1-1-2011

Urban high school students' attitudes toward democratic citizenship: A comparison of students in the NJROTC program and students in traditional civics classes

Ruthann Burns-McFadden
Wayne State University,

URBAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP: A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS IN THE NJROTC PROGRAM AND STUDENTS IN TRADITIONAL CIVICS CLASSES

by

RUTHANN BURNS MCFADDEN

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

2011

MAJOR: CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Approved by:

_____

Advisor Date

_____ _____

_____

DEDICATION

I dedicate my dissertation work to family and friends. Special thanks to my loving parents, Leonard and Ruth Burns, and my grandparents, William and Edna Cousins, whose words of encouragement to complete my education are still manifested in me.

Thanks to Theodore Burns, my nephew, who taught me how to read at age five. Thank you to my sister, Edna Burns, brothers, Eugene Burns, Robert Burns, Lawrence Burns, James Burns, Leroy Burns, and William Burns, whose push for tenacity still rings loudly.

I also dedicate this work and give thanks to my friends, Edward Parham, Unice and Rogia Parham, and Kecia. I also dedicate a special thanks to my best friend, Thelma Buford, for being there for me during the entire doctoral program. Thelma, you have been my best cheerleader.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to express my thanks to the students who were willing to be part of my study. All of my work depended on their willingness to participate. I would like to extend a special thanks to Dr. Marc Rosa, for his countless hours of encouragement and patience over the years throughout this entire process. I wish to thank my committee members, Dr. Jacqueline Tilles, and Dr. Sharon Elliott for sharing their time and expertise. I would like to thank Director of Research and Evaluation, Flint Community Schools, Dr. Leonard Bianchi, Superintendent of Flint Community Schools, Linda Thompson, President of the Board of Education, Flint Community Schools, Vera Perry, Central High School, Flint Community Schools, Principal, Dr. Corrine Edwards (for allowing me to work with NJROTC and for supporting me to honor a Fulbright Fellowship in Japan while working on my dissertation), Curriculum Specialist Naomi Bohonnan (thank you for allowing me to learn the practical side of curriculum instruction to align with the academic side), Chief of Schools, Flint Community Schools, Eugene Rutledge, Director of Community Programs, Flint Community Schools, Dr. Gayle Ganakas, The teachers at Central High School, Flint, Michigan and Chief and Commander Robinson of NJROTC Program for all the support you have extended to me as a doctoral student. Thank you Dr. Janice Green, Wayne State University, for granting me windows of opportunity (extensions) to complete my terminal degree and Dr. Paula Wood for placing me on the Dean's List at Wayne State University and counting me on the "Who's Who Among American College and University Students" and "Who's Who among American Teachers" list. Everyone's excitement and willingness to provide feedback when needed made the completion of this research quite an enjoyable experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter 1: Introduction

American public schools are expected to prepare students to be part of the global community of the 21st Century, and motivate students to participate in their government in this time when it is tempting to remain uninvolved in civic affairs because of their busy lives. Based on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), Niemi and Junn's study (1998) provided evidence of a positive relationship between civics education and increased civic and political knowledge. Going a step further, a more recent report from the National Conference of State Legislatures (Kurtz, Rosenthal & Zukin, 2003) suggested that civics education results in increased civic knowledge and *engagement*, as well as citizenship-oriented *attitudes*. Although a conscientious and informed citizenry has become more and more essential in maintaining the integrity of American democracy, traditional classroom instruction alone seems unable to provide everything that is needed to promote a community of civic-minded individuals.

Being engaged in civic activities and having positive attitudes towards such things as voting, are tangible results of the students' earlier experiences. These tangible results are, after all, the hoped-for effects of a civics education. Indeed, Stroupe and Sabato (2004) suggest that classroom instruction is foundational in developing communities that produce engaged citizens. But they also contended that classroom instruction is not enough, and that if the classroom component of civics education is weak, its influence is not likely to extend beyond the classroom. Additionally, Torney-Purta, Richardson, and Barber (2004) concluded that it may require an especially interactive teaching method, suggesting that a classroom climate which fosters open discussion may be a key factor in effective civics education (p. 15). Thus, if the classroom instruction is not well-designed, engagement in and attitudes towards civic participation also can be expected to suffer. Although studies show that people who *report*

having taken civics classes may *report* that they possess a greater number of skills than others who have not taken civics courses (Comber, 2003), these findings do not provide statistically sufficient support that civics classes affect civic skills.

This study investigated the dynamics of whether high school students who were in the Naval Junior Reserve officers Training Corps (NJROTC) civic curriculum and participate in the informal extracurricular political activities which are part of the program, had higher levels of knowledge and more positive attitudes toward democratic citizenship than high school students who experienced only the formal civics classes, and minimal, if any, extracurricular involvement in political activities. Measuring knowledge is nothing unusual in the field of education. Measuring the students' attitudes towards democratic citizenship and their participatory inclinations can be problematic (Center for Strategic Studies, 1999), and represents one of the challenges of this dissertation.

First, one of the problems that needed to be explored in this search for answers, was to figure out which factors in the literature would be reliable indicators of good citizenship in adulthood. The literature review highlights many theoretical and conceptual documents that articulate what experiences or factors *should* lead to good citizenship once a young person leaves high school; but because there are so few empirical studies that have addressed the components of good citizenship—that really delineate the construct, a survey was created for this study to determine whether the traditional civics curriculum or the NJROTC curriculum make a difference in forming good attitudes or dispositions toward involved citizenship.

Second, the literature review suggested general attitudes and specific behaviors that might likely lead to more engaged citizenship in adult life: (1) attitudes towards democratic citizenship, and (2) reading newspapers and discussing current events with peers, family

members, and teachers. These form the basis of the two hypotheses of this study. Since the literature review does support trust as a component of the disposition to participate in our democracy, trust was included as one of the five components of democratic citizenship. Questions were selected and adapted from a questionnaire designed by International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA, 1999). Since the original questionnaire had labeled subtopics within its set of questions on civics skills and civics attitudes, the survey for this study has questions that were selected and adapted to corresponded to the qualities of the two dependent variables. They make up five subscales: (a) good citizenship, (b) government responsibility, (c) equal opportunities, (d) trust, and (e) maintaining national culture. Thus, these five subscales underlie the survey questions, and enter into the analysis of the two dependent variables. These will be further explained in Chapter 3 and 4.

Third, observing the Naval Junior Officers Training Corps (NJROTC) program operating in an Urban High School, it seemed that the students who came from this program were more actively involved in the school government and in extracurricular service to the community than were students who had experienced only the traditional civics curriculum. Thus, group membership in either traditional civics or the NJROTC civics program determined the independent variable. Thus, the goal of this study can be best stated as a comparison of pre-determined groups to discover if there are differences between the attitudes and practices of students in the traditional civics classes and students who are members of the NJROTC program.

Background

Current issues in civics education. In designing national and state standards, educators have traditionally focused attention on a framework that includes concepts such as civic knowledge, cognitive skills, participatory skills, and civic dispositions (Patrick, 2002). These

four general concepts represent the core components that constitute the National Standards for Civics Education (Center for Civics Education, 1994) and are incorporated into the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) tests on civics. There are compelling arguments for the need to assess students' civic knowledge about current events or elected officials (Neimi & Junn, 1998). Although many empirical studies have highlighted the importance of civic knowledge (Delli Carpini & Keeter, 1996; Niemi, Junn, & Stehlik-Barry, 1996; Niemi & Junn, 1998), an understanding of how to measure participatory civic skills lags behind substantially. Patrick (2002) warned that while the four curricular components can produce the desired capacity and commitment in future citizens (Engle & Ochoa, 1988), both cognitive and participatory attitudes and skills need to be developed in the educational process. Kirlin (2002) added that civic skill development in the high school curriculum may be a key in the correlation between adolescent extracurricular participation and adult civic engagement.

As America moves further into the new century, every citizen needs to be committed to strengthening democratic principles. With the media exposing young people to the hard realities of elected officials involved in unethical and criminal activities; elected officials, civic and community organizations, and educators must renew their commitment to teaching the ideals of American citizenship. While cynicism grows among youth, our institutions need to be dedicated at every level to ensuring that the nation's youth are transformed into an active and engaged citizenry (Stroupe & Sabato, 2004). To accomplish this transformation, America's schools have a mandate to prepare citizens who are equipped to engage in the nation's political life (Campbell, 2005). Campbell noted that while often forgotten in the midst of the public attention paid to reading and math scores, schools also have a civic dimension. In fact, a number of states make this explicit in their constitutions, justifying public schools as the means to ensure a healthy

democratic culture (Torney-Purta, Richardson, & Barber, 2004). Indeed, the concept of taxpayer-financed common schools had civics education as its main objective, and even private schools provide comparable civics education (Campbell, 2001); however, policymakers generally have not made the evaluation of civics attitudes or skills a priority (Campbell, 2005).

Why civics education matters. Beyond the apparent lack of priority placed on developing and measuring civics attitudes, there are four issues that need consideration as they are entwined in the attitudes of young people toward participation in our democratic way of life. This section will highlight national trends as they relate to the variables of this study.

First, in recent years, a decline has been noted in the level of political engagement among America's young people, providing a compelling reason why civics education should become the focus of attention now more than ever. In *Bowling Alone,* Putnam (2000) drew on measures broader than voter turnout, attributing approximately half of America's overall decline in civic engagement to the drop-off among young people getting involved in the political process. Lending further support to the data on this decline, *The New American Voter,* Miller and Shanks (1996) focused on voter turnout specifically, and found similar declining rates among the youngest cohort of voters. More recently, Levine and Lopez (2002) found that voting among young people in national elections has decreased since 1972 – only 1 in 5 young Americans voted in 1998. Confirming this finding in 1999, the National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS) found that not only did less than 20% of the young Americans vote in 1998, but only 16% reported that they had volunteered to participate in a political campaign.

Second, there is a specific dynamic changing the picture of youth volunteerism. NASS found that 53% of their sample said that they *had* volunteered in *non*political organizations. NASS further found that our young people are focused on personal rather than public goals;

youth volunteerism rates are fairly high, but these volunteer activities most often take the form of social service rather than public service. Their study confirmed that the nation is at risk of losing this generation's participation in democracy, government, and citizenship. NASS also found that young people are generally apprehensive about their future and cautious in their dealings with others. Trust, as a component of civic attitudes, is examined in the literature review in some detail. In other words, America's young people are less likely to be engaged in politics now than in the past, and at their current trajectory, do not appear likely to catch up to their elders' level of engagement (Campbell, 2005). Something has to change if the trend is to be reversed. This study can take a step toward that objective by shedding light on the dynamics and determining if there is a relationship between the particular civics curriculum that students experience and their later participation in the political process.

Third, previous research on how educational experiences affect the political engagement of adolescents has proceeded along at least two different tracks. The literature has consistently found that belonging to clubs, groups, and associations in adolescence can be a "pathway" to other forms of civic and political participation in adulthood (Beck & Jennings, 1982; Hanks, 1981; McFarland & Thomas, 2004; Smith, 1999; Verba, Scholzman, & Brady, 1995; Youniss, McLellan, & Yates, 1997). More recently, a substantial body of research has begun to examine whether service learning programs in which adolescents perform community service as a class or graduation requirement have a positive impact on the political engagement of their participants (Billig, 2000; Galston, 2003; Niemi, Hepburn, & Chapman, 2000; Walker, 2002; Youniss & Yates, 1997).

Fourth, the literature on both extracurricular activities and service learning provide good reasons to think that political, participatory experiences in adolescence can shape behavior in

adulthood (Campbell, 2005). These bodies of research, however, are not always tied to an academic context or school setting because, according to Campbell, by definition, extra-curricular activities happen outside the formal instructional day.

What makes this study unique is that it will compare two models of civics education. It is the extra-curricular, more informal aspects of the NJROTC program that distinguish it from the traditional civics program. Is this unique type of civics experience enough to make a difference in the attitudes of students towards democratic citizenship? Ultimately, information gained from this study could affect positive future political participation of urban youth and perhaps help to reverse a disturbing trend in the state of American democracy.

The Proposed Study

This section of Chapter 1 includes the following: (1) the problem statement, (2) the significance of the study, (3) the purpose of the study, (4) the research questions and hypotheses, and (5) support for the study, (6) assumptions of the study, and (7) the definition of terms.

The problem statement. According to the IEA study, new global realities call for major rethinking by educators and policy makers regarding how young people are being prepared to participate in democratic societies in the 21st century. Further, results of a Gallop Poll indicate that the public considers preparing students to be responsible citizens to be the most important goal of public schools, surpassing preparing youths to be economically self-sufficient, promoting cultural unity, or improving social conditions (Rose & Gallup, 2000). It needs to be determined whether a traditional civics curriculum or one with NJROTC components added, can prepare students to have more positive attitudes towards participating in our democracy. Involvement among young people in our country's democratic processes has been in decline for forty years.

It is important to find out whether students in either program discuss current events or even read newspapers to provide a basis for their participation in our country's political system.

The significance of the study. This investigation can provide educators with an awareness and identification of which civics curriculum model might better prepare students for their participation in our country's democratic processes—traditional or one that incorporates elements of the NJROTC program. The NJROTC program extends far beyond the definition of extracurricular political activities because of the number of hours during and after school, inside and outside the formal and informal curriculum, as well as inside and outside the classroom environment. Determining whether the NJROTC program produces better results could help civics programs to make changes that align to best practices that instill and preserve our national culture of democratic values and institutions.

The purpose of the study. First, the purpose of this study is to compare whether a traditional civics curriculum, or the civics curriculum as delivered in the NJROTC program, in an urban high school, makes a difference in the students' attitudes towards democratic citizenship. Second, this study will compare whether either of the civics program models is correlated to students' reading newspapers and discussing current events with others.

Research questions and hypotheses.

1. Is there a statistically significant difference in positive attitudes toward democratic citizenship among high school students at an urban high school who participate in the NJROTC civics program and those who are exposed only to the formal civics curriculum?

H_1: NJROTC students in an urban high school will score higher on questions measuring positive attitudes toward democratic citizenship than students who are exposed only to the traditional civics curriculum.

H_{01}: There is no difference in positive attitudes toward democratic citizenship among students in an urban high school who participate in the NJROTC civics program and those who are exposed only to the formal civics curriculum.

2. Is there a statistically significant difference in participation in (a) discussions of current U.S. and international news events, and (b) reading newspapers and viewing news broadcasts among students in an urban high school who participate in the NJROTC civics program and those who are exposed only to the formal civics curriculum?

H_2: NJROTC students will (a) participate more in discussion of U.S. and international current events as measure by their reported frequency, and (b) will more often read newspapers and view news broadcasts, than students in the traditional high school civics classes.

H_{O2}: There is no statistically significant difference in (a) participation in discussions of current U.S. and international news events, and (b) reading and viewing news, among students in an urban high school who participate in the NJROTC civics program and those who are exposed only to the formal civics curriculum.

Support for the study. Support for the study is drawn from the International IEA Civics Education Study (Torney-Purta, 2002) and is premised on a model that invites the expression and analysis of many points of view that significant educators and researchers perceive as relevant to

civics education in a democracy. The present study is aligned with the IEA and examined Urban High School students' knowledge with regard to what constitutes democratic citizenship.

Assumptions of the study. Some assumptions of the study included:

1. The formal civics curriculum adheres to the Michigan Curriculum Framework.
2. The NJROTC civics curriculum includes additional social studies classes over the four years of the program and builds on what is being taught in the formal curriculum.
3. Although the study used self-report instruments, the researcher assumes that students provided accurate answers to the questions. No attempts were made to verify their responses.

Definition of terms.

Extracurricular Activities:	Activities that happen outside of formal instructional hours (Campbell, 2005).
Service Learning:	Learning that is typically embedded in a course of instruction, the service itself is done in the community—outside of the school (Campbell, 2005).
Open Classroom Environment:	School culture that promotes the open exchange of ideas and opinions on political and social issues and models individuals' perception that their teachers encourage political discussion (Campbell, 2005).
Citizenship:	Membership in a legally constituted state.

Citizens:	Individuals who possess certain rights and privileges and are subject to corresponding duties (*Grolier Multimedia Encyclopedia*, 2002).
Government:	A system or policy by which a political unit is governed. Government exists at the local, state, and national levels.
Democracy:	Democracy is a form of government in which a substantial proportion of the citizenry directly or indirectly participates in ruling the state (*Grolier Multimedia Encyclopedia*, 2002).
Political Participation:	Includes voting, correspondence and interaction with elected and appointed government officials, running for office, as well as less traditional activities such as disrupting government meetings and peaceful protest (Stroupe & Sabato, 2004, p. 9).
Civics Education:	Includes: (a) Political knowledge—intellectual skills and textbook facts necessary to observe and comprehend the mechanics and institution of the political process in America, specifically as it relates to political campaigns and other policy-making arenas; (b) Political attitudes—values and dispositions towards related to government and political participation (Stroupe & Sabato, 2004, p. 4).

