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About this Report from the White House Fellows Project

The White House Fellows Project (WHF Project) is an initiative of Professor D. Michael Lindsay of Rice University. It explores the role of the White House Fellowship in the lives of America’s top leaders and examines the program’s impact on improving the quality of the nation’s leadership. A signature element of the WHF Project was the first comprehensive survey of current and former Fellows, conducted in late 2008. Follow-up interviews are currently underway with a number of Fellows, directors, and commissioners who have been associated with the program over its 45-year history. This report, “Surveying America’s Leadership: A Study of the White House Fellows,” details major findings from the survey, which was conducted by the National Opinion Research Center under the direction of Raymond Lodato and Lisa Setlak.

Throughout this report, the use of “all Fellows” in graphs and statistics has been reserved for references to all White House Fellows. Otherwise, the graphs and statistics in this report represent the 473 Fellows who completed the survey, representing 78% of all living Fellows. Hence, their responses represent most Fellows, but this study did not entail a complete census of the Fellows.

Beyond Professor Lindsay’s contribution, this report is a collaborative effort directed by O. Pat Hastings and based on input and analysis from Amanda Dworak, Conrad Hackett, Mary Grace Hager, Ipek Martinez, Omar Metwalli, Payton Odom, Andrew Patterson, Jeremy Porter, Ariela Schachter, Melissa Sheng, and Betsy Stokes. Administrative and logistical support for the project was provided by Meagan Alley, Lisa Birenbaum, Garrett Dolan, Ute Franklin, Sonja Fulbright, Carlos Garcia, Patsy Garcia, Shawn O’Neill, Jean Packard, Kelly Quin, Heather Stern, Shirley Tapscott, and Chris Zalesky. We gratefully acknowledge the support of Rice University President David Leebron and Provost Gene Levy as well as colleagues Elizabeth Long, Lyn Ragsdale, Victoria Ricks, Darrow Zeidenstein, and Jeanette Zey—all of whom assisted with fundraising efforts for the WHF Project and supported this study from its beginning.

Photographs in this report have been graciously provided by various presidential libraries and the White House Photo Office. We also thank Fellows John McGinty and M. Tim Parris for providing personal photographs. Finally, we thank Brian Cossiboom, Ashley Hickey, and Don Willett for their help in securing photographs through the George W. Bush Presidential Library.

We especially thank Janet Eissenstat, director of the President’s Commission on White House Fellowships from 2005 until 2009, who lent invaluable support to the WHF Project. We are also incredibly appreciative of Jack LeCuyer, executive director of the White House Fellows Foundation and Association, as well as Foundation and Association Presidents Diane Yu and Bob Edmonds, who provided great counsel and assistance in bringing the WHF Project to completion. We also want to recognize former Fellows Jerome Loughridge, Doris Meissner, and Mike Ullman, who offered help at critical moments during the course of the study. Finally, the WHF Project and this report would not have been possible without the financial support of grants from Rice University’s Faculty Initiatives Fund, the James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. At the Baker Institute, we especially thank Ambassador Edward P. Djerejian and Professor Allen Matusow, and at the Carnegie Corporation, Geraldine P. Mannion. The study also could not have occurred without the generous support of Vester T. Hughes, Jack and Sherlie Rowe, and Joanne and Malcolm Turner.

The analyses and views expressed in this publication are solely the responsibility of the project’s principal investigator. For more information on this project or other studies on leadership in America, please contact Professor D. Michael Lindsay, Rice University, 6100 Main Street, MS-28, Houston, Texas, 77005, or via email at mlindsay@rice.edu.
Origins and Aims of the White House Fellowship

Great ideas are often born in unsettled times. In the midst of the tumult of the mid-1960s, Carnegie Corporation President John Gardner approached one of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s trusted aides with an idea for engaging talented young Americans for civic leadership. At the time, Johnson was increasingly concerned about the disaffection between youth and government. According to Gardner, the idea was “straightforward”:

“Each year a presidential commission would select a handful of outstanding young men and women to come to Washington and participate in government at the highest levels. As special assistants to key officials in the Executive Branch, the fellows would learn the workings of the federal government. We believed they would also learn a great deal about leadership as they saw the nation’s leaders at work and met with leaders from other parts of society. We hoped the program would strengthen the Fellows’ abilities and desires to contribute to their communities, their professions and the country.”

Johnson was enthusiastic about the idea and proceeded to invite campus leaders from universities across the country for an evening at the White House. In the fall of 1964, 250 student leaders arrived at the president’s bequest. Johnson addressed the students about the importance of engaging young people for America’s future: “A genuinely free society cannot be a spectator society.... Freedom, in its deepest sense, requires participation—full, zestful, knowledgeable participation. Toward that end, I have today established a new program entitled the White House Fellows.”

Since its establishment in 1964, the White House Fellows Program has been the nation’s most prestigious and competitive fellowship for early-career leaders, providing them with an unmatched opportunity to work with officials at the highest levels of government. The nonpartisan, year-long program assigns 12–19 exceptional people to work as senior aides to top government officials such as the president, the first lady, the vice president, a cabinet secretary, or a member of the White House staff. This governmental official supervises and ideally mentors the Fellow and is known as the Fellow’s “principal.” Often Fellows attend

---
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The program has three main objectives: 1) to expose exceptional young Americans to the inner workings of the federal government at the highest level, 2) to provide a first-class educational program for future American leaders, who then return to their communities with greater policy knowledge and leadership acumen, and 3) to create a reservoir of young men and women who are qualified for and interested in public leadership—that is, leaders for the American public, whether that be in politics, business, the arts, nonprofit life, or another field. The program’s mission statement expresses confidence in the potential of our nation to produce great leaders and puts forth a challenge: “If the sparsely settled American colonies of the late 18th century could produce Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Monroe, Madison, Hamilton, Franklin and others of superlative talent, breadth and statesmanship, should we not be able to produce ten times that number?”

To this day, over 625 Fellows have served in a variety of roles as part of their year-long Fellowship. The number of applicants each year has ranged from 400 to 3,100. From these, approximately 100 regional finalists are selected for two-day interviews that take place in eight cities across the country. That group, in turn, is culled to approximately 30 national finalists, who interview with the President’s Commission on White House Fellowships. Eventually, fewer than 20 of these finalists are selected as the next year’s class of White House Fellows.

Given the competitiveness of the program, few doubt that the selected Fellows are talented individuals with great potential. And these individuals, among

---
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the best and most qualified in the nation, are clearly given a firsthand experience of government at the highest of levels. But has the program achieved its lofty goals of enlisting the most capable of our country for a lifetime of civic service and leadership? Does it develop leaders for the nation? And has it helped the federal government, and by extension, the American people? Questions like these have motivated this study.

Now for the first time in the program’s history, we have produced a systematic analysis of the White House Fellows Program, its participants, and its impact on American democracy. In the fall of 2008, Professor D. Michael Lindsay launched a study that included a 72-question survey of living Fellows that explored three areas: 1) what Fellows were like before the Fellowship and how they learned about the program, 2) what the Fellowship experience meant to them (personally and professionally) and how it has affected their life since, and 3) the Fellows’ background, attitudes, and experiences and how they compare to those of the general population. Fellows had the option of completing the paper questionnaire (which was mailed to their homes), answering the survey questions online, or scheduling a telephone appointment. The survey packet included letters of support from the director of the President’s Commission on White House Fellowships and the president of the White House Fellows Foundation and Association. With this set of strategies, the survey achieved a 78% response rate among the program’s 627 living Fellows (N=473). Survey responses were supplemented with semi-structured interviews conducted by Dr. Lindsay with the 2008–2009 Class of Fellows in December of 2008. Complete survey results are included in appendix A of this report. Additional information was obtained on all 627 Fellows using biographical sketches from the brochures created for each new class of Fellows, information provided by the Foundation and Association, and online databases.
President Johnson and John Gardner hoped that a firsthand experience of government at the highest levels would provide Fellows the skills necessary to return to their communities and provide civic leadership. Community contributions are one way for Fellows to give back a portion of their Fellowship education on a local level. In Johnson’s words, Fellows should “repay that privilege” by “continuing to work as private citizens on their public agendas.”

Region of Residence

After the Fellowship, a majority of all Fellows (53%) immediately return to the region of the country where they had been living. However, 47% of all Fellows move to other parts of the country and begin building new community connections. It is most common for Fellows from the Northeast and least common for Fellows from the Midwest to return to their original region of residence after their Fellowship year (71% and 33%, respectively).

Fellows who do shift regions tend to move to the Northeast. Roughly one-third of all Fellows from other regions moved to the Northeast after their Fellowship year, causing the total population of Fellows in the Northeast to rise by 9%.

The influx of Fellows into government after their Fellowship year may explain this increase, since the Northeast includes the nation’s capital. Given that the number of Fellows in government more than doubles following their Fellowship year (compared to Fellows’ jobs before that year), it is logical that many Fellows shift their residences as well. Fellows in business and military—other popular professions for Fellows following their Fellowship—also tend to live in the Northeast (home to 50% of all Fellows who were in military and business after their Fellowship year).

---
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Civic Leadership

Though Fellows often pursue new professional opportunities after their Fellowship year, they still find time to give back to their community through volunteer work. We asked Fellows to estimate how often they had volunteered for a charitable organization in the past 12 months and in the 12 months prior to their Fellowship year. Results show that a majority of Fellows (60%) currently volunteer at least once a month, about a third of Fellows (30%) volunteer once a week or more, and only a small fraction of Fellows do not volunteer at all (8%). Indeed, the voluntaristic impulse characterizes a majority of Fellows before and after their Fellowship. This stands in sharp contrast to the general population. According to the 1972–2008 General Social Survey (cumulative data), over half of adults (53%) did not volunteer for a charity at all this past year. Only 9% report volunteering once a month, and another 9% volunteer once a week or more. Indeed, the volunteerism of White House Fellows is nearly the inverse of that of the general U.S. population.

Though civic-mindedness is a universal characteristic of the White House Fellows, we sought to determine which characteristics account for differences in current volunteerism among Fellows. Do factors such as profession, geographic location, or family obligations explain the frequency with which Fellows volunteer, or do their attitudes, values, and affiliations play the larger role? In order to respond to these questions, we conducted advanced statistical analyses to view the most influential factors of Fellows’ volunteer tendencies.

When considering demographic characteristics of the Fellows, our results show that older Fellows volunteer more frequently than younger Fellows. Despite this age differential, volunteerism tends to be a lifelong activity of Fellows that is only heightened by the Fellowship experience. Fellows who volunteered in the year prior to their Fellowship year are significantly more likely to presently volunteer with greater frequency than other Fellows, while involvement in one’s local community reflected a similarly positive relationship. Also, Fellows with children tend to volunteer more often than those Fellows without children, implying that family life draws Fellows into their respective communities through a variety of volunteer activities.

Our analyses show that across the range of professions in which Fellows work, the only significant predictor of volunteer habits occurs in one profession, the military. The model shows an inverse relationship between military service and volunteerism, meaning that a Fellow with military experience volunteers less often than a nonmilitary Fellow, with all other factors being held constant. Though our results do not show significant variation in
volunteer levels across different professions, it does suggest that certain activities related to personal or professional pursuits, such as appearing on television, correlate with higher levels of volunteerism among Fellows. Interestingly, not only professional experience predicts a Fellow’s volunteer habits; their attitudes also explain differing volunteer rates. Fellows who believe that others in society can generally be trusted are significantly more likely to volunteer with greater frequency than those who do not, even after controlling for demographic variation.

The results of our statistical analyses show that Fellows volunteer with varying frequency, but the Fellowship instills a strong affinity for volunteerism that is reflected above and beyond their individual characteristics. (For the complete results of these statistical analyses, please see Table 1 in appendix B.)

