

The Democracy Workshop
The George Washington University

Pilot Project for The Democracy Workshop

Robert Stoker, Eric Lawrence, Wilhelmine Miller, Lori Brainard, and John Dryzek*
January 2009

* The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Deborah Trent and Jeffrey Williams and the support of the Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration at The George Washington University and the George Washington Institute for Public Policy

Summary

The Democracy Workshop at The George Washington University (GW) conducted a pilot project during October 2008 to assess how knowledge of social security, attitudes about politics, and ideas about the practice of policy analysis might be influenced by a deliberative democracy experience. Twenty-nine graduate students in GW's Master of Public Policy program participated in a deliberative democracy exercise on the future of the Social Security program. Participants completed pre- and post-test questionnaires.

This report provides an overview of the pilot project. The body of the report focuses on key findings and issues for future research. Appendix A is a copy of the codebook for the pre- and post-test questionnaires that provides the text of the questions, variable names, and numerical codes. Appendix B presents the frequency distributions for each of the items included on the questionnaires.

Key findings:

- *Participants exhibited knowledge gains:* Although many participants demonstrated significant knowledge of the Social Security program in the pre-test, in several areas the participants demonstrated significant knowledge gains.
- *Participants exhibited more confidence in the Social Security program:* A larger proportion of the participants came to believe that the Social Security system was likely to “have the money available to provide the benefits you expect when you retire.”
- *Participants demonstrated increased political efficacy:* Participants were more likely to express the belief that they had sufficient knowledge and understanding to make informed judgments about policy issues and having a “say about what government does.”
- *Participants exhibited more political tolerance:* Participants became more likely to agree when asked whether “people with views different from mine often have very good reasons for their views.”
- *Participants reflected traditional views about the practice of policy analysis:* Although participants indicated a broad acceptance of the traditional standards and practices of policy analysis in the pre-test, they became somewhat more likely to reflect these views after the deliberation.

Introduction

The Democracy Workshop at The George Washington University conducted a pilot project during October 2008 in which twenty-nine graduate students in GW's Master of Public Policy program participated in a deliberative democracy exercise on the future of the Social Security Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (OASDI) program. The participants were asked to read the 2008 Social Security and Medicare Trustees report summary ("A Message to the Public") and *The Social Security Struggle: Fixing the Retirement System* (a National Issues Forum briefing booklet) in advance of the event.

The event took place in one evening from approximately 6:00 until 10:00 PM. The participants gathered in a lecture hall to listen to an educational briefing based on a PowerPoint presentation developed by Virginia Reno of the National Academy of Social Insurance ("Social Security Finances: A Primer"). Participants were then divided into three groups (of approximately ten members each) to discuss the reform options for approximately two hours. Each group was lead by a facilitator who was familiar with the National Issue Forum facilitator training manual and emphasized the values of participation and civil communication. Each group designated a "recorder" to take notes about the deliberation and a "reporter" to brief the larger group about their group's thoughts and conclusions. Participants completed a pre-test questionnaire before the educational briefing and a post-test questionnaire after the group discussions to assess how their knowledge of the OASDI program, their attitudes about politics, and their ideas about the practice of policy analysis.

This report is an overview of the results of the pilot project. The body of the report focuses on key findings and issues for future research. Appendix A is a copy of the codebook for the pre- and post-test questionnaires that provides the text of each question, response categories, variable names, and numerical codes. Appendix B presents the frequency distributions for each of the items included on the questionnaires.

Knowledge of OASDI

Deliberation is supposed to be an effective educative process that teaches participants about important public issues. In the pilot study, we wanted to see whether the deliberation would enhance the participants' knowledge of the details of the OASDI program. Participants generally thought they were well-informed; 75.9% of participants said they were "somewhat informed" or "very well informed" about the program. Pre-test results indicate substantial program knowledge in advance of the deliberation: All of the participants knew that the taxes collected for OASDI are not saved to pay each individual's retirement benefits; more than half knew that the retirement income one receives depends upon the amount of taxes paid to support the program; more than 65% knew that the OASDI trust funds had been in surplus since the mid-

1980s; and 44.8% knew that approximately six percent of the average worker’s paycheck is withheld to support OASDI.

In spite of this substantial knowledge in advance of the deliberation, knowledge of the program was improved in the post-test. Post-test results indicate that 100% of participants felt “somewhat informed” or “very well informed” about the program; More than 96.6% knew that the retirement income one receives depends upon the amount of taxes paid to support the program; more than 93% knew that the OASDI trust funds had been in surplus since the mid-1980s; and 79.3% knew that approximately six percent of the average worker’s paycheck is withheld to support OASDI. In only one case did knowledge decrease; one person switched a correct pre-test answer to an incorrect post-test answer regarding whether the taxes collected for OASDI are saved to pay each individual’s retirement benefits.¹

Table 1: Knowledge of OASDI

Variable Names	Explanation of Variables	Pre- Post Test Difference	P value
TaxPaid and TaxPaid2	OASDI benefit depends on tax paid	-.43	.0002
MoreTax and MoreTax2	OASDI has been collecting a surplus of tax revenue since the mid-1980s	-.28	.0095
SSTax and SSTax2	Percentage of average worker’s paycheck withheld to support OASDI	-.037	.82

These findings confirm the view that a deliberative experience can contribute to knowledge of complicated public policy issues. These finding are especially significant given the high levels of pre-test knowledge the participants displayed. However, these findings also implied another important question we would like to address in future research: Was it the educational briefing or the group discussion of the policy options or both that contributed to the participants’ knowledge gains?