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The debate over which educational model better serves the goal of preparing students for participation in a democratic society requires a clear explanation of what constitutes each of the two separate civics curriculum models, and what theoretical precepts underlie each. This chapter is, therefore, presented in two parts. First, the discussion of the theoretical framework for civics education including related theories and historical development of the civics curriculum will be presented. Second, the topics that comprise the theoretical framework will be viewed in light of the empirical evidence.

Theoretical Perspective on Civics Education

Debate has occurred over whether civics education classes in schools actually increase students' civic skills and knowledge (Niemi & Junn, 1998). In particular, Patrick (2002) emphasized that civic knowledge, civic skills, and civic dispositions or attitudes were necessary components of any citizenship education curriculum. This section of the chapter addresses theories and reasoning that delineates the purpose and goals of the civics curriculum in Michigan in relation to the variable of student participation in the democratic process.

Components of education for democratic citizenship. According to Patrick (1996), effective education for democratic citizenship encompasses four basic components.

1. *Knowledge* of citizenship and government in democracy,
2. *Critical thinking* and cognitive skills of democratic citizenship,
3. *Participatory skills* of democratic citizenship, and
4. Virtues of *dispositions or attitudes* of democratic citizenship.

Figure 1 presents these four components in greater detail.

Figure 1. Components of Education for Democratic Citizenship

1. KNOWLEDGE OF CITIZENSHIP AND GOVERNMENT IN DEMOCRACY a. Concepts on the substance of democracy b. Ongoing tensions that raise public issues c. Constitutions and institutions of democratic government d. Functions of democratic institutions e. Practices of democratic citizenship and the roles of citizens f. Contexts of democracy: cultural, social, political, and economic g. History of democracy in particular states and throughout the world
2. COGNITIVE SKILLS OF DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP a. Identifying and describing phenomena or events of political and civic life b. Analyzing and explaining phenomena or events of political and civic life c. Evaluating, taking, and defending positions on public events and issues d. Making decisions on public issues e. Thinking critically about conditions of political and civic life f. Thinking constructively about how to improve political and civic life
3. PARTICIPATORY SKILLS OF DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP a. Interacting with other citizens to promote personal and common interests b. Monitoring public events and issues c. Influencing policy decisions on public issues d. Implementing policy decisions on public issues
4. VIRTUES AND DISPOSITIONS OF DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP a. Promoting the general welfare or common good of the community b. Recognizing the equal moral worth and dignity of each person c. Respecting and protecting rights possessed equally by each person d. Participating responsibly and effectively in political and civic life e. Taking responsibility for government by consent of the governed f. Becoming a self -governing person by practicing civic virtues g. Supporting and maintaining democratic principles and practices

Patrick (1996)

Certain themes are found within each generic category that form the criteria by which civics education is defined for constitutional liberal democracy. According to Patrick (2002), if these themes were missing from the curriculum, then education for democratic citizenship could be grossly flawed.

In agreement with Patrick (2002), Torney-Purta, Richardson, and Barber (2004) hypothesized that when the theme of participatory skills is taught, it can foster a positive attitude

towards civic engagement later in life. They theorized that explicit teaching about political institutions and community involvement will build a foundation of trust in students and will promote engagement. They further suggested that by promoting knowledge of civics topics in the curriculum while creating a participatory culture in the schools through service learning, students will be more engaged in political activities as adult citizens (p. 15). This supports the connection between school curriculum and later political engagement.

The primary objective of the conventional civics curriculum is to teach systematically and thoroughly a set of concepts by which democracy in today's world is defined and practiced. Patrick (2002) noted that these concepts (listed in Figure 2) are minimal democracy, constitutionalism, rights, citizenship, civil society, and market economy.

Figure 2. Concepts on the Substance of Democracy at the Core of Education for Democratic Citizenship

1. Minimal Democracy	a. Popular sovereignty (government by consent of the governed) b. Representation and accountability in government c. Free, fair, and competitive elections of representatives in government d. Comprehensive eligibility to participate freely as voters in elections. e. Inclusive access to participate freely to promote personal or common interests f. Majority rule of the people for the common good
2. Constitutionalism	a. Rule of law in the government, society, and economy b. Limited and empowered government to secure rights of the people c. Separation, sharing, and distribution of powers in government d. Independent judiciary with power of judicial or constitutional review
3. Rights	a. Human rights/constitutional rights b. Political rights and personal or private rights c. Economic, social, cultural, and environmental rights d. Negative rights and positive rights

4. Citizenship	a. Membership in a people based on legal qualifications of citizenship b. Rights, responsibilities, and roles of citizenship c. Civic identity and other types of identity (e.g., ethnic, racial, religious) d. Rights of individual citizens and rights of groups of citizens
5. Civil Society (Free and Open Social System)	a. Voluntary membership in nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) b. Freedom of association, assembly, and social choice c. Pluralism/multiple and overlapping group memberships and identities d. Social regulation (rule of law, customs, traditions, virtues)
6. Market Economy (Free and Open Economic System)	a. Freedom of exchange and economic choice b. Economic regulation (rule of law, customs, traditions, virtues)
7. Ongoing Tensions in a Constitutional Liberal Democracy	a. Majority rule and minority rights (limits on majorities and minorities/individuals) b. Liberty and equality (combining negative and positive rights to achieve justice) c. Liberty and order (limits on power and liberty to achieve security for rights) d. Individual interests and the common good (latitude and limits of personal choice)

Patrick (2002)

First, this theoretical model holds that *knowledge* of this set of concepts can enable students to: (a) know what a constitutional liberal democracy is; (b) distinguish between types of governments; and (c) evaluate the extent to which their government and other governments of the world function as authentic, constitutional, liberal democracies. Secondly, Patrick also asserted that students who master this set of concepts on the theory and practice of democracy should be able to *think critically* about four types of issues that are generic to the constitutional and liberal form of democracy—issues that pertain to tensions within democracy, such as: (a) majority rule with minority rights, (b) liberty and equality, (c) liberty and order, and (d) individual interest and the common good (Patrick, 2002). Thus, knowledge of civics concepts,

the systemization of individual thoughts with specific facts, is prerequisite to critical thinking on these aspects of democracy.

In support of this, Chesney and Feinstein (1997) reasoned that without an understanding of the facts about our democracy and the democratic process, students will not likely even have an opinion on things political, let alone participate in the process (p. 7). Therefore, the actual facts about our democracy must be learned by students if they are to progress to a more critical thinking stage. Patrick (2002) further added that, beyond basic knowledge of how a democracy functions, a central facet of civics education for constitutional democracy is development of cognitive skills that empower citizens to identify, describe, explain, and evaluate information and ideas pertinent to public issues and to make and defend decisions on these issues.

The third component of a model civics education (See Figure 1) was concerned with *participatory skills* that empowered citizens to influence public policy decisions and hold their representatives accountable in government. In combination with cognitive skills, participatory skills are tools of citizenship whereby individuals, whether acting alone or in groups, can participate effectively to promote personal and common interests, secure their rights, and promote the common good. Furthermore, many theorists suggest that when adolescents have the capacity to promote the common good, their positive citizenship can have the dual effect of providing needed services to the community and society, and promoting psychological, social, and intellectual growth for young citizens (Aguirre International, 1999; Conrad & Hedin, 1982; Janoski, Musick, & Wilson, 1998; Johnson, Beebe, Mortimer & Snyder, 1998). According to Patrick (2002), a traditional civics curriculum would not promote these higher skills, but would stop at the knowledge level because the development of cognitive and participatory skills requires active learning by students inside and outside the classroom.

The fourth component of education for democratic citizenship pertains to virtues, *attitudes and dispositions* (Patrick, 2002). Appropriate character traits are necessary to preserve and improve a constitutional liberal democracy, our national culture. Coles (1997) reasoned that children learn by modeling adults' behaviors that are expressed in actions and lifestyles. They observe, absorb, and consider how adults live and interact with others as part of their character development. As they grow and mature, they begin to form attitudes and emulate the behaviors to which they were exposed during childhood.

Therefore, if citizens want to enjoy privileges and rights of their polity, they must take responsibility for them, requiring a certain measure of civic virtue or civic dispositions. The essential components of civics education appropriate for democratic citizenship (aligned with Figure 1) are: (a) Civic Knowledge (b) Civic Skills: Intellectual and Participatory and (c) Civic Dispositions: Essential Traits of Private and Public Character. These components are found in the voluntary "National Standards for Civics and Government" (Center for Civics Education, 1994) and have been addressed by more than 3,000 individuals and groups who participated in their development and review.

According to Patrick (2002), these civic virtues (e.g., self-discipline, civility, honesty, trust, courage, compassion, tolerance, and respect for the worth and dignity of all individuals) are indispensable to the proper functioning of civil society and constitutional government. These characteristics must be nurtured through various social agencies, including the school, in a healthy constitutional democracy.

Traditional civics education and the Michigan Curriculum Framework. People often think that a curriculum is strictly what goes on in the classroom, but curriculum is more

than just learning objectives and benchmarks. Olivia (1992) offers a more global definition that captures the sense in which it is discussed in this study.

> Curriculum is everything that goes on within school, including extra-curricular activities, guidance, and interpersonal relationships. Curriculum is defined as anything that is taught both inside and outside of school and is directed by the school, everything that is planned by school personnel, anything an individual learner experiences as a result of schooling (Olivia, 1992, p.15).

According to Branson, (1998), Associate Director of the Center for Civics education, Americans should take pride and confidence that they live in the world's oldest constitutional democracy and that it serves as a model for aspiring peoples around the world. They also need to realize that civics education is essential to sustain that constitutional democracy.

Branson (1998) denoted that civics education in a democracy is education in self-government. Democratic self-government means that citizens are actively *involved* in their governance; they do not accept the dictums of others passively or acquiesce to demands of others. Carter and Elshtain, (1997) reported to the American Political Science Association (APSA) that civics education all too often seems unable to counter the belief that one either wins or loses in politics, and winning means getting everything at once, now. They believed that conventional civics education appears to be unable to teach the lessons of United States political history: Only persistent civic engagement – the slow, patient building of coalitions first and then majorities – can generate social change.

Carter and Elshtain (1997) also believed that the message that politics need not, indeed must not, be a zero-sum game is important. The idea that "winner takes all" has no place in a democracy, because losers are likely to opt out of the democratic game. Sharing is essential in a democratic society – the sharing of power, resources, and responsibilities. Therefore, the

citizens' knowledge, skills, and personal integrity are necessary traits of private and public character are the products of a good civics education in a constitutional democracy.

The Michigan Curriculum Framework is a resource for helping Michigan's public and private schools design content-area curricula. The identified content standards are presented as models for developing local district curriculum by the Michigan Department of Education. They represent rigorous expectations for student performance and describe the knowledge and abilities needed to be successful in today's society (Michigan Department of Education, 1996). According to the Michigan Curriculum Framework, when content, instruction, and local and state assessments are aligned, they can contribute to successful student achievement. The Michigan Council for the Social Studies developed a curriculum framework component for social studies that included American government (Civics). The designers of the curriculum framework wanted to facilitate continuous school improvement by emphasizing commonalities among the content areas with regard to professional development, assessment, and instruction. At its July 19, 1995, meeting, the Michigan State Board of Education unanimously adopted the model content standards for curriculum. All public school districts are required to have a curriculum that is consistent with the Michigan Core Curriculum.

Thus, the purpose of social studies education, specifically civics education, is to develop social understanding and civic efficacy. In order to do this, the civics curriculum builds four capacities in young people: disciplinary *knowledge*, *thinking skills*, *commitment* to democratic values (attitudes), and citizen *participation*. Each capacity contributes uniquely to responsible citizenship. Social studies curriculum for responsible citizenship is a compelling priority if society expects to sustain a constitutional democracy, or in other words, if we want to preserve our national culture.

Social studies content strands and standards implementation related to civics education. The social studies curriculum was designed so that students meet 25 standards (those standards are related to the present study) that are indicators of *responsible citizenship* (Department of Education, 1995). These standards, expressed as attributes, are the intended results of students' educational experience. The social studies standards are grouped into seven broad categories called strands. The strands that are related to civics education include: Inquiry, Information Processing, Conducting Investigations, Public Discourse and Decision Making, Identifying and Analyzing Issues, Group Discussion, Persuasive Writing, and Citizen Involvement and Responsible Personal Conduct. Figure 3 below presents the standards and benchmarks for civics education that have been developed by the Michigan Department of Education.

Figure 3. Standards and Benchmarks for Civics Education

Content Standard	Benchmarks
1. All students will identify the purposes of national, state, and local governments in the United States, describe how citizens organize government to accomplish their purposes, and assess their effectiveness. (Purposes of Government)	1. Explain the advantages and disadvantages of a federal system of government. 2. Evaluate how effectively the federal government is serving the purposes for which it was created. 3. Evaluate the relative merits of the American presidential system and parliamentary systems.
2. All students will explain the meaning and origin of the ideas, including the core democratic values expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and other foundational documents of the United States. (Ideas of American Democracy)	1. Identify benefits and challenges of diversity in American life. 2. Use the ideas in the Declaration of Independence to evaluate the conduct of citizens, political behavior, and the practices of government.
3. All students will describe the political and legal processes created to make decisions, seek consensus and resolve conflicts in a free society. (Democracy in Action)	1. Using actual cases, evaluate the effectiveness of civil and criminal courts in the United States. 2. Explain why people may agree on democratic values in the abstract but disagree when they are applied to specific situations. 3. Evaluate possible amendments to the Constitution.

4. All students will explain how American governmental Institutions, at the local, state, and federal levels, provide for the limitation and sharing of power and how the nation's political system provides for the exercise of power. (American Government and Politics)	1. Evaluate proposals for reform of the political system. 2. Analyze causes of tension between the branches of government.
5. All students will understand how the world is organized politically, the formation of American foreign policy and the roles the United States plays in the international arena. (American Government and World Affairs)	1. Describe the influence of the American concept of democracy and individual rights in the world. 2. Evaluate foreign policy positions in light of national interests and American values.

Despite the claims of the purpose of social studies, according to Brannan, Information Resources Manager, Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (MCREL; personal correspondence, August 20, 2005), a national-level body charged with officially designating state standards for civics education as "acceptable" has not been formed. Furthermore, no national standards for civics education have even been proposed. In spite of initiatives by the American Federations of Teachers (2001) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), there has been no single set of guidelines for what constitutes a quality civics education curriculum.

Instead, standards in different content areas have been developed by national-level organizations [e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), National Reading Conference (NRC), etc.] and are referred to as "national standards" (Brannan, 2005). For example, curriculum standards for the State of Michigan were developed by the NCSS; however, no consensus, approval, or any other kind of official appraisal has been made by a national-level governing agency (Brannan, personal correspondence, August 20, 2005).

According to Brannan, *Education Week* publishes an annual report on a specific aspect of education in the U.S. The 2001 annual report focused on state standards, pointing out that the

state standards were based on the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) model. Gagnon (2003, p. 25) asserted that the standards "are the weakest on specifics and tend not to offer a common core of learning." Contrary to the social studies announced aim, "competent citizenship," these standards had little political history and were weak "… on the political, economic, social, and cultural ideas of all world civilizations, including Western" (Gagnon, 2003, p. 23). The report also criticized NCSS standards for social studies (Schneider as cited in Gagnon, 2003) because of their "sweeping topics: and vague, imprecise understandings [that are] contrary to preparing citizens of sound judgment" (p. 24). Thus, various reports support the notion that conventional civics education appears to be unable to teach what is necessary for students to understand American political history, which according to the theoretical model is necessary for students to acquire the critical thinking or participatory aspects of civics education.

In an effort to improve the overall civics curriculum and strengthen standards for civics education, State Superintendent Mike Flanagan spoke to the Michigan Board of Education on November 15, 2005, and announced that new and improved graduation requirements would "change the face of public education" (Walker, 2006). He stated that "in addition to the one civics course currently required by state law, Michigan high school students would be required to take 2.5 social science credits in addition to civics. Walker believed that the current state requirement for civics education should be producing students who could demonstrate exceptional competency in civics.

From 2000 to 2005, however, an average of only 28% of test-takers met or exceeded state standards in social studies, meaning that, on average, nearly three-quarters of students who graduated from Michigan public high schools in the past six years did not meet the state's standard for basic knowledge of the United States and Michigan. This lack of competency in

civics called out for remedial education at a cost of $600 million to Michigan post-secondary institutions annually, with many Michigan businesses forced to re-educate high school graduates to provide basic skills. The evidence seems to suggest that Michigan students are not being prepared for responsible democratic citizenship and they are not prepared to maintain our national culture—they are not prepared to perpetuate our society's democratic ideals.

