consideration within the fields of political science and education. Researchers have contributed an expansive pool of empirical findings in relation to the role of critical thinking within educational practices as well as with regard to political decision-making in general; and, in the era of “fake news,” studies dedicated to the role of critical thinking in relation to media literacy instruction abound (Bulger & Davison, 2018; Frederiksen, 2017; McGrew et al., 2017; Rosenzweig, 2017). Ten Dam and Volman (2004) conducted a review of 55 studies on the topic of critical thinking in education, and found that the most frequently used operationalizations of critical thinking classified it as a set of skills (e.g., questioning, organizing, and investigating), and identified an individual’s abilities to consider alternate perspectives and to think rationally, reflectively, and open-mindedly as primary attributes of the construct. Williams (1991) noted that traditional learning practices (listening, memorizing, and recalling) are foundationally inadequate for cultivating critical political thinking skills. Instead, methods and techniques involving evaluation of the veracity of policy claims and the ability to ascertain whether or not propositions logically support stated conclusions are seemingly more advantageous when seeking to cultivate independent, evidence-based thought.

Apparently, students thrive, retain the most political knowledge, and acquire a more

durable propensity towards future civic engagement in schools that promote “open classroom climates” (Torney-Purta, 2001/2002; Torney-Purta, 2002). Campbell (2008) described such climates as learning environments, within which educators facilitate open discussions and structured, respectful debates regarding real world political matters, requiring students to practice and demonstrate political knowledge and engagement right in the classroom, as opposed to merely memorizing a set of facts. Thus, whereas it has been established that merely taking civics or social studies courses yields some increase in political knowledge (Niemi & Junn, 1998), it is the practice of openly and respectfully discussing controversial public issues amongst diverse groups that generates the greatest potentiality for enhanced interpersonal skills, fair-mindedness, and a retained understanding of democratic processes (Clark, 2017; Greene et al., 1999; Pasek et al., 2008). Educators, then, should strive to structure and deliver civic/political lessons in ways that permit students to be exposed to a variety of instructional materials and/or mediums, and that grant them the liberty to articulate and analyze their own ideas, to respect other people’s ideas, and to reach their own conclusions (Martens & Gainous, 2013).

Purpose of the Study

Whereas strong critical thinking practices might ideally inform political decision-making habits, an array of studies demonstrates the human propensity to more readily rely upon factors rooted in competing facets of personhood. For example, political decision-making grounded in needs and desires for social belongingness, self-interest, and self-expression often override one’s inclination and/or motivation to access the higher-order thinking skills needed to evaluate the professional fitness of political leaders purposefully and effectively (assuming that voters were taught or inherently possess the analytical reasoning skills required to arrive at cogent, evidence-based conclusions). These factors might explain the incongruence that exists between

undergraduate students' self-identified political labels and related policy positions, and the proclivity of many voters to scarcely consider or completely bypass any in depth analyses of political candidates' stated policy positions and goals, instead opting to simply vote for those whose personalities they like or whomever is most preferred by those to whom they share the closest social bonds.

Consequently, the overall purpose of this study was to examine the ways that undergraduate students prioritize the personal characteristics and political values of people in politics and to determine whether those preferences bear any relation to their self-reported political labels or their critical thinking abilities. Four specific questions were addressed. Data addressing the first specific question examines which traits and values undergraduate Conservatives, Independents, and Liberals give the most priority when making political decisions. Whereas numerous researchers have assessed which characteristics are most important to the general electorate, studies investigating which traits are most meaningful to undergraduate students in the southeastern U.S. are limited. Because voters tend to adopt political identities that are closely aligned with their immediate families and peer groups, a second question focused on determining the influence of relational factors. That is, were respondents' self-reported labels consistent with the ones they indicated as being most common amongst their families, close friends, or the regions within which they were raised?

Additionally, because past research demonstrates that undergraduates have identified themselves as Conservatives when data indicated that they actually embraced more liberal values (Coles et al., 2015), question three focused on examining the extent to which label-value congruence exists amongst students within this demographic. Lastly, because results from prior studies indicate that higher order thinking skills positively influence one's ability to make

rational political decisions, question four examines the relationship between label-value congruence and students' critical thinking abilities.

Question 1: Which personality traits and political values do undergraduate students give the most priority when making political decisions?

Question 2: Are undergraduates' reported political labels consistent with their reported political values?

Question 3: Are undergraduates' reported political labels consistent with their perceived political labels of their extended family, close friends, or region of the country in which they grew up?

Question 4: What, if any, is the relation between respondents' label-value congruence and their scores on a critical thinking measure?

Based on past findings, it is anticipated that the majority of participants will identify as Conservative; undergraduates will report a greater preference for candidates' personality traits as compared to their political values/policy positions; the majority of participants will report preferred political values that are inconsistent with their reported political labels; reported political labels will be most aligned with those reported as belonging to their family members or close friends; and that analyses will reveal a relation between respondents' label-value congruence (or lack thereof) and their scores on a critical thinking test.

Chapter II

Methodology

Participants

This study was conducted in six sections of an undergraduate educational psychology course at a large southeastern university. This course is required for entry into the university's teacher education program (five percent of the study's participants reported current enrollment in the program). However, as a general education course, the sections are also comprised of students from various degree programs. Each section included between 24 and 31 students and respondents included a convenience sample of 167 students. A total of 64 students were excluded from final analyses [46 due to the submission of incomplete or incorrectly completed surveys, one due to graduate level enrollment, and 17 whose political profiles were inconsistent with the parameters of the study (Bipartisan)]. A final sample of 103 undergraduate students were retained (85% female, 15% male). Participants' academic classifications ranged from freshmen (10%), sophomores (54%), juniors (29%), and seniors (7%). The majority of participants were between the ages of 18 to 24 (96%), while 3% reported being between 25 to 29 years old, and one participant reported being age 30 or above.

Gender representativeness was unevenly distributed within the sample, with most respondents identifying as female (85%). The participants' age range was also nearly homogenous, as 96% of respondents reported being between the ages of 18 – 24. Sophomores (54%) and juniors (29%) accounted for almost 75 percent of the entire sample population. Students classified as freshman (10%) and seniors (7%) were limited. Approximately half of the students self-identified as Conservatives (48%). Nearly one-third of the sample self-identified as Liberal (33%). The remaining 19% of participants self-identified as Independent (See Table G1).

Researchers did not collect data from participants reflecting their racial/ethnic identifications. However, during the Fall 2017 semester when this study was conducted, the university's total enrollment included 76% of students identified as White, 21% as non-White, and 3% unknown. The racial composition of participants appeared consistent with the university distribution. The University's Institutional Review Board has approved this research study, and all students volunteered to participate in exchange for a small amount of course credit (10 total points – 5 points for completing the critical thinking test and 5 points for completing the Political Leadership Survey (1.7% of total course credit).

Instruments

Data were collected at the beginning of the Fall 2017 semester using three research inventories: a survey measuring respondents' political traits and values (See Appendix A), an identification form (Appendix B), and a critical thinking test.

Identification form. On the first day of class, each student was asked to complete an identification form detailing individual student characteristics as well as general demographic information. Students were instructed to complete and return their forms to their instructor or graduate teaching assistant (GTA) by the end of the second week of class (See Appendix B).

Critical thinking test. On the second day of class, participants were asked to complete the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, Form S (WGCTA; Watson & Glaser, 1994). This instrument contains 40 test items with either two or five response options, and was primarily designed to evaluate critical thinking skills in adults with at least a ninth-grade education. Both internal consistency and test-retest reliability coefficients for this measure are .81, according to the WGCTA Manual. Each of its five subtests includes eight items measuring skills in the areas of Inference —“discriminating among degrees of truth or falsity of inferences

drawn from given data,” Recognition of Assumptions — “recognizing unstated assumptions or presuppositions in given statements or assertions,” Deduction — “determining whether certain conclusions necessarily follow from information in given statements or premises,” Interpretation—“weighing evidence and deciding if generalizations or conclusions based on the given data are warranted,” and Evaluation of Arguments—“Distinguishing between arguments that are strong and relevant and those that are weak or irrelevant to a particular question or issue” (Watson & Glaser, 1994, pp. 9-10). Upon test completion, GTAs calculated and converted students’ raw scores into percentile ranks based upon reported test norms for college graduates (Watson & Glaser, 1994, p. 21).

Descriptive analysis of the participants’ performance on the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal (WGCTA) indicated that their critical thinking scores were not normally distributed, with a skewness of 1.526 ($SE = .38$) and a kurtosis of 1.580 ($SE = .472$). Group percentile scores were well below average ($M = 20.04$, $SD = 24.12$), with a median score of 10. The lowest percentile score fell in the first percentile and the highest fell in the 95th percentile.

A supplemental goal of this study was to determine whether any significant relations existed between the respondents’ critical thinking scores and the 30 traits and values listed on the Political Leadership Survey. Because the data distribution was non-normal, the Spearman’s Rank Order Correlation test was used to measure the strength of associations. There were weak, but statistically significant positive correlations between critical thinking scores and America First, $r_s(101) = .226$, $p < .05$, Lower Taxes for Everyone, $r_s(101) = .220$, $p < .05$, Personable, $r_s(101) = .270$, $p < .01$, and Good Mental Health, $r_s(101) = .197$, $p < .05$. There was a weak, but statistically significant negative correlation between critical thinking scores and Scientifically Based Decision Making, $r_s(101) = -.206$, $p < .05$. In general, the relations between the

participants' critical thinking scores and the political leadership survey characteristics were weak, as there were no correlates yielding medium to large coefficients (smallest reported = -.018, largest reported = .270).

Political leadership survey. On the second day of class, participants also completed a survey detailing the importance they assign to a range of personal characteristics and political values of governmental candidates and/or leaders and the degree to which those traits influence their political decision-making. This survey was not only designed to evaluate students' political values and preferences, but also to measure the congruence of those traits in relation to their preferred political labels, as well as those labels that they considered to best reflect the political perspectives of their relatives, close friends, and in the regions in which they were raised.

The survey design comprised six total tasks that elicited four categories of information: (1) isolated categorical rankings of Conservative, Liberal, and personality traits of political leaders influencing political decision-making; (2) identification of the Conservative, Liberal, and personality traits of most and least importance in influencing political decision-making overall; (3) overall combined rankings of Conservative, Liberal, and personality traits of political leaders influencing political decision-making; and (4) political demographics.

Participants' preferences and valuations of the presented traits were determined by requiring students to rank order categorically isolated or combined sets of characteristics. For example, to determine student's rankings of Conservative, Liberal, and personality traits, three sets of 10 characteristics were presented to the respondents to rank within each category. On the subsequent task, the three lists were merged into a combined list of 30 and presented in a randomized order. Participants were then asked to circle those 10 of the 30 items that were most important regarding their political decision-making and to place an X on those 10 of the 30 items

that were least important regarding their political decision-making. Respondents were then asked to rank order on the next page only the ten items they identified as being of most importance to their political decision-making. Finally, participants were asked to report perceptions of their individual, familial, relational, and regional political perspectives (i.e., Conservative, Lean Conservative, Independent, Lean Liberal, Liberal).

The primary course instructor and a research team of five doctoral-level graduate teaching assistants who also taught the course conceptualized the survey format as well as the response items. This group of six each initially brainstormed and referenced various politics-centered research and news articles in order to develop preliminary lists of values and characteristics they considered to be inclusive of Liberal, Conservative, and general personality traits of political figures. In total, team members agreed upon 60 traits they considered to be clearly Liberal, Conservative, or desirable personal qualities (20 per each category). Team members were then asked to rank each set of 20 items according to their top 10 most preferred per category. These responses were weighted by overall group preference, resulting in rater consensus on a final list of 30 characteristics with an equal number of personality, conservative, and liberal characteristics from which students would choose and rank their most preferred characteristics of political leaders. Survey items were then randomly sequenced within each section of the survey in order to minimize response biases (See Appendix A).