In addition to strong volunteerism, most Fellows (85%) have worked to solve a community problem within the past year. We found noticeable variation on this, however, by administration. For example, Fellows who served during the Carter White House reported the highest degree of working to solve a problem in their community (96%). Other administrations look this way:

- Johnson 92%
- Nixon 88%
- Ford 83%
- Reagan 90%
- G. Bush 78%
- Clinton 77%
- G. W. Bush 76%

Nonprofit Involvement

A strong majority (71%) of all Fellows are members of a nonprofit board, which is over twice the percentage of all Fellows who are members of for-profit boards (34%). Although over half of all Fellows who worked in the nonprofit sector before participating in the program transition to other professions following their Fellowship year (52%), a large majority of them (78%) maintain a connection with the nonprofit world by serving as a director for at least one nonprofit organization.

Sixteen percent of Fellows have worked in the nonprofit sector, including notable names like Elaine Chao (Class of 1983), former president and CEO of the United Way of America and director of the Peace Corps, and Admiral Marty Evans (Class of 1979), who headed both Girl Scouts of the USA and the American Red Cross. Many Fellows transition in and out of the nonprofit sector throughout their careers. Consider, for example, Senator Tim Wirth. After his Fellowship year in 1967, Wirth returned to Washington as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1975 and later served as a senator from Colorado and the undersecretary of state for democracy and global affairs under President Clinton. Having spent much of his life working in the public sector, Wirth became the first president of the United Nations Foundation in 1998, a position he still holds. In this role, Wirth leads out on issues such as the environment, population, children’s health, peace, security, and human rights.
Media Coverage

White House Fellows also appear in the national media. Fellows tended to get the most press coverage in the months surrounding a presidential election. Two-thirds of Fellows have been interviewed by the press within the past year (66%). Among these Fellows, over half were interviewed in 2008 during the months of October or November (57%). One-third of Fellows have appeared on television within the past year (34%). Among these, nearly half appeared on television in 2008 during the months of October and November (45%).

Publications

Roughly a quarter of all Fellows had published something before their Fellowship year (24%), compared to 40% of all Fellows who published something following their Fellowship year. To this day, nearly half of all Fellows (48%) have publications to their name, including Pulitzer Prize–winning presidential historian, Doris Kearns Goodwin (Class of 1967).

Fellows who worked in academia after their Fellowship year are most likely to be published; nearly 70% of these Fellows have published something since their Fellowship year.

International Experience

Fellows reported a wide variety of international experiences; 58% have lived some part of their lives outside the United States (including deployment), and 54% can speak a language other than English. The most common other languages spoken by Fellows are French (30%), Spanish (29%), and German (15%).
Career Changes

The White House Fellowship provides a chance for Fellows to explore a new career direction, and Fellows often transition to the public sector following their time at the White House. Two out of five Fellows changed career direction following their Fellowship year (40%). Business and government were the most popular post-Fellowship professions among Fellows who changed career direction, drawing 53% and 49% of these Fellows, respectively. Notable Fellows in business include former chairman and CEO of CNN, Tom Johnson (Class of 1965), and former chairman and CEO of Levi Strauss and Company, Robert D. Haas (Class of 1968).

All Fellows who were in media and nonprofit before their Fellowship year were least likely to return to their former profession afterwards. These Fellows were also most likely to enter government instead; 44% of Fellows in media and 37% of Fellows in nonprofit changed to government following their Fellowship year. Fellows who were in business, law, and medicine before their Fellowship year were most likely to continue in their original career direction; nearly 80% of these Fellows returned to their professions afterwards. A much higher percentage of female Fellows changed career direction after their Fellowship year (54%) than did male Fellows (36%).

Top Countries Where White House Fellows Have Lived*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>White House Fellows (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*List excludes the United States but includes military deployment

Most Popular Professions Among All Fellows

(Many Fellows have had more than one profession)

- Academia: 34%
- Business: 43%
- Finance: 14%
- Government: 46%
- Law: 23%
- Media: 9%
- Medicine: 8%
- Military: 37%
- Nonprofit: 16%

President Clinton meets with Fellows from the Class of 1997. Photo courtesy of the William J. Clinton Presidential Library.
CHARACTERISTICS OF FELLOWS

Gender

As with many other elite programs, a majority of all White House Fellows are men (76%). A number of prominent Fellows, however, have been women, such as former Immigration and Naturalization Service Commissioner Doris Meissner (Class of 1973).

Fellows selected in the first few years of the program were overwhelmingly male. Much to Lady Bird Johnson's disappointment, there was not one woman among the first White House Fellows, in 1965. One notable woman who did not make the Fellowship that year was Mary Elizabeth Hanford (Elizabeth Dole). Although she was cut in the final round of interviews, this certainly did not hinder her from achieving political success later in life. Hanford would become secretary of transportation under President Reagan, secretary of labor under President G. W. Bush, and eventually a U.S. senator from North Carolina. Fortunately, no other Fellowship class would have such a stark absence of gender diversity; Jane Cahill Pfeiffer would step into the White House as the first female Fellow in 1966.

Although the makeup of each class has certainly improved in terms of gender balance since President Johnson’s first year, there has not been a consistent rise in female representation among Fellows over time.

A higher percentage of female Fellows are appointed during Democratic administrations than Republican administrations.

Nearly 30% of classes during Democratic administrations have been female, compared to 21% during Republican administrations. The proportion of women in each class reached its peak during the Carter and Clinton administrations, when 35% of Fellows were female.

Predictably, women were least represented during the administrations of Johnson and Nixon, which was an era when women were just beginning to join the nation’s higher circles (9% and 11%, respectively). A more recent low occurred during President G. Bush’s administration in the late 1980s and early 1990s, when female representation fell to 20%. Over the past eight years, roughly 25% of the cohorts have been made up of women.

Being a female member of a minority race can create additional barriers that women
must overcome to achieve success. However, it is interesting to see that 34% of all females in the program over the years have been of a minority race or ethnicity, compared to only 24% of all males. In fact, one of the most notable White House Fellow alumni is Elaine Chao (Class of 1983), a Taiwanese American woman from Long Island, New York, who served as secretary of labor from 2001 until 2009.

Race

There has been significant variation in racial diversity across different administrations, from the inaugural class of Fellows, which included just one nonwhite Fellow, to classes in which nonwhite Fellows were the majority. Nonwhite Fellows typically make up more of a class during Democratic presidencies than Republican presidencies. Thirty percent of all Fellows appointed during Democratic presidencies were nonwhite, compared to 24% during Republican presidencies.

The classes during the administrations of Presidents Johnson, Ford, and Reagan had the least racial diversity, with minority Fellows making up less than 20% of these classes.

On the other hand, minority races and ethnicities were overrepresented and whites were underrepresented during the administrations of Presidents Clinton (41%), G. W. Bush (37%), and Carter (33%). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, whites made up 75% of the American population in 2000, but whites made up only 59% of the Fellows during the Clinton administration (1993–2001) and 63% of the Fellows during the G. W. Bush administration.
(2001–2009). The percentage of whites in the national population in 1980, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, was 80%, which is 13 percentage points more than the percentage of white Fellows during Carter’s administration (1977–1981).

Age

Unlike race and gender, the age of all Fellows follows a clear trend over time: the age of Fellows at the start of their Fellowship year is gradually increasing. During the Johnson administration, the average age of incoming Fellows was 29.6. Over the past eight years, the average age has been 34. Though the program is intended for Americans who are early in their careers—President Johnson summoned college leaders to the White House when announcing the program in 1964—careers are now beginning later in life. Also, an age restriction existed in the early years of the Fellowship, requiring that applicants be ages 23–35, though this limit was soon abolished over concerns about age discrimination.

During President Johnson’s administration, a clear majority of all Fellows were age 26–30 (51%). By the time of President Reagan’s administration in the 1980s, Fellows between those ages had fallen to only 33%, and with the most recent Bush administration, the figure had dropped to 15% (2001–2009). In fact, during G. W. Bush’s presidency, nearly all Fellows (86%) were over age 30, and nearly 40% were age 36 or older at the beginning of their Fellowship year. Moreover, since 1981, there have been only two White House Fellows who were 25 or younger at the start of their Fellowship: Kimberly R. Cornett of the Class of 1996 and David A. Neuman of the Class of 1983.
Neuman, at age 22, was the youngest person to ever become a White House Fellow. He was still an undergraduate student at UCLA in the process of earning a bachelor’s degree when he decided to try for the Fellowship. In his teen years, Neuman had been a television aficionado who dreamed more of entertainment than higher education, admitting in an interview to Broadcasting and Cable reporter John M. Higgins, “I was much more interested in getting into the entertainment business than going to college.” After the Fellowship, Neuman fulfilled his dreams of working in television, holding positions as an executive at NBC, as a division president at Disney, and later as the chief programming officer at CNN.

In contrast, the two most recent administrations of Clinton and Bush saw the highest percentages of Fellows over 36 years of age: 27% and 38%, respectively. The oldest two Fellows, both 44 at the start of their Fellowships, were New York City Fire Lieutenant Brenda G. Berkman (Class of 1996) and businessman Steven L. Poizner (Class of 2001).

**Hometown**

Fellows have come from all over the country, though the Northeast boasts significantly more Fellows than any other region, and the South has been the least represented. Prior to their Fellowship experience, 40% of all Fellows were living in the Northeast, 22% in the West, 19% in the Midwest, and 17% in the South.

A full 74% of all Fellows had lived in an urban area (as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau) prior to their Fellowship year (residency for college didn’t count). The rural 25% of Fellows (who did not come from an urban area) are significantly less likely than their urban counterparts to have attended an Ivy League university, both for undergraduate and/or graduate study. However, rural Fellows are significantly more likely to have attended a military academy as an undergraduate.

Rural Fellows are also statistically more likely to have served in the military at some point. In fact, 56% of all rural Fellows served, compared to 31% of all urban Fellows. According to a 2006 report by the Heritage Foundation, this fits with overall trends of overrepresentation of rural Americans in the armed forces.

---

Military Background

There has been a consistent military presence among White House Fellows; 37% of all Fellows have served in the military at some point in time. A higher percentage of military Fellows—that is Fellows who are active duty or are veterans—were appointed during Republican administrations (41%) than Democratic presidencies (30%). The percentage of military Fellows was highest during the years of the Nixon White House (48%), followed by the presidencies of G.W. Bush and Johnson (46%). Classes during the Carter and Clinton administrations had the lowest percentage of military Fellows (24% and 26%, respectively).

Also interesting to note is that military Fellows make up a higher percentage of classes during war years. War years are defined as those during which the United States is engaged in a declared military conflict: 1965–1973 (Vietnam War), 1990–1991 (Gulf War) and 2001–2008 (wars in Afghanistan and Iraq). Forty-five percent of all Fellows in war year classes were military Fellows, compared to 31% during nonwar years.

Among the four major military branches, military Fellows have served in the Army (40%) and least common for them to have served in the marines (7%).

It is more common for white and African American Fellows to have served in the military than Asian American and Hispanic Fellows. Nearly 40% of all white and African American Fellows have served in the military compared to 33% of all Hispanic Fellows and 21% of all Asian American Fellows.

Education

The President’s Commission on White House Fellowships, which selects the Fellows each year, tries to ignore demographic
characteristics—that is, the candidate’s race, gender, and similar characteristics—in favor of an applicant’s accomplishments. Dana Mead (Class of 1970), a former Fellow who served as a presidential commissioner for 25 years, has said that the commissioners “never discussed how many African American candidates we had, or how many women, or military personnel or lawyers we had or what geography was represented.” Roger Porter (Class of 1974), another former Fellow and commissioner, similarly expressed how the commissioners “never took into consideration people’s demographics, and inevitably, we ended up with a very diverse class.”

Given that commissioners do not actively seek demographic diversity when putting together a class, it is interesting to note particular differences among white, African American, Asian American, and Hispanic Fellows, especially in terms of educational honors and accomplishments.

Among our respondents, Fellows who are white or Asian American are more likely than Fellows who are African American or Hispanic to have gone to an Ivy League university, graduated with honors, been a member of Phi Beta Kappa, or received the Rhodes scholarship. However, more African American Fellows have gone to a selective military academy than have Fellows of other racial or ethnic groups. Most Fellows regardless of race or ethnicity held at least one leadership position during college.

Roughly one out of four of all Asian American Fellows (26%) graduated from an Ivy League school, compared to 20% of all Fellows who are white, 13% of all Hispanic Fellows, and 6% of African American Fellows.