Attitudes about OASDI

In additional to asking factual questions about OASDI, we also asked participants questions to assess their attitudes toward the program. When asked on the pre-test if the amount the government spends on social security is too much or too little, a slight majority said spending on OASDI is “about right,” 20.7% said we spend too much and 10.3% said we spend too little.

¹ The Pre- Post Test Differences presented in the Tables may not be intuitive because of the nature of the questions and the coding schemes. Interested reader may see the Appendices for details about the questions and codes.

When asked if they expected that social security will have the money to provide “the benefits you expect when you retire,” an emphatic 93.1% said no. These responses shifted significantly in the post-test. When asked if the amount the government spends on social security is too much or too little, 75.9% said spending on OASDI is “about right.” When asked if they expected that social security will have the money to provide “the benefits you expect when you retire,” only 48.3% said no. (An issue for future research is to clarify whether this attitude shift represents increased confidence in OASDI or acceptance of the inevitability that benefits will be reduced in the future.)

Table 2: Attitudes about OASDI

<i>Variable Names</i>	<i>Explanation of Variables</i>	<i>Pre- Post Test Difference</i>	<i>P value</i>
Spend and Spend2	Respondent’s opinion of the amount currently being spent on OASDI	-.25	.031
URetire and URetire2	OASDI will have the money to provide the benefits you expect when you retire	-.30	.021

These findings show that the deliberation changed policy attitudes. In particular, attitudes among the participants toward OASDI were more favorable in the post-test than in the pre-test. This is significant given that the participants were drawn from an age cohort that is thought to be skeptical about the integrity of Social Security program finances.

Political Efficacy

We asked a series of questions to assess levels of political efficacy among the participants. Political efficacy is the general attitude that one’s participation in politics is important and consequential because political elites care about and respond to expressions of interest or concern. Generally, in the pre-test participants expressed skepticism about the knowledge of members of the public, but excluded themselves from that concern (this may reflect the fact that the participants are graduate students in a public policy program). More than 58% indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the notion that the public knows too little to make informed judgments about policy issues. On the other hand, more than 58% indicated that they had a “pretty good understanding” of important policy issues and more than 72% thought they were better informed than most people. In addition, participants tended to disagree with the idea that government is too complicated for them to understand and that they have no say about what government does.

The post-test used some parallel forms of the pre-test questions. Only one person agreed that the public has sufficient knowledge to make informed judgments about policy issues. On the other hand, more than 75% indicated that they had a “good understanding” of important policy issues. In addition, more than 65% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the idea that they

are no better informed about politics and government than most people. Finally, participants tended to disagree with the ideas that government is too complicated (62.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed) for them to understand. However, only about 14% agreed that they have a lot of influence over what government does.

Table 3: Political Efficacy

<i>Variable Names</i>	<i>Explanation of Variables</i>	<i>Pre- Post Test Difference</i>	<i>P value</i>
LitKnow and LitKnow2	Most people have too little knowledge to make informed judgments about policy	-.5	.025
Complex and Complex2	Government is too complicated for a person like me to understand	.66	.0028
NoSay and NoSay2	People like me don't have any say about what government does	1.14	.0032

The pre- and post-test comparison indicates that negative attitudes about the public's knowledge and understanding of government and policy issues were intensified by the deliberation. At the same time, participants felt more confident in their own understanding (a component of internal political efficacy) and more skeptical about their ability to influence government (a component of external political efficacy).

Political Tolerance

Several questions assessed the extent to which participants were tolerant of people who disagree with them. Generally, the results suggest that the deliberation experience did enhance political tolerance. Participants were generally open-minded. In the pre-test, more than 93% of participants indicated that they were "very willing" or "moderately willing" to pay attention to people or other information sources that challenged their opinions; however, a majority (more than 58%) neither agreed nor disagreed or disagreed outright with the claim that people with different views "often have very good reasons for their views"; and more than 55% neither agreed nor disagreed with the claim that people who have different views "often lack factual knowledge about the issues."

Although the willingness of participants to pay attention to people or information sources that challenge their beliefs declined slightly in the post-test, shifts in attitudes were more evident on the other two measures of political tolerance. In the post-test, participants were more likely to agree that people with different views "often have very good reasons for their views" and somewhat more likely to disagree with the claim that people who have different views "often lack factual knowledge about the issues."