The Political Thinking Survey was comprised of three composite scales: Conservative, Independent, and Liberal. Each composite scale consisted of 10 items. The Conservative scale included ten items thought to be commonly associated with political conservatism: Lower Taxes for Everyone, Literal Interpretation of the Constitution, Secure National Borders, National Security, Personal Independence, Free Market, Christian Nation, Minimal Government

Regulations, America First, and States' Rights. The Liberal scale included ten items thought to reflect political liberalism: Scientifically Based Decision Making, Secular Decision Making, Universal Healthcare, Higher Taxes on the Rich, Welfare Benefits, Legal Rights for LGBT, Support for Public Education, Gender Equality in the Workplace, Emphasis on Civil Liberties, and Preservation of the Natural Environment. The Independent scale consisted of ten personality traits ideally observed in political leaders: Good Mental Health, Respect for Others' Views, Collaborative Problem-Solver, Engaging Leadership Style, High Moral Conduct, Articulate, Personable, Government Experience, Truthful, and Highly Intelligent.

Principal Components Analysis. A principal components analysis was run on a 30-item survey measuring the political preferences and attributes of 103 undergraduate students. Prior to analysis, the factorability of the 30 political traits and values was examined. Several well recognized criteria for evaluating factorability were used. First, it was observed that all 30 items yielded correlations of at least .30 with at least one other item, suggesting reasonable factorability. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .033, considerably below the commonly recommended value of .60. However, the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant ($\chi^2(435) = 1117.54, p < .001$). The communalities were all above .30, confirming that each item shared some common variance with other items. However, the sample size is considerably smaller ($N = 103$) than recommendations (Comrey & Lee, 2013) for a factor analysis with 30 items and cautious interpretation is encouraged.

PCA was conducted to identify and compute composite scores for the factors underlying the survey instrument. Initial eigenvalues indicated that the first two factors explained 12% and 7% of the variance. The third, fourth, fifth and sixth factors together explained an additional 26% of the variance. PCA of the 30 items, using varimax rotations, was conducted, with 6 factors

explaining just 45% of the variance. A varimax rotation provided the best option for a defined factor structure. All items in this analysis had primary loadings over .3. The distribution of the primary loadings did not present distinct factors that could be theoretically associated with the three political ideologies presented in the Political Leadership Survey.

Cronbach's alpha. The 30 survey items tested were selected and categorized based upon theoretical conceptualization and a review of literature in place of the factor analysis results. Three composite scores were created from analysis of the three categorical lists comprising the 30 items. Internal consistency for each of the composite scale scores (List A- Independent, List B - Conservative, and List C – Liberal) was examined using Cronbach's alpha. A minimally acceptable reliability score of .7 is preferred (Peterson, 1994). All three scales had limited levels of internal consistency. List A – Independent had an alpha of .01 which is considerably below the acceptable range and indicates that the ten items included in the scale do not reliably measure for the Independent political ideology. List B- Conservative had an alpha of .6 and falls in the poor range suggesting that this scale is not a reliable measure of political conservatism. List C – Liberal had an alpha of .58 which is also considered a poor measurement of consistency and suggests that this scale is not a reliable measure of political liberalism.

Procedures

Respondents participated in a designated Research Day scheduled during the second day of class for each of the six course sections. Participants received identification forms and were provided instructions about form completion during the first class meeting. Time during Research Day was used to complete both the critical thinking test and the political leadership survey. Each class period lasted 75 minutes. Participants were first administered the WGCTA and then the political leadership survey in paper-based formats. Course GTAs administered both

the test and the inventory, and provided each class section with clear verbal instructions and answered clarifying questions prior to starting the research activities. Written test and survey instructions were also made available within the pages of the test and the survey as well as on the white board. Participants were allotted a maximum of 40 minutes to complete the WGCTA, as recommended in the test manual. All students completed the test within that timeframe. Upon critical thinking test completion, respondents raised their hands to prompt administrators to collect WGCTA test items, and to present the political leadership survey. The survey was made available to each student on the course website five days prior to the initial class meeting, and an email was sent to all encouraging them to preview it in advance of Research Day. All participants completed both measures within the allotted 75-minute timeframe.

Data Analysis Plan

The current study was designed to determine the extent to which undergraduate university students prioritize the personal characteristics and political values of people in politics and to determine whether those preferences bear any relation to their self-reported political labels, the extent to which their values relate to those of their family and friends, and the relationship between their values and their critical thinking abilities. Results addressing Research Question 1 addressed the relative importance of values and characteristics influencing undergraduates' political decision-making by examining their responses to a Political Leadership Survey developed specifically for this research. Psychometric properties of the survey were evaluated using principal components analysis (PCA) and Cronbach's alpha scores to measure the internal consistency of composite scales. Descriptive statistics were used to identify the priority with which students identifying as politically Conservative, Independent, and Liberal ranked the 30 values and traits included in the survey according to both general and categorical

preferences. Several Chi Square Tests of Independence were conducted to evaluate any significant associations between the participants' reported political labels as compared to their self, family, peer, and regional congruences.

Content analyses were used to examine and tabulate survey data qualitatively addressing Research Questions 2 and 3, specifically to determine whether congruence existed between expected and observed political values in relation to the respondents' reported political labels and those reflective of their reporting of their relatives', peers', and childhood regions' political perspectives. Ranking profiles were used to define "actual" political labels based upon an evaluation of the respondents' reported political values. Individuals who reported 6 or more characteristics per any category were labeled as Conservative, Independent, or Liberal. Individuals who reported 4 to 5 characteristics per any category were labeled as those with political leanings (Lean Conservative, Lean Independent, Lean Liberal). In order to yield more concise statistical analyses, profiles determined to reflect leanings were grouped categorically with the ideology towards which the participant leaned (i.e., Conservative Leaners were grouped with Conservatives). Respondents whose reported political values were split-evenly across categories (e.g., 4-4-2 or 5-5) were considered Bipartisan and removed from the data set (See Appendices C - F).

Another goal of the study, addressed in Research Question 4, was to determine if any significant relation exists between respondents' critical thinking scores and the congruence between their reported and actual political labels. Due to the non-normal distribution of critical thinking scores, a nonparametric test (Mann-Whitney U Test) was deemed most appropriate to evaluate for statistical significance. For the same reason, Spearman's Rho correlation analyses were used to determine which traits and values were most associated with respondents' critical

thinking scores. An alpha value of .05 was used as the criterion for determining statistical significance. A two-way ANOVA was also conducted to explore the interaction effects of reported political labels and self-congruence on critical thinking scores between political groups.

Chapter III

Results

Data addressing Research Question 1 focuses on determining which personality traits and political values of undergraduate students are most highly valued when making political decisions. Overall, participants' indicated that their top ten most preferred traits and values in political leaders are Support for Public Education ($M = 2.90, SD = 2.07$), National Security ($M = 3.00, SD = 2.18$), Truthful ($M = 3.32, SD = 2.11$), Personal Independence ($M = 3.79, SD = 2.57$), Respect for Others' Views ($M = 3.83, SD = 2.17$), High Moral Conduct ($M = 3.91, SD = 2.58$), Gender Equality in the Workplace ($M = 4.08, SD = 2.25$), Good Mental Health ($M = 4.42, SD = 2.89$), Emphasis on Civil Liberties ($M = 4.63, SD = 2.55$), and Universal Healthcare ($M = 4.67, SD = 2.89$), respectively. Government Experience ($M = 6.49, SD = 2.92$), Welfare Benefits ($M = 6.64, SD = 2.18$), Minimal Government Regulations ($M = 6.82, SD = 2.44$), Engaging Leadership Style ($M = 6.88, SD = 2.32$), Secular Decision Making ($M = 6.88, SD = 2.66$), Christian Nation ($M = 6.95, SD = 3.46$), Personable ($M = 7.02, SD = 2.54$), Literal Interpretation of the Constitution ($M = 7.31, SD = 2.53$), Articulate ($M = 7.56, SD = 2.18$), and Higher Taxes on the Rich ($M = 7.73, SD = 2.10$) were ranked in the bottom ten and considered to be of least importance (See Table G2).

When analyzed categorically by self-reported political identification, participants who self-identified as Conservatives indicated that their top ten most preferred traits and values in political leaders are Support for Public Education ($M = 2.35, SD = 1.98$), National Security ($M = 3.08, SD = 2.29$), Truthful ($M = 3.35, SD = 2.35$), Respect for Others' Views ($M = 3.73, SD = 2.06$), High Moral Conduct ($M = 3.86, SD = 2.46$), Gender Equality in the Workplace ($M = 4.00, SD = 2.28$), Emphasis on Civil Liberties ($M = 4.14, SD = 2.19$), America First ($M = 4.33, SD =$

2.77), Preservation of the Natural Environment ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 2.40$), and Personal Independence ($M = 4.53$, $SD = 2.37$). Traits and values ranked in the bottom ten and considered to be of least importance to self-identifying Conservatives include Welfare Benefits ($M = 6.67$, $SD = 2.32$), Highly Intelligent ($M = 6.71$, $SD = 2.46$), Engaging Leadership Style ($M = 6.76$, $SD = 2.33$), Personable ($M = 6.82$, $SD = 2.69$), Scientifically Based Decision Making ($M = 6.84$, $SD = 2.57$), Literal Interpretation of the Constitution ($M = 7.00$, $SD = 2.75$), Legal Rights for LGBT ($M = 7.22$, $SD = 2.60$), Minimal Government Regulations ($M = 7.31$, $SD = 2.39$), Higher Taxes on the Rich ($M = 7.76$, $SD = 1.97$), and Articulate ($M = 7.76$, $SD = 2.10$), See Table G3.

Self-identifying Independents indicated that their top ten most preferred traits and values in political leaders are Support for Public Education ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 2.38$), Truthful ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.70$), National Security ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 2.51$), Good Mental Health ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 2.64$), Personal Independence ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 2.66$), Respect for Others' Views ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 2.32$), High Moral Conduct ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 2.52$), Gender Equality in the Workplace ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 2.18$), and Free Market ($M = 4.75$, $SD = 2.69$). Engaging Leadership Style ($M = 6.30$, $SD = 2.29$), Legal Rights for LGBT ($M = 6.35$, $SD = 2.66$), Christian Nation ($M = 6.60$, $SD = 3.81$), Secure National Borders ($M = 6.95$, $SD = 1.84$), Secular Decision Making ($M = 7.05$, $SD = 3.06$), Literal Interpretation of the Constitution ($M = 7.10$, $SD = 2.12$), Personable ($M = 7.20$, $SD = 2.46$), Articulate ($M = 7.55$, $SD = 2.48$), Government Experience ($M = 7.70$, $SD = 2.92$), and Higher Taxes on the Rich ($M = 7.80$, $SD = 2.09$) were ranked in the bottom ten and considered to be of least importance (See Table G4).

Self-identifying Liberals indicated that their top ten most preferred traits and values in political leaders are Personal Independence ($M = 2.68$, $SD = 2.48$), National Security ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.81$), Truthful ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 2.01$), Support for Public Education ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.84$),

Universal Healthcare ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 2.53$), High Moral Conduct ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 2.81$), Respect for Others' Views ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 2.27$), Gender Equality in the Workplace ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 2.28$), Good Mental Health ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 3.19$), and Lower Taxes for Everyone ($M = 4.65$, $SD = 2.29$). Government Experience ($M = 6.29$, $SD = 2.66$), Minimal Government Regulations ($M = 6.53$, $SD = 2.04$), Welfare Benefits ($M = 7.06$, $SD = 1.85$), Personable ($M = 7.21$, $SD = 2.40$), Articulate ($M = 7.29$, $SD = 2.15$), Engaging Leadership Style ($M = 7.41$, $SD = 2.28$), Higher Taxes on the Rich ($M = 7.65$, $SD = 2.34$), Literal Interpretation of the Constitution ($M = 7.88$, $SD = 2.39$), Secular Decision Making ($M = 7.68$, $SD = 2.69$), and Christian Nation ($M = 9.12$, $SD = 1.36$) were ranked in the bottom ten and considered to be of least importance (See Table G5).