Almost one out of four of all African American Fellows (23%) attended a military academy, compared to 19% of all whites, 15% of all Hispanics, and 5% of all Asian Americans.

---
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Nearly half (49%) of all Fellows of Asian descent graduated with honors, compared with 41% of all white Fellows, 30% of all African American Fellows and 34% of all Hispanic Fellows. Asian American Fellows are also more likely than other Fellows to have been selected for prestigious fellowships (outside of the Rhodes scholarship), with approximately one-third receiving such a fellowship for postundergraduate education.

**Political Affiliation**

The White House Fellowship program is expressly nonpartisan, and Fellows are not asked to disclose their party affiliation at any point during the selection process. As a whole, however, Fellows tend to lean to the political left, though this differs according to certain demographic factors:

- Roughly 80% of Fellows identified with a major political party during their Fellowship year, though Democrats slightly outnumbered Republicans (by 6%).
- Fellows who have served in the military are far less likely to be Democrats. According to survey results, only 23% of military Fellows identified themselves as a Democrat at the time of their Fellowship year, compared to 55% of nonmilitary Fellows.
- Male Fellows, white Fellows, and Fellows who have served in the military have higher percentages of Republicans than do other groups of Fellows (43%, 45%, and 44%, respectively).
- Significant majorities of females, African Americans, and Asian Americans identified themselves as Democrats at the time of their Fellowship year. Asian Americans are more likely than any other group to self-identify as democrat (77%), though African Americans and females are close behind (71%).
- While a majority of Hispanic Fellows are left-leaning, Hispanic Fellows have a higher percentage of Republicans than does any other minority group of Fellows, 20% of them identifying as right-leaning. This is more than twice the percentage of Asian American, and five times the percentage of African American Fellows who identified as Republican.

**Motivations for Applying**

To be even considered for the White House Fellowship, one must fill out what one Fellow has called “the mother of all application forms.” In addition to having three to five letters of recommendation and providing basic administrative data such as birth date and address, there is a writing-intensive portion of the application consisting of 10 narrative questions. These include a summary of community involvements over the past decade, a 500-word memo in which the applicant must describe and defend a policy proposal to the president, and a 300-word description of one’s life’s ambition.

Of course, the application is only the first step toward
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attaining the Fellowship. One hundred applicants are then chosen to interview in front of a distinguished panel at regional finals. Approximately 30 advance to national finals, where they are reviewed by a Commission of outstanding individuals who have been hand-selected by the president. President Clinton, for instance, chose to include Olympic gold medalist Edwin Moses and astronaut Sally Ride in his Commission in 1993, remarking that “This Commission is comprised of some of the brightest, most talented and most accomplished people in the country.”

With such a daunting application process required for mere consideration, what originally drove respondents to apply for the White House Fellowship? Former Fellows were asked to identify their motivation(s) for applying to the program among the following four options:

1. Someone you knew encouraged you to apply
2. The opportunity to work closely with a senior leader in government
3. The quality of people who have been Fellows in years past
4. The opportunity to develop as a person and a leader

For most Fellows, external encouragement is a driving force. Sixty-two percent of respondents identified the influence of someone else as their initial motivation for applying. This answer was especially common among African Americans and women. Among all the groups, African American Fellows were most likely to identify another person as providing the initial drive, with 76% of them choosing this answer. A significant majority of women (74%) also chose this answer, compared to 59% of men.

Nearly half (47%) of respondents who were encouraged by someone to apply received that encouragement from a former Fellow. This suggests that many applicants were already familiar through at least one personal connection with the White House Fellowship. Among Fellows who identified someone else as their initial motivation, roughly half of Asian American and white Fellows were motivated by a former Fellow (46% and 50%, respectively), compared to roughly 36% of African Americans and Hispanics.

Another common motivation was the opportunity to develop as a person and a leader (59%). A significant majority of Asian American Fellows were driven by personal development (77%), and all nine female Asian American respondents chose this answer.

**Personal Connections**

Having contact with a high-ranking member of government can be helpful when you want to get things done. How connected were Fellows before they began the program? A majority of respondents (60%) had conversed with a high-ranking federal government official even before they applied. But this varies by some interesting measures:

- Sixty-two percent of men had contact with a high-ranking government official before they began the White House Fellowship, compared to 51% of women.
- According to our results, the military may facilitate access to top political leaders. Nearly 70% of Fellows who have been in the military had contact with a high-ranking government official prior to their Fellowship year, compared to 54% of nonmilitary Fellows. This may explain the discrepancy of governmental access between men and women, given that 92% of all military Fellows are men.
- It was especially common for Asian American respondents to have had governmental access before their Fellowship. Eighty-one percent of Asian American Fellows had conversed with a high-ranking government official prior to applying, compared to 50-60% for other races and ethnicities.
According to the program’s mission statement, the White House Fellowship experience is designed to give Fellows “a sense of personal involvement in the leadership of society, a vision of greatness for the society, and a sense of responsibility for bringing that greatness to reality.” Given such lofty goals, how do Fellows perceive the program and its impact on their lives?

For nearly 30% of Fellows, traveling was the most memorable experience of the Fellowship year. As part of the educational program, Fellows take part in trips both domestically and overseas to witness policy in action. For David L. Bere (Class of 1983), the most memorable experience of the Fellowship year was a class trip to the Middle East: “Meeting the leaders and understanding the issue was a profound experience.” Seeing an issue up close was also significant for Barbara L. Anderson (Class of 1973), who considers her class’s trip to Africa the year’s most memorable experience, because she saw firsthand the effects of apartheid. Class trips also bring Fellows close together through shared experiences. Rodney Bullard (Class of 2005) considers his class’s international trip the most memorable, because it “solidified the relationships I keep to this day.” Many other Fellows share this sentiment.

Leadership Development

A strong majority of Fellows (69%) feel that the White House Fellowship has been “very important” to their development as a leader, and nearly all Fellows feel that the program has been at least “somewhat important” to their development as a leader (96%).

Clearly, the White House Fellowship provides a pivotal opportunity for leadership development. To supplement these survey responses, we employed advanced statistical analyses to inquire as to how a Fellow’s personal characteristics and experiences most significantly shaped his or her perspective toward the program.

1 www.whitehouse.gov/about/fellows/
The results show that positive, lasting personal connections that emerge from the Fellowship are an important determinant of how the program shapes a Fellow’s path of personal and professional growth. Specifically, close relationships with a principal and through the White House Fellows Foundation and Association greatly increase the odds of viewing the Fellowship as “very important” to one’s own leadership development.

The Fellowship clearly holds benefits for professional advancement, but these analyses also suggest that Fellows who integrate the lessons and relationships from their Fellowship year on a personal level are significantly more likely to view the program as foundational to their development as a leader. For example, Fellows who related to their principal like a “parent,” “mentor,” or “friend” (as opposed to a “supervisor” or “distant uncle”) are 2.7 times more likely to rate the Fellowship as very important to their development, and Fellows indicating that connections made through the Foundation and Association had helped them or their families in some way are 3.1 times more likely to regard the Fellowship as formative.

Not only do interpersonal connections influence how Fellows perceive their Fellowship year; learning one’s own values and styles of management and problem-solving bear significantly on one’s leadership development as well. Fellows who view the Fellowship year as an important time for self-reflection and evaluation are 2.6 times more likely to consider the Fellowship as a vital part of their growth as leaders, compared to those who do not, even after controlling for demographic variation. Interestingly, the top-rated aspect of the Fellowship year—taking advantage of all the educational opportunities available to Fellows—is not significantly related to leadership development, despite the fact that more than half of all Fellows rated the education component of the Fellowship as critical to a successful Fellowship experience. This suggests that educational opportunities from the Fellowship are most effective when they are part of a larger process of self-examination and personal development during the course of the Fellowship year. (For the complete results of these statistical analyses, please see Table 2 in appendix B.)

What Constitutes a “Successful” Fellowship

Majorities of Fellows consider the following aspects critical for a successful Fellowship year: gaining a strong understanding of the executive branch (76%), taking advantage of the educational opportunities (77%), and learning about oneself and one’s leadership style (60%). Fellows are least concerned with having a big impact on the agency or place where they are assigned; only 9% of Fellows see that as critical for a successful Fellowship year.

Career Mobility

In addition to leadership development, the program provides Fellows with a degree of career mobility: quite a few Fellows are able to work in an area directly related to their Fellowship assignment after their time at the White House, even if they had little or no experience in that area before their Fellowship. For example, a Fellow who entered the program as a public school teacher may be assigned to work at the Office of Management and Budget. Following the program, the Fellow may pursue a career in business instead of returning to the classroom. These sorts of transitions occurred frequently.

### Aspects Considered Critical for a Successful Fellowship Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking advantage of all the educational opportunities available to Fellows</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining a strong understanding of the executive branch at the highest level of government</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning a great deal about yourself and your personal leadership style</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a close relationship with your principal</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastering a skill or domain of knowledge over the year that you didn’t have</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being substantially involved in big decisions</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a big impact on the agency/place you were assigned</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Roughly one-third of Fellows without prior experience in the sector they served in during their Fellowship year later went on to work in a related field after their Fellowship. In this context, sector refers to the area of government that Fellows were assigned to during their Fellowship. The three most popular sectors that Fellows were assigned to were the Departments of Defense, State, and Treasury. Nearly all respondents (88%) who did have experience in the sector they were assigned to as a Fellow (such as a medical doctor serving in the Department of Health and Human Services) continued to work in a related field after their Fellowship year.

In particular, many Fellows transition into government after their Fellowship year without having prior governmental experience. According to program guidelines, federal civil servants are not allowed to apply, although the program does draw applicants who work in state and local governments as well as those on active-duty military service. Given the diverse background of applicants, does the program fulfill its goals of enlisting capable people for a lifetime of public service and civic leadership? Indeed, government (not including military duty) is one of the most popular areas of work for Fellows after their Fellowship year.

The percentage of all Fellows in government rose from 22% before their Fellowship year to 38% following their Fellowship year. Since the Fellowship requires that applicants not currently hold a federal government position, the 22% of Fellows with prior government experience commonly got their experience at a local or state level. Oftentimes these Fellows worked in the offices of an elected official, such as a mayor or state representative.

Roughly one-third of all Fellows (31%) who had not worked in government prior to their Fellowship year have since worked in government, and roughly two-thirds of all Fellows (63%) who had worked in government prior to their Fellowship year returned to that line of work afterwards.

Given that one of the aims of the White House Fellowship is to develop leaders who would serve their communities and country, we wondered what characteristics of one’s Fellowship experience would predict whether or not a Fellow has served in government (at the local, state, or federal level) at some point since their Fellowship year. For example, would the relationship a Fellow makes with his or her principal or with other Fellows be more influential in determining if a Fellow would later serve in government?

Using advanced statistical techniques that allow us to control for variables such as pre-Fellowship government experience and current age (since older alumni Fellows have had more time to work in government),

---
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we find that receiving some form of assistance (including career help) from one’s principal is a very significant predictor for serving in government. For example, a Fellow who received career assistance from his or her principal is 2.6 times more likely to have served in government than is one who did not, presumably because the principal’s experience in the executive branch builds connections that can be useful for a Fellow, even years after the Fellowship experience.

In addition, Fellows who reported changing career paths after the Fellowship or that they made professional contacts during the Fellowship that advanced their career are also significantly more likely (74% and 92%, respectively) to have worked in government after their Fellowship year. This means that among Fellows who do not return to the profession they had before the Fellowship, many go into government. Of course, this makes sense, but it is interesting to see how much certain elements of the Fellowship experience draw new leaders into government.

Just as positive Fellowship experiences serve as a good predictor for working in the public sector, negative experiences decrease the chances of a Fellow later working in government. We found that Fellows who had a conflict with the Fellowship director were 70% less likely to later serve in government. This relationship with the director is uniquely important, because conflict with one’s principal or another Fellow had no significant relationship to post-Fellowship government experience. (For the complete results of these statistical analyses, please see Table 3 in appendix B.)