Table 4: Political Tolerance

<i>Variable Names</i>	<i>Explanation of Variables</i>	<i>Pre- Post Test Difference</i>	<i>P value</i>
Listen and Listen2	Willingness to read things that or listen to people who challenge your opinions	-.069	.33
DiffView and DiffView2	People with views different from mine often have good reasons for their views	.34	.03
NoFact and NoFact2	People with views different from mine lack factual knowledge of the issues	-.24	.15

The attitude shifts that were observed suggest that participants became somewhat more politically tolerant after participating in the deliberation. However, gains in political tolerance are modest in comparison to other changes observed in the pilot project. In our future research we are particularly interested in the question of how the diversity of participants influences political toleration. Given the lack of political and ideological diversity among the participants – no participants self-identified as Republicans and none indicated a political ideology to the right of moderate – it is possible that changes in political tolerance in the pilot project were blunted by this lack of political diversity.

Practicing Policy Analysis

The final issue we investigated was how the experience of participating in a deliberation might affect participants’ attitudes about the practice of policy analysis. All of the pilot study participants were first year students in GW’s Master of Public Policy program who were training for careers as policy analysts. Many of the pre-test responses indicated that most of the participants’ views of the profession were consistent with the emphasis traditional modes of policy analysis practice place on accurate facts and value-neutrality; 79.3% agreed or strongly agreed with these positions; only 34.5% agreed or strongly agreed that claims about ethical and political neutrality in the profession are “an illusion”; 75.9% agreed or strongly agreed that analysts contribute to the creation of a “good society” by providing “unbiased advice.”

Post-test responses indicate that the deliberation did little to change these attitudes, except to have strengthened them. Slightly more of the post-test responses indicated that disagreements about policy were likely to reflect a lack of factual knowledge. The proportion that agreed or strongly agreed about the importance of accurate facts and value neutrality increased slightly (from 79.3% in the pre-test to 89.66% in the post-test). The proportion that agreed or strongly agreed that claims about ethical and political neutrality in the profession are “an illusion” declined slightly (from 34.5% to 27.6%). On the other hand, the proportion that agreed or strongly agreed that analysts contribute to the creation of a “good society” by providing “unbiased advice” decreased slightly (from 75.9% to 72.4%). The proportion that

agreed or strongly agreed in the belief that responsible policy analysis helps policymakers to look at problems in different ways was the only significant attitude change.

Table 5: Policy Analysis Practice

<i>Variable Names</i>	<i>Explanation of Variables</i>	<i>Pre- Post Test Difference</i>	<i>P value</i>
LackFact and LackFact2	Disagreements about policy reflect a lack of factual knowledge	.29	.28
PrimeJob and PrimeJob2	Primary job is to provide accurate facts to policymakers	.16	.50
ValNtrl and ValNtrl2	Policy analysts should be objective and value-neutral	-.17	.17
Ethical and Ethical2	Purported ethical and political neutrality of policy analysis is an illusion	.10	.52
GoodSoc and GoodSoc2	Analysts contribute to the good society by providing unbiased advice	-.036	.84
NewWay and NewWay2	Responsible analysts enable policymakers to look at problems in different ways	-.38	.032

These results suggest that the deliberation was insufficient to change the largely conventional views of policy analysis that composed the dominant understanding of the practice of policy analysis among the participants. An issue we hope to investigate in future research is how other curriculum changes and experiences might further alter the views of these fledgling policy analysts about the possibilities that exist for their practice.

Limitations of the Pilot Study

Although the pilot study provided a valuable source of experience and data for The Democracy Workshop, the analysis was limited in several ways.

- There were twenty-nine participants. However, in spite of this small number, we did generate some statistically significant differences in the pre- and post-intervention responses.
- The pilot project design was unsophisticated. Using a simple pre- and post-test survey design limits our ability to answer research questions of interest that would be allowed in future research that applies more sophisticated experimental designs.
- In terms of external validity, the pilot project is limited because the participants were uniformly more educated, active, and informed compared to the general public.

Appendix A: Codebook for The Democracy Project: Pilot Study

This is the codebook for The Democracy Project, Pilot Study, October 2008. The codebook presents column locations, variable names (in italics), and valid codes for each variable. The codebook explains both pre-and post-test codes.

Column A, *RespID*

Integer value assigned by coder after matching pre- and post-test instruments for each respondent (valid range 1-29)

For the following variables, the recorded score is the number the respondent circled. Circles placed on the plus sign were scored ½ point above the score directly to the left. Missing value is 9. Response categories are as given below:

Strongly Disagree				Neither					Strongly Agree			
1	+	2	+	3	+	4	+	5	+	6	+	7

Pre-test questions

Column B, *LitKnow*

Most people have too little knowledge to make informed judgments about policy issues.

Column C, *Values*

More often than not, political disagreements reflect basic differences in values.

Column D, *LackFact*

More often than not, disagreements about policy reflect a lack of factual knowledge about complex issues.

Column E, *Issues*

I feel that I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing our country.

Column F, *Informed*

I think that I am better informed about politics and government than most people.