The second goal of this study, addressed in Research Question 2, was to determine whether or not the participants' reported political labels were consistent with their reported political values. Overall, 43% of respondents reported political values that were congruent with their preferred political labels. However, 57% of the sample reported political values that were inconsistent with their political labels of choice ($N = 103$). By category, the Conservatives yielded the highest level of incongruence, with 78% of their group reporting political values that were inconsistent with their preferred political label. Twenty-two percent of Conservatives reported congruent labels and values ($n = 49$). Fifty-three percent of Liberals reported congruent political labels and values, while 47% of their group did not ($n = 34$). Seventy-five percent of Independents reported self-congruence between their preferred political label and values, whereas 25% of their group reported inconsistencies ($n = 20$). A Chi-Square Test of Independence showed that there was a significant association between current political view and

self-congruence $\chi^2(2, N = 103) = 18.19, p < .001$. That is, the majority of participants reported preferred political values that were inconsistent with their preferred political labels.

Evaluating congruence between participants' self-reported political labels and those they reported as being most prevalent amongst their extended families, close friends, and the region of the country in which they were raised was another goal of this study, addressed in Research Question 3. Regarding congruence between participants' preferred political labels and those labels most dominant amongst their family members, 79% of respondents reported belonging to families whose predominant political ideology is Conservative. A total of nine percent reported Independent families. A total of 12% reported Liberal families. It was determined that 90% of Conservatives reported having predominantly Conservative families. Four percent reported primarily Independent family members, and six percent have primarily Liberal relatives ($n = 49$). In contrast, 75% of Independents have predominantly Conservative relatives, with 20% having primarily Independent and 5% having primarily Liberal family members ($n = 20$). Sixty-five percent of Liberals reported predominantly Conservative relatives. Twenty-seven percent of their relatives were reported as also being Liberal, and 9% were reported as Independents ($n = 34$). A Chi-Square Test of Independence was performed to examine the relation between current political view and dominant political view in family. The relation between these variables was significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 103) = 13.49, p < .009$, indicating that the dominant political views of the respondents' relatives were very similar to their own.

Regarding congruence between participants' preferred political labels and those labels most dominant amongst their close friends, overall, 52% of respondents reported fostering friendship with peers whose predominant political ideology is Conservative. A total of 35% reported Liberal friends. A total of 13% reported close friends identifying as Independent. The

Conservative group reported that 84% of their friends also identified as Conservative. Four percent of their close friends identify as Independent and 12% identify as Liberal ($n = 49$). Sixty-two percent of Liberals reported also having close friends who identify as Liberal. Twenty-three percent of their close friends are Conservative, and 15% of their friends identify as Independent ($n = 34$). Thirty percent of Independents also have close friends who identify as Independent. Forty-five percent of their close friends group identify as Liberal. Twenty-five percent of their friends reportedly identify as Conservative ($n = 20$). A Chi-Square Test of Independence showed that there was a significant association between current political view and dominant political view of friends, $\chi^2(4, N = 103) = 39.94, p < .001$. Those who reported that they identify as Conservative or Liberal also indicated that most of their close friends self-identify within those same political categories. However, Independents, who reported the most diverse group of close friends, shared most of their friendships with Liberals.

A Chi-Square Test of Independence was also conducted to examine the relation between participants' self-reported political labels and those labels most prevalent in the region of the country in which they were raised. The relation between these variables was not significant. Overall, however, 82% of participants reported growing up in a predominantly Conservative region of the country. Thirteen percent reportedly grew up in primarily Liberal regions, and five percent were raised in regions with primarily Independent values ($N = 103$). Seventy-six percent of Conservatives, 85% of Independents, and 88% of Liberals reported being raised in a primarily Conservative region of the country. Seven percent of Conservatives, 5% of Independents, and 3% of Liberals reported being raised in a primarily Independent region of the country. Eighteen percent of Conservatives, 10% of Independents, and 9% of Liberals reported being raised in a primarily Liberal region of the country.

Due to the prevalence of self-incongruence reported by the participants, especially amongst the Conservative group, the demographics and order of ranking choices reported by respondents in accordance with their “actual” political labels as determined by their political preference profiles was considered (See Appendix C). When reorganized in alignment with political identifications as indicated in their preference profiles, only 11% of participants were determined to be actual Conservatives, as compared to 48% by self-report. The majority of participants (66%) were determined to be actual Independents, as compared to 19% by self-report. Liberals proved to be the most stable of the three groups, with 23% determined to be actual Liberals, as compared to 22% by self-report (See Table G6).

Realignment of preferred traits and values ranking choices within groups was also examined. Across all three groups (Conservative, Independent, and Liberal), the majority of characteristics ranked in the top ten most preferred remained relatively stable despite adjustments in political labeling (between 70 and 90% consistent). The majority of characteristics ranked in the bottom ten also remained relatively stable (between 70 and 90% consistent). Between the Conservative ranking lists (by self-report and by political preference profiles), five rankings remained the same, while 25 rankings shifted up or down the list to varying degrees. Between the Independent ranking lists, three rankings remained the same, while 27 rankings shifted up or down the list. Lastly, between the Liberal ranking lists, seven rankings remained the same, while 23 rankings shifted up or down the list (See Table G7).

Further analysis of the table revealed that within every political group, whether by self-identification or preference profiling, there were six characteristics that were universally ranked within the top ten preferences: Support for Public Education, National Security, Truthful, Respect for Others’ Views, High Moral Conduct, and Gender Equality in the Workplace. There

were also five characteristics that were universally ranked within the bottom ten preferences: Engaging Leadership Style, Personable, Literal Interpretation of the Constitution, Articulate, and Higher Taxes on the Rich.

Results from a non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test addressed Research Question 4, i.e., whether a significant relation existed between respondents' label-value congruence and their scores on a critical thinking measure. Critical thinking percentile scores were greater for participants with self-congruence ($Mdn = 17.5$) than for participants without self-congruence ($Mdn = 5$), $U = 920.5$, $p = .011$. To determine whether that finding held true within each political category, a two-way ANOVA was also conducted that examined the effects of self-congruence and self-reported political view on critical thinking scores. There were no statistically significant interactions between the effects of self-congruence and self-reported political views on critical thinking scores, $F(2,97) = .243$, $p = .784$.

Chapter IV

Discussion

Gaining insights into how voters reason toward their political decisions has been a longstanding topic of interest for social scientists and educators, as well as for current or aspiring elected government officials (Caprara et al., 1997; Wyckoff, 2012). Past research indicates that both personal values and preferred political labels are of immense importance to voters (Dalton, 2016; Teven, 2008). Knowing this commonly compels candidates to attempt to align their political identities and policy platforms with those characteristics that most appeal to those to whom they are courting as future constituents (Baum, 2005; Popa et al., 2018). The purpose of this study was to evaluate the priority with which undergraduate students attending college in the southeastern region of the United States rank political values and personal traits commonly associated with people in politics, as well as to ascertain whether or not those preferences were significantly related to their self-reported political labels, the political leanings of family members and friends, and their critical thinking.

Based on the results from data addressing Research Question 1, Support for Public Education, National Security, Truthfulness, Respect for Others' Views, High Moral Conduct, and Gender Equality in the Workplace were identified as values and characteristics most consistently preferred by the respondents across political categories. Engaging Leadership Style, Personable, Literal Interpretation of the Constitution, Articulate, and Higher Taxes on the Rich were identified as values and characteristics consistently least preferred by the participants across political categories. Also, whereas it was hypothesized that participants would rank candidates' personality traits with the greatest priority, the opposite was proven to be true. Analyses of the top ten most preferred characteristics revealed that political values were consistently ranked with

greater priority than personality traits across political categories.

As anticipated, results from data addressing Research Question 2 indicated that participants' preferred political values were significantly incongruent with their preferred political labels, particularly amongst those who self-identified as Conservative. Data addressing Research Question 3 confirmed that college-aged students in the southeastern U.S. mostly belong to families wherein the dominant political ideology is conservatism, and that they themselves will largely opt to identify as Conservative even when misalignment exists between that label and their reported political values. There is, however, significant congruence between the respondents' self-reported political labels and those they reported as belonging to their close friends. Apparently, students who identified as Conservative or Liberal foster most of their close friendships with persons who prefer their same political labels. Independents, though, seem to maintain the least conservative peer group, with most of their closest friends being identified as either Independent or Liberal. The relation between preferred political labels and the region of the country in which the participants were raised was insignificant.

Finally, data analyses addressing Research Question 4 indicated that while the majority of participants' performance on the WGCTA was considered to be poor, analyses revealed that higher critical thinking scores were recorded for those students whose preferred political labels and values were congruent. Lower scores were most associated with students whose labels and values were misaligned. These findings were consistent across political categories.

Principal Findings

Rankings. The first goal of this study was to determine the priority with which participants would rank political traits and personal characteristics listed on the Political Leadership Survey. Determining which attributes were considered most important to our sample

bears significant merit, not only in understanding the group's political preferences, but also in identifying which types of governmental leaders 18 to 25-year-old undergraduate students in the southeastern U.S. would consider to be most appealing. Based upon the review of literature, it was expected that the range of identified preferences would be comprised of both personality traits and political values. Although it was hypothesized that participants would favor personality traits above policy stances, personal characteristics only accounted for 30-40% of the top ten overall most preferred traits across political categories, thereby deeming political values in general as being most important to this demographic.

The overall preference rankings are important, as they reflect those traits and values most and least prioritized by all participants (See Table G2). However, due to the high degree of label-value incongruence within the sample, as well as an uneven distribution of participants self-identifying as Conservative, Independent, or Liberal, traits consistently ranked amongst the top and bottom ten preferences across political categories were considered to reflect the most stable representation of preferences. When accounting for these factors, Support for Public Education, National Security, Truthful, Respect for Others' Views, High Moral Conduct, and Gender Equality in the Workplace were always ranked amongst the top ten most preferred traits.

Of course, the rankings of any of the survey traits could be explained or influenced by themes, opinions, and commentaries most prevalent within the news media or within the cultural zeitgeist during the time of data collection. Despite that, certain preferences do make more sense than others considering the sociodemographic characteristics of the study's participants. Support for Public Education was ranked at or near the top of the preference ranking lists across political categories. Although only five percent of participants reported current enrollment in the university's teacher education program, the educational psychology course in which this study

was conducted was required for education majors, and many participants reported an interest in teaching as an intended major.

Career aspirations notwithstanding, it is also practical to suspect that public education is ranked so highly because education is simply what college students would reasonably value the most during a time in their lives when academic achievement is particularly salient. The presence of National Security amongst the top choices is also quite plausible. Considering political motives rooted in rational choice, prospect, and altruism theories, it is sensible that individuals would highly prioritize the safety and welfare of the country in which they live as well as their fellow citizens. Additionally, the preference for Gender Equality in the Workplace could be reasonably accounted for by the overwhelmingly female sample. It would not be unusual for women to prioritize their own human rights above other considerations in any given scenario. Also, reported preferences for personal traits such as High Moral Conduct, Truthful, and Respect for Others' Views are not especially remarkable considering that data were collected in a region of the country nicknamed the "Bible Belt."