Junior Officers Training Corp (JROTC) program and curriculum. In contrast with a one-semester course in American government, which constitutes the traditional civics education, students can elect to be part of JROTC, a four-year program. Congress established Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (JROTC) in 1916 with the broad mandate to develop good citizenship and responsibility in young people (Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1999). They began with a handful of units and have reached nearly 3,000 units across the United States today. By 1966, all services had established their programs and units in various high schools (Chief of Staff of Army Headquarters, Dept. of the Army, 1986). According to CSIS, the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps established appropriate missions and objectives. For example, their benchmark for evaluating the JROTC in the United States was its effectiveness in helping to develop the nation's youth. The oldest and largest public enterprise for youth development is JROTC. Over 219,000 cadets are enrolled in JROTC units in the United States and its possessions. Cadet distribution by service is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Number of Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) by Service 1987 and 2003

Military Service	1983	2003
Army	136,502	272,746
Navy	30,728	83,187
Marines	19,660	Not Available
Air Force	41,505	114,668
Total	219,396	470,601

Note: Zwartz, 1987, p. 14; National Catholic Reporter (NCR) Online, 2003

Naval Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (NJROTC). The Naval JROTC (NJROTC) program, with 584 units as of 2002 (NCR Online, 2003), was established by Public Law 88-647 on October 13, 1964. NJROTC is under the command and control of the chief of Naval education and training (CNET), Pensacola, Florida (CSIS, 1999). The NJROTC program manager has a small headquarters staff located at CNET consisting of 13 full-time military and civilian personnel. Seven regional area managers and seven clerical assistants serve across the country as a closer link to the individual host schools. Total overhead personnel consist of 27 full-time military and civilian employees (CSIS, 1999). According to the NCR Online (2003), the Navy JROTC was expected to expand to more than 600 units by the start of the 2003 school year. The budget for 2002 was $35.3 million. Of the 83,187 students in the Navy JROTC in the 2002-2003 academic year, 40% were female and 60% were male. The majority of students (59%) in the NJROTC program are minorities, including African American (30%), Hispanic (18%), Asian American/Pacific Islander, (7%), and Native American/Alaskan Native (1%), and other (3%). Approximately 40% of all NJROTC program graduates enter military service and

about 58% of the program graduates attend post-secondary education (including ROTC programs and military academies).

The Department of the Navy CNET Instruction 1533.9J dated July 10, 1996, provides written guidance for the program administration. The stated purpose of NJROTC, as stipulated in legislation, is "to instill in students in United States secondary educational institutions the values of citizenship, service to the United States, personal responsibility and a sense of accomplishment" (CISS, 1999). The supporting objectives (e.g., developing informed and responsible citizens, promoting a healthy and drug-free life, encouraging the completion of high school) are similar to those described above in the discussion of army JROTC. A cornerstone of these plans is performance-based instruction (PBI that focuses on developing skills rather than memorizing facts, encourages a participatory rather than a teacher-centered instructional environment, and visibly ties learning activities to the intended outcome (the student's eventual ability to demonstrate specific skills and knowledge; U.S. Army Cadet Command, 1997).

The primary vehicle for attaining these objectives is the Navy program of instruction, which includes components pertaining to such topics as leadership, citizenship, drug-abuse prevention, career planning, the past and present Navy, nautically relevant aspects of natural science (e.g., meteorology, astronomy, maritime geography, oceanography), first aid, and survival training (Department of the Navy, CNET as cited in CSIS, 1999, p. 8). According to Navy guidelines, the program offered by each NJROTC unit is to last at least three academic years with 120 hours of instruction per year (72 hours in the classroom and 48 hours of activities such as military drill and athletics; CSIS, 1999). NJROTC's combination of printed classroom materials and multimedia technology (e.g., videodiscs, videocassettes, CD-ROMs, computers,

etc.) strive for an active participatory learning environment and has drawn praise from school systems and teachers (CSIS, 1999). Students, in many cases, find the recorded instruction boring.

As with other military services, the Navy operates a summer learning program called the Summer Leadership Academy that offers leadership training, physical-fitness instruction, obstacle course field orientation, sail training, social-etiquette instruction, and other courses that build self-esteem and character (CSIS, 1999). Further, all NJROTC units included a community-service program that involves students in such activities as drug and alcohol awareness programs, highway and waterway cleanup, tutoring, funeral details, food drives, color guard and ceremonial details, and retirement-home assistance visits (CSIS, 1999). According to the Navy, NJROTC high school units averaged over 1,500 hours of community service work during the 1996-1997 school year (CSIS, 1999).

Opinions of NJROTC. Public opinion of JROTC in public schools falls into two sharply divided camps. People tend either to oppose the JROTC presence in high schools vigorously, accusing it of encouraging militaristic attitudes among the nation's youth, or to love it. The latter group is comprised mainly of people who have had direct exposure to JROTC, associating with young people who have gone through the program and seeing firsthand positive results of the experience, or at least seeing a unit in operation in a local community. Both groups base their opinions on subjective analysis (Center for Strategic International Studies, 1999). The JROTC program can provide a fresh start in life for students considered at-risk, particularly those minorities who are living in crime-plagued ghettos. Therefore, ROTC could be considered a social bargain (Powell, 1995). Any money spent on JROTC is an investment, and the United States can receive benefits in the future as its citizens may be better educated and further prepared to face future challenges (Livingston, 1996). The Army JROTC has established a

reputation of excellence for its members and the services they provide. This commitment to superiority has been recognized by the young men and women, educators and administrators at Twiggs County Comprehensive High/Middle School in Jeffersonville, Georgia (Saxby & Chambliss, 1997). The JROTC program is an integral part of efforts to help troubled young people change their attitudes and behavior. The results of the program have been amazing, and the success of the JROTC program is expected to continue in the future (Brooks & Boyd, 1997). Now the discussion of the research will move from the conceptual framework to an examination of the research pertinent to this study.

Empirical Studies and Anecdotal Research

This section of Chapter 2 will discuss the research that has contributed to the discussion of the two research questions of this investigation**.** First, this section will examine the research regarding the first hypothesis on students' attitudes towards democracy, government, and citizenship. Second, the remainder of this chapter will address the second hypothesis, by reviewing the limited research on students' frequency of seeking information about current events and discussing political issues.

Attitudes towards democratic citizenship. According to the Center for Strategic Studies, (1999), some objectives, such as promoting citizenship, are not readily measurable. Accordingly, some evidence of program effectiveness is testimonial and anecdotal, including statements by teachers, school officials, parents and cadets attesting to the positive difference that JROTC has made for individual cadets, the school, and the community. Comparison to national norms, however, is not always appropriate because many JROTC programs are targeted toward at-risk youth (U.S. Army Cadet Command, 1998).

One study (Seiverling, 1973) compared mean scores of Pennsylvania JROTC cadets enrolled in the senior class with students at a similar class level who did not pursue the same course of study. The JROTC cadets were found to have higher mean scores in positive attitudes towards citizenship than students not enrolled in JROTC, but the difference was not statistically significant. A 1990 research study by Day, Middleton, and Wollfley (as cited in CSIS, 1999, using representative samples from the U.S. East Coast) concluded that cadets, as compared to non-cadet students, were more "responsible citizens" and had a greater appreciation of integrity and a positive response to constituted authority (CSIS, 1999). Accepting constituted authority is not surprising in a military organization, but importantly, more than 90% of cadets surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that JROTC had taught them ethical values that underlie good citizenship. According to data initially collected for Operation Capital from the senior class in the Washington, D.C., public schools in the 1987-1988 school year, 94% of cadets graduated compared to 75% for all seniors in the school district. Teachers and administrators were unanimous in asserting that the JROTC program enhanced school curriculum, (Day et al., as cited in CSIS, 1999).

The CSIS study group located documents written by organizations that argued that JROTC was not in the best interest of students and that the military should not be involved in the public schools. These groups included the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors (CCCO), the Center for Defense Information (CDI), Women Against Military Madness (WAMM), Veterans for Peace (VP), the Committee Opposed to Militarism and the Draft (COMD), the War Resisters League, and the Project on Youth and Non-Military Opportunities (Project YANO).

Despite philosophical objections to JROTC programs, the overall finding of CSIS (1999) is that JROTC benefits a substantial segment of the nation's youth and their communities. Many recommendations were designed to ensure that all communities and schools shared in the benefits that JROTC offers to students. Although disadvantaged youth often are able to gain the most benefits from participation in JROTC, CSIS maintained that the program must remain an attractive option for all sectors of the nation's youth to retain and enhance its democratic character.

Although schools are agencies for promoting the values of our democracy, according to Colby and Damon (1999), parents, peers, culture, and society also play a large part in socializing individuals to have a sense of morality (or lack of morality) and civic virtues. Parents who are role models for volunteering behaviors in their children, and participating in general activities with their children, often have children who are more likely to be involved in volunteering activities (Dunham & Bengston, 1992; Flanagan, Bowes, Jonsson, Csapo, & Sheblanova, 1998; Fletcher, Edler, & Mekos, 2000; Hashway, 1998). Research also supports the concept that the social contextual variables have been found to promote the types of values that predict civic engagement. For example, parenting strategies and parent civic behaviors are related to youth moral development (e.g., Gunnoe, Hetherington, & Reiss, 1999; Hoffman, 1975), with peers and siblings modeling empathy, morals, and values (Eisenberg, 2003; Volling, 2003). The society and culture in which youth are raised can promote either individualistic or collectivistic values (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1988).

At the heart of volunteer activities in the community is the concept of acting for the greater good. In spite of American culture promoting competition and self-centeredness, the concept of giving time to help others is still alive. Students can enhance their capacities to

develop and maintain political and civic conditions that are important to the survival of democracy by developing a desire to act for the greater good. This participation appears to be a good predictor of civic engagement later in life. Research suggested that collectivism, defined as putting the community goals ahead of individual goals, can be a better predictor of civic engagement than individualism (Avrahami & Dar, 1993; Omoto & Snyder, 1995; Perkins, Brown & Taylor, 1996). Conversely, most young people characterize their volunteering as an alternative to official politics, that they see as corrupt, ineffective, and unrelated to their deeper ideals. They have confidence in collective acts, especially those undertaken through public institutions whose operations they regard as remote, opaque, and virtually impossible to control (Hart-Teeter 1997; National Association of Secretaries of State 1999).

In 1999, the National Association of Secretaries of States conducted a study called *The New Millennium Survey: American Youth Attitudes on Politics, Citizenship, Government and Voting.* They examined several issues that young people, and depending on their age, differing issues held more importance than others. One finding was that crime and drugs was of highest concern among high school students; economy and jobs (11%) took a distant second in the youth issue matrix. Table 2 presents results of the survey on the most important problem by the age group of the respondents.

Table 2

Most Important Problem by Age Group (In Percents)

Age Groups	Crime/Drugs	Economy/Jobs
Overall	21	11
15-17 years	29	4
18-20 years	20	14
21-24 years	14	16
Education Level		
High School Graduate	20	11
Some College	17	18
College Graduate	8	29

Among focus group participants (all of whom were over 18 years old), the primary concerns were about job security and being able to pay for school and their immediate necessities. Important issues like foreign affairs (9%), education (6%), budget/taxes/spending (6%) morals/values (4%) environment (3%), and politicians/incumbents (2%) were among the lower level concerns. What do the participants' responses say about their attitudes towards participating in our democracy? One obstacle to youth becoming engaged in political activity was their distrust of people. They generally believed that most people could be trusted (32%). When asked if most people should be approached with caution, 65% of young people agreed. Every demographic youth group showed a disturbingly low level of trust towards other people. Nevertheless, geographic location, race, education level, and age (to a lesser degree) revealed substantial differences in shaping youth attitudes about trust in other people. The most trusting young people were Whites who lived in the western part of the country, while the most cautious were minorities who lived in the South. Table 3 provides results of the analysis of trust by race.

Table 3

Trust in People (Percent)

Race	Most can be Trusted	Approach with caution
Whites	38	60
African Americans	20	76
Hispanics	20	77

While education levels played a substantial role in the responses, a linear relationship was not found within the demographic grouping studied. Over 75% of participants with a high school degree or less were more skeptical about people, as compared to those with some college and those with college degrees who were slightly more trusting.

Something important to note for this investigation is that personal distrust was also reinforced by political distrust. Of those who said they generally approach people with caution, 65% also believe that "you can't trust politicians because most are dishonest;" in contrast, just 43% of those who generally trusted people and 57% of all youth believed this statement.

The polling results showed a strong relationship between lack of trust in people and lack of political participation. Those who were non-voters, those who said they paid very little attention to politics, those who hardly ever talked to their parents about politics, those who saw no impact of government in their lives and those who rated being involved in democracy as unimportant – all stood out as the least trusting of young people. In addition, volunteers were slightly more likely to trust people (35%) than non-volunteers (30%); however, both groups tended to exercise caution toward trusting people in general.

Although children and adolescents are in the process of developing attitudes regarding government and other social institutions, few studies have attempted to differentiate among

various types of trust (in institutions compared with more generalized trust in people) and determine how trust can impact children's and adolescents' political socialization. Torney-Purta, Richardson, and Barber (2004) asserted that while adults have been the focus of research on the nature and effects of trust in social and political institutions, the purpose of *their* study was to "explore the nature and correlates of trust in political institutions and its correlates in expected civic and political participation among adolescents" (Torney-Purta et al., 2004, p. 2). Data collected from the IEA Civics Education Study of 14-year-olds in 1999. was used to investigate trust at three levels; (a) trust in institutions with which individuals have little or no daily contact (those delegated as representatives in institutions such as the national legislature), (b) trust in institutions with representatives that frequently interact with individuals (schools), and (c) trust in other people.

Another study (Torney-Purta et al., 2004) examined levels of the three types of trust and compared student perceptions of them in five democracies whose levels of political stability varied (Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, England and the United States). The students in the United States were more trusting of governmental institutions than students in the other four countries. Nevertheless, the levels of trust reported for United States students for courts, legislature, national government, as well as local government did not exceed a mean score of 3 on a 4-point scale, indicating they had only moderate levels of trust. Trust in political parties was generally lower, with students in the United States reporting the highest mean scores. However, students in the United States had the second *lowest* scores in terms of trust in the police and showed the lowest scores in regard to schools.

Torney-Purta et al. (2001) argued that 14-year-old adolescents as well as adults are more likely to report higher levels of trust in political institutions if they are living in durable and

stable democracies rather than in newly established or unstable ones. Adolescents who have higher levels of trust in governmental institutions can be a foundation on which civic participation can be built. Conversely, the same students have difficulty in understanding the notion of delegating authority to political institutions that are intended to represent citizens' interests (Torney-Purta et al, 2001). They suggested that school practices (e.g., explicit teaching about political institutions and community problems, allowing students to play a role in school government) can play a role in building trust, and thereby promoting engagement. Their study pointed towards teaching knowledge, emphasizing civic topics in the curriculum, and ensuring a participatory culture; in doing these things, schools can make a difference in preparing students for civic and political engagement. These are the types of experiences that the NJROTC program specifically promotes.

The study also examined school climate, family variables, and community participation, as well as civic knowledge as a predictor of expectation of voting and obtaining information about candidates. Interestingly, the findings indicated that civic knowledge is not a predictor of the expectation of civic participation in their communities. Service learning experiences, however, were found to have some positive effects on expectations of voting and greater influence on expectations of civic participation in the community, especially for United States students. If this is true, then the *knowledge* obtained from the civics curriculum will not necessarily lead to more civic engagement. Service learning as often integrated into the NJROTC program, on the other hand, would be a closer correlate of later political engagement. Thus, this study supported the idea that, while necessary, knowledge is not enough to lead to political engagement; the extracurricular service learning, which distinguishes the NJROTC program from the traditional program, would seem to be a key for political engagement later in life.

Indeed, the results of these studies indicated that students who have higher levels of trust are more likely to become active participants in civic and political activities. This finding also suggested that students who had higher levels of trust would be expected to become more involved in civic and political actions. Additionally, family socialization was a statistically significant predictor of political activity in the five countries. In summary, the authors asserted that "trust is important in a positive sense for engagement (in civic and political activities), but its relationship is complex and it is far from the only relevant aspect of schooling or society for adolescents" (Torney-Purta & Amadeo, 2004, p. 16).