Column G, *Complex*

Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.

Column H, *NoSay*

People like me don't have any say about what government does.

For the questions below, numerical codes are as given to the right of each response category.
In all cases the missing value is 9.

Column I, *DoRight*

How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right-- just about always, most of the time or only some of the time?

- Just about always 1
- Most of the time 2
- Some of the time 3
- Rarely 4
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column J, *DemWork*

How satisfied are you with the way democracy works in the United States?

- Extremely satisfied 1
- Very satisfied 2
- Moderately satisfied 3
- Slightly satisfied 4
- Not satisfied at all 5
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column K, *WhoBen*

Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?

- A few big interests 1
- All of the people 2
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column L, *Waste*

Do you think that people in the government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?

- A lot of waste 1
- Some waste 2
- Not much waste 3
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column M, *Listen*

How willing are you to read things or listen to people who challenge your own opinions and provide different perspectives on political affairs?

- Very willing 1
- Moderately willing 2
- Slightly willing 3
- Not willing at all 4
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column N, *DiffView*

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "I discover that people with views different from mine often have very good reasons for their views."

- Strongly agree 1
- Agree 2
- Neither agree nor disagree 3
- Disagree 4
- Strongly disagree 5
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column O, *NoFact*

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "I discover that people with views different from mine often lack factual knowledge of the issues."

- Strongly agree 1
- Agree 2
- Neither agree nor disagree 3
- Disagree 4
- Strongly disagree 5
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column P, *SSInfo*

How well informed are you about the Social Security program? Would you say you are very well informed, somewhat informed, not very well informed, or not at all informed?

- Very well informed 1
- Somewhat informed 2
- Not very well informed 3
- Not informed at all 4
- I don't know 8

Column Q, *Spend*

What is your opinion of the amount we are currently spending on Social Security: we're spending too much; we're spending about the right amount; or we're spending too little?

- Too much 1
- About right 2
- Too little 3
- I don't know 8

Column R, *URetire*

Do you think the Social Security program will have the money available to provide the benefits you expect when you retire?

- Yes 1
- No 2
- I don't know 8

Column S, *TaxPaid*

The amount of retirement income someone gets from the Social Security program depends upon the amount of taxes they paid to support the program.

- True 1
- False 2

Column T, *SaveTax*

The government saves the Social Security taxes I pay in an individual account that will be used to pay my benefits when I retire.

- True 1
- False 2

Column U, *MoreTax*

The Social Security program has been collecting more in tax revenue than it has paid out in benefits since the mid-1980s.

- True 1
- False 2

Column V, *SSBudget*

How much of the federal budget in 2007 do you think was devoted to paying Social Security benefits?

- About 30 percent 1
- About 20 percent 2
- About 15 percent 3
- Less than 10 percent 4
- I don't know 8

Column W, *SSTax*

What percentage of the average worker's paycheck is withheld to support the Social Security OASDI program?

- About 10 percent 1
- About 8 percent 2
- About 6 percent 3
- About 4 percent 4
- Less than 2 percent 5
- I don't know 8

The question below was subdivided into a series of dummy questions where a score of 1 indicates a respondent check and a score of zero indicates no check. There is no missing code.

Which groups are qualified to receive Social Security benefits? (Check all that apply)

- Column X, *Poor*

 People who have an income below the federal poverty standard
- Column Y, *Retiree*

 People who worked and reached retirement age
- Column Z, *Disabled*

 People who are disabled
- Column AA, *Baby*

 Poor people who are having a baby
- Column AB, *Young*

 Poor people who have young children to support
- Column AC, *Spouse*

 People who are the spouse of a worker who died
- Column AD, *Child*

 People who are the children of a worker who died
- Column AE, *Depress*

 People who live in depressed parts of the country
- Column AF, *Unemploy*

 People who are unemployed
- Column AG, *LowEdu*

 People who have a low level of education

For the questions below, numerical codes are as given to the right of each response category.
In all cases the missing value is 9.

Column AH, *Register*

Are you currently registered to vote?

- Yes 1
- No 2

Column AI, *Vote*

Do you plan to vote in the election of 2008?

- Yes 1
- No 2

Column AJ, *Talk*

During the recent primary campaign, did you talk to any people and try to show them why they should vote for one of the parties or candidates?

- Yes 1
- No 2

Column AK, *Rally*

Have you ever attended political meetings, rallies, speeches, fund raising dinners, or things like that in support of a particular candidate?

- Yes 1
- No 2

For the following variables, the recorded score is the number the respondent circled. Circles placed on the plus signs were scored $\frac{1}{2}$ point above the score directly to the left. Missing value is 9. Response categories are as given below:

Strongly Agree		Neither		Strongly Disagree				
1	++++	2	++++	3	++++	4	++++	5

Column AL, *PrimeJob*

The primary job of policy analysts is to make sure that policymakers have accurate facts to make decisions.

Column AM, *ValNtrl*

Policy analysts should be objective and value-neutral. They should not let their personal values and preferences affect their analysis of fact.