Traits consistently ranked within the bottom ten and considered least preferred include Engaging Leadership Style, Personable, Literal Interpretation of the Constitution, Articulate, and Higher Taxes on the Rich. It is not surprising that Higher Taxes on the Rich was ranked at or near the bottom of the lists by a predominantly Conservative identifying sample. It is, however, surprising that Literal Interpretation of the Constitution was ranked so low for that same reason. Either this sample of respondents is unaware of policy platforms that are traditionally associated with their preferred political labels, or younger members of these groups genuinely hold values that are different from those common to their older counterparts. What was most unforeseen of all preference rankings was the lack of priority assigned to Engaging Leadership Style and

Personable across political categories. Considering the broad body of research devoted to detailing the value of charisma and extroversion in political leadership (Antonakis et al., 2016; Banks et al., 2017; Bono & Judge, 2004), respondents' consistent ranking of the two traits within the bottom ten preferences was intriguing. In relation, the participants did generally rank political values with higher priority than personality traits, so perhaps substance and merit is genuinely more important to this group than charm, even if an articulate leader is not considered to be necessary at all.

Label-Value Congruence. The second and third goals of this study were to determine whether undergraduates' reported political labels are consistent with their reported political values, as well as to analyze the congruence that existed between the participants preferred political labels and those labels they reported as being most prevalent amongst their families, close friends, and regions of the country in which they were raised. It is reasonable to assume that individuals ordinarily choose to characterize themselves using labels they perceive as being accurately reflective of their self-concepts. Ideally, one should be able to establish a valid and reliable understanding of another's personhood based upon the set of labels that person uses to describe and categorize themselves. Data analyses, however, revealed that 57% of the current study's participants preferred political labels that were misaligned with their reported political values. This finding is consistent with outcomes revealed in past studies examining political label-value congruence (Classen et al., 2015; Coles et al., 2015). Apparently, whereas consistency between personal labels and beliefs might be deemed appropriate in general, incongruence as it pertains to political values and ideological labeling is evidently not uncommon, particularly amongst those who self-identify as Conservative.

Self-identifying Conservatives reported significantly more label-value incongruence than their Independent and Liberal counterparts. Their families and close friends were also proportionally more Conservative than what was reported by the other political groups. Thus, adhering to a common group label appears to be most prevalent amongst Conservatives, but is also somewhat common of Liberals regarding their close friends but not their families. Label conformity does not appear to be a primary motivating factor amongst Independents considering that their family members were reported as primarily Conservative and they classified the majority of their friends as Liberals (45%), Independents (30%) and Conservatives (25%), thereby reflecting the most politically diverse peer group across categories.

Arguably, adopting political labels because they are socially meaningful is just as rational as doing so because those labels are congruent with one's political beliefs; being motivated by either reason could be more or less critical depending upon to which social groups an individual belongs. Therefore, the lack of statistical significance associated with region of childhood upbringing was not surprising considering the strength of influence accounted for by familial and/or peer connectedness. Presumably, being raised in a predominantly "red" or "blue" state is not more persuasive as it relates to political self-labeling than the relationships one fosters within those regions.

Of course, determining whether or not mismatches between preferred political labels and values are rooted in a lack of political knowledge versus a human propensity to adopt labels more frequently associated with intimate social groups is beyond the scope of this study. However, the influence of group belongingness was statistically significant and, according to data analyses related to Research Question 4, participants who displayed higher critical thinking abilities were significantly more likely to also report label-value congruence than those whose

critical thinking scores were lower. Past research indicates that most K-12 students in the U.S. have not been exposed to an especially robust political curriculum (McAvoy et al., 2016; Wyckoff, 2012). Hence, it is conceivable that participants were largely unable to accurately pair political policies and labels due to having received limited and/or inadequate civics instruction while enrolled in middle and high school. However, it is also worth considering that political knowledge and political self-labeling might, for some, be mutually exclusive, and that professed political labels are perhaps grounded in factors bearing no relation to formal education at all.

Recognizing this, it is useful to acknowledge that whereas both labels and values represent important aspects of one's identity, our preferred political labels can be just as oriented in and symbolic of our social identities as they are of the political policies that are most significant to us. Thus, the incongruence identified between many of the participants' political labels and values could bear some degree of social utility despite the apparent lack of categorical organization; and although it can be convenient for voters' political beliefs to perfectly align with their preferred labels, the need and drive for social belongingness might supplant the meaningfulness of label-value congruence, at least, in the minds of some individuals.

Critical Thinking Outcomes. It is concerning, though not especially surprising, that participants scored poorly on the critical thinking test. With an overall group mean falling within the 20th percentile, there is a clear need for the development of critical thinking skills amongst our sample population, political affiliation notwithstanding, as group averages were generally the same across political categories. The fact that higher critical thinking scores were more associated with participants whose preferred political labels and values were congruent is telling. These findings, at least, indicate that individuals whose preferred political labels and values were categorically misaligned are those who are less apt to apply the five critical thinking skills

measured for on the WGCTA when making decisions: inference, recognition of assumptions, deduction, interpretation, and the evaluation of arguments. The degree to which the application of these skills differs when making political decisions versus ordinary daily choices is unknown. However, one would assume that a higher demonstration of competence within these domains is more optimal than for one to exhibit limitations in these ways.

There has been a longstanding push for the promotion and integration of critical thinking skills within educational practice in general, but also as applied to political thinking and decision-making (Clark, 2017; Ten Dam & Volman, 2004; Wyckoff, 2012). Progress has been gradual but remains inadequate considering that as of 2016, only 10 states required the integration of curricular frameworks sufficient to enhance critical thinking skills as applied to political reasoning (McAvoy et al., 2016). Thus, the participants' low scores are likely just as much suggestive that they lack critical thinking abilities as they are indicative of inefficient or nonexistent training in how to rationally apply those higher order thinking skills they do possess.

The significant relations between certain items on the Political Leadership Survey and critical thinking scores might also support the need for critical thinking instruction as applied to political reasoning. First, only five out of thirty traits were significantly associated with critical thinking scores and one of those was negatively related. Ideally, more of these traits and values would have been positively associated with higher order thinking skills. However, due to a dearth of average and/or above average scores on the critical thinking measure, it was unanticipated that any would be positively related at all. After all, even those correlations that were identified as statistically significant were weak, and Scientifically Based Decision Making being negatively related to critical thinking abilities seems counterintuitive. One might also suspect that, considering the nature of higher order thinking skills, Highly Intelligent or Support

for Public Education would have made the short list for positive correlations. However, America First, Lower Taxes for Everyone, Personable, and Good Mental Health were the only other traits identified.

Limitations and Implications for Future Research

This study included several limitations. First, gender, age, and regional diversity within the sample was limited. The overwhelming majority of participants identified as female and nearly all of the respondents reported being between the ages of 18 and 24. Also, data were collected from a sample of students who self-identified largely as Conservatives and who were enrolled at a large relatively selective land-grant public university located in a predominantly conservative U.S. state; these results may not generalize to students in other colleges/universities (e.g., small liberal arts schools, private or community colleges). Additionally, a significant number of participants' data was omitted from statistical analyses due to missing demographic information and/or incorrectly completed surveys. Further, standardization norms for the WGCTA were outdated at the time of data collection. The tests norms had been revised twice since the publication of the 1994 norms referenced within this study.

The 5-point Likert scale model used to record preferred political labels was limited as it did not account for the full range of political leans typically reported in major political surveys. Also, requiring participants to rank order their preference responses as opposed to rating them using a Likert-scale format likely bore some influence on preference outcomes, as ranking responses required forced choice responses in instances when respondents might have otherwise rated various items with the same degree of priority (Colton & Covert, 2007). Also, the extent of past political science education and direct instruction in critical thinking practices was unreported. Finally, Cronbach's alpha analyses indicated that the three subscales of the Political

Leadership Survey yielded extremely limited internal consistency and do not reliably or validly measure the three political ideologies assumed. In relation, the sample size was significantly smaller than what is typically recommended for a principal components analysis with 30 items, deeming factor analysis an unsuitable method for determining survey factorability.

Future studies should include a larger, multi-regional, age and gender balanced sample proportionally representing Conservatives, Independents, and Liberals. A psychometrically sound Political Leadership Survey should also be developed and piloted to ensure reliable and valid categorization and analyses of ideological preferences. The improved survey might also include conceptualization from a diverse sample of undergraduate students from around the country to promote a more generalizable understanding of ideological characteristics. The integration of survey items useful for identifying the effects of social network and/or partisan news exposure would likely also prove insightful as media exposure could be more or less persuasive than the influence of family and friends.

The incorporation of a more broadly defined political ideology scale and the use of a critical thinking test with up-to-date norms are imperative. Pre- and post-tests measuring critical thinking abilities should also be conducted, with consideration given to the usefulness of direct critical thinking instruction throughout the semester. In addition to that, future researchers might also consider developing a critical thinking test that requires respondents to apply higher order thinking skills specifically to political scenarios such as label-value matching, media literacy, and/or candidate-constituent congruence.

Conclusion

The ultimate goal of integrating critical thinking practices with high quality civics education within schools is to produce a citizenry that applies the highest degree of logic when navigating

political information and choices. It is critically important for citizens to actively think about the political choices that they make because electing incapable political leaders will fundamentally lead to poor outcomes for everybody. Thus, whereas various study findings might differ in identifying which traits and values are most important in political candidates, assuredly the majority of those asked would agree that it is more advantageous to elect leaders with greater as opposed to fewer positive traits commonly associated with effective political leadership.

Strong political leaders, however, are elected only when their constituents' abilities to competently evaluate their fitness for office are also strong. Accordingly, elected government officials directly reflect not only their constituents' political priorities, but also their abilities to think critically about whom they have elected to represent them. Concerns arise upon the revelation that many voters' preferred labels and values are misaligned, particularly when this lack of congruence bleeds over into the proclivity of many to think and act politically in ways that are most consistent with their friends' and families' beliefs as opposed to critically identifying and evaluating their own priorities. Who, then, stands as the voice of reason amongst the electorate? The onus most ostensibly falls on our public education system to execute the hard work of not only teaching people those things that are important to think about, but even more crucially, how to rationally do so.

References

- Achen, C. H. (2002). Parental socialization and rational party identification. *Political Behavior*, 24(2), 151-170.
- Antonakis, J., Bastardo, N., Jacquart, P., & Shamir, B. (2016). Charisma: An ill-defined and ill-measured gift. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 3(1), 293–319.
- Banks, G. C., Engemann, K. N., Williams, C. E., Gooty, J., McCauley, K. D., & Medaugh, M. R. (2017). A meta-analytic review and future research agenda of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28, 508-529.
- Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., Vecchione, M., & Fraley, C. R. (2007). Voters' personality traits in presidential elections. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42, 1199-1208.
- Baum, M. A. (2005). Talking the vote: Why presidential candidates hit the talk show circuit. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(2), 213-234.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 901-910.
- Bulger, M., & Davison, P. (2018). The promises, challenges and futures of media literacy. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 10(1), 1-21.
- Campbell, D. E. (2008). Voice in the classroom: How an open classroom climate fosters political engagement among adolescents. *Political Behavior*, 30, 437-454.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1997). Politicians' uniquely simple

- personalities. *Nature*, 385, 493.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (1999). Personality profiles and political parties. *Political Psychology*, 20(1), 175-197.
- Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2002). When parsimony subdues distinctiveness: Simplified public perceptions of politicians' personality. *Political Psychology*, 23(1), 77-95.
- Caprara, G. V., Schwartz, S., Capanna, C., Vecchione, M., & Barbaranelli, C. (2006). Personality and politics: Values, traits, and political choice. *Political Psychology*, 27(1), 1-28.
- Caprara, G. V., & Zimbardo, G. P. (2004). Personalizing politics: A congruence model of political preference. *American Psychologist*, 59(7), 581-594.
- Cialdani, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 591-621.
- Clark, C. H. (2017). Examining the relationship between civic education and partisan alignment in young voters. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 45(2), 218-247.
- Classen, C., Tucker, P., & Smith, S. S. (2015). Ideological labels in America. *Political Behavior*, 37, 253 – 278.
- Coate, S., Colin, M., & Moro, A. (2008). The performance of pivotal-voter models in small-scale elections: Evidence from Texas liquor referenda. *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(3-4), 582-596.
- Cohen, G. L. (2003). Party over policy: The dominating impact of group influence on political beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(5), 808-822.
- Coles, J. T., Carstens, B. A., Wright, J. M., & Williams, R. L. (2015). Political incongruity between students' ideological identity and stance on specific public policies in a

- predominantly white southeastern state institution. *Innovative Higher Education*, 40, 5-18.
- Colton, D. & Covert, R. W. (2007). *Designing and constructing instruments for social research and evaluation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Comrey, A. L. & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Conover, P. J., & Feldman, S. (1981). The origins and meaning of liberal and conservative self- identifications. *American Journal of Political Science*, 25(4), 617–645.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.
- Dalton, R. J. (2016). Party identification and its implications. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.72
- Davis, K. M., & Gardner, W. L. (2012). Charisma under crisis revisited: Presidential leadership, perceived leader effectiveness, and contextual influences. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23, 918-933.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.
- Doherty, D., Dowling, C. M., Gerber, A. S., & Huber, G. A. (2017). Are voting norms conditional? How electoral context and peer behavior shape the social returns to voting. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(3), 1095- 1100.
- Downs, A. (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Duffy, J., & Tavits, M. (2008). Beliefs and voting decisions: A test of the pivotal voter model. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(3), 603-618.