Returning to the New Millennium Survey (NASS, 2001), another issue relating to young people's individualistic v. collectivist orientation surfaced. Young people's interests were found to be individualistic, with participation in public life and collective activities (i.e., politics) ranking at the bottom of their list of priorities. The NASS survey asked a series of questions that tested nine potential future goals of young people on a scale from 1 to 10. Rankings of these youth priorities revealed a contrast between youth attitudes towards individual pursuits like family, personal growth and career success and the more group-oriented goals like being involved in the community or in democracy. Whether insightful of young people's true attitudes or indicative of a more politically correct response, young survey respondents rated doing well financially (29%) as no more important than civic pursuits.

Specifically, data indicated that "having a close-knit family" (61% gave it a "10", the top rating), gaining knowledge, education and skills (60%), and becoming successful in a career (50%) all ranked near the top. Youth rated these personal goals with higher importance than being a good American who cares about the good of the country (27%), being involved in democracy and voting (26%) or being involved and helping their community become a better

place (25%) – which ranked at the bottom. Thus, they found a cultural norm among young people that seemed to override other efforts to promote participating in and devoting energy to political activities. This seems to be a generation of young people who are distrustful of many governmental institutions, and unlikely to make personal sacrifice for the greater good of the society. It paints an enigmatic picture. Has our young citizenry become completely self-concerned? Is there any evidence that an educational program can affect these attitudes?

There has been at least one attempt to show how a particular type of civics curriculum can mold attitudes that support democratic citizenship. During the spring of 1993, a study was conducted on effects of the Center for Civics education's "We the People…" program on students' civic attitudes (Brody, 1993). The study focused on the concept of "political tolerance," a concept that encompasses many beliefs, values, and attitudes that are essential to a functioning democracy. For example, while majority rule is a basic principle of democracy, without attention to the rights of those in the minority, it can degenerate into tyranny. "Political tolerance" referred to citizens' respect for political rights and civil liberties of all people in society including those whose ideas they may find distasteful or abhorrent.

According to Brody (1993), the study was designed to determine the degree to which civics curricula in general, and the "We the People..." program in particular, influence students' political attitudes. The report was based on analysis of survey responses of 1,351 high school students from across the United States. Among the most important findings were:

- Overall, students in high school civics, government and American history classes display more "political tolerance" than the average American.
- Students in classes using all or part of the "We the People..." curriculum are more tolerant than students following other curricula.
- The "We the People..." program fosters increased tolerance because it promotes higher levels of self-confidence and the perception of fewer limits on students' own political freedom.

- Among "We the People..." students, those involved in the simulated congressional hearing competitions, demonstrate the highest levels of tolerance.

The study demonstrated that higher levels of participation in the "We the People..." simulated congressional hearing competition, the greater the likelihood of students' opposition to limits on free assembly, due process rights, and freedom of speech, press, and religion (Brody, 1993). Participation in the simulated hearings indicated that the increased *time* spent in preparing for the competition was not an important factor; however, *how the time was spent* in preparing for the hearings had a measurable impact on the tolerance levels of students who were included in "We the People..." program.

Thus, it is evident that attitudes towards democratic citizenship involve complex dynamics entangled with trust and students' life goals. On the other hand, there is a precedent for a school curriculum to somehow promote attitudinal change that supports democratic principles.

The concluding section of this chapter looks at the available research addressing the second hypothesis, students' participation in seeking information and discussing current events.

Frequency of participation in seeking information about and discussing current events. Interestingly, during the 2008 national election year, young voters from ages 18 to 29 were demonstrating more interest in the political process than in the last several races for the U.S. Presidency. According to a survey sponsored by the *Washington Post* of a cross-section of young voters in Ohio, Florida, Colorado, and Virginia (American University, 2008), 97% of the respondents said they intend to vote. The majority identified more than one major issue in the Presidential campaign; almost half of the respondents cited their concern about health care, typically an issue of importance to older voters. High school students who were interviewed in Indiana (Bennett, 2008) had registered in unprecedented numbers and reported feeling

empowered by their having a voice in the national election. Perhaps significantly, their government teachers had assigned them to research individual candidates; the students remarked that they had become intensely interested in the candidates (either for or against the one they had investigated), and in turn, had become tuned in to the political process going on around them.

Perhaps not surprisingly, Torney-Purta and Amadeo, (2004) found that reading newspapers was a statistically significant predictor of students *volunteering* in the community. They also concluded that while becoming an informed voter could be predicted from civic knowledge, it was less important than parental discussions about politics. Thus, *knowledge* in this study is not a dependent variable, but discussions of political matters is. Interestingly, even actual *participation* in community activities (e.g., volunteering, collecting for charity, etc.) was not related to knowledge in any of the other four countries studied, but was related to reading newspapers and having political discussions.

Unfortunately, despite a recent increase in interest in the national elections (Bennett, 2008), still relatively few youth participate in civic activities. Although, a trend has been noted toward greater youth participation in community service (Faison & Flanagan, 2001), fewer than 50% (and, depending on the data cited, closer to 30%) of youth actually participate in volunteer activities (e.g., Child Trends, 2002; Flanagan, Bowes, Jonsson, Csapo, & Sheblanova, 1998; Harris Interactive, 2001; National Association of Secretaries of State, 1999; Zaff, Moore, Papillo & Williams, 2003). These low rates of political and community involvement do not mean that adolescents are disengaged from society as a whole. Indeed, nearly 80% of youth report being members of clubs (e.g., sports teams or academic and arts clubs; Ehrle & Moore, 1999; National Association of Secretaries of State, 1998). The key issue of the present study, however, is not

how youth become involved in general activities, but how they become engaged in *civic* activities.

Harkening back to Patrick (2002), students cannot rely on the cleverness or elegance of constitutional design or institutional structures to maintain our national culture of democracy. They must discuss events and tune into the news in order to make informed decisions. Sadly, there seem to have been no studies in how *frequently* high school students read newspapers or keep abreast of current events, nor are there readily available studies on how often or with whom students discuss U.S. or international politics. Thus, the frequency of their gathering information for discussing politics is the dependent variable in the second hypothesis. Clearly, more data is needed to shed light on the motivations and dynamics that govern young people's political activities. Ultimately, students can learn that the success or failure of democracy depends on their knowledge, skills, habits, attitudes, and the actions of committed citizens, as well as political and civic conditions they create. Our democracy cannot run itself. It requires actively involved citizens.

Summary

This chapter has brought into focus the theoretical and conceptual framework for examining the variables in this study. First, the traditional civics paradigm was outlined, followed by a discussion of the NJROTC model of civics education. Second, studies that pertain to high school students' attitudes toward democratic citizenship were presented, followed by a look at studies that address students' attention to current events. Chapter 3 will present how the new data was gathered to investigate the two dependent variables of this study: (1) attitudes towards democratic citizenship, and (2) the frequency with which students seek information

about and discuss political current events. The independent variable, membership in traditional civics program or the NJROTC civics program will be tested for their interactions.

Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter presents a discussion of the methods that were used to collect and analyze the data needed to address the research questions and test the hypotheses for this study. The topics in this chapter include: restatement of the purpose of the study, research design, setting for the study, participants, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

Restatement of the Purpose of the Study

This study was conducted, first, to determine if students in NJROTC programs have more positive attitudes toward democratic citizenship than students in the traditional civics classes. Secondly, the study investigated whether students in NJROTC programs have more frequent discussions of current news events, and read or view more news than students who take a traditional civics class.

Research Design

A static group comparison design was used for this study because students belonged to one group or the other based on pre-existing characteristics, and thus, the independent variable was not manipulated and no intervention or treatment was offered to the participants. The independent variable was group membership, NJROTC or traditional civics class. Whether students were in grade 9, 10, 11, or 12 was another level of the independent variable. The dependent variables were attitudes toward democratic citizenship and participation in discussions of current news events.

Setting for the Study

The setting for this study was a large urban school district located in a Midwestern state. The school district had an enrollment of 19,760 students with four combined middle-high schools and 26 elementary schools. In addition, the district had two alternative schools and one

career technical school. The community in which the school district is located was generally working class, with a median income of $39,045. The median home value was $49,865.

The study was conducted at one combined middle-high school in the school district. The combined middle-high school had an enrollment of 1,388 students in grades 9 through 12. The high school failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress in 2005. The racial/ethnic distribution for the 2005-2006 academic year included Black (72.5%), White (22.0%), Hispanic (4.2%), Asian/Pacific Islander (0.7%), and American Indian/Alaska native (0.7%). Forty-five percent of the students qualified for the free or reduced lunch program.

Two hundred and seven students took the social studies portion of the MEAP test in the 2004-2005 academic year. Of this number, 47.3% scored satisfactorily in social studies, including 3.4% at Level 1 (exceeded Michigan standards), 27.5% at Level 2 (met Michigan standards), and 16.4% (at basic level). The remainder of the students (52.7%) had not met Michigan standards for social studies.

Participants in the Study

Students enrolled in the NJROTC program (n = 100) and a comparison group of students in general education programs (n = 100) were asked to participate in this study. These students were in grades 9 through 12 and included both male and female students.

All students in the NJROTC program were asked to participate in this study, as was a sample of students in general education programs. Parents were sent passive consent forms to inform them of the study, and for permission to allow their children to participate in the study. The parents were asked to return the consent form to the researcher if they did not want their child to participate in the study. Only those students whose parents had agreed to allow them to participate in the study were included in the sample.

Instrument

The survey developed for this study was designed to measure students' perceptions and knowledge of government and civics, and included demographic questions to obtain information about the personal characteristics of the students. The survey is divided into five sections. The first part includes 56 items that measure perceptions of government and civics. These items were inspired by a questionnaire developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (IEA, 1999). The students were asked to rate each item using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 for *strongly disagree* to 5 for *strongly agree*. Eleven items on the survey were reverse worded to encourage the students to read each of the items carefully. These items were recoded prior to statistical analysis.

Before analyzing the responses on this section of the survey, a principal components factor analysis using a varimax rotation was used to determine if factors emerge that could be used as subscales in addressing the research questions. The retention of an item on the factor analysis was based on three criteria, as recommended by Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, (2006) (a) must have a factor loading greater than .40, (b) must not load on more than one factor, and (c) the Eigenvalue for the factor must be greater than 1.00. The factors that emerged from the principal components factor analysis were used as subscales for measuring "democratic citizenship". The results of the factor analysis are presented in Appendix E.

The second part of the survey addressed the students' frequency of participation in discussion of current news events as the dependent variable; thus, this section of the survey provided data for testing the second hypothesis. To measure this variable, students were asked if they discuss what is happening in the government and in international politics. In addition, they were asked the frequency with which they read newspapers and listen to news broadcasts on

television and radio. Items on this section of the instrument were rated using a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 for *never* to 4 for *often*. A place is also provided for *don't know*, for students who were unaware of what the question was asking.

The third section of the survey asked students if they were going to become active in government and politics as adults, which provided further data relevant to the first hypothesis. They were asked to rate each item in this section using a 4-point Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 for *I will certainly not do this* to 4 for *I will certainly do this.* A place was provided for *don't know* for students who were unaware of what the question was asking.

The fourth section of the survey asked the students to respond to six multiple-choice questions that measured students' knowledge of government and civics. One choice of answer was correct for each of the questions, with one point awarded for each correct answer. Since Patrick (2002) had stated that knowledge was prerequisite to positive attitudes toward democratic citizenship, this section of the survey provided data as to whether, indeed, there was a difference in the level of knowledge between the two groups. Having this data could help explain differences in attitudes between the two groups that might otherwise be misinterpreted.

The last section of the survey obtains information on the students' personal characteristics (e.g., age, gender, grade in school, ethnicity, membership in NJROTC, and political activity in school and the community). The items in this section of the survey used a combination of forced-choice and fill-in-the-blank questions.

Validity and Reliability

Although the survey for this study was based on a survey from IEA Civics Study, no data were available on the validity or reliability of the new instrument. The researcher asked three civics instructors to review the survey to determine the face validity of the instrument. They also

were asked to indicate any items they felt need to be reworded to improve their readability, and indicate items that should be removed or added. The researcher reviewed their comments and made changes that were recommended by two of the three civics instructors.

The researcher tested the instrument for internal consistency by calculating Cronbach alpha coefficients on the students' survey responses. Results of these analyses are presented in Chapter 4.

Data Collection Procedures

Following approval from the Human Investigation Committee and the superintendent of schools, the researcher obtained a list of names and addresses of students in NJROTC and in general education classes at the research site. The researcher sent passive consent forms to the parents of each of these students. The use of a passive consent form allowed parents to approve of their children's participation in research, without having to sign and return the consent form. However, if a parent chose not to allow his/her child to participate in the research, the parents could return the form and that student was excluded from the study.

The researcher developed survey packets that included a copy of the student assent form and a copy of the survey. The surveys were not coded in any way and no other identifying information was on the survey in order to protect the identity of the students who participated in the study.

Two weeks after the distribution of the parental consent forms, the researcher met with the Master Chief of the NJROTC and teachers who were distributing the surveys to discuss the procedures that were used with the students. The researcher explained the purpose of the student assent form that must be distributed to all students who were participating in the study. The teachers and Master Chief were requested to remove any students from the area where the

surveys were being completed if they did not sign the student assent form. The researcher discussed the distribution of the survey packets after the assent forms had been collected. The researcher then went over the survey with the teachers. They were encouraged to ask any questions during this meeting to enable them to answer any questions the students might have. Data collection was completed during this same week.

To maintain confidentiality of the students in the study, the assent forms were placed together in an envelope separate from the students' completed surveys. The teachers and the Master Chief distributed survey packets to the students who were asked to work alone and complete the survey. The Master Chief was responsible for collecting data from the NJROTC students, with civics teachers responsible for having their students complete their surveys in class. The students were cautioned not to place any identifying information on the surveys in order to maintain their confidentiality.

After the surveys were completed, the students were directed to place them in the envelopes and return them to the teacher. No survey packets were allowed outside of the classroom where the surveys were being completed. Students who had parent consent to participate in the study and were absent when data were being collected were not allowed to participate in the study.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the surveys were entered in a computer file for data analysis using SPSS – Windows, version 17.0. The data analyses were divided into three sections. The first section used frequency distributions, cross-tabulations, and measures of central tendency and dispersion to provide a profile of the students. The second section used descriptive statistics to provide baseline data on the subscales from the survey. Inferential statistical analyses,

including multivariate analysis of variance procedures were used to address the research questions in the third section. All decisions regarding the statistical significance of the findings were made using an alpha level of .05. Figure 4 presents the statistical analysis that was used with each research question.

Figure 4 Statistical Analysis

Research Questions	Variables	Statistical Analysis
1. Is there a statistically significant difference in positive attitudes toward democratic citizenship among high school students at an urban high school who participate in the NJROTC civics program and those who are exposed only to the traditional civics curriculum? H_1 : NJROTC students in an urban high school will score higher on questions measuring positive attitudes toward democratic citizenship than students who are exposed only to the traditional civics curriculum. H_{01}: There is no difference in positive attitudes toward democratic citizenship among students in an urban high school who participate in the NJROTC civics program and those who are exposed only to the traditional civics curriculum.	Dependent Variable Attitudes toward democratic citizenship Independent Variable Type of program NJROTC General Education Grade level of student 9^{th}, 10^{th}, 11^{th}, 12^{th} grades	A 2 x 4 factorial analysis of variance procedure was used to determine if attitudes toward democracy, government, and citizenship differ between students in the NJROTC program and those in general education curriculum and by grade level. If statistically significant differences were obtained on the omnibus F tests, the univariate analysis of variance tests were interpreted for the main effects of program and grade and the interaction between program and grade. The mean scores for the type of program were examined to determine the direction of the differences on the subscales with statistically significant univariate F tests. Scheffé a posteriori tests were used to compare all possible pairwise comparisons for grade level to determine which grades are contributing to the statistically significant outcomes for the subscales with statistically significant univariate F tests. If the interaction between type of program and grade level were statistically significant for any of the univariate F tests, simple effects analysis was used to determine if the groups were contributing to the statistically significant differences.
2. Is there a statistically significant difference in participation in discussions of current U.S. and international events among students in an urban high school who participate in the NJROTC civics program and those who are exposed only the traditional civics curriculum? H_2: NJROTC students will (a) participate more in discussion of U.S. and international current events as measure by their reported frequency, and (b) will more often read and view news broadcasts, than students in the traditional high school civics classes. H_{O2}: There is no statistically	Dependent Variables Frequency of participation in discussions of current news events • Happening in the US government • Happening in international politics Frequency of reading about and listening to news broadcasts Independent Variable Type of program NJROTC General Education Grade level of student 9^{th}, 10^{th}, 11^{th}, 12^{th} grades	A 2 x 4 factorial analysis of variance procedure was used to determine if participation in discussions of current events and frequency of reading about and listening to news broadcast differ between students in the NJROTC program and those in general education curriculum and by grade level. If statistically significant differences were obtained on the omnibus F tests, the univariate analysis of variance tests were interpreted for the main effects of program and grade and the interaction between program and grade. The mean scores for the type of program were examined to determine the direction of the differences on the

Figure 4 Statistical Analysis

Research Questions	Variables	Statistical Analysis
significant difference in (a) participation in discussions of current news events, and (b) reading and viewing current news broadcasts among students in an urban high school who participate in the NJROTC civics program and those who are exposed only to the traditional civics curriculum.		subscales with statistically significant univariate F tests. Scheffé a posteriori tests were used to compare all possible pairwise comparisons for grade level to determine which grades are contributing to the statistically significant outcomes for the subscales with statistically significant univariate F tests. If the interaction between type of program and grade level were statistically significant for any of the univariate F tests, simple effects analysis were used to determine groups were contributing to the statistically significant differences.