Column AN, *NewWay*

Responsible policy analysts enable policymakers to look in different ways at the nature of the social problems they have to address.

Column AO, *ValDiff*

Responsible policy analysts enable policymakers to appreciate the value differences that are important to understanding the social problems they have to address.

Column AP, *GoodSoc*

An analyst contributes to the good society, at least in the long run, by consistently providing unbiased advice even when it does not lead to the selection of personally favored policies.

Column AQ, *Argue*

The policy analyst is a producer of policy arguments, more similar to a lawyer than to an engineer or a scientist.

Column AR, *TopPols*

Value decisions are best left up to top policymakers and need not nor should not be the subject of policy analysis.

Column AS, *Struggle*

The policymaking process is a struggle between clients with competing policy positions, and policy analysis provides clients with a strategy and ammunition for the struggle.

Column AT, *Ethical*

The purported ethical and political neutrality of policy analysis is an illusion masking the inherently value-laden character of any analytic method.

For the questions below, numerical codes are as given to the right of each response category. In all cases the missing value is 9.

Column AU, *PartyID*

Generally speaking, do you think of yourself as a Republican, Democrat, or what?

- Republican 1
- Democrat 2
- Independent 3
- Some other party 4

Column AV, *StrRep*

a. If you are a Republican, would you say you are a:

- Strong Republican 1
- Not very strong Republican 2

Column AW, *StrDem*

b. If you are a Democrat, would you say you are a:

- Strong Democrat 1
- Not very strong Democrat 2

Column AX, *Lean*

c. If you are neither a Republican nor a Democrat, which party would you say you lean more towards:

- Republican 1
- Democrat 2
- Do not lean either way 8

Column AY, *Ideology*

When it comes to politics do you usually think of yourself as very liberal, liberal, slightly liberal, moderate (or middle of the road), slightly conservative, conservative or very conservative?

Very Liberal	Moderate	Very Conservative
1 ++ 2 ++ 3 ++ 4 ++ 5 ++ 6 ++ 7		

For Column AY, *Ideology*, respondents that circled the plus signs were given a score ½ point above the score directly to the left.

Column AZ, *Sex*

Are you:

- Male 1
- Female 2

End of Pre-test

Post-test questions

For the following variables, the recorded score is the number the respondent circled. Circles placed on the plus sign were scored ½ point above the score directly to the left. Missing value is 9. Response categories are as given below:

Strongly Disagree		Neither		Strongly Agree								
1	+	2	+	3	+	4	+	5	+	6	+	7

Column BA, *Issues2*

I feel that I have a good understanding of the important political issues facing our country.

Column BB, *Informed2*

I think that I am not better informed about politics and government than most people.

Column BC, *Complex2*

Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what is going on.

Column BD, *LitKnow2*

Most people have sufficient knowledge to make informed judgments about policy issues.

Column BE, *Values2*

Political disagreements rarely reflect basic differences in values.

Column BF, *LackFact2*

Disagreements about policy rarely reflect a lack of factual knowledge about complex issues.

Column BG, *NoSay2*

People like me have a lot of influence over what government does.

For the questions below, numerical codes are as given to the right of each response category.
In all cases the missing value is 9.

Column BH, *Waste2*

Do you think that people in the government waste a lot of money we pay in taxes, waste some of it, or don't waste very much of it?

- A lot of waste 1
- Some waste 2
- Not much waste 3
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column BI, *Listen2*

How willing are you to read things or listen to people who challenge your own opinions and provide different perspectives on political affairs?

- Very willing 1
- Moderately willing 2
- Slightly willing 3
- Not willing at all 4
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column BJ, *DoRight2*

How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right-- just about always, most of the time or only some of the time?

- Just about always 1
- Most of the time 2
- Some of the time 3
- Rarely 4
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column BK, *DemWork2*

How satisfied are you with the way democracy works in the United States?

- Extremely satisfied 1
- Very satisfied 2
- Moderately satisfied 3
- Slightly satisfied 4
- Not satisfied at all 5
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column BL, *WhoBen2*

Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all the people?

- A few big interests 1
- All of the people 2
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column BM, *NoFact2*

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "I discover that people with views different from mine often lack factual knowledge of the issues."

- Strongly agree 1
- Agree 2
- Neither agree nor disagree 3
- Disagree 4
- Strongly disagree 5
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column BN, *DiffView2*

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "I discover that people with views different from mine often have very good reasons for their views."

- Strongly agree 1
- Agree 2
- Neither agree nor disagree 3
- Disagree 4
- Strongly disagree 5
- I haven't thought much about this 8

Column BO, *SSInfo2*

How well informed are you about the Social Security program? Would you say you are very well informed, somewhat informed, not very well informed, or not at all informed?

- Very well informed 1
- Somewhat informed 2
- Not very well informed 3
- Not informed at all 4
- I don't know 8

Column BP, *Spend2*

What is your opinion of the amount we are currently spending on Social Security: we're spending too much; we're spending about the right amount; or we're spending too little?