- Edlin, A., Gelman, A., & Kaplan, N. (2007). Voting as a rational choice: Why and how people vote to improve the well-being of others. *Rationality and Society*, 19, 293-314.
- Egerton, G. (1992). Politics and autobiography: Political memoir as polygenre. *Biography*, 15(3), 221-242.
- Egorov, G. (2015, June). *Single-issue campaigns and multidimensional politics*. (NBER Working Paper 21265). National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Ember, S., & Steves, M. (2020, August 19). What the democratic party platform actually says. *New York Times* <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/19/us/politics/democratic-party-platform.html>
- Feddersen, T. J. (2004). Rational choice theory and the paradox of not voting. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 18(1), 99-112.
- Feigin, S., Owens, G., Goodyear-Smith, F. (2014). Theories of human altruism: A systematic review. *Annals of Neuroscience and Psychology*, 1(1), 1-9.
- Fieldhouse, E., & Cutts, D. (2012). The companion effect: Household and local context and the turnout of young people. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(3), 856-869.
- Fowler, J. H. (2006). Altruism and turnout. *The Journal of Politics*, 68(3), 674-683.
- Frederiksen, L. (2017). Fake news. *Public Services Quarterly*, 13, 103-107.
- Fredman, L. A., Buhrmester, M. D., Gomez, A., Fraser, W. T., Talaifar, S., Brannon, S. M., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2015). Identity fusion, extreme pro-group behavior, and the path to defusion. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 9(9), 468-480.
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C. M. (2011). The big five personality traits in the political arena. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 14, 265-287.
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different

- sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(5), 1029 – 1046.
- Grand Old Party. (2020). Support the gop's principles for American renewal. Retrieved from <https://www.gop.com/principles-for-american-renewal>
- Greene, S. (1999). Understanding party identification: A social identity approach. *Political Psychology* 20(2), 393–403.
- Greene, S. 2000. The psychological sources of partisan-leaning independence. *American Politics Quarterly* 28(4) 511–37.
- Greene, S. 2004. Social identity theory and party identification. *Social Science Quarterly* 85(1), 136–53.
- Greene, J. P., Mellow, N., & Giammo, J. (1999). Private schools and the public good: The effect of private education on political participation and tolerance in the Texas poll. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 2(4), 429 – 443.
- Harder, J., & Krosnick, J. A. (2008). Why do people vote? A psychological analysis of the causes of voter turnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(3), 525-549.
- Hillygus, D. S. (2005). The missing link: Exploring the relationship between higher education and political engagement. *Political Behavior*, 27(1), 25-47.
- Hogg, M. A., Sherman, D. K., Dierselhuis, J., Maitner, A. T., & Moffitt, G. (2007). Uncertainty, entitativity, and group identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 135–142.
- Hohman, Z. P., Hogg, M. A., & Bligh, M. C. (2010). Identity and intergroup leadership: Asymmetrical political and national identification in response to uncertainty. *Self and*

- Identity*, 9, 113-128.
- Holian, D. B., & Prysby, C. (2014). Candidate character traits in the 2012 presidential election. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 44(3), 484-505.
- Huber, G. A., & Malhotra, N. (2016). Political homophily in social relationships: Evidence from online dating behavior. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(1), 269-283.
- Iyengar, S., Konitzer, T., & Tedin, K. (2018). The home as a political fortress: Family agreement in an era of polarization. *The Journal of Politics*, 80(4), 1326- 1338.
- Jennings, M. K., Stoker, L., & Bowers, J. (2009). Politics across generations: Family transmission reexamined. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(3), 782-799.
- Jost, J. T. (2006). The end of the end of ideology. *American Psychologist*, 61(7), 651–670.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339–375.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263-291.
- Kesebir, S. (2012). The superorganism account of human sociality: How and when human groups are like beehives. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(3), 233-261.
- Koppensteiner, M., & Stephan, P. (2014). Voting for a personality: Do first impressions and self-evaluations affect voting decisions? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 51(100), 62-68.
- Kurtzleben, D. (2016, April 30). *Why are highly educated Americans getting more liberal?* NPR. <https://www.npr.org/2016/04/30/475794063/why-are-highly-educated-americans-getting-more-liberal>

- Laloggia, J. (2019, May 15). *6 facts about U.S. political independents*.
<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/05/15/facts-about-us-political-independents/>
- Loeb, L. (2017). Politicians on celebrity talk shows. *Discourse, Context, & Media*, 20, 146-156.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18(5), 302-318.
- Martens, A. M., & Gainous, J. (2013). Civic education and democratic capacity: How do teachers teach and what works? *Social Science Quarterly*, 94(4), 956-976. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-6237.2012.00864.x
- McAvoy, P., Fine, R., & Ward, A. H. (2016). *State standards scratch the surface of learning about political parties and ideology* (CIRCLE Working Paper #81). Retrieved from The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement website: https://circle.tufts.edu/sites/default/files/202001/WP81_StateStandardsPoliticalIdeology_2016.Pdf
- McGrew, S., Ortega, T., Breakstone, J., & Wineburg, S. (2017). The challenge that's bigger than fake news: Civic reasoning in a social media environment. *American Educator*, 41(4), 4-9, 39.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415 – 444.
- Miller, D. T. (1999). The norm of self-interest. *American Psychologist*, 54(12), 1053-1060.
- Moy, P., Xenos, M. A., & Hess, V. K. (2005). Priming effects of late- night comedy. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 18(2), 198–210.

- Mucciaroni, G. (2011). The study of lgbt politics and its contributions to political science. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(1), 17-21. doi:10.1017/S1049096510001782
- Mummolo, J., & Nall, C. (2016). Why partisans do not sort: The constraints on political segregation. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(1), 45-59.
- Mulligan, C. B., & Hunter, C. G. (2003). The empirical frequency of a pivotal vote. *Public Choice*, 116(1-2), 31-54.
- Niemi, R. G., & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education: What makes students learn*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Opdycke, K., Segura, P., & Vasquez, A. M. (2013). The effects of political cynicism, political information efficacy and media consumption on intended voter participation. *Colloquy*, 9, 75-97.
- Opp, K. D. (2001). Why do people vote? The cognitive-illusion proposition and its test. *KYKLOS*, 54(2-3), 355-378.
- Pasek, J., Feldman, L., Romer, D., & Jamieson, K. H. (2008). Schools as incubators of democratic participation: Building long-term political efficacy with civic education. *Applied Developmental Science*, 12(1), 26-37.
- Peterson, R. A. (1994). A meta-analysis of Cronbach's coefficient alpha. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(2), 381 – 391.
- Pew Research Center. (2014, June 12). *Political polarization in the American public: How increasing ideological uniformity and partisan antipathy affect politics, compromise and everyday life* [Report]. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-American-public/>

- Pew Research Center. (2016, April 26). A wider ideological gap between more and less educated adults. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2016/04/26/a-wider-ideological-gap-between-more-and-less-educated-adults/>
- Pew Research Center. (2017). Dislike of candidates or campaign issues was most common reason for not voting in 2016. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/06/01/dislike-of-candidates-or-campaign-issues-was-most-common-reason-for-not-voting-in-2016/>
- Pew Research Center. (2018, March 28). *Wide gender gap, growing educational divide in voters: College graduates increasingly align with democratic party* [Report]. <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2018/03/20/wide-gender-gap-growing-educational-divide-in-voters-party-identification/>
- Pew Research Center. (2018, September 13). *Republicans, democrats see opposing party as more ideological than their own* <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2018/09/13/republicans-democrats-see-opposing-party-as-more-ideological-than-their-own/>
- Pew Research Center. (2019). Most democrats are excited by “several” 2020 candidates – not just their top choice. Retrieved from <https://www.people-press.org/2019/08/16/most-democrats-are-excited-by-several-2020-candidates-not-just-their-top-choice/>
- Popa, A. B., Hazels, M., & Barker, D. (2018). Learning about the predictive power of young voter party affiliation and leadership perceptions in u.s. presidential elections. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 17(3), 61-80.
- Rosenzweig, A. (2017). Understanding and undermining fake news from the classroom. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 7(1), 105-112.
- Smith, A. (1776). *Wealth of Nations*. London: W. Strahan and T. Cadell.

- Stieglitz, S., & Dang-Xuan, L. (2013). Social media and political communication: A social media analytics framework. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 3(4), 1277-1291.
- Stier, S., Bleier, A., Lietz, H., & Strohmaier, M. (2018). Election campaigning on social media: Politicians, audiences, and the mediation of political communication on facebook and twitter. *Political Communication*, 35, 50-74.
- Swann, W. B., Jr., Gomez, A., Seyle, D. C., Morales, J. F., & Huici, C. (2009). Identity fusion: The interplay of personal and social identities in extreme group behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(5), 995-1011.
- Tedin, K. L. (1987). Political ideology and the vote. *Research in Micropolitics*, 2, 63-94.
- Ten Dam, G. T. M., & Volman, M. L. L. (2004). Critical thinking as a citizenship competence: Teaching strategies. *Learning and Instruction*, 14(4), 359-379. DOI:10.1016/j.learninstruc. 2004. 01.005
- Teven, J. J. (2008). An examination of perceived credibility of the 2008 presidential candidates: Relationships with believability, likeability, and deceptiveness. *Human Communication*, 11(4), 383-400.
- Torney-Purta, J. (2001-2002). What adolescents know about citizenship and democracy. *Educational Leadership*, 59(4), 45-50.
- Torney-Purta, J. (2002). The school's role in developing civic engagement: A study of adolescents in twenty-eight countries. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 203-212.
- Vis, B. (2011). Prospect theory and political decision making. *Political Studies Review*, 9, 334-343.

Watson, G., & Glaser, E. M. (1994). *Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal – Form S*. San Antonio: TX: Harcourt Brace.

Whitesides, J. (2017, February). *From disputes to a breakup: Wounds still raw after U.S. election*. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-relationships-insight-idUSKBN15M13L?utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=Social

Williams, C. H. (1991). Doing critical thinking together: Applications to government, politics, and public policy. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 24(3). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/420101>

Wyckoff, P. G. (2012, October 11). *What exactly is critical thinking?* Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2012/10/11/essay-what-political-campaign-shows-about-need-critical-thinking>

Zaccaro, S. J., Kemp, C., & Bader, P. (2004). Leader traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds). *The Nature of Leadership* (pp. 101-124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zschirnt, S. (2011). The origins and meaning of liberal/conservative self-identification revisited. *Political Behavior*, 33(4), 685–701.

Appendices

Appendix A

PREFERRED TRAITS OF POLITICAL LEADERS

In the lists below, you will find three sets of personal characteristics and political values of people in politics. Please rank each list of characteristics from 1 to 10 in order of those characteristics most to least important to you regarding your political decision-making. A ranking of “1” would indicate a trait you consider most important, and a ranking of “10” would indicate a characteristic least important to you.