Chapter 4: Results of the Data Analysis

The purpose of the study was to determine if a statistically significant difference existed among urban high school students who participate in the NJROTC program and students who participate only in the formal traditional civics/government curriculum. Students in each of the two programs were surveyed for evidence of two particular effects. First, the study investigated whether students in the NJROTC program in an urban high school have a more positive attitude towards democratic citizenship than students in the traditional civics classes. Secondly, the research examined whether students in the NJROTC program have more frequent discussions of current news events than students who attended a traditional civics course.

This chapter presents the results of the data analyses that were used to describe the sample and to address the research questions developed for this study. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section provides a description of the participants based on the data from the demographic questions. The second section tests the role of grade level as a possible confound. Third, data are presented on attitudes towards democratic citizenship, the first research question. The fourth section presents the results of data pertaining to the second research question on students' discussing U.S. and international current events.

Description of the Participants

A total of 108 students participated in the study. These students included 71 (65.7%) cadets in the Naval Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (NJROTC) and 37 (34.3%) students in regular education classes. All of the students had parent approval to participate in the study.

The students were asked to indicate their age, gender, and ethnicity on the survey. The total sample of participants ranged in age from fourteen to eighteen, with more than half of them being fifteen or sixteen years old. See Table 4 for an age profile of the total sample. For a

breakdown of this demographic by group membership, see Appendix F. The sample was comprised of approximately equal proportions of males and females (Table 5). For a breakdown of gender by group membership, see Appendix G. The majority of participants reported their ethnicity as African American (n = 51) or Caucasian (n = 29). See Table 6 for descriptive data regarding ethnicity for the entire sample. For a more detailed breakdown of the group comparisons on this demographic feature, see Appendix H. Students were also asked to specify their grade level. These data are presented in Table 7.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution for Age of Participants

Age	Group Total	
	n	%
14	9	8.7
15	30	28.8
16	33	31.8
17	20	19.2
18	12	11.5
Total	104	100.0

Missing 4

Table 5

Frequency Distribution for Gender of Participants

	Total	
	n	%
Male	50	48.5
Female	53	51.5
Total	103	100.0

Missing 5

Table 6

Frequency Distribution for Ethnicity of Participants

	Total	
Ethnicity	n	%
African American	51	50.5
Native American	1	1.0
Caucasian	29	28.6
Hispanic	5	5.0
Multi-ethnic	11	10.9
Other	3	4.0
Total	104	100.0

Missing 4

Table 7

Frequency Distribution for Grade Level of Participants

Grade	Total n	%
9	27	26.0
10	40	38.4
11	19	18.3
12	18	17.3
	104	100.0

Missing 4

Additionally, in order to more specifically characterize the two groups, the participants were asked if they had run for class office or if they had volunteered in the community. Their responses were cross-tabulated by group membership, with the results presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Cross-tabulation of "Run for Class Office or Volunteer in Community" by Group

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Run for class office						
Yes	7	10.0	2	6.1	9	8.7
No	63	90.0	31	93.9	94	91.3
Total	70	100.0	33	100.0	103	100.0
Volunteer in community						
Yes	62	88.6	14	43.8	76	74.5
No	8	11.4	18	56.2	26	25.5
Total	70	100.0	32	100.0	102	100.0

Missing	Run for class office	
	NJROTC	2
	Regular education	4
	Volunteer in community	
	NJROTC	2
	Regular education	5

Based on the Table 8, NJROTC participants ran for class office at a higher rate than the students in the regular civics class, and volunteered in the community at more than twice the rate of the traditional civics students.

Finally, to further describe the sample, participants were asked to answer six questions regarding their knowledge of political science, because political knowledge is foundational to "discusses current news events", a dependent variable in this study. The questions had right and wrong answers. Their responses were cross-tabulated by group membership. See Appendix I for the results of these analyses.

The majority of the students (n = 65, 63.8%) provided the correct answer to the question regarding which documents describe the powers of the President of the United States, "The Constitution." Fifty-two (73.3%) of the participants were in the NJROTC and 13 (41.9%) were in regular education.

When asked to indicate: “The number of electoral votes each state is allowed is based on the state’s...,” 58 (58.6%) students correctly answered “...number of representatives in Congress.” Included in this number were 48 (66.7%) students in NJROTC and 12 (40.0%) students in regular education.

The students were asked if: “In the United States, what do labor unions, civil rights groups, business associations, and environmental organizations all have in common?” A total of 40 (41.7%) students provided the correct response, “They try to influence public policy and get people elected.” This number included 28 (42.4%) students in NJROTC and 12 (40.1%) in regular education.

The students were asked to answer: “The Bill of rights mostly addresses the rights on . . .” A total of 75 (75.0%) of the participants correctly answered, “individuals.” Of this number, 56 (80.0%) students in NJRTOC and 19 (63.3%) students in regular education answered correctly.

The question: “According to the Bill of rights, what is true about the rights described in the Constitution?” was answered correctly, “People have no guaranteed rights other than those listed in the Bill of Rights” by 10 (10.2%) students. Seven (10.1%) students in the NJROTC and 3 (10.3%) students in regular education provided the correct answer.

A total of 57 (57.0%) students, including 45 (65.3%) in the NJROTC and 12 (38.7%) in regular education, answered the question, “The United States Congress can pass a bill even if the President disagrees with the bill because...” The correct answer was “...Congress is the primary legislative power of the government.” Forty-five (65.3%) students in NJROTC and 12 (38.7%) students in regular education answered correctly.

The mean number of correct answers for the six political knowledge questions was used as the dependent variable in a t-test for two independent samples. Group membership, NJROTC and regular education, was used as the independent variable in this analysis. Table 9 presents results of this analysis.

Table 9

t-Test for Two Independent Samples: *Political Science Knowledge Test by Group*

Group	Number	Mean	SD	DF	t-Value	Sig
NJROTC	71	3.83	1.92	106	4.65	<.001
Regular Civics	37	2.11	1.63			

The results of the t-test for the two groups, comparing their mean scores on the political science knowledge questions, was statistically significant, $t(106) = 4.65$, $p < .001$. The students in the NJROTC ($m = 3.83$, $sd = 1.92$) had significantly higher mean scores than students in regular education ($m = 2.11$, $sd = 1.63$).

Test for Confounds

Grade level was considered as a possible confound because the NJROTC students attended their program for all four years of high school, whereas students in the traditional classes had only one semester of civics instruction, which would usually occur in the tenth or eleventh grade. As such, the independent variable of group membership is related to grade level of the participants. See Table 10 for the breakdown of group membership by grade level.

The next step was to determine whether grade level was related to each relevant dependent variable: attitudes toward democratic citizenship, discussion of U.S. current events, and discussion of international current events. See Tables 11, 12, and 13 respectively for analyses of

the effect of grade level on these dependent variables. The descriptive statistics corresponding to these analyses can be found in Appendices J, K and L. Because grade level was not related to any of the dependent variables, it was deemed not to be a confound, and as such, was not addressed further in this study.

Table 10

Cross-tabulation of Grade in School by Group

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
Grade in School	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ninth	24	34.3	3	8.8	27	26.0
Tenth	18	25.7	22	64.7	40	38.4
Eleventh	12	17.1	7	20.6	19	18.3
Twelfth	16	22.9	2	5.9	18	17.3
Total	70	100.0	34	100.0	104	100.0

Missing	NJROTC	1
	Regular Education	3

Table 11

One-Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance "Attitude toward Democratic Citizenship" by Grade Level

Hotelling's Trace	F Ration	DF	Sig	Effect Size
.24	1.49	15,284	.109	.07

Table 12

One-Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance "Discussion of U. S. Government" by Grade Level

Hotelling's Trace	F Ration	DF	Sig	Effect Size
.09	.96	9,278	.470	.07

Table 13

One-Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance "Discussion of International Politics" by Grade Level

Hotelling's Trace	F Ration	DF	Sig	Effect Size
.12	1.20	9,281	.297	.04

Data Related to Attitudes toward Democratic Citizenship: Hypothesis #1.

Hypothesis #1. NJROTC students in an urban high school will score higher on questions measuring positive attitudes toward democratic citizenship than students who are exposed only to the traditional civics curriculum. This hypothesis was not supported by the data.

Factor analysis. As discussed in Chapter 3, a factor analysis was run to determine if factors emerged that could be used as subscales in addressing this research question. The retention of an item on the factor analysis was based on three criteria, as recommended by Meyers, Gamst, &Guarino, (2006) (a) must have a factor loading greater than .40, (b) must not load on more than one factor, and (c) the Eigenvalue for the factor must be greater than 1.00. The factors that emerged from the principal components factor analysis were used as subscales

for measuring "democratic citizenship". The results of the factor analysis are presented in Appendix E.

Fourteen of the 56 items were excluded from further analyses, as they failed to meet the criteria for retaining them on the factor analysis. Five factors (good citizenship, government responsibility, equal opportunities, trust, and maintaining national culture) emerged from the factor analysis, which were represented by the 42 items that were retained. These items explained a total of 38.98% of the variance in the dependent variable, attitudes toward democratic citizenship. The associated eigenvalues were greater than 1.00, indicating that the amount of variance explained by each of the factors was statistically significant. The Cronbach alpha coefficients were obtained for the five factors to determine the internal consistency. The alpha coefficients ranged from .58 for *maintaining national culture* to .77 for *government responsibility*, which are considered excellent representatives of their respective factors (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). As charted in Figure 5, the five subscale factors clearly correspond to the civic virtues and dispositions of democratic citizenship espoused by Patrick (1996):

Figure 5.
Correspondence of 5 Subscales to Patrick's Components of Attitudes toward Democratic Citizenship

5 Subscale Components of Democratic Citizenship based on Factor Analysis	**Patrick's List of Virtues/Dispositions of Democratic Citizenship**
Good Citizenship	Becoming a self-governing person by practicing civic virtues.
Government Responsibility	Protecting rights possessed equally by each person. Taking responsibility for government by consent of the governed.
Equal Opportunities	Recognizing the equal moral worth and dignity of each person. Respecting rights possessed equally by each person.
Trust	Participating responsibly in political and civic life.
Maintaining National Culture	Promoting the general welfare or common good of the community. Supporting and maintaining democratic principles.

Each of these five subscales was measured by at least five items on the questionnaire. Taken together, the five subscale components measured the dependent variable "attitudes toward democratic citizenship," which is addressed in the first hypothesis.

A mean score was calculated for each of the five subscales by summing the numeric responses for each item, and then dividing the sum by the number of items of the subscale. The use of a mean score allows comparisons across the subscales regardless of the number of items on each subscale.

Group differences. The following section describes the results of survey questions that shed light on any group differences with regard to attitudes towards democratic citizenship. Separate one-way multivariate analysis of variance procedures were used to compare attitudes of students in NJROTC and students in regular civics education regarding democratic citizenship. Five subscales, good citizenship, government responsibility, equal opportunities, trust, and maintaining national culture, were used to measure the dependent variable, with group membership used as the independent variable. Table 14 presents results of this analysis.

Table 14

One-Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance: Democratic Citizenship by Group Membership

Hotelling's Trace	F Ration	DF	Sig	Effect Size
.05	.99	5,101	.431	.05

The Hotelling's trace of .05 obtained on the comparison of the five subscales measuring democratic citizenship between students in NJROTC and students in regular education was not statistically significant, $F (5, 101) = .99$, $p = .431$, $D = .05$. This finding provided evidence that

perceptions of the five subscales did not differ by group membership. Descriptive statistics of this finding is shown in Appendix M. An inspection of the mean scores support the lack of statistical difference on the five subscales measuring democratic citizenship between the two groups of students.

Potential political involvement. The students were asked about their potential participation in political activities as adults. Their responses were cross-tabulated by type of student (NJROTC or regular education. Appendix N shows the results of these analyses.

The largest group of students (n = 53, 52.0%) reported that they planned to vote often in national elections when they became adults. Included in this number were 41 (59.5%) students in the NJROTC and 12 (36.4%) students in regular education. None of the NJROTC students and 5 (15.1%) of the students in regular education indicated they were not planning to vote in national elections as adults.

When asked if they planned to get information about candidates before voting in an election as adults, the majority of students (n = 55, 53.9%) reported often as their response. Included in this number were 39 (56.6%) students in NJROTC and 16 (48.6%) students in regular education. Two (2.9%) students in NJROTC and 4 (12.1%) students in regular education indicated that as adults they never planned to get information about candidates before voting in an election.

The students were asked if they planned to join a political party as an adult. The largest group of students (n = 27, 26.5%), including 17 (24.6%) students in NJROTC and 10 (30.3%) students in regular education, reported that they did not know if they would join a political party as an adult. Twelve (11.8%) students indicated they often planned to join a political party as an

adult. This number included 10 (14.6%) students in NJROTC and 2 (6 %) students in regular education.

When asked if they planned to write letters to a newspaper about social or political concerns as adults, the largest group (n = 29, 28.4%) of students reported rarely. Included in this number were 20 (29.0%) students in NJROTC and 9 (27.3%) students in regular education. Among the 9 (8.8%) students who indicated that as adults they would often write letters to a newspaper about social or political concerns were 6 (8.7%) students in NJROTC and 3 (9.1%) students in regular education.

The students were then asked if they planned to be a candidate for a local or city office as an adult. The largest group of students (n = 31, 30.4%) reported that they rarely planned to be a candidate. This number included 18 (26.2%) students in the NJROTC and 13 (39.4%) students in regular education classes. Of the 9 (8.8%) students who indicated they often wanted to be a candidate for a local or city office, 8 (11.6%) were in the NJROTC and 1 (3.0%) were in regular education.

In the next set of questions, participants were asked to indicate what they expected to do regarding political activism as adults. Their responses to these items were cross-tabulated by group membership for presentation in Appendix O.

Political activism. The students were asked if they would volunteer time to help poor or elderly people in the community. The largest group of students (n = 51, 51.0%) reported they would probably do this. Of this number were 33 (49.3%) students in the NJROTC and 18 (54.6%) students in regular education. Four (12.1%) students in regular education reported that they certainly would not do this, while 3 (4.5%) NJROTC students indicated that they would

probably not volunteer time to help poor or elderly people in the community. Four NJROTC students and 4 regular education students did not provide a response to this question.

The largest group of students (n = 45, 44.1%) reported they probably would collect money for a social cause. Included in this number were 35 (50.8%) students in NJROTC and 10 (30.3%) students in regular education. Three (4.3%) NJROTC students and 4 (12.1%) regular education students reported that they certainly would not collect money for a social cause. Two students in the NJROTC and 4 students in regular education did not provide a response to this question.

Thirty (30.7%) students, including 26 (38.8%) in NJROTC and 4 (12.9%) in regular education, reported that they would probably collect signatures for a petition. Of the 7 (7.1%) students who reported they certainly would not collect signatures for a petition, 4 (6.0%) were in the NJROTC and 3 (9.7%) were in regular education. Four NJROTC students and 6 regular education students did not provide a response to this question.

The largest group of students (n = 28, 28.0%) indicated they probably would not participate in a peaceful protest march or rally. Included in this number were 17 (24.6%) students in NJROTC and 11 (35.5%) students in regular education. Among the 11 (11.0%) students who reported they would certainly not participate in a peaceful protest march or rally, 7 (10.1%) were in the NJROTC and 4 (12.9%) were in regular education. Two students in NJROTC and 6 students in regular education did not provide a response to this question.

The students were asked if they would spray paint protest slogans on walls. Of the 45 (44.1%) who indicated they certainly would not do this, 33 (47.9%) were in the NJROTC and 12 (36.4$) were in regular education. Eight (11.6%) NJROTC students and 1 (3.0%) regular

education students reported that they certainly would spray paint protest slogans on walls. Two NJROTC students and 4 regular education students did not provide a response to this question.