- Too much 1
- About right 2
- Too little 3
- I don't know 8

Column BQ, *SaveTax2*

The government saves the Social Security taxes I pay in an individual account that will be used to pay my benefits when I retire.

- True 1
- False 2

Column BR, *MoreTax2*

The Social Security program has been collecting more in tax revenue than it has paid out in benefits since the mid-1980s.

- True 1
- False 2

Column BS, *URetire2*

Do you think the Social Security program will have the money available to provide the benefits you expect when you retire?

- Yes 1
- No 2
- I don't know 8

Column BT, *TaxPaid2*

The amount of retirement income someone gets from the Social Security program depends upon the amount of taxes they paid to support the program.

- True 1
- False 2

Column BU, *SSBudget2*

How much of the federal budget in 2007 do you think was devoted to paying Social Security benefits?

- About 30 percent 1
- About 20 percent 2
- About 15 percent 3
- Less than 10 percent 4
- I don't know 8

Column BV, *SSTax2*

What percentage of the average worker's paycheck is withheld to support the Social Security OASDI program?

- About 10 percent 1
- About 8 percent 2
- About 6 percent 3
- About 4 percent 4
- Less than 2 percent 5
- I don't know 8

The question below was subdivided into a series of dummy questions where a score of 1 indicates a respondent check and a score of zero indicates no check. There is no missing code.

Which groups are qualified to receive Social Security benefits? (Check all that apply)

- Column BW, *Poor2*
People who have an income below the federal poverty standard
- Column BX, *Retiree2*
People who worked and reached retirement age
- Column BY, *Disabled2*
People who are disabled
- Column BZ, *Baby2*
Poor people who are having a baby
- Column CA, *Young2*
Poor people who have young children to support
- Column CB, *Spouse2*
People who are the spouse of a worker who died
- Column CC, *Child2*
People who are the children of a worker who died
- Column CD, *Depress2*
People who live in depressed parts of the country
- Column CE, *Unemploy2*
People who are unemployed
- Column CF, *LowEdu2*
People who have a low level of education

For the following variables, the recorded score is the number the respondent circled. Circles placed on the plus signs were scored ½ point above the score directly to the left. Missing value is 9. Response categories are as given below:

Strongly Agree		Neither		Strongly Disagree				
1	++++	2	++++	3	++++	4	++++	5

Column CG, *PrimeJob2*

The primary job of policy analysts is to make sure that policymakers have accurate facts to make decisions.

Column CH, *ValNtrl2*

Policy analysts should be objective and value-neutral. They should not let their personal values and preferences affect their analysis of fact.

Column CI, *NewWay2*

Responsible policy analysts enable policymakers to look in different ways at the nature of the social problems they have to address.

Column CJ, *ValDiff2*

Responsible policy analysts enable policymakers to appreciate the value differences that are important to understanding the social problems they have to address.

Column CK, *GoodSoc2*

An analyst contributes to the good society, at least in the long run, by consistently providing unbiased advice even when it does not lead to the selection of personally favored policies.

Column CL, *Argue2*

The policy analyst is a producer of policy arguments, more similar to a lawyer than to an engineer or a scientist.

Column CM, *TopPols2*

Value decisions are best left up to top policymakers and need not nor should not be the subject of policy analysis.

Column CN, *Struggle2*

The policymaking process is a struggle between clients with competing policy positions, and policy analysis provides clients with a strategy and ammunition for the struggle.

Column CO, *Ethical2*

The purported ethical and political neutrality of policy analysis is an illusion masking the inherently value-laden character of any analytic method.

End of Post-Test

Appendix B: Frequency distributions (all pre- and post-test variables)

RespID (omitted)

<i>LitKnow</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
3	2	6.90	6.90
5	9	31.03	37.93
5.5	1	3.45	41.38
6	13	44.83	86.21
7	4	13.79	100.00
Total	29	100.00	

<i>Values</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
3	4	13.79	13.79
4	5	17.24	31.03
5	7	24.14	55.17
5.5	1	3.45	58.62
6	11	37.93	96.55
7	1	3.45	100.00
Total	29	100.00	

<i>LackFact</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
2	2	6.90	6.90
3	7	24.14	31.03
3.5	1	3.45	34.48
4	3	10.34	44.83
5	8	27.59	72.41
6	7	24.14	96.55
7	1	3.45	100.00
Total	29	100.00	

<i>Issues</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
3	2	6.90	6.90
4	1	3.45	10.34
5	9	31.03	41.38
6	11	37.93	79.31
7	6	20.69	100.00
Total	29	100.00	

<i>Informed</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
3	1	3.45	3.45
5	6	20.69	24.14
5.5	1	3.45	27.59
6	14	48.28	75.86
7	7	24.14	100.00
Total	29	100.00	

<i>Complex</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	5	17.24	17.24
2	6	20.69	37.93
3	4	13.79	51.72
4	7	24.14	75.86
5	3	10.34	86.21
6	3	10.34	96.55