Politics and the Fellowship

The White House Fellowship is, as explained earlier, explicitly nonpartisan. During the early years of each new administration, however, people who voted for the new president and his party apply to the Fellowship in large numbers. For them, the Fellowship is a chance to join an administration that they supported during the campaign. The applicant pool, therefore, is influenced by politics even before the first cut is made in the selection process. Also, final selection of Fellows is conducted by a group of commissioners who serve at the pleasure of the president. Hence, even on Commissions with remarkable balance, party politics invariably seeps in. Among the Fellows surveyed, nearly one in five (19%) say that the White House Fellows program is actually partisan.

In fact, every President’s Commission on White House Fellows has selected more Fellows belonging to the political party of the sitting president than Fellows who are independent or who belong to another party.

Political representation was most imbalanced during the presidencies of Carter, Clinton, and Reagan. Under Carter and Clinton, roughly 70% of Fellows were Democrats, and less than 20% were Republicans. Among Fellows who served in those two administrations, close to 40% now consider themselves “strong Democrats,” and less than 5% consider themselves “strong Republicans.”
On the other hand, during Reagan’s administration, two out of three Fellows were Republican, and 18% of Fellows were Democrat. One-fifth of Fellows during the Reagan White House now consider themselves “strong Republicans” (20%), compared to less than one-tenth who consider themselves “strong Democrats” (6%).

Even though most Fellows selected during the administrations of Carter, Clinton, and Reagan belonged to the political party of the sitting president, practically none of the Fellows who were Republicans during Clinton’s or Carter’s administrations or Democrats under Reagan’s administration felt that the program was partisan.

Classes during the administrations of G. W. Bush and Ford were the most politically balanced. Though the President’s Commission did select more Republicans than Democrats during both of these administrations, the gap was smaller by comparison. There were only 2% more Republicans than Democrats during G. W. Bush’s administration, and 6% more during Ford’s. In fact, more Fellows who served under Presidents G. W. Bush and Ford now consider themselves to be “strong Democrats” (11% and 15%, respectively) than “strong Republicans” (6% and 10%, respectively).

**Fellows as Campaigners**

A slight majority of Fellows (54%) have actively campaigned for a presidential candidate in a presidential election. Fellows who identify as Democrat, Fellows who have not served in the military, and Fellows who are relatively young at the start of their Fellowship year tend to be the most active in presidential campaigns:

A strong majority of Democrat Fellows (70%) have actively campaigned for a presidential candidate during an election period, compared to 57% of Republican Fellows and 33% of independent Fellows.

Sixty-five percent of Fellows who were under age 30 at the time of their Fellowship year have actively campaigned for a presidential candidate during an election period, compared to roughly half (49%) of Fellows who were over 30 at the start of their Fellowship.


RELATIONSHIPS AND CONNECTIONS

Relationships with Their Principals

Most Fellows describe their principal as a mentor—someone who can provide guidance and tutelage during their year at the White House. This guidance builds connections between the Fellow and the program—ties that can last for a long time.

Not surprisingly, Fellows who perceive their principal as a mentor are most likely to stay in contact with him or her after the Fellowship year. Nearly three in four Fellows who call their principal a mentor have had subsequent contact with him or her since the Fellowship. Majorities of Fellows who describe their principal as relating more like a “supervisor” or a “distant uncle” (69% and 84%, respectively) have not had subsequent contact with their principal since their time as a Fellow.

There are some intriguing variations regarding principal-Fellow relationships. Out of the 10 most popular Fellowship assignments, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Department of Transportation employed Fellows who were most likely to regard their principal as a mentor. A majority of Fellows assigned to these departments (65% and 61%, respectively) hold that perspective. Fellows who served in the Office of the Vice President and the Department of Defense during their Fellowship year are least likely to regard their principal as a mentor (only 28% and 32%, respectively).

About one fifth of Fellows (21%) view their principal in a strictly professional light, describing him or her as a supervisor. Less than a quarter of Fellows view their principal as a distant relative, indicating that most Fellows had sufficient interaction with their principal to develop some form of relationship. Fellows who served in the Department of Defense are the exception; a majority of them (64%) perceived their principal as a “distant uncle.”

Fellows hardly ever view the relationship with their principal as being like a friend (5%) or parent (2%).

Relationships with Their Cohort

Though the Fellowship lasts only a year, strong relationships and connections are developed over that time. Having shared the Fellowship experience, nearly all Fellows (91%) regard other Fellows as friends rather than professional acquaintances. Brian Alexander (Class of 2008) talks about how he and the other Fellows would sit down for coffee after their one-hour speaker sessions and share perspectives, remarking, “We’ve become very close.”
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Conflict is relatively uncommon among Fellow cohorts; most Fellows (86%) do not recall having a major conflict with another Fellow during their time at the White House.

After the completion of their Fellowship year, nearly all Fellows (95%) stay in touch with other Fellows in their class. Roughly 70% of Fellows estimate that they have maintained contact with at least one-quarter of their classmates, and 50% with at least half of their class.

Considering that Fellows are able to maintain such strong connections, we wanted to examine what class characteristics would increase the number of Fellows who keep in contact after their year together as classmates.

Using advanced statistical analyses that allowed us to control for standard demographic variables (gender, race, age) and military experience (supposing that the common experience of being military Fellows may make them naturally more cohesive), we tested how the percentage of Fellows with various characteristics impacted their Fellowship experience. Several interesting results emerged. An increase in the percentage of nonwhite Fellows and of Fellows who hail from outside the Northeast in a given class significantly increases the chances of Fellows staying in touch with more of their classmates. On the other hand, gender makeup or the number of strong partisans in a class had no effect worth reporting.

Additional class characteristics were examined. One interesting finding is that classes who served when a Democrat was in the White House are much more likely to keep in touch. On the other hand, classes that are the first to be chosen by a new presidential administration—such as the Classes of 1969, 1977, 1981, 1989, 1993 and 2001—whether Republican or Democrat, are much less likely to keep in touch. Clearly, there are other institutional forces at work when Fellows come to the White House, and these results point to some of the lasting effects of such administration factors.

Not surprisingly, negative experiences with other Fellows decreases the odds of a Fellow staying in touch with his or her classmates. If a Fellow experienced a conflict with another Fellow or felt that another Fellow in his or her class had a big ego, that Fellow is significantly less likely to stay in touch with other classmates. (For the complete results of these statistical analyses, see Table 4 in appendix B).

In addition to developing relationships with classmates, many White House Fellows take advantage of a broader network of Fellows through the program’s alumni group, the White House Fellows Foundation and Association. This group keeps a majority of Fellows (65%) connected at least “somewhat” to other Fellows and nearly one quarter of Fellows (23%) connected “a great deal” to other Fellows.

Such level of connection for a program that lasts only one year is remarkable when compared to people’s ties to their colleges or universities, which are forged over four or more years. For example, according to the Voluntary Support of Education Survey (conducted by the Council for Aid to Education), the national average for annual alumni giving to educational institutions—which is regarded as the “gold standard” for alumni loyalty—is 13.6%. Indeed, the White House Fellowship elicits a greater degree of commitment among Fellows, which is even more remarkable considering the number of institutional ties they develop over the course of their lives.
Several questions interested us about the connections maintained through the White House Fellows Foundation and Association. Do Fellows’ experiences with their own cohort affect whether or not they develop more connections through the program’s alumni network, and do certain types of Fellows gravitate toward alumni connections?

Not surprisingly, multivariate analyses show that Fellows who benefited from contacts gained and relationships formed during their Fellowship year tended to be more likely to participate in the White House Fellows Foundation and Association, after controlling for continued contact with Fellows from their own class. Similarly, those who characterized the Fellowship as “very important” to their development as a leader are 2.5 times more likely to be active in its alumni network and its activities than are those who did not see the program in this way. On the other hand, Fellows who changed career paths following their Fellowship year are 52% less likely to be highly involved in alumni association activities than are Fellows who returned to their pre-Fellowship profession.

Besides the Fellowship experience itself, our results illustrate that personal attitudes and activities influence the likelihood of significant involvement in the alumni network. Those Fellows who volunteer more often and who tend to be more trusting of others are significantly more likely (31% and 43%, respectively) to be highly involved in alumni association activity. Interestingly, our results showed a significantly positive relationship between Fellows completing their Fellowship in a transition year—the year during which a new president enters the Oval Office—and the likelihood of high involvement in alumni activities. This result points to the importance of the administration of the Fellowship and how an administration may influence Fellows’ attitudes and actions during its inaugural year in ways not repeated for subsequent classes. It may also be the case that years of presidential transitions forge deeper bonds of loyalty among these Fellows than those of other classes and that, in turn, affects a Fellow’s level of commitment to the program as an alumnus. (For the complete results of these statistical analyses, please see Table 5 in appendix B.)

### The Strength of Fellowship Ties

Connections forged during the Fellowship experience can lead to opportunities beyond the White House, for both a Fellow’s career and personal life.

A majority of Fellows (61%) say that they have advanced in their career as a result of whom they met during their Fellowship year.

Thirteen percent of Fellows have received job-placement assistance from their principal, and nearly 20% have met someone important to their career development through their principal or been recommended for an honor or award by their principal.

A principal’s assistance can also extend beyond career-related matters; roughly one-third of all Fellows have gotten advice from their principal regarding an important life decision.

### Developing Diverse Connections

Even though the President’s Commission on White House Fellowships has no quota system in place when selecting Fellows, they end up drawing together a varied group. And Fellows have expressed appreciation for the different perspectives that emerge as these diverse classes interact. Dan Fletcher (Class of 2008) says that the most intellectually satisfying aspect of being a Fellow is having his thinking analyzed and challenged: “I just love the diversity of opinions here.”

Given that Fellows are exposed to talented people from various professional backgrounds, including leaders in military, business, finance, and law, we wondered whether this exposure would affect how Fellows perceived the institutions that their classmates worked in. For example, does a Fellow with a background in finance view medicine differently after being in a class with a doctor, or does a lawyer’s opinion of business change after working with another Fellow who has been a business leader? After looking through several professions, we found interesting results regarding Fellows’ attitudes toward the military and its leaders.

Using advanced statistical techniques, we examined the effects on Fellows without any military experience (nonmilitary Fellows) of being in a class with...
a high percentage of military Fellows. The results were striking. In fact, even when accounting for standard demographic variation among Fellows and previous military exposure—both from being in the military and having a family member in the military—a Fellow’s odds of having a great deal of confidence in the military still increases by 18% for each additional military Fellow in his or her class.

For example, if a Fellow was a member of a class in which less than 10% of Fellows were from a military background, that individual has a 54% likelihood of expressing a great deal of confidence in the military. That same person, in a class where the military composition was between 60 and 69 percent (as has been the case five times in the program’s history), would have an 81% likelihood of expressing the same level of confidence. This means that nonmilitary Fellows from classes with higher representations of military Fellows tend to look more favorably upon the military itself—even though they have no personal experience with the institution directly. (For the complete results of these statistical analyses, please see Table 6 in appendix B.)

The results are also remarkable because the analyses show significant effects both for recent Fellows as well as those who completed their Fellowship decades ago. In other words, a Fellow’s contact with a classmate in the military has an effect for the rest of a Fellow’s life. Indeed the type of personal connections forged during the course of a Fellowship year can be formative to Fellows’ viewpoints of various institutions in society for the rest of their lives.

### Nonmilitary Fellows with Confidence in Military

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of military Fellows in Class</th>
<th>Percentage of nonmilitary Fellows with a &quot;great deal of confidence&quot; in the military</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President Bush speaks with Fellows from the Class of 1991. Photo courtesy of the George Bush Presidential Library.
**Fellows’ Personal Lives**

**Marital Status**

Using 2000 statistics from the U.S. Census Bureau, our findings indicate that White House Fellows are significantly more likely to be married and less likely to be divorced than are the general population.

Most White House Fellows (81%) are currently married, compared to 65% of the general population ages 30 and up, according to the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau (ages of Fellows surveyed range from 30 to 79).

Six percent of White House Fellows are currently divorced or separated, compared to 15% of the general population ages 30 and up.

Fellows not only get married, they stay married. Eighty-one percent of currently married Fellows are married to the same person as during their Fellowship year.