Forty-five (46.5%) students indicated they certainly would not block traffic as a form of protest. This number included 31 (45.5%) students in NJROTC and 16 (48.5%) students in regular education. Five (7.4%) students in NJROTC indicated they certain would block traffic as a form of protest. Six (8.8%) students in NJROTIC and 7 (21.2%) students in regular education did not know if they would block traffic as a form of protest. Three NJROTC students and 4 regular education students did not provide a response to this question.

When asked if they would occupy public buildings as a form of protest, 42 (41.2%) students reported they would certainly not do this. This number included 32 (46.5%) students in NJROTC and 10 (30.3%) students in regular education. Eight (7.8%) students, including 7 (10.1%) students in NJROTC and 1 (3.0%) students in regular education, responded that they would certainly occupy public buildings as a form of protest.

The mean scores provided additional support that students, regardless of their grade level, did not differ substantially in their perceptions of democratic citizenship. Based on these findings, the null hypothesis of no difference in the comparison of the five subscales measuring democratic citizenship by group membership and grade level was retained.

Data Related to Pursuing News of Current Events and Discussions of Such

Hypothesis #2. NJROTC students will (a) participate more in discussion of U.S. and international current events as measured by their reported frequency, and (b) will more often read newspapers and view news broadcasts, than students in the traditional high school civics classes. This hypothesis was only partially supported.

Knowledge of current news events. As established in Chapter 2, knowledge of news events and the continuing pursuit of current news are prerequisites to participating fully in a democracy (Niemi & Junn, 1998;Patrick, 2002). The students were asked to indicate the frequency with which they sought out knowledge of events in this country and other countries either through reading or media news broadcasts. The cross-tabulations of their responses to these questions are presented in Appendix P.

The largest group of students (n = 39, 37.9%) reported they *sometimes* read articles in the newspaper about happenings in this country. This number included 25 (35.7%) students in the NJROTC and 14 (42.4%) student in regular education. Thirty (29.1%) students, including 23 (32.9%) in the NJROTC and 7 (21.2%) in regular education indicated they *often* read newspaper articles about happenings in this country.

Among the 37 (35.9%) students who reported they sometimes read articles in the newspaper about what is happening in other countries were 25 (35.8%) students in the NJROTC and 12 (36.4%) students in regular education. Twenty-seven (26.3%) students, including 18 (25.7%) students in NJROTC and 9 (27.3%) students in regular civics education rarely read newspaper articles about what is happening in other countries.

The majority of students (n = 52, 50.5%) students indicated they viewed or listened to news broadcasts on television. This number included 38 (54.5%) students in NJROTC and 14 (42.4%) in regular education. Thirty-two students, included 21 (30.0%) in NJROTC and 11 (33.3%) in regular education, indicated that they *often* listened to news broadcasts on television.

The largest number of students (n = 31, 30.1%), including 22 (31.4%) in the NJROTC and 9 (27.4%) in regular education, *often* listened to news broadcasts on the radio. The second largest number of students (n = 25, 24.3%) reported that they sometimes listened to news

broadcasts on the radio. Of this number, 17 (24.3%) were in the NJROTC and 7 (21.2%) were in regular civics education.

Frequency of discussion of current news events. As part of the investigation into frequency of discussion of current news events, the participants were asked to indicate the frequency with which they had discussion of what is happening in the United States government with three different groups: peers, parents or older adult family members, or teachers. See Appendices Q and R for the frequency table and cross-tabulation of responses.

Discussion of U. S. events with peers. The largest group of students (n = 37, 35.9%) reported they sometimes discussed the U. S. government with people of their own age. Included in this number were 28 (40.0%) students in the NJROTC and 9 (27.3%) students in regular education. Thirteen (18.6%) NJROTC students and 5 (15.2%) students in regular education indicated they often talked about the U. S. government with people of their own age.

Discussion U.S. events with adult family members. The largest group of students (n = 35, 34.4%) reported that they sometimes talked with their parents or other adult family members about the U. S. government. This number included 25 (35.6%) NJROTC students and 10 (31.3%) students in regular education. Twenty-four (34.3%) students in NJROTC and 5 (15.2%) in regular education indicated that they often discussed the U. S. government with their parents or other adult family members..

Discussion of U.S. events with teachers. When asked if they discussed the U. S. government with their teachers, the largest group of students (n = 40, 38.8%) reported often. Included in this number were 29 (41.5%) students who were in the NJROTC and 11 (33.3%) students in regular education. Thirty-seven (35.9%) students, including 21 (30.0%) in the

NJROTC and 16 (48.5%) in regular education reported that they sometimes discussed the U. S. government with their teachers.

Table 15

One-Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance: Discussion of U. S. Government by Group Membership

Hotelling's Trace	F Ration	DF	Sig	Effect Size
.05	1.63	3,98	.187	.05

As Table 15 shows, the Hotelling's trace of .05 obtained on this analysis was not statistically significant, F (3, 98) = 1.63, p = .187, D = .05. Based on this result, it does not appear that students in NJROTC and in general education classes differed in the frequency in which they discussed happenings in the U. S. government.

Then students were asked how often they had discussions with the same three groups on events in *international* politics. Their responses to these questions were cross-tabulated by group membership for presentation in Appendix S. The one-way multivariate analysis of variance is illustrated in Table 16.

Table 16

One-Way Multivariate Analysis of Variance: Discussion of International Politics by Group Membership

Hotelling's Trace	F Ration	DF	Sig	Effect Size
.21	6.76	3,990	<.001	.17

The Hotelling's trace obtained on the comparison of the three items measuring the discussion of international politics by group membership was statistically significant. The effect size of .17 was moderate, indicating that the difference had some practical significance. To further explore this significant difference, the univariate statistical analyses were examined. Table 17 presents results of this analysis.

Table 17

Descriptive Statistics: Discussion of International Politics by Group Membership

Discuss international politics with	N	Mean	SD	DF	F	Sig	Effect Size
People of own age							
NJROTC	70	2.56	1.30	1,103	10.28	.002	.09
Traditional Civics	33	1.73	1.04				
Adult family members							
NJROTC	70	2.73	1.22	1,103	11.91	.001	.11
Traditional Civics	33	1.88	1.88				
Teachers							
NJROTC	70	3.03	1.23	1,103	.01	.994	<.01
Traditional Civics	33	3.03	.98				

Two statistically significant findings were obtained for the three items measuring the frequency with which the students discussed international politics. The first statistically significant finding was for discussing international politics with people of their own age, F (1, 103) = 10.28, p = .002, D = .09. The small effect size indicated that while this finding was statistically significant, it had little practical significance. This result indicated that students in the NJROTC (m = 2.56, sd = 1.30) were more likely to discuss international politics with their peers than students in general education (m = 1.73, sd = 1.04). The comparison of discussing happenings in international politics with parents or other adult family members was statistically significant, F (1, 103) = 11.91, p = .001, D = .11. The small effect size provided evidence that the

result had little practical significance although the finding was statistically significant. In comparing the mean scores, students in NJROTC (m = 2.73, sd = 1.22) had significantly higher scores for discussion of happenings in international politics with parents or other adult family members than students in general education (m = 1.88, sd = 1.05). The results of the comparison of discussion of happenings in international politics with teachers yielded no evidence of a statistically significant difference between the two groups of students.

Based on the findings of the analyses, the null hypothesis of no difference by group membership for discussion of happenings in the U. S. government and international politics was not rejected. Three of the four analyses were not statistically significant, indicating that students had discussed happenings in U. S. government and international politics at similar levels.

Discussion of international events with peers. The largest group of students (n = 36, 35.0%) reported they never discussed international politics with people of their own age. Included in this number were 18 (25.7%) NJROTC students and 18 (54.5%) students in regular education. Of the 29 (28.2%) students who indicated they rarely discussed international politics with people of their own age, 19 (27.2%) were in NJROTC and 10 (30.3%) were in regular education.

Discussion of international events with adult family members. Thirty-three (32.0%) students reported they sometimes discussed international politics with parents or other adult family members. This number included 15 (21.4%) students in the NJROTC and 10 (30.3%) students in regular education. Among the 31 (30.1%) students who indicated they never discussed international politics with their family and other adult family members were 14 (20.0%) students in NJROTC and 17 (51.5%) students in regular education classes

Discussion of international events with teachers. Thirty-seven (35.9%) students,

including 20 (28.6%) in the NJROTC and 17 (51.5%) in regular education, reported that they sometimes discussed international politics with their teachers. Of the 28 (27.2%) students who indicated that often discussed politics with their teachers, 19 (27.1%) were in the NJROTC and 9 (27.3%) were in regular education classes.

Summary

The results of the statistical analyses that were used to describe the sample and test the hypotheses have been presented in this chapter. A discussion of the findings and conclusions for this study are included in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of the study was to determine if statistically significant differences existed between urban high school students who participate in the NJROTC program, and students who participate only in the formal traditional civics curriculum. It was anticipated that students in the NJROTC program would indicate more positive attitudes towards participation in our democratic institutions, such as voting, political activism, and volunteerism. It was also expected that students in the NJROTC program would more diligently pursue news of current events in the form of newspapers and media broadcasts; and because of this inclination, would more frequently engage in discussions of current U.S. and international political events. The research intent was to substantiate the claim that citizenship education should integrate extracurricular activities (as practiced in the NJROTC program) with critical-thinking about values and the learning of political knowledge.

A descriptive research design was used in this study integrating a static-groups comparison. An instrument developed by the researcher was used to collect information from two groups of students (NJROTC and traditional civics education) in a single urban high school. The survey, given to 108 participants, gathered demographic information in addition to the sections on determining attitudes toward democratic citizenship and on reading about and discussing current news events.

This chapter will present a discussion of the findings, and will consider some possible limitations of the study. Based on this discussion, areas for future research will be recommended.

Why So Few Significant Findings?

Several factors might explain why few significant differences were found between the NJROTC participants and those who took the standard civics course in the high school with regard to the elements being measured in this study. Five main areas of discussion bring up questions that could lead to further research to clarify the issues of this dissertation: (a) parent-home factors, (b) teaching methods used by civics teachers, (c) ethnic makeup of the group of participants in the study, (d) disconnect between civics education and the real world, and (e) knowledge vs. inclination to participate. Each of these topics is interrelated with the others, but each brings up unique questions and considerations.

Parent-home factor. It is intriguing to think how the parents of the participants in the study might respond if asked to complete the same survey as the students completed. No one disputes that parents and home environment have an influence on students and their educational preparation, as well as their goals in life. But several studies support the notion that parental involvement in civic activities is a reliable predictor of their children's involvement (Feldman & Matjasko, 2005). Do the parents model any of the behaviors mentioned on the survey? Do they write their legislators? Do they help with community projects? Do they follow local or world politics on the radio or television? In the end, is their interest and participation in civic activities more influential in determining their children's interest and participation, or lack of it, than their school instruction? Does the parents' example override anything the curriculum might seek to change in the students' attitudes towards civic issues?

Teaching methods used by civics teachers. It is possible that one reason that the study did not find significant differences on many issues that were examined was because teachers in both classroom settings used very similar strategies. A study could be conducted on how civics

teachers in the NJROTC classes are teaching the curriculum to determine if the methods used by regular civics teachers are appreciably different from those used with NJROTC students. Sampling the classroom activities via observations, and through a review of teacher lesson plans for particular units of the curriculum, might prove useful in interpreting students' responses on the survey.

Civics is a part of the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) test for social studies, with teachers feeling the pressure to prepare students for the test. The full-year course offered by the NJROTC program allows for more community service projects, guest speakers, and field trips, while the regular civics course is one semester long. The lack of time in a one-semester government class precludes field trips or lengthy debates on topics of high interest to the students in favor of preparing for the state test. Because regular education students take a government class for only one semester, best practices need to be used more frequently and more effectively. Time cannot be stretched; teachers can only teach the history of our country's political ideals and processes in the little time they have.

Ethnic background of the participants in the study. Perhaps a pool of participants from a different ethnic background would have produced differing results. In fact, the findings would almost certainly be different if the sample had not been primarily African-American students (Kahne & Middaugh, 2008). Even if significant differences had not been found between the two study groups, there would likely have been much higher levels of engagement if the sample were taken from a suburban middle-class school. As Kahne and Middaugh found in their study, equal access to civics learning opportunities needs to be a priority in our country because students in urban schools, especially schools with high African-American populations are getting short changed. They found that because the students have less access to learning opportunities in

their school civics education, they end up being under-represented in the political process. The traditional civics group was predominantly African-American. With 50% of the total sample indicating their ethnicity as African-American and another 25% being of other non-Caucasian groups, a distrust for, or disinterest in, the American political process is understandable as they may perceive themselves as marginalized from the process. This may, in fact, explain why despite being significantly higher in knowledge, even the NJROTC students did not indicate significantly stronger attitudes towards participation in the democratic system. In some ways, this factor is tied up closely to the fifth one – the school and life disconnect.

Disconnect between civics education and the real world. In the state of New Hampshire, the Department of Education (2005) launched a study to determine how to reform their schools. Three of the top four issues they were examining included:

1. Students are disenfranchised both psychologically and academically.
2. There is a lack of real-world connections for students.
3. Kids don't truly understand where learning will take them in life. (p. 10)

Many students come to school in the morning, leaving a very different world behind them. They seem to put on a student façade as they enter the school. The NJROTC students dominate the discussions in my civics classes, bringing considerable information and enthusiasm to the discussion. These same students show that they are concerned about their appearance in school, right down to their spit-shined shoes. In listening to discussions about politics in civics classes, teachers are encouraged by the prospect of their taking their spirited words into the world outside the school, where they might make a real difference. Other times it may be an intellectual exercise, with no ramifications for future involvement in politics.

When students at Urban High School go home, they may encounter bigger concerns that could explain their lack of interest in community service and the political process. Some students indicate that they are worried about getting their next meal, are trying to determine how to get their brother out of jail, or are trying to cope with their girlfriend's pregnancy. Yet another student missed school repeatedly because his mother is an alcoholic and he is afraid that if he leaves her home alone, she will start drinking again. Most students are not concerned about going to college after finishing high school. Their more immediate concern is getting a job. With the high unemployment rate, they are not hopeful nor are they confident in the system. With all of these concerns and problems, they may lack the inclination to participate in the American political system.

Knowledge vs. inclination to participate. As the literature review explained, intellectual understanding of civics concepts is not necessarily a factor that encourages participation in community politics or services. Research shows it to be prerequisite to critical thinking about political decisions, but not necessarily causal. Many people who are knowledgeable about civics are not interested in getting involved in the process due to cynicism, apathy, or lack of time. Students who test well on the concepts may have no interest in world politics or events. They may be studying to do well on a test and maintain their grade point average and nothing more.

The participants completed a 6-item test of political science knowledge as part of the research instrument. NJROTC students' scores were higher on the knowledge questions than students in regular civics classes; this was a statistically significant difference. One explanation might be that although students in both groups complete the government classes using the same curriculum, the NJROTC students are more likely to be involved in discussion and debate in

their classes, helping them understand and appreciate the government course better. Another possible explanation for this difference might be that students in regular education may be more passive learners, content to listen to lectures without getting involved, which may be why they did not join NJROTC in the first place. Alternately, it could be that students with more initial knowledge of political science tend to enter this program. A *t*-test showed that knowledge is related to the independent variable of *group membership*, but because students' political knowledge upon entering the high school was not measured, and knowledge was not controlled for in this study, it cannot be shown to be related to the dependent variable—attitudes toward democratic citizenship. It can, however, be used to describe a group difference in the sample.

Limitations of the Study

Sample. The anticipated sample of over 200 students ultimately was pared to 108. This was due to a threatened school closure (the school that was the research site) which resulted in many students leaving the school and enrolling elsewhere. The instability of the pool of participants, thus, reduced the statistical power of the study by reducing the sample size. Considering this, perhaps offering an incentive of extra points in class, or of a special movie showing, might have somewhat increased the number of participants.

Another limitation was not coding the individual surveys with an identification code so that, for example, students with a specific knowledge score or a specific ethnicity might have been correlated to the dependent variables of either attitudes or discussion behaviors. This would be an important change that would help bring further findings of interest if this study were tried again.

Self-report measures. With any survey where behavior is being reported rather than observed, or where anticipated behavior is being reported, there is always a concern for the

verity of the responses. The behaviors and dispositions being researched in this study would not be easily observable. Thus, it had to be assumed that participants were being forthright in their responses. Nevertheless, it can be conjectured, were the NJROTC just saying that they discussed international politics more at home than other students because they thought that is what their teacher might like them to say?