7		1	3.45	100.00
---	--	---	------	--------

Total		29	100.00	
-------	--	----	--------	--

<i>NoSay</i>		Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
--------------	--	-------	---------	--------------

1		6	20.69	20.69
2		8	27.59	48.28
3		7	24.14	72.41
4		2	6.90	79.31
5		3	10.34	89.66
6		1	3.45	93.10
7		2	6.90	100.00

Total		29	100.00	
-------	--	----	--------	--

<i>DoRight</i>		Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
----------------	--	-------	---------	--------------

1		1	3.45	3.45
2		7	24.14	27.59
3		14	48.28	75.86
4		7	24.14	100.00

Total		29	100.00	
-------	--	----	--------	--

<i>DemWork</i>		Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
----------------	--	-------	---------	--------------

2		3	10.34	10.34
3		14	48.28	58.62
4		10	34.48	93.10
5		2	6.90	100.00

Total		29	100.00	
-------	--	----	--------	--

<i>WhoBen</i>		Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
---------------	--	-------	---------	--------------

1		19	65.52	65.52
2		8	27.59	93.10
8		1	3.45	96.55
9		1	3.45	100.00

Total		29	100.00	
-------	--	----	--------	--

<i>Waste</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	9	31.03	31.03
2	19	65.52	96.55
3	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Listen</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	15	51.72	51.72
2	12	41.38	93.10
3	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>DiffView</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	2	6.90	6.90
2	10	34.48	41.38
3	8	27.59	68.97
4	9	31.03	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>NoFact</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
2	10	34.48	34.48
3	16	55.17	89.66
4	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>SSInfo</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	4	13.79	13.79
2	18	62.07	75.86
3	6	20.69	96.55
4	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Spend</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	6	20.69	20.69
2	15	51.72	72.41
3	3	10.34	82.76
8	4	13.79	96.55
9	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>URetire</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	5	17.24	17.24
2	22	75.86	93.10
8	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>TaxPaid</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	15	51.72	51.72
2	13	44.83	96.55
9	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>SaveTax</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
2	29	100.00	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>MoreTax</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	19	65.52	65.52
2	10	34.48	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>SSBudget</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	6	20.69	20.69
2	6	20.69	41.38
3	8	27.59	68.97
4	6	20.69	89.66
8	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>SSTax</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	3	10.34	10.34
2	6	20.69	31.03
3	13	44.83	75.86
4	4	13.79	89.66
5	1	3.45	93.10
8	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Poor</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	24	82.76	82.76
1	5	17.24	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Retiree</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	1	3.45	3.45
1	28	96.55	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Disabled</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	5	17.24	17.24
1	24	82.76	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Baby</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	28	96.55	96.55
1	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Young</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	28	96.55	96.55
1	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Spouse</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	5	17.24	17.24
1	24	82.76	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Child</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	10	34.48	34.48
1	19	65.52	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Depress</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	28	96.55	96.55
1	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Unemploy</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	26	89.66	89.66
1	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>LowEdu</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	27	93.10	93.10
1	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Register</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	28	96.55	96.55
2	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Vote</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	27	93.10	93.10
2	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Talk</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	22	75.86	75.86
2	7	24.14	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Rally</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	22	75.86	75.86
2	7	24.14	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>PrimeJob</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	11	37.93	37.93
1.5	1	3.45	41.38
2	11	37.93	79.31
3	1	3.45	82.76
4	3	10.34	93.10
5	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>ValNtrl</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	7	24.14	24.14
2	16	55.17	79.31
3	2	6.90	86.21
4	4	13.79	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>NewWay</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	15	51.72	51.72
2	10	34.48	86.21
3	1	3.45	89.66
4	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>ValuDiff</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	7	24.14	24.14
2	11	37.93	62.07
3	3	10.34	72.41
4	6	20.69	93.10
5	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>GoodSoc</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	9	31.03	31.03
2	13	44.83	75.86
3	3	10.34	86.21
4	2	6.90	93.10
5	1	3.45	96.55
9	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Argue</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	1	3.45	3.45
2	10	34.48	37.93
3	8	27.59	65.52
4	7	24.14	89.66
5	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>TopPols</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	1	3.45	3.45
2	3	10.34	13.79
3	7	24.14	37.93
4	14	48.28	86.21
5	4	13.79	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Struggle</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	2	6.90	6.90
2	16	55.17	62.07
3	4	13.79	75.86
4	4	13.79	89.66
5	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Ethical</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	3	10.34	10.34
2	7	24.14	34.48
3	10	34.48	68.97
4	7	24.14	93.10
5	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>PartyID</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
2	25	86.21	86.21
3	4	13.79	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>StrRep</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
9	29	100.00	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>StrDem</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	19	65.52	65.52
2	6	20.69	86.21
9	4	13.79	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Lean</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
2	6	20.69	20.69
3	1	3.45	24.14