Though majorities of both male and female Fellows are married, far more of the men are married than the women. Currently, 62% of these women are married, compared to 86% of the men. Among the Fellows who are currently married, less than half of women (46%) were married at the time of their Fellowship year, compared to 83% of men. However, according to data from the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau, women generally marry at a younger age than men. Given that men and women are of the same average age at the start of their Fellowship year (32 years), one would not automatically expect fewer married women than men. Hence, we conclude that the Fellowship draws women who are different from the average American woman. Female Fellows tend to marry later or not at all.

Among respondents, 23% of females are single and have never been married, compared to only 5% of males. On a national level, however, there are more never-married men (13%) than women (10%).

**Relationship Success and Hardship**

Although slightly less than half of currently married female Fellows were married at the time of their Fellowship (46%), those women who were married experienced fewer relationship troubles than did their male counterparts during their Fellowship year. They also feel more successful at balancing work and family life than do male married Fellows.

Sixty-five percent of women who were married during their Fellowship year report feeling “very successful” or “completely successful” at balancing work.
and family life, compared to less than half of women who married after their Fellowship year (49%). Half of married men, regardless of whether they were married during or after their Fellowship, feel “very” or “completely successful” at balancing work and family life.

Work Life and Family Life

As a whole, Fellows feel a good deal of success in their work life. A majority (64%) of Fellows report feeling very successful in this sphere, compared to only 37% of the general population, based on data from the 2008 General Social Survey.

Most Fellows say that they succeed at balancing work and family commitments. Roughly half report feeling “somewhat successful,” and roughly 40% report feeling “very successful” at this.

Fellows who are single and have never been married tend to feel the least successful at balancing work and family: only 28% feel “completely” or “very successful” at this, compared to half of all Fellows who are married or who live in a marriage–like relationship.

Asian American Fellows are least likely to feel a great deal of success in balancing their career and family compared to other groups. Only 31% of Asian American Fellows feel very or completely successful at this.

African American Fellows are most likely to report success: a majority of African American Fellows (52%) answered that they feel very or completely successful.

---

**Success Balancing Work and Family Among Married Fellows**

How successful do you feel balancing work and family life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Not very successful</th>
<th>Somewhat successful</th>
<th>Completely successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males married during Fellowship</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females married during Fellowship</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males married after Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females married after Fellowship</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Success Balancing Work and Family**

How successful do you feel balancing work life and family life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White House Fellows</th>
<th>General Social Survey*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all successful</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very successful</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat successful</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very successful</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely successful</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on 1972–2008 cumulative dataset

---

**Success in Work Life**

How successful do you feel in your work life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White House Fellows</th>
<th>General Social Survey*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all successful</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very successful</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat successful</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very successful</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely successful</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*based on 1972–2008 cumulative dataset
There are also interesting findings about feeling successful at work. White and Asian American Fellows have the most positive perception when it comes to success in work life. A strong majority of white and Asian American Fellows (79% and 77%, respectively) feel very or completely successful in their work life, compared to 70% of Hispanic and 66% of African American Fellows.

Eighty-two percent of Fellows who have served in the military feel very or completely successful in their work life, compared to 73% of nonmilitary Fellows. However, only 41% of military Fellows feel very or completely successful in balancing work and family life, compared to 49% of nonmilitary Fellows.

### Life Priorities

Career and politics rank higher in the lives of Fellows than they do among the general population (based on the 1972–2008 General Social Survey):

A majority of Fellows (64%) say that career and work is “very important” to them, compared to only 45% of the general population.

Roughly one-third of Fellows consider politics and public life “very important” (30%), compared to only 11% of the general population.

On the other hand, the general population attributes more importance to free time and relaxation and to religion and church than Fellows do.

Roughly half of the general population considers religion and church or free time and relaxation “very important,” compared to one-third of White House Fellows.

Although only 33% of Fellows consider religion and church “very important,” 72% of Fellows identify themselves as either Protestant or Catholic, and nearly all (91%) affiliate themselves with some religious tradition.

### Children

Among Fellows who have ever been married or been in a marriage-like relationship, males tend to have larger families. Female Fellows tend to have had between 0 and 2 children, whereas male Fellows tend to have had between 2 and 3.

Both male and female Fellows are less likely to stay at home for more than six months to care for children than are their spouses of...
respective genders. Whereas most male Fellows’ wives stayed home six months or more to care for their child (90%), less than one third of female Fellows have done the same (29%). Similarly, roughly 10% of female Fellows’ husbands have stayed home to take care of their child, compared to only 5% of male Fellows who report doing this.

This is not to say that Fellows care more about career than family; in fact, the opposite is true. While a majority of Fellows (64%) consider career and work “very important,” nearly every Fellow (98%) considers family and children “very important,” with no major differences between male and female respondents.
Viewpoints of Fellows

Confidence in American Institutions

The White House Fellowship is meant to prepare Fellows to become leaders in their respective fields. How do Fellows feel about major institutions in America and the directions they are taking?

The percentage of Fellows with a “great deal of confidence” in the leadership of the U.S. Supreme Court, medicine, the military, and the scientific community is more than 10 percentage points higher than that of the general population (17, 16, 14 and 17 percentage points higher, respectively).

Fellows are less likely to have a “great deal of confidence” in education compared to the general population, even though Fellows are among the most educated in the nation. Nearly all Fellows have a graduate degree (96%), and 36% have multiple graduate degrees.

It is interesting to note that only 14% of Fellows have a “great deal of confidence” in the leaders of the executive branch of the federal government, a percentage only slightly higher by 4% than that of the general population. Despite having had a firsthand experience of the executive branch through the White House Fellowship, Fellows tend to have lesser confidence in its leadership than the leadership of most other institutions listed in the survey.

Fellows are least likely to have a “great deal of confidence” in organized labor (2%), Congress (3%), and banks and financial institutions (6%).
Trust of Their Fellow Humans

Nearly four decades ago, a team of researchers at Columbia University surveyed 545 top American leaders in fields similar to those now occupied by White House Fellows. This survey was called the American Leadership Study and was conducted in 1971 and 1972. Given this study’s elite population, its results provide a helpful comparison for the attitudes expressed by White House Fellows today.

One measure asked on both surveys deals with trust. Roughly one out of five Fellows (21%) responded that he or she completely agrees with the statement “Most people can be trusted.” This figure is half the level of trust expressed by respondents to the American Leadership Study (45%). Clearly, America’s leaders express lower levels of trust today than they did four decades ago.

Fellows who are African American or Hispanic are more likely than Fellows who are Asian American or white to disagree with the statement that “Most people can be trusted.” Roughly 30% of African American Fellows and 20% of Hispanic Fellows responded that they “somewhat disagree” or “completely disagree” with the statement, compared to 4% of Asian American Fellows and 10% of white Fellows.

Executive Income

In light of the recent economic downturn, we wondered whether Fellows would endorse a top limit on executive incomes. Roughly 40% of Fellows have worked in business following their Fellowship year, presumably in a leadership position.

A cap on executive incomes would directly impact many of their salaries. For the 46% of all Fellows who have worked in government, however, limits on income are quite familiar. The President himself makes only $400,000 a year, and top White House staff members make under $200,000 annually. Do Fellows from different industries hold divergent opinions as to whether or not executive incomes should be limited?

Comparing White House Fellows’ opinions in 2008 to leaders in the 1970s who participated in the American Leadership Study, we see that White House Fellows today are significantly more likely to think that there should be a cap on executive incomes (37%) than were leaders in the earlier study (16%).

Half of all female Fellows believe there should be a cap on executive incomes, compared to a third of all male Fellows.

The percentage of nonwhite Fellows who believe that there should be a limit on executive incomes is 10 percentage points higher than white Fellows who believe that way.

Half of all Fellows who identify themselves as Democrat believe there should be a cap on executive incomes, compared to roughly 20% of Fellows who identify as Republican.

Over one-third of Fellows in business (34%) think that there should be a limit on executive incomes. Levels of support for capping executive incomes are even
higher among Fellows who work in medicine (57%), academia (46%), or government (37%).

As another point of comparison, in a 2009 Gallup Poll, 59% of Americans favored the federal government taking steps to limit executive pay. This suggests that, although leaders and the general public are more likely to favor capping executive pay today than compared to previous studies (such as the American Leadership Study), differences remain on this subject between this cohort of leaders and the general population.1

Ideas on Improving Society

The White House Fellowship hopes to create future leaders who are able to have a great impact on society. Many Fellows are at the helm of major institutions and have the potential for great influence. What do Fellows think is the best way to go about improving society?

The Ideological Scale Development (ISD) Study was conducted in 1976 by Herbert McClosky and Charles A. Bann, political scientists at the University of California, Berkeley. McClosky and Bann surveyed members of different political groups such as the Americans for Democratic Action and the American Conservative Union. We compared the views of Democratic and Republican Fellows with the results of the ISD study.

Fellows are significantly more likely than respondents in the ISD study to think that the best way to improve society is “to follow an overall program or theory.” Roughly half of Fellows who identify with either major political party chose this method.

1 Gallup Poll, June 13-14, 2009
to improve society, compared to only a third of liberals and 12% of conservatives among the population polled by the ISD study. A strong majority of conservatives polled by the ISD study (65%) responded that society would be best improved by allowing changes to develop naturally by themselves, whereas only 23% of Fellows who identify as Republican felt this way. In essence, leaders today favor following an overall program for society as opposed to simply responding to challenges and opportunities as they arise.

**Suspicion of People’s Motives**

Fellows are slightly less cynical about the selfishness of others than were the institutional leaders surveyed by the American Leadership Study. Nearly 70% of Fellows do not agree with the statement, “Most people are interested only in personal gain,” compared to 62% of institutional leaders in the 1970s.

**Respect for the Self-made Man**

When asked to what extent they agreed with the statement, “The self-made man is likely more ethical than the man born to wealth,” 18% of Fellows reported “somewhat,” and 4% reported “completely.” Higher percentages of Fellows who served in medicine, the military, or finance after their Fellowship year agree with the statement (36%, 32%, and 24%, respectively) than do Fellows from other industries. Only 17% of Fellows who served in academia or law agree with the statement.

Roughly a quarter of male Fellows (26%) agree with the statement, compared to only a tenth of female Fellows.

**Confidence in Political Representation**

A majority of Fellows (68%) agree to some extent with the statement, “My friends and I are well-represented in our political system,” although only 15% completely agree.

Fellows who are white were most likely to agree with the statement (71%), followed by Fellows of Asian descent (65%). Only about half of African American or Hispanic Fellows agree that they are well-represented in the political system.

---
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President Obama talks to Class of 2008 Fellows. Photo courtesy of the White House Photo Office.
## Top 20 Books Recently Read by Fellows

Nota: Each respondent mentioned up to two books he or she had recently read. Bar length corresponds to total number of mentions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team of Rivals</td>
<td>Doris Kearns Goodwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hot, Flat, and Crowded</td>
<td>Thomas L. Friedman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Audacity of Hope</td>
<td>Barack Obama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The War Within</td>
<td>Bob Woodward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>David McCullough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The World is Flat</td>
<td>Thomas L. Friedman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Black Swan</td>
<td>Nassim Nicholas Taleb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Kite Runner</td>
<td>Khaled Hosseini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Last Lecture</td>
<td>Randy Pausch and Jeffrey Zaslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Post-American World</td>
<td>Fareed Zakaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Snowball</td>
<td>Alice Schroeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dreams from My Father</td>
<td>Barack Obama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Good to Great</td>
<td>Jim Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Three Cups of Tea</td>
<td>Greg Mortenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Freakonomics</td>
<td>Steven D. Levitt and Stephen J. Dubner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>John Adams</td>
<td>David McCullough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Shack</td>
<td>William Paul Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The Holy Bible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Blink</td>
<td>Malcolm Gladwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Angels and Demons</td>
<td>Dan Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDITIONAL INTERESTING RESPONSES FROM FELLOWS

The top five responses are given for each survey question, which was open-ended.