Implications for the Civics Classroom

Based on this study, the following are recommendations for practice:

1. Encourage teachers to join national civics organizations to examine state and local curricular standards and to collaborate on ways to give students tools and desire to enhance participation in communities as students move into adulthood.
2. Incorporate best practices such as service learning, volunteering, mock courts, mock elections, petitions, and writing letters to legislators to help empower students. All teachers are capable of implementing simulations and leading thoughtful discussions of current events, but professional development would help teachers use these practices more effectively (Kahne & Middaugh, 2008).
3. Incorporate some NJROTC stipulations, such as the value of citizenship, service to the United States, and personal responsibility, into the general education curriculum. These attributes are written in the state standards as part of the social studies curriculum; however, they cannot be accurately measured on a standardized test.
4. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) offered a key suggestion. "The states should require renewal and reform of teacher preparation programs to provide prospective teachers with deep knowledge of content and effective teaching methods" (Gagnon, 2003, p. 30).

Recommendations for Further Research

Following up on this study, research that would address the limitations of this study could prove very useful. An effort could be made to control for knowledge and ethnicity; and perhaps performance-based factors could be considered, rather than strictly self-report measures.

Despite a body of literature that focuses on the students' need for civics education, attempts to improve both cognitive and participatory skills which are required in civics education and adult life, have not been studied. One recommendation would be for additional empirical inquiry about the role of education in development of participatory civic skills. Researchers' understanding of ways to measure participatory civic skills is important in obtaining useful information. For example, surveys of state level civics standards acknowledge the relationship between participatory and intellectual skills, but have been unable to assess the participatory skills in state standards.

The literature also suggests that the civics courses should involve experiential learning in the community and give the student the ability to engage in reflective practice. The evidence of high youth *civic* participation paired with increasing *political* disaffection and alienation could help to substantiate that citizenship education should capitalize on the use of active learning that can lead to greater political and civic participation.

Several areas suggested by the findings merit further investigation.

1. Assess the impact of using various teaching strategies (elected officials as guest speakers, mock elections, online simulation of Congress such as *e-Congress*) on students' interest in future political action or community involvement.

2. Study the use of performance-based instruction (PBI), which is the cornerstone of the NJROTC program and places the focus on developing skills rather than emphasizing the memorization of facts.
3. Use a similar research design to study students' perceptions of involvement in the political process nationally. This future study also could examine teachers' strategies that are successful in engaging their students as active participants in civics issues.
4. Study the effects of teacher attitudes and professional development on how schools are meeting their civics mission responsibilities.

Closing Thoughts

Although it would have been gratifying to have seen more significant differences between the two groups in the study, teachers need to remain dedicated to incorporating more real-world and community-based activities for their students in all civics classes. Teachers need to do everything they can to make civics classes more engaging for their students. Teachers who guided their students through mock campaigns and elections during the 2008 presidential election and the 2010 gubernatorial election should be applauded for their efforts.

Civics teachers are charged with shaping the political engagement of all students, including minority students, in our American democracy—in essence, shaping America's future. And as Kahne and Maddaugh concluded, "The very individuals who have the least influence on political processes—the voices schools most need to inform and support in order to promote democratic equality—often get fewer school-based opportunities to develop their civic capacities and commitments than other students" (p. 7). If teachers in urban schools lose these students decade after decade, the survival of American democratic ideals is in peril. Providing simulations of real life in classroom instruction may be the only way to keep students engaged; it

may be the only way to prepare students to perpetuate America's democratic culture, which has long distinguished this country from the rest of the world.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY

Attitudes Toward Democratic Citizenship

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers. Please be honest with your responses. Use the following scale for your answers:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Place a check mark (T) in the column that most closely matches your agreement with each of the following statements:	1	2	3	4	5
1. Everyone should have the right to express their opinions freely.					
2. Political leaders should not give government jobs to members of their families.					
3. Private business should not have restrictions placed on them by the government.					
4. People should demand that their political and social rights are respected.					
5. Women should not be encouraged to become political leaders.					
6. Courts and judges should not be influenced by politics.					
7. Young people have an obligation to participate in activities to help their communities.					
8. People should be encouraged to participate in political parties to influence government.					
9. People should not refuse to obey a law that violates human rights.					
10. Wealthy business people should have more influence on government than others.					
11. Good citizens obey the laws of the land.					
12. Good citizens vote in every election.					
13. Good citizens participate in peaceful protests against laws that are believed to be unjust.					
14. Good citizens should be unwilling to serve in the military to defend the country.					
15. Good citizens participate in activities to help people in the community.					
16. Good citizens take part in activities promoting human rights.					
17. Good citizens participate in activities to protect the environment.					
18. Good citizens participate in political discussions.					
19. Government does not have a responsibility to guarantee a job for everyone.					
20. Government has a responsibility to keep prices under control.					
21. Government has a responsibility to provide basic health care for everyone.					
22. Government has a responsibility to assure that senior citizens have an adequate					

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Place a check mark (T) in the column that most closely matches your agreement with each of the following statements:	1	2	3	4	5
standard of living.					
23. Government does not have a responsibility to assure that unemployed people can have an adequate standard of living.					
24. Government is responsible for providing a free education to all people.					
25. Government is responsible for promoting honesty and moral behavior among all people.					
26. People trust the national government.					
27. People trust the state government.					
28. People trust the court system in the United States.					
29. People do not trust the police in their local areas.					
30. People trust that newspapers are publishing the truth in their stories.					
31. People living in the United States should buy products made in the United States to protect jobs.					
32. Other countries should be prevented from trying to influence political decisions in the United States.					
33. The flag of the United States is not an important symbol of freedom.					
34. People should be alert to possible threats to the safety of the country.					
35. People should support their country even if they think their country is doing something wrong.					
36. The people should be proud of the accomplishments of the United States.					
37. Outsiders should be stopped from influencing the traditions of the United States.					
38. All children have an equal chance of receiving a good high school education.					
39. All people, regardless of race/ethnicity, should have equal chances of obtaining employment in their chosen fields.					
40. All citizens of the United States should be able to run for and be elected to public office.					
41. All people in the United States should be free to state their opinions regardless of whether they are against the government.					
42. Schools should teach students to respect members of all ethnic and racial groups.					
43. Men and women should not get equal pay for equal work.					
44. Immigrants should not be able to keep their own language.					
45. Immigrant children should have the same opportunities for education as other children					

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Place a check mark (T) in the column that most closely matches your agreement with each of the following statements:	1	2	3	4	5
in the United States.					
46. Immigrants should have to become citizens before they can vote in elections, regardless of how long they have lived in the United States.					
47. Immigrants should be allowed to maintain their own customs and lifestyles.					
48. Immigrants should have the same rights as citizens.					
49. Politicians do not care about the people who voted for them.					
50. Politicians try to find out what ordinary citizens want.					
51. In this country, a few individuals have a lot of political power while the rest of the people have little power.					
52. I do not understand most political issues.					
53. Politicians quickly forget the needs of the voters who elected them.					
54. Electing student representatives to suggest changes in how the school is run makes schools better.					
55. When students work together, positive changes happen in the school.					
56. Students acting together can have more influence on what happens in this school than students acting alone.					

How often you have discussions of what is happening in the U. S. government:	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Don't know
With people of your own age					
With parents or other adult family members					
With teachers					
How often do you have discussions of what is happening in international politics?	**Never**	**Rarely**	**Sometimes**	**Often**	**Don't know**
With people of your own age					
With parents or other adult family members					
With teachers					
How often do you . . .	**Never**	**Rarely**	**Sometimes**	**Often**	**Don't know**
Read articles in the newspaper about what is happening in this country?					
Read articles in the newspaper about what is					

happening in other countries?					
Listen to news broadcasts on television?					
Listen to news broadcasts on the radio?					

When you are an adult, what do you expect that you will do?	I will certainly not do this	I will probably not do this	I will probably do this	I will certainly do this	Don't know
1. Vote in national elections					
2. Get information about candidates before voting in an election.					
3. Join a political party.					
4. Write letters to a newspaper about social or political concerns.					
5. Be a candidate for a local or city office.					
When you are an adult, what do you expect that you will do?	I will certainly not do this	I will probably not do this	I will probably do this	I will certainly do this	Don't know
6. Volunteer time to help poor or elderly people in the community.					
7. Collect money for a social cause.					
8. Collect signatures for a petition.					
9. Participate in a peaceful protest march or rally.					
10. Spray-paint protest slogans on walls.					
11. Block traffic as a form of protest.					
12. Occupy public buildings as a form of protest.					

1. Which of the following documents describes the powers of the President of the United States?
   - ☐ The Declaration of Independence
   - ☐ The Mayflower Compact
   - ☐ The Constitution
   - ☐ The Articles of Confederation

2. The number of electoral votes each state is allowed is based on the state's . . .
   - ☐ Size
   - ☐ Representation in Congress
   - ☐ Average income
   - ☐ Number of years as a state

3. In the United States, what do labor unions, civil rights groups, business associations, and environmental organizations all have in common?
   - ☐ They try to influence public policy and get people elected.
   - ☐ They share the same ideas about political issues.
   - ☐ They are all funded by the federal government.
   - ☐ They have to pay state and federal taxes.

4. The Bill of Rights mostly addresses the rights of . . .
   - □ States
   - □ Cities
   - □ Individuals
   - □ Public officials

5. According to the Bill of Rights, what is true about the rights described in the Constitution?
   - □ People have no guaranteed rights other than those listed in the Bill of Rights
   - □ Rights not listed in the Bill of Rights are not recognized in the United States
   - □ The federal government, but not state governments, can interfere with the people's rights.
   - □ The fact that only some rights are listed does not mean that the people have no others.

6. The United States Congress can pass a bill even if the President disagrees with the bill because:
   - □ Congress must make sure that the needs of all citizens are met
   - □ Congress can make laws more quickly when it does not have to involve the President
   - □ Congress usually knows more about what the laws mean than the President does
   - □ Congress is the primary legislative power of the government

Answer the following questions as they apply to you. There are no right or wrong answers and all responses will be confidential.

Age

_____ years

Grade in School

- □ Ninth grade
- □ Tenth grade
- □ Eleventh grade
- □ Twelfth grade

Gender

- □ Male
- □# Female

Ethnicity

- □ African American
- □ American Indian/Alaskan Native
- □ Caucasian
- □ Hispanic
- □ Middle Eastern
- □ Multi-ethnic
- □ Other _____

Are you a member of the Naval Junior ROTC? □ Yes □ No

Have you run for a class office? □ Yes □ No

Do you volunteer in the community? □ Yes □ No

Thank You for Participating in the Survey

APPENDIX B

PARENT RESEARCH INFORMATION SHEET

Parental Research Information Sheet

Title of Study: ATTITUDES AND KNOWLEDGE OF URBAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' TOWARD DEMOCRACY, GOVERNMENT, AND CITIZENSHIP AFTER PARTICIATION IN EXTRACURRICULAR POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Purpose:
You are being asked to allow your child to be in a research study at your child's school that conducted by Ruth McFadden, a student from Wayne State University to study the attitudes and knowledge of urban high school students regarding democracy, government, and citizenship after participating in extracurricular political activities.

Study Procedures:
If you decide to allow your child to take part in the study, your child will be asked to complete a questionnaire developed for the study to obtain information from students in either the Naval Junior Reserve Officer Training Program or students in general education program concerning student attitudes and behaviors toward democracy, government, and citizenship. In addition, he/she will be asked to complete a short demographic survey. The total time required to complete these questionnaires will be 30 to 40 minutes.

Examples of questions from the survey include:

Using a scale that ranges from strongly disagree to strongly agree, students will be asked to rate statements, such as:

People should be encouraged to participate in political parties to influence government

People should not refuse to obey a law that violates human rights

Other items on the survey, include:

Which of the following documents describes the powers of the President of the United States?

- The Declaration of Independence
- The Mayflower Compact
- The Constitution
- The Articles of Confederation

Copies of all instruments will be available at the school office for parent review.

Benefits:
No known benefits to students. Teachers can benefit by understanding how participation in NJROTC activities can help their children be more aware of politics and government.

Costs
There is no cost for participating in this study.

Title of Study: URBAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP: A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS IN THE NJROTC PROGRAM AND STUDENTS IN TRADITIONAL CIVICS CLASSES

Risks:
There are no known risks at this time to participation in this study.

Compensation:
You or your child will not be paid for your child's participation in this research study.

Confidentiality:

All information collected about your child during the course of this study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. Your child will be identified in the research records by a code name or number. Information that identifies your child personally will not be released without your written permission. However, the study sponsor, the Human Investigation Committee (HIC) at Wayne State University or federal agencies with appropriate regulatory oversight, may review your records.

Voluntary Participation /Withdrawal:
Your child's participation in this study is voluntary. You may decide that you do want your child to take part in this study, or if you decide to take part, you or your child can change your minds later and withdraw from the study. You are free withdraw your child at any time. Your decision will not change any present or future relationships with Wayne State University or its affiliates, your child's school or other services you are entitled to receive

Questions:
If you have any questions now or in the future, you may contact Ruth McFadden at the following phone number . If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, the Chair of the Human Investigation Committee can be contacted at (313) 577-1628.

Participation:
If you do not contact the principal investigator (PI) within a 2- week period, to state that you do not give permission for your child to be enrolled in the research trial, your child will be enrolled into the research trial.

If after reviewing this information sheet, you choose not to allow your child to participate in this study, please complete and return this form to your child's teacher.

I do not want my child to participate in this study.

_____

Child's Name (Please Print)

_____ _____

Signature of Parent/Guardian Date

APPENDIX C

STUDENT ASSENT FORM

Title of Study: URBAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP: A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS IN THE NJROTC PROGRAM AND STUDENTS IN TRADITIONAL CIVICS CLASSES

Ruth McFadden
Principal Investigator

Introduction and Purpose

You are being asked to be in a research study at your school that will be conducted by Ruth McFadden, a student from Wayne State University to study your attitudes and knowledge about democracy, government, and citizenship. Two groups of students will be asked to participate in the study, students who are the Naval Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps and those who are in general education programs.

Procedures

You are being asked to complete a survey about your attitudes toward democracy, government, and citizenship. Additionally, you will be asked to complete some information about yourself including your age, gender, and ethnicity. The surveys will be completed during your social studies or language arts class. The surveys should not take longer than one class period to complete, however, if additional time is needed, it will be provided accordingly.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to. In addition, if you begin and decide you do not wish to continue, that is acceptable. There are no consequences for not participating. Your decision to participate or not to participate will not influence your grades and no one will be angry with you if you choose not to participate.

Benefits

You may or may not benefit from taking part in this research study.

Risks

There are no known risks to your participation in this research.

Compensation

You will receive no compensations for your participation in the study.

STUDENT ASSENT FORM

Title of Study: URBAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP: A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS IN THE NJROTC PROGRAM AND STUDENTS IN TRADITIONAL CIVICS CLASSES

Ruth McFadden
Principal Investigator

Confidentiality

Your name will not appear on any reports. The information will be in summary form only.

Questions

If you have any questions about the research study, you can ask to speak to the principal investigator, Ms. McFadden at . If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you can contact the Chair of the Human Investigation Committee, Wayne State University, at (313) 577-1628.

Your signature below means that you have read the above information about the study and have had a chance to ask questions to help you understand what you will do in this study. Your signature also means that you have been told that you can change your mind later and withdraw if you want to. By signing this assent form, you are not giving up any of your legal rights. You will be given a copy of this form.

_____ _____
Signature of Participant (13 yrs and older) Date

_____ _____
Printed Name of Participant (13 yrs and older) Date

_____ _____
** Signature of Witness (When Applicable) Date

_____
Printed Name of Witness

_____ _____
Signature of person who explained this form Date

_____
Printed name of person who explained this form

APPENDIX D

HUMAN INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

HUMAN INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE
1101 East Alexandrine Building
Detroit, Michigan 48201
Phone: (313) 577-1628
FAX: (313) 993 7122
http://hic.wayne.edu

NOTICE OF EXPEDITED APPROVAL

To:	Ruth Mcfadden Teacher Education 8237 Oneil,N.	
From:	Ellen Barton, Ph.D., Chairperson, Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3)	
Date:	August 05, 2009	
RE:	HIC #:	0808088BE
	Protocol Title	A Comparison Study of the NJROTC Civics Curriculum and the Traditional Civics Curriculum in an Urban High School and their Relation to Civics Knowledge, Civic Attitudes and Political Participation
	Sponsor:	
	Coeus #:	0805006044
Expiration Date:	August 04, 2009	
Risk Level/Category:	No greater than minimal risk.	