9	22	75.86	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Ideology</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	5	17.24	17.24
2	16	55.17	72.41
3	6	20.69	93.10
4	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Sex</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	10	34.48	34.48
2	19	65.52	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Issues2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
3	1	3.45	3.45
5	6	20.69	24.14
6	16	55.17	79.31
7	6	20.69	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Informed2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	4	13.79	13.79
2	15	51.72	65.52
3	2	6.90	72.41
5	3	10.34	82.76
6	3	10.34	93.10
7	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Complex2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	4	13.79	13.79
2	14	48.28	62.07
3	6	20.69	82.76
5	2	6.90	89.66
6	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>LitKnow2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
2	13	44.83	44.83
3	11	37.93	82.76
4	1	3.45	86.21
5	3	10.34	96.55
6	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Values2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	2	6.90	6.90
2	11	37.93	44.83
3	12	41.38	86.21
4	1	3.45	89.66
5	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>LackFact2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
2	6	20.69	20.69
3	16	55.17	75.86
4	2	6.90	82.76
5	4	13.79	96.55
6	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>NoSay2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	1	3.45	3.45
2	4	13.79	17.24
3	8	27.59	44.83
4	4	13.79	58.62
5	8	27.59	86.21
6	4	13.79	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Waste2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	6	20.69	20.69
2	22	75.86	96.55
3	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Listen2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	15	51.72	51.72
2	10	34.48	86.21
3	4	13.79	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>DoRight2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
2	12	41.38	41.38
3	16	55.17	96.55
4	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>DemWork2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
2	4	13.79	13.79
3	15	51.72	65.52
4	7	24.14	89.66
5	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>WhoBen2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	17	58.62	58.62
2	10	34.48	93.10
8	1	3.45	96.55
9	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>NoFact2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	1	3.45	3.45
2	10	34.48	37.93
3	8	27.59	65.52
4	8	27.59	93.10
5	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>DiffView2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	5	17.24	17.24
2	9	31.03	48.28
3	12	41.38	89.66
4	2	6.90	96.55
5	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>SSInfo2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	10	34.48	34.48
2	19	65.52	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Spend2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	1	3.45	3.45
2	22	75.86	79.31
3	5	17.24	96.55
8	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>SaveTax2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	1	3.45	3.45
2	28	96.55	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>MoreTax2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	27	93.10	93.10
2	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>URetire2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	13	44.83	44.83
2	14	48.28	93.10
8	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>TaxPaid2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	28	96.55	96.55
2	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>SSBudget2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	6	20.69	20.69
2	7	24.14	44.83
3	2	6.90	51.72
4	11	37.93	89.66
8	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>SSTax2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	2	6.90	6.90
2	3	10.34	17.24
3	23	79.31	96.55
4	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Poor2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	12	41.38	41.38
1	17	58.62	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Retire2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	25	86.21	86.21
1	4	13.79	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Disabled2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	25	86.21	86.21
1	4	13.79	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Baby2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	6	20.69	20.69
1	23	79.31	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Young2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	9	31.03	31.03
1	20	68.97	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Spouse2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	24	82.76	82.76
1	5	17.24	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Child2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	22	75.86	75.86
1	7	24.14	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Depress2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	8	27.59	27.59
1	21	72.41	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Unemploy2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	10	34.48	34.48
1	19	65.52	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>LowEdu2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
0	7	24.14	24.14
1	22	75.86	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>PrimeJob2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	10	34.48	34.48
2	16	55.17	89.66
4	2	6.90	96.55
5	1	3.45	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>ValNtr12</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	4	13.79	13.79
2	16	55.17	68.97
3	6	20.69	89.66
4	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>NewWay2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	6	20.69	20.69
2	17	58.62	79.31
3	3	10.34	89.66
4	3	10.34	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>ValDiff2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	7	24.14	24.14
2	14	48.28	72.41
3	6	20.69	93.10
4	2	6.90	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>GoodSoc2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	6	20.69	20.69
2	15	51.72	72.41
3	8	27.59	100.00

Total | 29 100.00

<i>Argue2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
1	1	3.45	3.45
2	10	34.48	37.93
3	7	24.14	62.07
4	8	27.59	89.66

5	3	10.34	100.00
---	---	-------	--------

Total	29	100.00	
-------	----	--------	--

<i>TopPols2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
-----------------	-------	---------	--------------

1	2	6.90	6.90
2	6	20.69	27.59
3	5	17.24	44.83
4	12	41.38	86.21
5	3	10.34	96.55
9	1	3.45	100.00

Total	29	100.00	
-------	----	--------	--

<i>Struggle2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
------------------	-------	---------	--------------

1	2	6.90	6.90
2	15	51.72	58.62
3	7	24.14	82.76
4	5	17.24	100.00

Total	29	100.00	
-------	----	--------	--

<i>Ethical2</i>	Freq.	Percent	Cum. Percent
-----------------	-------	---------	--------------

1	2	6.90	6.90
2	6	20.69	27.59
3	16	55.17	82.76
4	5	17.24	100.00

Total	29	100.00	
-------	----	--------	--