Why do you feel you were chosen to be a White House Fellow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique background, unique field</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishments</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-service background</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance during interview process</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership background</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now think of your last day as a White House Fellow. If you could choose one word to describe your feeling that day, what would it be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grateful/Honored/Appreciative</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished/Confident/Satisfied</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward looking/Excited/Eager</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset/Sad/Sensing loss</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful/Nostalgic/Bittersweet</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Think back to your first day as a White House Fellow. If you could choose one word to describe what you were feeling that day, what would it be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excited/Eager/Interested</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbled/Awed</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grateful/Honored</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused/Disoriented</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious/Scared</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy/Elated</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What single accomplishment in life are you most proud of?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accomplishment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenting/Family life</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and family-life accomplishments</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military service</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The White House Fellowship</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOP FIVE PEOPLE MOST ADMIRE BY WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS

Up to three responses were allowed.

1. Abraham Lincoln
2. Barack Obama
3. Colin Powell
4. Ronald Reagan
5. Martin Luther King, Jr.
# APPENDIX A

## Survey Results

The following are the overall responses among White House Fellows to each of the 72 survey items. Percentages are calculated based on the total number of respondents for each item.

1. **What initially motivated you to apply for the White House Fellowship?**
   - Someone you knew encouraged you to apply: 62%
   - The opportunity to develop as a person and a leader: 59%
   - The opportunity to work closely with a senior leader in government: 45%
   - The quality of people who have been Fellows in years past: 34%

1a. **If someone you knew encouraged you to apply, was this a former Fellow?**
   - Yes, 47%
   - No, 53%

1b. **If yes, who was it?** *Open-ended written response.*

2. **In the 12 months prior to being named a Fellow, how often did you do volunteer work for a charitable organization?**
   - Once a week or more often: 37%
   - At least once a month: 30%
   - Several times: 16%
   - Once or twice: 7%
   - Not at all: 11%

3. **Prior to applying for the Fellowship, had you ever had a conversation with a high ranking leader in the federal government?**
   - Yes, 60%
   - No, 40%

4. **Which of the following comes closest to describing your sentiments during the final selection weekend?**
   - I’ve had some good moments over the weekend. My chances are probably 50-50: 47%
   - I can hold my own in this crowd. I bet this works out: 24%
   - The people here are more impressive than me, but I have a slight chance of being selected: 19%
   - I can’t believe I made it this far, but I surely won’t be selected: 11%

5. **Why do you feel you were chosen to be a White House Fellow?** *Open-ended written response.*
   - Unique background, unique field: 15%
   - Accomplishments: 13%
   - Public service background: 11%
   - Performance during interview process: 11%
   - Leadership background: 7%

6. **Think back to your first day as a White House Fellow. If you could choose only one word to describe what you were feeling that day, what would it be?** *Open-ended written response (top five answers given).*
   - Excited/Eager/Interested: 45%
   - Humble/Awed: 12%
   - Grateful/Honored: 12%
   - Confused/Disoriented: 11%
   - Anxious/Scared: 9%

7. **Who was your principal for the Fellowship, and what was his or her title?** *Open-ended written response.*

Percentages may not add exactly up to 100 because of rounding.
8. Which of the following best describes the relationship you had with your principal? Was he or she more like a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant uncle</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Since completing the Fellowship, has your principal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offered advice on an important life decision</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced you to someone who was important to your career development</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended you for an honor or award</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped you or your family in some way</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped you get a job</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not had subsequent contact with your principal</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Did your relationships with immediate family and close friends experience hardship or suffer because of your Fellowship experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10a. If yes, how did they experience hardship or suffer? *Open-ended written response.*

11. How important was the Fellowship in your development as a leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unimportant</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Which of the following are critical for a Fellowship year to be considered successful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Somewhat Critical</th>
<th>Not Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing a close relationship with your principal</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastering a skill or domain of knowledge over the year that you didn’t have before</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being substantially involved in big decisions</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning a great deal about yourself and your personal leadership style</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking advantage of all the educational opportunities available to Fellows</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a big impact on the agency/place you were assigned</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining a strong understanding of the executive branch at the highest of levels</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Was there one or more Fellow(s) in your class who:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had an unusually big ego</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was personally insecure</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was competitive with other Fellows</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to dominate the group</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Which of the following best describes your relationship with the Director of the President’s Commission on White House Fellowships? Was he or she more like a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant Uncle</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How much access would you say your Director had to the President and senior administration officials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal of access</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some access, but not as much as we needed</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much access</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not add exactly up to 100 because of rounding.
16. During the Fellowship year, did you ever have a major conflict with your/an:
- Other Fellow: 15%
- Director: 13%
- Principal: 3%

17. Which of the following would most accurately describe your relationship with other Fellows?
- Friendship: 91%
- Professional acquaintanceship: 10%
- Rivalry: 0%

18. What was the most important project you worked on during your fellowship year?
Open-ended written response.

19. What was your most memorable experience as a Fellow?
Open-ended written response (top six answers given).
- Travel: 28%
- Meeting and forming relationships with other Fellows: 7%
- Working with president, high level officials: 5%
- Assignment, project: 5%
- Meeting foreign leaders: 4%
- Ceremonial event: 4%

20. Now think of your last day as a White House Fellow. What’s one word that would describe how you felt then?
Open-ended written response (top six answers given).
- Grateful/Honored/Appreciative: 20%
- Accomplished/Confident/Satisfied: 17%
- Forward looking/Excited/Eager: 17%
- Upset/Sad/A sense of Loss: 16%
- Anxious/Unsure of next step/Frustrated: 7%

21. Approximately what percentage of your class of Fellows do you still stay in regular contact with?
- Average answer: 44%
- Median answer: 40%

22. Did you change career directions after your Fellowship year, or did you continue in the same direction?
- Continued in the same direction: 60%
- Changed directions: 40%

23. To what extent have you remained connected to other Fellows through involvement in the White House Fellows Foundation and Association?
- A great deal: 23%
- Somewhat: 42%
- Not very much: 26%
- Not at all: 10%

24. Since completing your Fellowship year, have relationships formed through the White House Fellows Foundation and Association?
- Introduced you to someone who was important to your career development: 32%
- Helped you get a job: 17%
- Recruited you to serve in government: 10%
- Helped you or your family in some other way: 32%

25. Have contacts made through the White House Fellows program helped you advance your career?
- Yes, 61%
- No, 39%

26. In terms of personal change, which of the following best describes your Fellowship experience?
- It made you more humble as a person than before: 29%
- You remained about as humble as before: 59%
- It made you less humble as a person than before: 13%

27. What job offers did you receive immediately after being a White House Fellow?
Open-ended written response.

28. What job did you take or return to after your Fellowship?
Open-ended written response.
29. **What, in your opinion, is the best way to improve society?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To follow an overall program or theory</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To allow changes to develop naturally by themselves</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither/undecided</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. **As far as the people running the institutions below are concerned, would you say you have a great deal of confidence, only some confidence, or hardly any confidence in them?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Hardly any confidence</th>
<th>Only some confidence</th>
<th>A great deal of confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banks and financial institutions</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major businesses</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized religion</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized labor</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Supreme Court</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific community</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive branch of the federal government</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. **To what extent do you agree with the following statements?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Completely Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Completely Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people can be trusted</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people who don’t succeed in life are just plain lazy</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends and I are well-represented in our political system</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The self-made man is likely more ethical than the man born to wealth</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people are interested only in personal gain</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. **How important are the following aspects of life to you?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One’s own family and children</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and work</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free time and relaxation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and acquaintances</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and church</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics and public life</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. **In your opinion, should there be a top limit on an executive’s income?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Yes, 37%</th>
<th>No, 63%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33a. **If yes, what do you think would be accomplished by this?** Open-ended written response.

34. **In the past twelve months, have you gotten together informally with or worked with others in your community or neighborhood to try to deal with some community issue or problem?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Yes, 85%</th>
<th>No, 15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

35. **How successful do you feel in your work life?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>0.2%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>22%</th>
<th>64%</th>
<th>13%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not add exactly up to 100 because of rounding.
36. What about your success in balancing your paid work with your family life? Do you feel:

- Not at all successful: 1%
- Not very successful: 7%
- Somewhat successful: 46%
- Very successful: 39%
- Completely successful: 8%

37. Have you ever been on active duty for military training or service for two consecutive months or more?

- Yes, 39%
- No, 61%

37a. If yes, what was your total time on active duty?
Open-ended written response.

37b. What was the highest rank you achieved?
Open-ended written response.

38. Have any members of your immediate family—that is, your spouse, parent, children, brothers, or sisters—ever served in the armed forces?

- Yes, 58%
- No, 43%

39. Do you personally feel that the White House Fellows program is non-partisan?

- Yes, 81%
- No, 19%

40. Have you actively campaigned for a presidential candidate in any presidential election?

- Yes, 54%
- No, 46%

41. Using the following five-point scale, how would you describe yourself? Are you a...

- Strong Democrat: 21%
- Strong Independent: 20%
- Somewhat Independent: 25%
- Strong Republican: 24%
- Other: 10%

42. Have you changed political party affiliation since your Fellowship year?

- Yes, 18%
- No, 82%

43. Who are three public figures, currently living or deceased, whom you admire?
Open-ended written response.

44. What were the last two books you read?
Open-ended written response.

45. What is your marital status?

- Single, never married: 9%
- Not married, but living in a marriage-like relationship: 1%
- Married: 81%
- Divorced/separated: 6%
- Widowed: 2%

46. If you are currently married, what is your spouse’s occupation? Open-ended written response.

47. If you are currently married, were you married at the time of your White House Fellowship?

- Yes, 77%
- No, 23%

48. If you were married at the time that you began your White House Fellowship, are you still married to the same person?

- Yes, 81%
- No, 19%

49. How many children have you ever had?

Average answer: 2.2 children

50. If you have children, did you ever stay at home to take care of them for more than six months?

- Yes, 10%
- No, 91%

51. If you have children, did your spouse ever stay at home to take care of them for more than six months?

- Yes, 77%
- No, 24%

52. What is your date of birth?
Open-ended written response.

53. Where did you grow up?
Open-ended written response.

54. What was your father’s occupation?
Open-ended written response.

55. What was your mother’s occupation?
Open-ended written response.

56. Were both your parents born in this country?

- Yes, 77%
- No, 24%
56a. If no, where were your parents born?
Open-ended written response.

57. What is your religious preference?
- Protestant: 47%
- Catholic: 24%
- Jewish: 10%
- Other: 10%
- None: 10%

57a. If Protestant, what church or denomination?
Open-ended written response.

58. How important is religion in your own life?
- Not at all important: 11%
- Not very important: 21%
- Fairly important: 28%
- Very important: 41%

59. Would you say your own health, in general, is excellent, good, fair, or poor?
- Poor: 1%
- Fair: 4%
- Good: 29%
- Excellent: 67%

60. How would you describe your life?
- Not at all stressful: 3%
- Not very stressful: 18%
- Somewhat stressful: 59%
- Very stressful: 20%

61. How tall are you without your shoes on?
- Male average: 5’11”
- Female average: 5’6”

62. How much do you weigh?
- Male average: 191 lbs
- Female average: 144 lbs

63. At the time you were selected as a White House Fellow, how much did you weigh?
- Male average: 181 lbs
- Female average: 132 lbs

64. During your Fellowship year, approximately how many days of work did you have to miss because of illness?
Open-ended written response.

65. In the last year, have you been interviewed by the press?
- Yes, 66%
- No, 35%

65a. If yes, when was the last time you were interviewed?
Open-ended written response.

65b. What was the subject of this interview?
Open-ended written response.

66. In the last year, have you appeared on television?
- Yes, 34%
- No, 66%

66a. If yes, when was the last time you appeared on television?
Open-ended written response.

66b. What was the subject of this television appearance?
Open-ended written response.

67. Have you ever lived in a country other than the United States?
- Yes, 58%
- No, 42%

67a. If yes, what other countries have you lived in?
Open-ended written response.

68. Can you speak a language other than English?
- Yes, 54%
- No, 46%

68a. If yes, please list all other languages you speak:
Open-ended written response.