LIST A	RANK (1-10)
Good Mental Health	
Respect for Others’ Views	
Collaborative Problem-Solver	
Engaging Leadership Style	
High Moral Conduct	
Articulate	
Personable	
Government Experience	
Truthful	
Highly Intelligent	

LIST B	RANK (1-10)
Lower Taxes for Everyone	
Literal Interpretation of the Constitution	
Secure National Borders	
National Security	
Personal Independence	
Free Market	
Christian Nation	
Minimal Government Regulations	
America First	
States’ Rights	

LIST C	RANK (1-10)
Scientifically-Based Decision-Making	
Secular Decision-Making	
Universal Healthcare	
Higher Taxes on the Rich	
Welfare Benefits	
Legal Rights for LGBT	
Support for Public Education	
Gender Equality in the Workplace	
Emphasis on Civil Liberties	
Preservation of the Natural Environment	

Below you will find a bank of thirty words including personality and political traits. Please **CIRCLE ten** characteristics you would consider to be of the most importance regarding your political decision-making. Please place an **X** on **ten** characteristics you would consider least important to your political decision-making.

Truthful	Personal Independence	Support for Public Education
America First	Christian Nation	Articulate
States' Rights	Respect for Others' Views	Engaging Leadership Style
Gender Equality in the Workplace	Emphasis on Civil Liberties	Welfare Benefits
Universal Healthcare	Higher Taxes on the Rich	Literal Interpretation of the Constitution
Legal Rights for LGBT	High Moral Conduct	Lower Taxes for Everyone
Scientifically-Based Decision Making	Collaborative Problem-Solver	Preservation of the Natural Environment
National Security	Minimal Government Regulations	Personable
Free Market	Secular Decision-Making	Highly Intelligent
Good Mental Health	Government Experience	Secure National Borders

Referencing ONLY the ten items you CIRCLED in the word bank, please rank those 10 traits in a list below. Please rank this list of characteristics from 1 to 10, in order of those qualities most to least important to you regarding your political decision-making. A ranking of “1” would indicate a trait you consider most important, and a ranking of “10” would indicate a trait of least importance.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVES

1. Indicate how you see your current political values:

A. Conservative, B. Lean Conservative, C. Independent, D. Lean Liberal, E. Liberal

2. Indicate how you see the dominant political values of most of your extended family:

A. Conservative, B. Lean Conservative, C. Independent, D. Lean Liberal, E. Liberal

3. Indicate how you see the dominant political values of most of your close friends:

A. Conservative, B. Lean Conservative, C. Independent, D. Lean Liberal, E. Liberal

4. Indicate how you see the dominant political values of the region of the country in which you grew up:

A. Conservative, B. Lean Conservative, C. Independent, D. Lean Liberal, E. Liberal

Name: _____

Writing your name will allow us to award you extra credit for completing this survey.

No student names will be included in the research database.

Appendix B

Ed Psych 210 Identification Form

Name (print) _____ User name _____

Phone numbers: Local _____ Home _____

Email address _____ Home address _____

Gender: Male _____ Female _____ Age: 18-24 _____ 25-29 _____ 30 or above _____

School year: Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____ Graduate _____

Academic major _____ High School GPA _____ College GPA _____

College credit hours completed _____ Expected grade in 210 _____

Academic scholarship: Yes _____ No _____ Student loan: Yes _____ No _____

Course hours this semester _____ Employment hours this semester _____

Academic style: Highly organized _____ moderately organized _____ loosely organized _____

Procrastination in completing course assignments: Frequent procrastination _____, moderate procrastination _____, minimal procrastination _____

Preferred course organization: Highly organized _____, moderately organized _____ loosely organized _____

Preferred notetaking in class: Take extensive notes _____, take moderate notes _____, take few notes _____, take no notes _____.

Preferred instructor style: primarily lecturing _____, primarily leading class discussion _____, combining lecturing and class discussion _____

Typical response to course information: Previous beliefs more important than course information Yes _____ No _____; course information more important than previous beliefs Yes _____ No _____; balance between course information and previous beliefs Yes _____ No _____.

Career aspiration _____

Reason for career choice _____

Application to the Teacher Education Program: Yes _____ No _____

Acceptance into Teacher Preparation Program: Yes _____ No _____

Appendix C

<u>Research Question 2: Political Profile for Self-Congruence</u>						
Are undergraduates' reported political labels consistent with their actual political values? (<i>Survey List D, pages 3 and 4</i>)						
Research #	Consrv	Indp	Lib	Profile (<i>Actual</i>)	Reported	Congruence
003	3	3	4	L. Lib	L. Lib	Yes
005	3	4	3	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
006	3	5	2	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
007	2	3	5	L. Lib	L. Lib	Yes
008	5	2	3	Consvr	L. Consvr	Yes
011	0	7	3	Indp	Lib	No
012	2	6	2	Indp	Indp	Yes
014	1	3	6	Lib	Lib	Yes
016	1	6	3	Indp	L. Consvr	No
018	3	3	4	L. Lib	L. Consvr	No
020	1	7	2	Indp	Consvr	No
021	0	4	6	Lib	L. Lib	Yes
022	3	6	1	Indp	L. Consvr	No
023	6	3	1	Consvr	Consvr	Yes
025	6	3	1	Consvr	Consvr	Yes
026	4	5	1	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
027	0	3	7	Lib	Lib	Yes
035	3	5	2	L. Indp	Indp	Yes
036	3	5	2	L. Indp	Consvr	No
037	4	5	1	L. Indp	Indp	Yes
038	1	5	4	L. Indp	L. Lib	No
040	3	5	2	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
041	1	5	4	L. Indp	L. Lib	No
042	5	4	1	L. Consvr	Consvr	Yes
044	3	5	2	L. Indp	Consvr	No
045	6	4	0	Consvr	Consvr	Yes
046	3	3	4	L. Lib	Indp	No
047	5	4	1	L. Consvr	L. Consvr	Yes
049	1	7	2	Indp	L. Consvr	No
052	3	6	1	Indp	Consvr	No
054	3	6	1	Indp	L. Consvr	No
056	7	1	2	Consvr	Consvr	Yes
060	5	3	2	L. Consvr	L. Consvr	Yes
061	1	9	0	Indp	L. Consvr	No
062	1	6	3	Indp	Indp	Yes
065	0	3	7	Lib	L. Lib	Yes
066	3	5	2	L. Indp	Indp	Yes

Appendix C Continued.

Research #	Consrv	Indp	Lib	Profile (Actual)	Reported	Congruence
067	1	2	7	Lib	Indp	No
068	2	5	3	L. Indp	Indp	Yes
069	2	3	5	L. Lib	Lib	Yes
070	1	7	2	Indp	L. Lib	No
072	3	5	2	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
077	0	6	4	Indp	L. Lib	No
078	4	6	0	Indp	Consvr	No
079	3	4	3	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
080	0	2	8	Lib	Lib	Yes
081	1	3	6	Lib	L. Lib	Yes
082	0	4	6	Lib	Lib	Yes
085	2	5	3	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
086	1	7	2	Indp	L. Lib	No
087	1	5	4	L. Indp	L. Lib	No
088	0	3	7	Lib	Lib	Yes
089	2	6	3	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
091	3	4	3	L. Indp	L. Lib	No
092	2	8	0	Indp	Consvr	No
093	3	4	3	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
095	4	5	1	L. Indp	Consvr	No
097	0	4	6	Lib	L. Lib	Yes
098	3	5	2	L. Indp	Consvr	No
099	1	7	2	Indp	L. Lib	No
100	2	6	2	Indp	Consvr	No
101	2	6	2	Indp	L. Consvr	No
102	2	5	3	L. Indp	Indp	Yes
103	3	3	4	L. Lib	Indp	No
104	1	5	4	L. Indp	Indp	Yes
107	1	6	3	Indp	L. Lib	No
108	3	5	2	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
109	3	5	2	L. Indp	Consvr	No
111	3	6	1	Indp	L. Consvr	No
112	1	5	4	L. Indp	Lib	No
115	1	6	3	Indp	L. Lib	No
117	3	5	2	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
118	2	5	4	L. Indp	L. Consvr	No
120	5	2	3	L. Consvr	L. Consvr	Yes
121	3	6	1	Indp	Consvr	No
122	0	6	4	Indp	Indp	Yes
123	1	7	2	Indp	Consvr	No

Appendix C Continued.

Research #	Consrv	Indp	Lib	Profile (Actual)	Reported	Congruence
125	3	4	3	L. Indp	Consrv	No
126	0	3	7	Lib	Lib	Yes
128	3	4	3	L. Indp	Indp	Yes
131	2	5	3	L. Indp	Lib	No
132	3	4	3	L. Indp	Indp	Yes
133	0	6	4	Indp	L. Lib	No
134	3	4	3	L. Indp	L. Consrv	No
135	1	6	3	Indp	Lib	No
137	1	7	2	Indp	Indp	Yes
139	0	4	6	Lib	L. Lib	Yes
141	3	4	3	L. Indp	Indp	Yes
142	0	6	4	Indp	Lib	No
143	2	8	0	Indp	L. Consrv	No
146	0	6	4	Indp	Indp	Yes
149	1	4	5	L. Lib	Lib	Yes
150	0	6	4	Indp	Indp	Yes
151	2	3	5	L. Lib	L. Consrv	No
152	1	4	5	L. Lib	Indp	No
153	1	7	2	Indp	Consrv	No
157	4	3	3	L. Consrv	Consrv	Yes
161	0	4	6	Lib	Lib	Yes
162	2	3	5	L. Lib	Indp	No
163	2	6	2	Indp	Consrv	No
164	8	2	0	Consrv	Consrv	Yes
165	1	5	4	L. Indp	L. Lib	No
167	2	3	5	L. Lib	L. Lib	Yes

Appendix D

Research Question 3a: Political Profile for Family Congruence					
Are undergraduates' reported and actual political labels consistent with their perceived political labels of their extended family? (<i>Survey List D, pages 3 and 4</i>)					
Research #	Profile (<i>Actual</i>)	Reported	Extended Family	Congruence	
				Actual	Reported
003	L. Lib	L. Lib	L. Lib	Yes	Yes
005	L. Indp	L. Consvr	L. Lib	No	No
006	L. Indp	L. Consvr	L. Consvr	No	Yes
007	L. Lib	L. Lib	Indp	No	No
008	Consvr	L. Consvr	L. Consvr	Yes	Yes
011	Indp	Lib	Consvr	No	No
012	Indp	Indp	L. Consvr	No	No
014	Lib	Lib	Lib	Yes	Yes
016	Indp	L. Consvr	Indp	Yes	No
018	L. Lib	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
020	Indp	Consvr	L. Consvr	No	Yes
021	Lib	L. Lib	L. Consvr	No	No
022	Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
023	Consvr	Consvr	Consvr	Yes	Yes
025	Consvr	Consvr	L. Consvr	Yes	Yes
026	L. Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
027	Lib	Lib	L. Lib	Yes	Yes
035	L. Indp	Indp	Indp	Yes	Yes
036	L. Indp	Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
037	L. Indp	Indp	Indp	Yes	Yes
038	L. Indp	L. Lib	Indp	Yes	No
040	L. Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
041	L. Indp	L. Lib	L. lib	No	Yes
042	L. Consvr	Consvr	Consvr	Yes	Yes
044	L. Indp	Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
045	Consvr	Consvr	Consvr	Yes	Yes
046	L. Lib	Indp	L. Consvr	No	No
047	L. Consvr	L. Consvr	Consvr	Yes	Yes
049	Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
052	Indp	Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
054	Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
056	Consvr	Consvr	Lib	No	No
060	L. Consvr	L. Consvr	L. Consvr	Yes	Yes
061	Indp	L. Consvr	Lib	No	No
062	Indp	Indp	Consvr	No	No
065	Lib	L. Lib	L. Consvr	No	No
066	L. Indp	Indp	Indp	Yes	Yes

Appendix D Continued.