69. Within the last 12 months, how often did you do volunteer work for a charitable organization?
- Once a week or more often: 30%
- At least once a month: 29%
- Several times: 22%
- Once or twice: 11%
- Not at all: 8%

70. Did you hold any leadership positions in college?
- Yes, 85%
- No, 16%

71. Finally, what single accomplishment in your life thus far are you proudest of?
Open-ended written response.

72. Would you like to receive a copy of the results from this survey?
- Yes, 95%
- No, 5%

Percentages may not add exactly up to 100 because of rounding.
Appendix B
Regression Tables
Table 1: Results from OLS Regressions on Levels of Volunteerism by Various Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Service</td>
<td>-.115*</td>
<td>-.102*</td>
<td>-.116*</td>
<td>-.107*</td>
<td>-.101*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.016*</td>
<td>.120**</td>
<td>.103*</td>
<td>.108*</td>
<td>.121**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>.191***</td>
<td>.127**</td>
<td>.187***</td>
<td>.173***</td>
<td>.109*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Fellowship level of volunteerism</td>
<td>.273***</td>
<td>.269***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in local community within the past year</td>
<td>.348***</td>
<td>.334***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in trustworthiness of others</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.088*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television appearance within the past year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.182**</td>
<td>.119**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.780***</td>
<td>.922**</td>
<td>2.449***</td>
<td>2.633***</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


† p ≤ 0.10, * p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, *** p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed)

Dependent Variable:
Likert Scale response to survey question — “Within the past 12 months, how often did you volunteer for a charitable organization?”
### Table 2: Odds Ratios from Logistic Regressions on Leadership Development by Various Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>1.548</td>
<td>1.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Service</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to Principal like a parent, mentor, or friend</td>
<td>3.181***</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.648***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director had access to president and senior staff</td>
<td>1.573†</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained beneficial contacts through alumni group</td>
<td>2.642***</td>
<td>3.120***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained contacts in Fellowship to advance career</td>
<td>3.225***</td>
<td>2.272**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in substantive decisions critical to program</td>
<td>2.510**</td>
<td>2.620**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflection and learning critical to program</td>
<td>2.907***</td>
<td>2.592***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining knowledge of executive critical to program</td>
<td>1.904*</td>
<td>1.604†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.519†</td>
<td>.179***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 Log Likelihood: 534.412, 518.513, 533.375, 453.775

Pseudo-R² (Nagelkerke R²) | .112 | .166 | .124 | .296 |

N | 461 | 467 | 466 | 456 |


Dependent Variable: Answered “very important” to survey question — “How important was the Fellowship to your development as a leader?”

† p ≤ 0.10, * p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed)
Table 3: Odds Ratios from Logistic Regressions on Post-Fellowship Government Experience by Various Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>1.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Service</td>
<td>.455***</td>
<td>.580**</td>
<td>.512***</td>
<td>.478***</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.048***</td>
<td>1.059***</td>
<td>1.054***</td>
<td>1.044***</td>
<td>1.059***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in government prior to Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed career path after Fellowship</td>
<td>4.034***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.986***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained contacts in Fellowship to advance career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received career assistance from principal</td>
<td>2.135***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.921**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received other assistance from principal</td>
<td>2.262***</td>
<td>2.581**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encountered conflict with Fellowship director</td>
<td>2.870***</td>
<td>3.778***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.049***</td>
<td>.008***</td>
<td>.026***</td>
<td>.072***</td>
<td>.007***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| -2 Log Likelihood                                               | 576.657   | 516.209   | 548.093   | 568.208   | 477.174   |
| Pseudo-R² (Nagelkerke R²)                                       | .104      | .246      | .179      | .122      | .337      |
| N                                                               | 466       | 462       | 466       | 465       | 462       |


Dependent Variable: Respondent worked in a government position at any point following their Fellowship year.
Table 4: Results from OLS Regression on Level of Continued Cohort Contact by Various Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.089†</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Service</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.094*</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.110*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of racial minorities in cohort</td>
<td>.304***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.273***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First cohort class in new administration</td>
<td>-.164***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.168***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of cohort from outside the Northeast</td>
<td>.126**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.111*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced conflict with another Fellow in class</td>
<td>-.094*</td>
<td>-.121**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought at least one cohort member had big ego</td>
<td>-.146**</td>
<td>-.131**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic administration during Fellowship year</td>
<td>.162**</td>
<td>.123**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.245***</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>7.339***</td>
<td>6.002***</td>
<td>2.830*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


† p ≤ 0.10, * p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed)

Dependent Variable: Answer to survey question — “With what percentage of your cohorts do you maintain regular contact?”
Table 5: Odds Ratios from Logistic Regressions on Alumni Association Involvement by Various Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Service</td>
<td>1.769**</td>
<td>1.771**</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>1.897**</td>
<td>1.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>1.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship occurred during transition year</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.544*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship critical to leadership development</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.451**</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.482**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained contacts in Fellowship to advance career</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.820***</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.197***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed career after Fellowship</td>
<td>.555**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued contact with cohort Fellows</td>
<td>1.030***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.032***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of recent volunteerism</td>
<td>1.317**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.310*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in trustworthiness of others</td>
<td>1.377*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.434*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.323***</td>
<td>.316***</td>
<td>.027***</td>
<td>.034***</td>
<td>.002***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>498.198</td>
<td>497.692</td>
<td>413.721</td>
<td>482.549</td>
<td>395.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-R² (Nagelkerke R²)</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


† p ≤ 0.10, * p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.001 (two-tailed)

Dependent Variable:
Answered “very high” to survey question — “What is your level of involvement in the White House Fellows Foundation and Association?”
Table 6: Odds Ratios from Logistic Regressions on Great Confidence in the Military by Various Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.407***</td>
<td>3.538***</td>
<td>2.796***</td>
<td>2.703***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.977*</td>
<td>.975**</td>
<td>.970**</td>
<td>.968***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>.471†</td>
<td>.436†</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in trustworthiness of others</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.405**</td>
<td>1.406**</td>
<td>1.471***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military service</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.898**</td>
<td>1.653*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member in the military</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>1.505†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile of military in cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.179**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.921*</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>560.727</td>
<td>551.602</td>
<td>532.486</td>
<td>525.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-(R^2) (Nagelkerke (R^2))</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


† \(p \leq 0.10\), \* \(p \leq 0.05\), ** \(p \leq 0.01\), *** \(p \leq 0.001\) (two-tailed)

Dependent Variable:
Answered “very high” to survey question — “What is your level of confidence in the military?”
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Class of 1965–66
William R. Cotter
John A. De Luca
Richard L. de Neufville
Edwin B. Firmage
W. Thomas Johnson
Robert R. Lee
Ronald B. Lee
Charles M. Maguire
David C. Mulford
Howard N. Nemirovski
Robert E. Patricelli
Harold A. Richman
Thomas C. Veblen
Michael H. Walsh
Kimon S. Zachos

Class of 1966–67
William S. Abbott
Walter S. Baer
John W. Bassett
Richard D. Copaken
Thomas E. Cronin
William P. Graham
Sanford D. Greenberg
Samuel H. Howard
Walter J. Humann
Thomas O. Jones
F. Pierce Linawaver
James P. Maloney, Jr.
John W. McCarter, Jr.
J. Timothy McGinley
Jane Cahill Pfeiffer
John S. Pustay
Charles D. Ravenel
Harold P. Smith, Jr.

Class of 1967–68
Richard E. Balzhiser
Barbara Currier Bell
J. T. Dykman
Barnes H. Ellis
Joseph Freitas, Jr.
Donald A. Furtado
John E. Havelock
Robert P. Huefner
Doris Kearns Goodwin
Peter F. Krogh
Betsy Levin
John M. McGinty
Howard N. Newman
Gerard L. Snyder
Preston Townley
Timothy E. Wirth

Class of 1968–69
Paul F. Anderson
James H. Bockhaus
James E. Connor
Arthur E. Dewey
Hudson B. Drake
Gerald G. Garbacz
Robert D. Haas
Robert L. Joss  
Edgar F. Kaiser, Jr.  
Charles R. Larson  
David K. Lelewer  
Caro E. Luhrs  
David C. Miller, Jr.  
Laurence I. Moss  
Richard T. Pascale  
Robert L. Sansom  
Glen E. Wegner  
Thomas R. Williams  
John W. Woodmansee, Jr.

Class of 1969–70  
Michael H. Armacost  
Pastora S. Cafferty  
Judge A. Dickson  
C. Nelson Dorny  
W. Landis Jones  
Barbara G. Kilberg  
William J. Kilberg  
Michael A. Levett  
Charles M. McArthur  
Percy A. Pierre  
Richard J. Ramsden  
Robert Sansone  
Geoffrey C. Shepard  
Woodrow B. Sneed  
Victor H. Sparrow, III  
Wilson K. Talley  
Stuart A. Taylor  
George S. Wills

Class of 1971–72  
Henry G. Cisneros  
Peter W. Cook  
Robert A. Dey  
W. Antoinette Ford  
Stephen J. Gage  
Franklin R. Gannon  
John S. Grinalds  
Glen R. Kendall  
John M. Maurice  
Terence D. McCann  
Robert C. McFarlane  
Michael S. Noling  
Martin E. Seneca, Jr.  
Richard E. Stephenson  
Brandon W. Sweitzer  
Deanell R. Tacha

Class of 1972–73  
Douglas C. Bauer  
Robert H. Baxter  
James E. Bostic, Jr.  
Joseph P. Carroll  
John C. Fryer, Jr.  
James H. Gross  
Stephen G. McConahey  
William E. McGlassan  
John B. Mumford  
Luis G. Nogales  
Lee R. Nunn  
Colin L. Powell  
Ann S. Ramsay-Jenkins  
David W. Schrempf

Class of 1971–74  
Barbara H. Anderson  
William E. Barry  
Frederick S. Benson, III  
Peter M. Dawkins  
Ursula F. Fairbairn  
James A. Fletcher  
Bruce B. Henry  
David L. Jackson  
E. Randy Jayne, II  
Doris M. Meissner  
W. Delano Meriwether  
John H. Moellering  
Gilbert S. Omenn  
Warren S. Rustand  
Betty J. Shelton  
Michael J. Spector  
Albert C. Zapanta

Class of 1973–74  
Barbara H. Anderson  
William E. Barry  
Frederick S. Benson, III  
Peter M. Dawkins  
Ursula F. Fairbairn  
James A. Fletcher  
Bruce B. Henry  
David L. Jackson  
E. Randy Jayne, II  
Doris M. Meissner  
W. Delano Meriwether  
John H. Moellering  
Gilbert S. Omenn  
Warren S. Rustand  
Betty J. Shelton  
Michael J. Spector  
Albert C. Zapanta

Class of 1974–75  
John L. Borling  
J. Melissa Brown  
Garrey E. Carruthers  
Kent W. Colton  
Leslie G. Denend  
William F. Hamilton  
Adam W. Herbert  
Betty L. McCormick  
Lawrence E. Mock, Jr.
Ronald J. Naples
Roger B. Porter
Ronald E. Ray
Geri M. Riegger
George S. Robinson
Susan S. Stautberg

Class of 1975–76
Dennis C. Blair
Marshall N. Carter
Wesley K. Clark
James P. Connelly
Patricia A. Davis
Randall W. Hardy
Arthur H. House
Martin C. Jischke
Thomas J. Kline, Jr.
John M. Oblak
Dean L. Overman
David H. Roe
W. Scott Thompson
Judith A. Walter

Class of 1976–77
Raoul H. Alcala
Charles A. Ansbacher
W. Anderson Barnes
Marie D. Bembery
David J. Cleary
Geraldine V. Cox
William J. Drummond
Walter M. Fiederowicz
Donald H. Haider
Gail H. Klapper
Kai N. Lee
Susan B. Magee
Mary L. Myers
Jane G. Pisano
Judy P. Rosenstreich
Lynn A. Schenk

Class of 1977–78
Joseph B. Anderson, Jr.
Gregory H. Canavan
Martha A. Darling
Nelson A. Diaz
Thomas M. Downs
Thomas E. Harvey
Beverly J. Hawkins
Robert O. Heavner
James S. Jardine
Robert R. King