Research #	Profile (<i>Actual</i>)	Reported	Extended Family	Congruence	
				Actual	Reported
067	Lib	Indp	L. Consv	No	No
068	L. Indp	Indp	Consv	No	No
069	L. Lib	Lib	L. Consv	No	No
070	Indp	L. Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
072	L. Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
077	Indp	L. Lib	L. Consv	No	No
078	Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
079	L. Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
080	Lib	Lib	Consv	No	No
081	Lib	L. Lib	Lib	Yes	Yes
082	Lib	Lib	L. Lib	Yes	Yes
085	L. Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
086	Indp	L. Lib	Consv	No	No
087	L. Indp	L. Lib	L. Consv	No	No
088	Lib	Lib	Consv	No	No
089	L. Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
091	L. Indp	L. Lib	Consv	No	No
092	Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
093	L. Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
095	L. Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
097	Lib	L. Lib	L. Lib	Yes	Yes
098	L. Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
099	Indp	L. Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
100	Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
101	Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
102	L. Indp	Indp	Consv	No	No
103	L. Lib	Indp	Consv	No	No
104	L. Indp	Indp	Consv	No	No
107	Indp	L. Lib	L. Consv	No	No
108	L. Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
109	L. Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
111	Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
112	L. Indp	Lib	Consv	No	No
115	Indp	L. Lib	L. Consv	No	No
117	L. Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
118	L. Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
120	L. Consv	L. Consv	Indp	No	No
121	Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
122	Indp	Indp	L. Consv	No	No
123	Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes

Appendix D Continued.

Research #	Profile (<i>Actual</i>)	Reported	Extended Family	Congruence	
				Actual	Reported
125	L. Indp	Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
126	Lib	Lib	Consrv	No	No
128	L. Indp	Indp	Consrv	No	No
131	L. Indp	Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
132	L. Indp	Indp	Lib	No	No
133	Indp	L. Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
134	L. Indp	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
135	Indp	Lib	Consrv	No	No
137	Indp	Indp	Consrv	No	No
139	Lib	L. Lib	Consrv	No	No
141	L. Indp	Indp	L. Consrv	No	No
142	Indp	Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
143	Indp	L. Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
146	Indp	Indp	Consrv	No	No
149	L. Lib	Lib	Consrv	No	No
150	Indp	Indp	Indp	Yes	Yes
151	L. Lib	L. Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
152	L. Lib	Indp	Consrv	No	No
153	Indp	Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
157	L. Consrv	Consrv	Consrv	Yes	Yes
161	Lib	Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
162	L. Lib	Indp	Consrv	No	No
163	Indp	Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
164	Consrv	Consrv	Consrv	Yes	Yes
165	L. Indp	L. Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
167	L. Lib	L. Lib	Indp	No	No

Appendix E

Research Question 3b: Political Profile for Peer Congruence					
Are undergraduates' reported and actual political labels consistent with their perceived political labels of their close friends? (<i>Survey List D, pages 3 and 4</i>)					
Research #	Profile (<i>Actual</i>)	Reported	Close Friends	Congruence	
				Actual	Reported
003	L. Lib	L. Lib	L. Consv	No	No
005	L. Indp	L. Consv	L. Lib	No	No
006	L. Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
007	L. Lib	L. Lib	L. Consv	No	No
008	Consv	L. Consv	L. Consv	Yes	Yes
011	Indp	Lib	Lib	No	Yes
012	Indp	Indp	L. Consv	No	No
014	Lib	Lib	Lib	Yes	Yes
016	Indp	L. Consv	L. Lib	No	No
018	L. Lib	L. Consv	Lib	Yes	No
020	Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
021	Lib	L. Lib	L. Consv	No	No
022	Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
023	Consv	Consv	L. Consv	Yes	Yes
025	Consv	Consv	Consv	Yes	Yes
026	L. Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
027	Lib	Lib	Indp	No	No
035	L. Indp	Indp	Indp	Yes	Yes
036	L. Indp	Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
037	L. Indp	Indp	Indp	Yes	Yes
038	L. Indp	L. Lib	Lib	No	Yes
040	L. Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
041	L. Indp	L. Lib	Consv	No	No
042	L. Consv	Consv	Consv	Yes	Yes
044	L. Indp	Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
045	Consv	Consv	L. Consv	Yes	Yes
046	L. Lib	Indp	L. Lib	Yes	No
047	L. Consv	L. Consv	L. Consv	Yes	Yes
049	Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
052	Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
054	Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
056	Consv	Consv	Consv	Yes	Yes
060	L. Consv	L. Consv	L. Consv	Yes	Yes
061	Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
062	Indp	Indp	Indp	Yes	Yes
065	Lib	L. Lib	L. Lib	Yes	Yes

Appendix E Continued.

Research #	Profile (<i>Actual</i>)	Reported	Close Friends	Congruence	
				Actual	Reported
066	L. Indp	Indp	Indp	Yes	Yes
067	Lib	Indp	L. Lib	Yes	No
068	L. Indp	Indp	Consrv	No	No
069	L. Lib	Lib	Indp	No	No
070	Indp	L. Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
072	L. Indp	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
077	Indp	L. Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
078	Indp	Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
079	L. Indp	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
080	Lib	Lib	Lib	Yes	Yes
081	Lib	L. Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
082	Lib	Lib	L. Lib	Yes	Yes
085	L. Indp	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
086	Indp	L. Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
087	L. Indp	L. Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
088	Lib	Lib	Lib	Yes	Yes
089	L. Indp	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
091	L. Indp	L. Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
092	Indp	Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
093	L. Indp	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
095	L. Indp	Consrv	Indp	Yes	No
097	Lib	L. Lib	L. Lib	Yes	Yes
098	L. Indp	Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
099	Indp	L. Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
100	Indp	Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
101	Indp	L. Consrv	L. Lib	No	No
102	L. Indp	Indp	L. Lib	No	No
103	L. Lib	Indp	L. Lib	Yes	No
104	L. Indp	Indp	L. Consrv	No	No
107	Indp	L. Lib	Indp	Yes	No
108	L. Indp	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
109	L. Indp	Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
111	Indp	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
112	L. Indp	Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
115	Indp	L. Lib	Lib	No	Yes
117	L. Indp	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
118	L. Indp	L. Consrv	Indp	Yes	No
120	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	Yes	Yes
121	Indp	Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
122	Indp	Indp	L. Lib	No	No

Appendix E Continued.

Research #	Profile (<i>Actual</i>)	Reported	Close Friends	Congruence	
				Actual	Reported
123	Indp	Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
125	L. Indp	Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
126	Lib	Lib	Lib	Yes	Yes
128	L. Indp	Indp	L. Lib	No	No
131	L. Indp	Lib	Lib	No	Yes
132	L. Indp	Indp	Indp	Yes	Yes
133	Indp	L. Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
134	L. Indp	L. Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
135	Indp	Lib	Lib	No	Yes
137	Indp	Indp	Indp	Yes	Yes
139	Lib	L. Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
141	L. Indp	Indp	L. Consrv	No	No
142	Indp	Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
143	Indp	L. Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
146	Indp	Indp	Consrv	No	No
149	L. Lib	Lib	L. Lib	Yes	Yes
150	Indp	Indp	L. Lib	No	No
151	L. Lib	L. Consrv	L. Lib	Yes	No
152	L. Lib	Indp	L. Lib	Yes	No
153	Indp	Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
157	L. Consrv	Consrv	Consrv	Yes	Yes
161	Lib	Lib	Indp	No	No
162	L. Lib	Indp	L. Lib	Yes	No
163	Indp	Consrv	L. Lib	No	No
164	Consrv	Consrv	L. Consrv	Yes	Yes
165	L. Indp	L. Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
167	L. Lib	L. Lib	Indp	No	No

Appendix F

Research Question 3c: Political Profile for Regional Congruence

Are undergraduates' reported and actual political labels consistent with their perceived political labels of the region of the country in which they grew up? (*Survey List D, pages 3 and 4*)

Research #	Profile (<i>Actual</i>)	Reported	Region	Congruence	
				Actual	Reported
003	L. Lib	L. Lib	L. Consvr	No	No
005	L. Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
006	L. Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
007	L. Lib	L. Lib	Consvr	No	No
008	Consvr	L. Consvr	Indp	No	No
011	Indp	Lib	Consvr	No	No
012	Indp	Indp	L. Lib	No	No
014	Lib	Lib	Consvr	No	No
016	Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
018	L. Lib	L. Consvr	Lib	Yes	No
020	Indp	Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
021	Lib	L. Lib	Consvr	No	No
022	Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
023	Consvr	Consvr	L. Consvr	Yes	Yes
025	Consvr	Consvr	Consvr	Yes	Yes
026	L. Indp	L. Consvr	Indp	Yes	No
027	Lib	Lib	L. Consvr	No	No
035	L. Indp	Indp	Consvr	No	No
036	L. Indp	Consvr	L. Consvr	No	Yes
037	L. Indp	Indp	L. Lib	No	No
038	L. Indp	L. Lib	Consvr	No	No
040	L. Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
041	L. Indp	L. Lib	Consvr	No	No
042	L. Consvr	Consvr	Consvr	Yes	Yes
044	L. Indp	Consvr	L. Consvr	No	Yes
045	Consvr	Consvr	Indp	No	No
046	L. Lib	Indp	Consvr	No	No
047	L. Consvr	L. Consvr	L. Lib	No	No
049	Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
052	Indp	Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
054	Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
056	Consvr	Consvr	Consvr	Yes	Yes
060	L. Consvr	L. Consvr	Consvr	Yes	Yes
061	Indp	L. Consvr	Consvr	No	Yes
062	Indp	Indp	Consvr	No	No
065	Lib	L. Lib	Consvr	No	No

Appendix F Continued.

Research #	Profile (<i>Actual</i>)	Reported	Region	Congruence	
				Actual	Reported
066	L. Indp	Indp	L. Consv	No	No
067	Lib	Indp	Consv	No	No
068	L. Indp	Indp	Consv	No	No
069	L. Lib	Lib	L. Consv	No	No
070	Indp	L. Lib	L. Consv	No	No
072	L. Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
077	Indp	L. Lib	Consv	No	No
078	Indp	Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
079	L. Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
080	Lib	Lib	Consv	No	No
081	Lib	L. Lib	Consv	No	No
082	Lib	Lib	Consv	No	No
085	L. Indp	L. Consv	Lib	No	No
086	Indp	L. Lib	Consv	No	No
087	L. Indp	L. Lib	Indp	Yes	No
088	Lib	Lib	Consv	No	No
089	L. Indp	L. Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
091	L. Indp	L. Lib	Consv	No	No
092	Indp	Consv	L. Consv	No	Yes
093	L. Indp	L. Consv	L. Lib	No	No
095	L. Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
097	Lib	L. Lib	Consv	No	No
098	L. Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
099	Indp	L. Lib	Consv	No	No
100	Indp	Consv	Lib	No	No
101	Indp	L. Consv	Lib	No	No
102	L. Indp	Indp	L. Consv	No	No
103	L. Lib	Indp	L. Consv	No	No
104	L. Indp	Indp	L. Consv	No	No
107	Indp	L. Lib	Lib	No	No
108	L. Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
109	L. Indp	Consv	L. Lib	No	No
111	Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
112	L. Indp	Lib	L. Lib	No	Yes
115	Indp	L. Lib	Consv	No	No
117	L. Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
118	L. Indp	L. Consv	Consv	No	Yes
120	L. Consv	L. Consv	L. Consv	Yes	Yes
121	Indp	Consv	Consv	No	Yes
122	Indp	Indp	Indp	No	Yes

Appendix F Continued.