Jack A. LeCuyer
J. Stuart Lemle
Louise L. Liang
Bryant L. Young

Class of 1978–79
Judith A. Brown
David R. Calkins
Carolyn S. Chin
Nelson G. Dong
Francis J. Harvey
Steven R. Hill
Isiah Leggett
Charles A. Martin
James J. Padilla
Craig S. Ritchey
John D. Saxon
Teresa M. Schwartz
James H. Scott
Fernando M. Torres-Gil
Michael O. Wheeler

Class of 1979–80
Mari C. Aponte
Lincoln W. Caplan, II
Fredrica Chállandes-Angelini
Victoria L. Chan–Palay
Anne H. Cohn Donnelly
Marsha J. Evans
Elizabeth A. Fetter
Katherine A. Hagen
Kenneth A. Jones
Richard Northern

Class of 1980–81
Joan Abrahamson
A. Jane Bradley
Thomas J. Campbell
Mark A. Clodfelter
Bruce G. Dew
John W. Holmes
Emma C. Jordan
Michael K. Korenko
Harold E. Krents
M. Margaret McKeown
Phoebe D. Morse
Gael C. Rabb
Alexander R. H. Rodriguez
Kelsey P. Selander
Merrie Spaeth
David J. Vidal
W. Earl Walker

Class of 1981–82
Paul V. Applegarth
Joe L. Barton
Richard E. Birney
Ellen E. Colemire
Wayne Dale Collins
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Priscilla H. Douglas
David K. Karnes
Thomas C. Shull
James K. Stewart
H. Patrick Sweeney
George L. Thomas
Myron E. Ullman, III
Mary Anne Q. Wood
Michael E. Zacharia

Class of 1982–83
Catherine L. Anderson
Michael L. Campbell
Paula H. Cholmondeley
Clayton M. Christensen
Jonathan Scott Gration
Paul T. Hasse
Frank G. Klotz
Douglas W. Kmiec
Kathy Stroh Mendoza
Daniel T. Oliver
Sharon I. Richie
William L. Roper
Adis M. Vila
Diane W. Vines

Class of 1982–83
David L. Bere
Elaine L. Chao
Craig P. Coy
Muliufi F. Hannemann
Stephen Harty
James R. Kearl
Joseph R. Lupica
James W. Muller
David A. Neuman
T. Wood Parker
George H. Seldon, Jr.
Kenneth O. Simon
Oren E. Whyche-Shaw

Class of 1985–86
John L. Barry
Thomas E. Bennett
Alexander Dimitrief
Karen M. Galatz
Charles R. Kubic
Jerrold T. Lundquist
Mark Timothy Parris
Kien D. Pham
Jeri Eckhart Queenan
Ronald L. Quincy
Charlene C. Quinn
Arnold I. Rachlis
Ann E. Rondeau
Richard P. Sybert

Class of 1986–87
Paul A. Gigot
Kristine A. Langdon
William J. Lennox, Jr.
Meredith A. Neizer
Vicki O’Meara
Michael R. Reopel
Michael C. Ryan
Thomas A. Saponas
Robert G. Schwetje
William L. Webb, III
Diane C. Yu

Class of 1987–88
Arthur J. Athens
Karen S. de Bartolome
Bruce A. Berwick
George M. Drysdale
Jeffrey S. Hall
Robert E. Johnson, Jr.
Alan S. Kopit
David F. Melcher
James L. Nuzzo
A. Mary Schiavo
David M. Webster
John H. Weiland

Class of 1988–89
Bradford B. Baker
Jeffrey W. Colyer
Charles P. Garcia
Jonathan D. George
David E. Greenberg
Nancy J. Kelley
Michael T. Lempres
Alan W. Marty
Mark E. Readinger
Mitchell Reiss
John E. Shephard, Jr.
David L. Simms
Clifford L. Stanley
Patrick M. Walsh
Class of 1989–90
Antonio M. Angotti
Thomas P. Bostick
John W. Danaher
Wade T. Dyke
Gregory P. Hess
Michael D. Klausner
Robert G. Marbut, Jr.
Barry R. McBee
John McKay
John W. Orrison
Daniel B. Poneman
Joyce J. Rayzer
Wayne Tuan
Leigh Warner

Class of 1990–91
Andrew I. Batavia
Samuel D. Brownback
Robert B. Chess
Robert R. Grusky
Will A. Gunn
Randall H. Kehl
Jody A. Greenstone Miller
John W. Miller
Eric M. Phillips
Edward A. Rice,
Joseph E. Samora, Jr.
Kimberly Till

Class of 1991–92
Joseph S. Broz
William B. Caldwell, IV
Margarita M. Colmenares
Darlene L. Cox
Charlene Y. Douglas
Walter S. Gray, IV
Mark R. Hagerott
William F. Hagerty, IV
Patrick T. Harker
Raymond E. Johns, Jr.
Rodney A. McCowan
Matthew L. Miller
Betsy A. Roe
Alison Kutchins Ross
Sally J. Thoman
George H. Young, III

Class of 1992–93
Margaret Belknap
Kurt M. Campbell
Michael B. G. Froman
Steven L. Gill
Lawrence E. Golub
Robert L. Gordon, III
Richard D. Hooker, Jr.
Lawrence F. Jindra
Lloyd E. Kelley
Dennis Murphy
Thomas Nelson
Rana Sampson
Dartainian Warr
William M. Webster, IV
Michael Wing

Class of 1993–94
Paul T. Antony
Suzanne R. Becker
Christopher F. Chyba
Jami Floyd
W. Scott Gould
Kevin V. Grimes
Suzan Johnson Cook
Michael N. Levy
R. Gaynor McCown
Barbara J. Paige
Raul Perea–Henze
Leslie W. Ramirez
David M. Rhodes
Reginald L. Robinson
Martha E. Stark
Todd Ulmer
Roderick K. von Lipsey

Class of 1994–95
Janet B. Abrams
Timothy J. Atkin
Larry J. Berger
S. Lael Brainard
Yvonne E. Campos
Dennis C. Cobb
Philip Hart Cullom
Christopher J. Day
Angela Diaz
Wifredo A. Ferrer
Preston G. Foster
Megan R. Golden
David C. Iglesias
Jeffrey L. Kang
Sharon C. Kiely
Michael Levitan
Marcel T. Thomas

Class of 1995–96
David M. Albala
David K. Edmonds
James J. Eisenhower, III
Michael E. Hatchett
David E. Jones
Teresa Isabel Leger de Fernandez
Robert W. Leland
Peter Lawrence Levin
Cynthia Lillian McCaffrey
Kent S. Pekel
Tanya Martin Pekel
Anthony D. So
Julia C. Vindasius
E. Kinney Zalesne
Class of 1996–97
Brenda G. Berkman
Audrey Choi
Kimberly R. Cornett
Linda Eddleman
Stephanie L. Ferguson
Susan D. Fink
Peter S. Fiske
Lewis P. Long
Mark J. Mathabane
Kevin Monroe
David A. Moore
Robert C. Orr
Bonnie J. Ryan
Stefanie J. Sanford
Elisabeth A. Stock
Loree K. Sutton
Reginald M. Turner
John R. Wood

Class of 1997–98
Amy E. Alving
John C. Burchett
Brad R. Carson
Cheryl L. Dorsey
Sanjay Gupta
Francis J. James
Jon P. Jennings
Terrence K. Kelly
Jamie Frederic Metzl
Sean Eugene O’Connor
Jeffrey M. Prieto
Peter Rundlet
Lois A. Scott
Clifford A. Skelton
Matice J. Wright

Class of 1998–99
Pieter Boelhouwer
Jean Callahan
Leela de Souza
Carlos Del Toro
Stephen England
Alex S. Friedman
Jeffrey S. Glueck
Selma Gomez Orr
Henry B. Hicks, III
Bruce M. McNamer
Kate J. Mehr
Mark Montgomery
James J. O’Connor
Michelle A. Peluso
Clara J. Shin
John K. Tien
Felicia Wong

Class of 1999–2000
Khalid Azim
Esther T. Benjamin
John B. Buxton
Daniel F. Feldman
Juan M. Garcia, III
Sunil Garg
Melissa M. Goldstein
Gary Hall
Jacqueline F. Lain
Christopher M. Moore
Peter F. Najera
Barrye L. Price
Reynaldo A. Valencia
Timothy C. Wu
Lance E. Wyatt
Ariel Zwang

Class of 2000–01
Kathryn Allen Donovan
David A. Aronberg
Scott D. Berns
Richard M. Clark
John Fenzel III
Michael R. Fenzel
John M. Gallagher
Marissa E. Ghez
Katie Hong
Raymond M. Jefferson
David F. Lussier

Class of 2001–02
Tina Choi
Kimberly A. Connors
Jennifer A. Franke
Kris W. Kobach
Michael S. Lynn
Bruce H. McClintock
Ricardo O. Morales
Steven L. Poizner
Mary Elise Sarotte
Robert L. Shea
Katherine E. White
Howard Alan Zucker

Class of 2002–03
Cesar A. Aristeigueta
Balan Rama Ayyar
David A. Carmel
Cesar R. Conde
Heather H. Graham
Richard Greco, Jr.
Eric D. Hothen
Vincent D. McBeth
Jonathan S. Spaner
Daniel S. Sullivan
William J. Thornton
Rajeev V. Venkayya
Barry K. Williams
Class of 2003–04
Ajay K. Amlani
Timothy W. Docking
Garth N. Graham
Jerome R. Loughridge
George A. Pivik
Nazanin Samari-Kermani
Robert J. Smullen
Gina Eileen Stephens
Michael Suk
Erwin J. Tan
Cathy L. Taylor
Thomas R. Williams

Class of 2004–05
Randi D. Burlew
Ronald J. Clark
Wesley P. Hallman
Jerry L. Johnson
Samrat S. Khichi
Patrick J. McClanahan
Patrick S. O’Hanlon
Louis F. O’Neill
Daniel J. Orcutt
Ahmed M. Saeed
Amy Wilkinson
Lauren Zucker

Class of 2005–06
Rodney D. Bullard
John Daniel Caine
Eric R. Greitens
Jennifer A. Jacobs
Sean P. McLaughlin
Steven L. Parker
Keith A. Pellegrini
Robert L. Reffkin
Michael W. Studeman
Cory T. Wilson
Kenneth R. Zeff
Laurie C. Zephyrin

Class of 2006–07
Christian Caballero
Jason Scott Dean
Jeffrey William Eggers
Miguel Damian Howe
Eugene J. Huang
Bedouin Leclerc Joseph
Frederick William Kacher
Westley Watende Moore
Jocelyn Jones Pickford
George Ruiz
Lena Sene
Mark DuBois Smith
Jeffrey Daniel Stern
Mark Vincent Vlasic

Class of 2007–08
Jaime Areizaga
Louis Bremer
Patrick Conway
Bobbi Doorenbos
Dawn Dunlop
John Patrick Gallagher
Stacey Hawkins
Julissa Marenco
Travis Matheson
Anne Neuberger
Eric Patterson
Jaewon Ryu
Kristine Singler
Andrew Smarick
Kathryn Spletstosser

Class of 2008–09
Brian Alexander
Margaret Angell
Daniel Fletcher
J. Nadine Gracia
Michael Hayes
Sarita James
Ryan Janovic
David Loaiza
Nicole M. E. Malachowski
Christopher Meyer
Eyrique Miller
David Rawlinson
Jason Snyder
Everett S. Spain

Class of 2009–10
Laura Bacon
Nicole Campbell
Jonathan Finer
Zheng Huang
Kellee James
Sarah Johnson
Rob Lyman
Anish Mahajan
Mehret Mandefro
Annie Maxwell
Emil Michael
Kendric Robbins
Marc Sternberg
Adam Taylor
Raúl Torrez
“WHEREAS it is in the national interest that our future leaders in all walks of life have opportunities to observe at firsthand the important and challenging tasks of American Government; and

WHEREAS participation in Government service early in their careers will help persons with high qualifications to become well-informed and public-spirited citizens; and

WHEREAS it is appropriate that public recognition be given to persons of exceptional promise who are willing to devote their time to increasing their understanding of the public business …”

— excerpted from “Executive Order 11183 — Establishing the President’s Commission on White House Fellowships,” October 3, 1964