Research #	Profile (<i>Actual</i>)	Reported	Region	Congruence	
				<u>Actual</u>	<u>Reported</u>
123	Indp	Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
125	L. Indp	Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
126	Lib	Lib	Consrv	No	No
128	L. Indp	Indp	Consrv	No	No
131	L. Indp	Lib	Consrv	No	No
132	L. Indp	Indp	Consrv	No	No
133	Indp	L. Lib	Consrv	No	No
134	L. Indp	L. Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
135	Indp	Lib	Lib	No	Yes
137	Indp	Indp	Consrv	No	No
139	Lib	L. Lib	Consrv	No	No
141	L. Indp	Indp	L. Consrv	No	No
142	Indp	Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
143	Indp	L. Consrv	L. lib	No	No
146	Indp	Indp	Consrv	No	No
149	L. Lib	Lib	Consrv	No	No
150	Indp	Indp	L. Consrv	No	No
151	L. Lib	L. Consrv	Consrv	No	Yes
152	L. Lib	Indp	Consrv	No	No
153	Indp	Consrv	L. Consrv	No	Yes
157	L. Consrv	Consrv	Consrv	Yes	Yes
161	Lib	Lib	L. Consrv	No	No
162	L. Lib	Indp	L. Consrv	No	No
163	Indp	Consrv	L. Lib	No	No
164	Consrv	Consrv	Consrv	Yes	Yes
165	L. Indp	L. Lib	Consrv	No	No
167	L. Lib	L. Lib	Consrv	No	No

Appendix G

List of Tables

Table G1

Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants

Participant Characteristics	Total Sample		Identify Conservative		Identify Independent		Identify Liberal	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Total	103	100	49	48	20	19	34	33
Gender								
Male	15	15	7	14	4	20	4	12
Female	88	85	42	86	16	80	30	88
Age								
18-24	99	96	48	98	19	95	32	94
25-29	3	3	1	2	1	5	1	3
30 or above	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
Classification								
Freshman	10	10	4	8	4	20	2	6
Sophomore	56	54	32	65	8	40	16	47
Junior	30	29	11	23	7	35	12	35
Senior	7	7	2	4	1	5	4	12

Note. *N* = 103.

Table G2*Overall Rankings*

Ranking	Traits and Values	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Support for Public Education	2.90	2.07
2	National Security	3.00	2.18
3	Truthful	3.32	2.11
4	Personal Independence	3.79	2.57
5	Respect for Others' Views	3.83	2.17
6	High Moral Conduct	3.91	2.58
7	Gender Equality in the Workplace	4.08	2.25
8	Good Mental Health	4.42	2.89
9	Emphasis on Civil Liberties	4.63	2.55
10	Universal Healthcare	4.67	2.89
11	States' Rights	4.81	2.16
12	Preservation of Natural Environment	4.89	2.56
13	America First	5.03	2.83
14	Collaborative Problem Solver	5.57	2.52
15	Free Market	5.68	2.40
16	Lower Taxes for Everyone	5.78	2.50
17	Secure National Borders	5.84	2.31
18	Highly Intelligent	6.00	2.54
19	Legal Rights for LGBT	6.22	2.69
20	Scientifically Based Decision Making	6.31	2.92
21	Government Experience	6.49	2.92
22	Welfare Benefits	6.64	2.18
23	Minimal Government Regulations	6.82	2.44
24	Engaging Leadership Style	6.88	2.32
25	Secular Decision Making	6.88	2.66
26	Christian Nation	6.95	3.46
27	Personable	7.02	2.54
28	Literal Interpretation of the Constitution	7.31	2.53
29	Articulate	7.56	2.18
30	Higher Taxes on the Rich	7.73	2.10

Note. Participants ranked traits and values on a scale of one (most preferred) to 10 (least preferred). Means closer to one represent choices most preferred by the group overall.

Table G3*Self-Identify as Conservative Rankings*

Ranking	Traits and Values	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Support for Public Education	2.35	1.98
2	National Security	3.08	2.29
3	Truthful	3.35	2.35
4	Respect for Others' Views	3.73	2.06
5	High Moral Conduct	3.86	2.46
6	Gender Equality in the Workplace	4.00	2.28
7	Emphasis on Civil Liberties	4.14	2.19
8	America First	4.33	2.77
9	Preservation of the Natural Environment	4.45	2.40
10	Personal Independence	4.53	2.37
11	Good Mental Health	4.61	2.79
12	States' Rights	4.73	2.48
13	Collaborative Problem Solver	5.27	2.47
14	Universal Healthcare	5.31	2.94
15	Secure National Borders	5.31	2.37
16	Christian Nation	5.59	3.62
17	Government Experience	6.12	3.02
18	Secular Decision Making	6.27	2.35
19	Free Market	6.53	2.18
20	Lower Taxes for Everyone	6.59	2.40
21	Welfare Benefits	6.67	2.32
22	Highly Intelligent	6.71	2.46
23	Engaging Leadership Style	6.76	2.33
24	Personable	6.82	2.69
25	Scientifically Based Decision Making	6.84	2.57
26	Literal Interpretation of the Constitution	7.00	2.75
27	Legal Rights for LGBT	7.22	2.60
28	Minimal Government Regulations	7.31	2.39
29	Higher Taxes on the Rich	7.76	1.97
30	Articulate	7.76	2.10

Note. Participants ranked traits and values on a scale of one (most preferred) to 10 (least preferred). Means closer to one represent choices most preferred by participants who self-identified as Conservatives.

Table G4*Self-Identify as Independent Rankings*

Ranking	Traits and Values	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Support for Public Education	3.10	2.38
2	Truthful	3.20	1.70
3	National Security	3.30	2.51
4	Good Mental Health	3.80	2.64
5	Personal Independence	3.85	2.66
6	Respect for Others' Views	4.05	2.32
7	High Moral Conduct	4.40	2.52
8	Gender Equality in the Workplace	4.50	2.18
9	Free Market	4.75	2.69
10	States' Rights	4.85	1.95
11	Emphasis on Civil Liberties	4.95	2.81
12	Universal Healthcare	4.95	2.94
13	Preservation of the Natural Environment	5.00	2.92
14	Collaborative Problem Solver	5.25	2.67
15	Scientifically Based Decision Making	5.45	2.89
16	Highly Intelligent	5.65	2.66
17	Lower Taxes for Everyone	5.70	2.45
18	America First	5.80	3.03
19	Welfare Benefits	5.85	2.23
20	Minimal Government Regulations	6.10	2.98
21	Engaging Leadership Style	6.30	2.29
22	Legal Rights for LGBT	6.35	2.66
23	Christian Nation	6.60	3.81
24	Secure National Borders	6.95	1.84
25	Secular Decision Making	7.05	3.06
26	Literal Interpretation of the Constitution	7.10	2.12
27	Personable	7.20	2.46
28	Articulate	7.55	2.48
29	Government Experience	7.70	2.92
30	Higher Taxes on the Rich	7.80	2.09

Note. Participants ranked traits and values on a scale of one (most preferred) to 10 (least preferred). Means closer to one represent choices most preferred by participants who self-identified as Independents.

Table G5*Self-Identify as Liberal Rankings*

Ranking	Traits and Values	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1	Personal Independence	2.68	2.48
2	National Security	2.71	1.81
3	Truthful	3.35	2.01
4	Support for Public Education	3.59	1.84
5	Universal Healthcare	3.59	2.53
6	High Moral Conduct	3.71	2.81
7	Respect for Others' Views	3.85	2.27
8	Gender Equality in the Workplace	3.94	2.28
9	Good Mental Health	4.50	3.19
10	Lower Taxes for Everyone	4.65	2.29
11	Legal Rights for LGBT	4.71	2.16
12	States' Rights	4.88	1.82
13	Free Market	5.00	2.17
14	Emphasis on Civil Liberties	5.15	2.79
15	Highly Intelligent	5.18	2.36
16	Preservation of the Natural Environment	5.47	2.51
17	America First	5.59	2.63
18	Secure National Borders	5.97	2.27
19	Scientifically Based Decision Making	6.06	3.32
20	Collaborative Problem Solver	6.21	2.45
21	Government Experience	6.29	2.66
22	Minimal Government Regulations	6.53	2.04
23	Welfare Benefits	7.06	1.85
24	Personable	7.21	2.40
25	Articulate	7.29	2.15
26	Engaging Leadership Style	7.41	2.28
27	Higher Taxes on the Rich	7.65	2.34
28	Literal Interpretation of the Constitution	7.88	2.39
29	Secular Decision Making	7.68	2.69
30	Christian Nation	9.12	1.36

Note. Participants ranked traits and values on a scale of one (most preferred) to 10 (least preferred). Means closer to one represent choices most preferred by participants who self-identified as Liberals.

Table G6*Comparison Between Reported Political Identification and Political Identification by**Preference Profile*

Participant Characteristics	Conservative		Independent				Liberal					
	Reported		Profile		Reported		Profile		Reported		Profile	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Total	49	48	11	11	20	19	68	66	34	22	24	23
Gender												
Male	7	14	4	36	4	20	10	15	4	12	1	4
Female	42	86	7	64	16	80	58	85	30	88	23	96
Age												
18-24	48	98	11	100	19	95	65	96	32	94	23	96
25-29	1	2	0	0	1	5	3	4	1	3	0	0
30 or above	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4
Classification												
Freshman	4	8	1	9	4	20	6	9	2	6	3	12
Sophomore	32	65	7	64	8	40	40	59	16	47	9	38
Junior	11	23	3	27	7	35	18	26	12	35	9	38
Senior	2	4	0	0	1	5	4	6	4	12	3	12

Note. *N* = 103

Table G7*Group Rankings by Political Self-Identification and Political Preference Profile*

Traits and Values	Conservatives		Independents		Liberals	
	Report	Profile	Report	Profile	Report	Profile
Support for Public Education	1	1	1	1	4	5
National Security	2	4	3	2	2	2
Truthful	3	3	2	3	3	3
Personal Independence	10	11	5	8	1	1
Respect for Others' Views	4	5	6	4	7	7
High Moral Conduct	5	2	7	6	6	4
Gender Equality in the Workplace	6	7	8	5	8	6
Good Mental Health	11	14	4	7	9	12
Emphasis on Civil Liberties	7	6	11	9	14	11
Universal Healthcare	15	15	12	11	5	8
States' Rights	12	9	10	12	12	9
Preservation of Natural Environment	9	10	13	10	16	19
America First	8	12	18	13	17	17
Collaborative Problem Solver	13	8	14	17	20	10
Free Market	19	20	9	14	13	16
Lower Taxes for Everyone	20	22	17	16	10	15
Secure National Borders	14	16	24	15	18	21
Highly Intelligent	22	19	16	18	15	13
Legal Rights for LGBT	27	24	22	22	11	14
Scientifically Based Decision Making	25	30	15	19	19	18
Government Experience	17	26	29	20	21	22
Welfare Benefits	21	17	19	25	23	23
Minimal Government Regulations	28	25	20	27	22	20
Engaging Leadership Style	23	28	21	24	26	24
Secular Decision Making	18	18	25	26	29	25
Christian Nation	16	13	23	21	30	30
Personable	24	21	27	23	24	29
Literal Interpretation of the Constitution	26	23	26	28	28	26
Articulate	30	27	28	29	25	27
Higher Taxes on the Rich	29	29	30	30	27	28

Note. Report columns reflect ranking positions according to group rankings by political self-identification (See Tables G2 – G4). Profile columns reflect ranking positions according to categorical group rankings as determined by political preference profiles (see Appendix C).

Vita

Maya Ailene Mingo was born and raised in Washington, D.C., and relocated to Louisiana after high school where she attended Southern University in Baton Rouge. From that institution, she earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology and a Master of Arts degree in Mental Health Counseling. In the Fall of 2014, Maya began her doctoral studies in School Psychology at the University of Tennessee. In May of 2017, she received a Master of Science degree in Applied Educational Psychology. Maya completed a year-long pre-doctoral internship with the Tangipahoa Parish School System as a part of the Louisiana School Psychology Internship Consortium (LASPIC). Maya will receive her Ph.D. in December 2021.