The above referenced protocol and items listed below (if applicable) were APPROVED following *Expedited Review (Category 7)* by the Chairperson/designee for the Wayne State University Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3) for the period of 08/05/2009 through 08/04/2009. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals that may be required.

- Assent Information Sheet (dated 8/30/08)
- Information Sheet (dated 6/30/08)

- Federal regulations require that all research be reviewed at least annually. You may receive a "Continuation Renewal Reminder" approximately two months prior to the expiration date; however, it is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval *before* the expiration date. Data collected during a period of lapsed approval is unapproved research and can *never* be reported or published as research data.
- All changes or amendments to the above-referenced protocol require review and approval by the HIC BEFORE implementation.
- Adverse Reactions/Unexpected Events (AR/UE) must be submitted on the appropriate form within the timeframe specified in the HIC Policy (http://www.hic.wayne.edu/hicpol.html).

NOTE:

1. Upon notification of an impending regulatory site visit, hold notification, and/or external audit the HIC office must be contacted immediately.
2. Forms should be downloaded from the HIC website at each use.

*Based on the Expedited Review List, revised November 1998

APPENDIX E

Factor Analysis: Attitudes toward Democratic Citizenship

	Factor				
Scale Item	Good Citizenship	Government Responsibility	Equal Opportunities	Trust	Maintaining National Culture
17	.68				
9	.61				
16	.58				
18	.52				
12	.50				
7	.50				
15	.48				
11	.47				
13	.47				
33	-.44				
49	-.39				
44	-.38				
53		.64			
55		.64			
24		.63			
22		.62			
51		.54			
20		.50			
56		.48			
46		.47			
21		.44			
1			.64		
4			.61		
5			-.55		
45			.53		
41			.51		
48			.51		
36			.46		
6			-.43		
42			.40		
50			.39		
25				.78	
27				.71	
28				.61	
35				.52	
52				.37	
31					.55
37					.51
10					-.50
32					.48
54					.47
39					.44
Percent of explained variance	9.85	9.07	7.75	6.32	5.98
Eigenvalue	4.14	3.81	3.26	2.66	2.51
Cronbach alpha coefficients	.76	.77	.71	.62	.58

APPENDIX F

Cross-tabulation of Age by Group Membership

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
Age	n	%	n	%	n	%
14	9	12.7	0	0.0	9	8.7
15	18	25.4	12	36.4	30	28.8
16	20	28.1	13	39.3	33	31.8
17	14	19.7	6	18.2	20	19.2
18	10	14.1	2	6.1	12	11.5
Total	71	100.0	33	100.0	104	100.0

Missing Regular Education 4

APPENDIX G

Cross-tabulation of Gender by Group

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
Gender	n	%	n	%	n	%
Male	31	43.7	19	59.4	50	48.5
Female	40	56.3	13	40.6	53	51.5
Total	71	100.0	32	100.0	103	100.0
Missing Regular Education	5					

APPENDIX H

Cross-tabulation Ethnicity by Group

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
Ethnicity	n	%	n	%	n	%
African American	28	40.7	23	71.8	51	50.5
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	1.4	0	0.0	1	1.0
Caucasian	23	33.3	6	18.8	29	28.6
Hispanic	5	7.2	0	0.0	5	5.0
Multi-ethnic	9	13.1	2	6.3	11	10.9
Other	3	4.3	1	3.1	4	4.0
Total	69	100.0	32	100.0	104	100.0

Missing 4

APPENDIX I

Cross-tabulation of Political Science Knowledge Questions by Group

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Which of the following documents describes the powers of the President of the United States						
The Declaration of Independence	11	15.5	9	29.0	20	19.6
*The Constitution	52	73.3	13	41.9	65	63.8
The Mayflower Compact	3	4.2	1	3.3	4	3.9
The Articles of Confederation	5	7.0	8	25.8	13	12.7
The number of electoral votes each state is allowed is based on the state's						
Size	14	20.3	14	46.7	28	28.3
Average income	4	5.8	3	10.0	7	7.1
*Representatives in Congress	46	66.7	12	40.0	58	58.6
Number of years as a state	5	7.2	1	3.3	6	6.1
In the United States, what do labor unions, civil rights groups, business associations, and environmental organizations all have in common?						
*They try to influence public policy and get people elected	28	42.4	12	40.1	40	41.7
They share the same ideas about political issues	11	16.7	4	13.3	15	15.6
They are all funded by the federal government	9	13.6	10	33.3	19	19.8
They have to pay state and federal taxes	18	27.3	4	13.3	22	22.9
The Bill of Rights mostly addresses the rights of . . .						
States	11	15.7	4	13.3	15	15.0
Cities	1	1.4	1	3.3	2	2.0
*Individuals	56	80.0	19	63.3	75	75.0
Public officials	2	2.9	6	20.0	8	8.0
According to the Bill of Rights, what is true about the rights described in the Constitution?						
*People have no guaranteed rights other than those listed in the Bill of Rights	7	10.1	3	10.3	10	10.2
Rights not listed in the Bill of Rights are not recognized in the United States	12	17.4	7	24.1	19	19.4
The federal government, but not state governments, can interfere with the people's rights	5	7.2	9	31.0	14	14.3
The fact that only some rights are listed does not mean that the people have no others	45	65.2	10	34.5	55	56.1
The United States Congress can pass a bill even if the President disagrees with the bill because:						
Congress must make sure that the needs of all citizens are met	10	14.5	9	29.0	19	19.0
Congress can make laws more quickly when it does not have to involve the President	5	7.2	4	12.9	9	9.0
Congress usually knows more about what the laws	9	13.0	6	19.4	15	15.0

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
mean than the President does						
*Congress is the primary legislative power of the government	45	65.3	12	38.7	57	57.0

*Indicate the correct answer

APPENDIX J

Descriptive Statistics: Attitudes towards Democratic Citizenship by Grade Level

Subscale	Number	Mean	SD
Good Citizenship			
Ninth	27	3.27	.55
Tenth	40	3.61	.47
Eleventh	19	3.77	.80
Twelfth	18	3.85	.70
Government Responsibility			
Ninth	27	3.60	.55
Tenth	40	3.77	.67
Eleventh	19	3.70	.80
Twelfth	18	3.94	.60
Equal Opportunities			
Ninth	27	3.76	.51
Tenth	40	3.91	.56
Eleventh	19	3.72	.75
Twelfth	18	3.64	.72
Trust			
Ninth	27	2.92	.63
Tenth	40	2.90	.89
Eleventh	19	2.96	.76
Twelfth	18	2.90	.70
Maintaining National Culture			
Ninth	27	3.20	.61
Tenth	40	3.54	.62
Eleventh	19	3.47	.82
Twelfth	18	3.56	.82

APPENDIX K

Descriptive Statistics: Discussion of U. S. Government by Grade Level

Discussing U.S. Government Events	Number	Mean	SD
People of Own Age			
Ninth	27	2.59	1.15
Tenth	37	2.51	1.19
Eleventh	18	2.33	.84
Twelfth	18	3.22	.94
Parents or Other Adults Family Members			
Ninth	27	2.78	1.12
Tenth	37	2.97	1.26
Eleventh	18	2.83	.79
Twelfth	18	3.11	.96
Teachers			
Ninth	27	3.11	1.05
Tenth	37	3.30	.97
Eleventh	18	3.39	.85
Twelfth	18	3.39	1.15

APPENDIX L

Descriptive Statistics: Discussion of International Politics by Grade Level

Discussing International Political Events	Number	Mean	SD
People of Own Age			
Ninth	27	2.56	1.40
Tenth	37	2.05	1.31
Eleventh	19	2.00	1.25
Twelfth	18	2.67	.91
Parents or Other Adults Family Members			
Ninth	27	2.74	1.35
Tenth	37	2.38	1.23
Eleventh	19	2.05	.97
Twelfth	18	2.67	1.24
Teachers			
Ninth	27	2.89	1.37
Tenth	37	3.14	1.06
Eleventh	19	2.68	1.00
Twelfth	18	3.33	1.14

APPENDIX M

Descriptive Statistics: Attitudes toward Democratic Citizenship by Group Membership

Subscale	Number	Mean	SD
Good Citizenship			
NJROTC	71	3.64	.66
Traditional Civics	36	3.49	.55
Government Responsibility			
NJROTC	71	3.72	.65
Traditional Civics	36	3.76	.67
Equal Opportunities			
NJROTC	71	3.86	.54
Traditional Civics	36	3.66	.71
Trust			
NJROTC	71	2.97	.73
Traditional Civics	36	2.82	.80
Maintaining National Culture			
NJROTC	71	3.44	.67
Traditional Civics	36	3.41	.78

APPENDIX N

Cross-tabulation: Potential Involvement in Political Activities as Adults by Group

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Vote in national elections						
Never	0	0.0	5	15.1	5	4.9
Rarely	1	1.4	1	3.0	2	2.0
Sometimes	18	26.1	12	36.4	30	29.3
Often	41	59.5	12	36.4	53	52.0
Don't know	9	13.0	3	9.1	12	11.8
Total	69	100.0	33	100.0	102	100.0
Get information about candidates before voting in an election.						
Never	2	2.9	4	12.1	6	5.9
Rarely	4	5.8	1	3.0	5	4.9
Sometimes	17	24.6	8	24.2	25	24.5
Often	39	56.6	16	48.6	55	53.9
Don't know	7	10.1	4	12.1	11	10.8
Total	69	100.0	33	100.0	102	100.0
Join a political party						
Never	8	11.6	12	36.4	20	19.6
Rarely	17	24.6	8	24.2	25	24.5
Sometimes	17	24.6	1	3.0	18	17.6
Often	10	14.6	2	6.1	12	11.8
Don't know	17	24.6	10	30.3	27	26.5
Total	69	100.0	33	100.0	102	100.0
Write letters to a newspaper about social or political concerns.						
Never	14	20.3	9	27.3	23	22.5
Rarely	20	29.0	9	27.3	29	28.4
Sometimes	18	26.1	4	12.1	22	21.7
Often	6	8.7	3	9.1	9	8.8
Don't know	11	15.9	8	24.2	19	18.6
Total	69	100.0	33	100.0	102	100.0
Be a candidate for a local or city office.						
Never	17	24.6	5	15.2	22	21.6
Rarely	18	26.2	13	39.4	31	30.4
Sometimes	13	18.8	6	18.2	19	18.6
Often	8	11.6	1	3.0	9	8.8
Don't Know	13	18.8	8	24.2	21	20.6
Total	69	100.0	33	100.0	102	100.0

Missing	Vote in national elections		
	NJROTC		2
	Regular education	4	
	Get information about candidates before voting in an election		
	NJROTC		2
	Regular education	4	
	Join a political party		
	NJROTC		2
	Regular education	4	
	Write letters to a newspaper about social or political concerns		
	NJROTC		2
	Regular education	4	
	Be a candidate for a local or city office		
	NJROTC		2
	Regular education	4	

APPENDIX O

Cross-tabulation of Political Activism as Adults by Group

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Volunteer time to help poor or elderly people in the community						
I will certainly not do this	0	0.0	4	12.1	4	4.0
I will probably not do this	3	4.5	0	0.0	3	3.0
I will probably do this	33	49.3	18	54.6	51	51.0
I will certainly do this	23	34.3	7	21.2	30	30.0
Don't know	8	11.9	4	12.1	12	12.0
Total	67	100.0	33	100.0	100	100.0
Collect money for a social cause.						
I will certainly not do this	3	4.3	4	12.1	7	6.9
I will probably not do this	7	10.1	6	18.2	13	12.7
I will probably do this	35	50.8	10	30.3	45	44.1
I will certainly do this	16	23.2	6	18.2	22	21.6
Don't know	8	11.6	7	21.2	15	14.7
Total	69	100.0	33	100.0	102	100.0
Collect signatures for a petition.						
I will certainly not do this	4	6.0	3	9.7	7	7.1
I will probably not do this	10	14.9	9	29.0	19	19.4
I will probably do this	26	38.8	4	12.9	30	30.7
I will certainly do this	12	17.9	4	12.9	16	16.3
Don't know	15	22.4	11	35.5	26	26.5
Total	67	100.0	31	100.0	98	100.0
Participate in a peaceful protest march or rally.						
I will certainly not do this	7	10.1	4	12.9	11	11.0
I will probably not do this	17	24.6	11	35.5	28	28.0
I will probably do this	20	29.0	4	12.9	24	24.0
I will certainly do this	11	15.9	3	9.7	14	14.0
Don't know	14	20.3	9	29.0	23	23.0
Total	69	100.0	31	100.0	100	100.0
Spray-paint protest slogans on walls						
I will certainly not do this	33	47.9	12	36.4	45	44.1
I will probably not do this	12	17.4	8	24.2	20	19.6
I will probably do this	9	13.0	6	18.2	15	14.7
I will certainly do this	8	11.6	1	3.0	9	8.8
Don't know	7	10.1	6	18.2	13	12.7
Total	69	100.0	33	100.0	102	100.0
Block traffic as a form of protest.						
I will certainly not do this	31	45.5	16	48.5	47	46.5
I will probably not do this	18	26.5	9	27.3	27	26.7
I will probably do this	8	11.8	1	3.0	9	8.9

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
I will certainly do this	5	7.4	0	0.0	5	5.0
Don't know	6	8.8	7	21.2	13	12.9
Total	68	100.0	33	100.0	101	100.0
Occupy public buildings as a form of protest.						
I will certainly not do this	32	46.5	10	30.3	42	41.2
I will probably not do this	11	15.9	13	39.4	24	23.5
I will probably do this	10	14.5	2	6.1	12	11.8
I will certainly do this	7	10.1	1	3.0	8	7.8
Don't know	9	13.0	7	21.2	16	15.7
Total	69	100.0	33	100.0	102	100.0

Missing Volunteer time to help poor or elderly people in the community
NJROTC 4
Regular education 4
Collect money for a social cause
NJROTC 2
Regular education 4
Collect signatures for a petition
NJROTC 4
Regular education 6
Participate in a peaceful protest march or rally
NJROTC 2
Regular education 6
Spray pint protest slogans on walls
NJROTC 2
Regular education 4
Block traffic as a form of protest
NJROTC 3
Regular education 4
Occupy public buildings as a form of protest
NJROTC 2
Regular education 4

APPENDIX P

Cross-tabulation of Awareness of Events in this Country and Other Countries by Group

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Read articles in the newspaper about what is happening in this country						
Never	7	10.0	6	18.2	13	12.6
Rarely	14	20.0	6	18.2	20	19.4
Sometimes	25	35.7	14	42.4	39	37.9
Often	23	32.9	7	21.2	30	29.1
Don't know	1	1.4	0	0.0	1	1.0
Total	70	100.0	33	100.0	103	100.0
Read articles in the newspaper about what is happening in other countries						
Never	12	17.1	7	21.2	19	18.4
Rarely	18	25.7	9	27.3	27	26.3
Sometimes	25	35.8	12	36.4	37	35.9
Often	14	20.0	4	12.1	18	17.5
Don't know	1	1.4	1	3.0	2	1.9
Total	70	100.0	33	100.0	103	100.0
Listen to news broadcasts on television						
Never	2	2.9	0	0.0	2	1.9
Rarely	8	11.4	6	18.2	14	13.6
Sometimes	21	30.0	11	33.3	32	31.1
Often	38	54.3	14	42.4	52	50.5
Don't know	1	1.4	2	6.1	3	2.9
Total	70	100.0	33	100.0	103	100.0
Listen to news broadcasts on the radio						
Never	13	18.6	8	24.2	21	20.4
Rarely	17	24.3	8	24.2	25	24.3
Sometimes	17	24.3	7	21.2	24	23.3
Often	22	31.4	9	27.4	31	30.1
Don't know	1	1.4	1	3.0	2	1.9
Total	70	100.0	33	100.0	103	100.0

Missing	Read articles in the newspaper about what is happening in this country	
	NJROTC	1
	Regular education	4
	Read articles in the newspaper about what is happening in other countries	
	NJROTC	1
	Regular education	4
	Listen to news broadcasts on television	
	NJROTC	1
	Regular education	4
	Listen to news broadcasts on radio	
	NJROTC	1
	Regular education	4

APPENDIX Q

Descriptive Statistics: Discussion of U. S. Government by Group Membership

Discussing U.S. Government Events	Number	Mean	SD
People of Own Age			
NJROTC	70	2.81	1.07
Traditional Civics	32	2.34	1.21
Parents or Other Adults Family Members			
NJROTC	70	3.04	1.00
Traditional Civics	32	2.66	1.21
Teachers			
NJROTC	70	3.27	1.03
Traditional Civics	32	3.22	.98

APPENDIX R

Cross-tabulation of Discussion about United States Government by Group

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
With people of your own age						
Never	9	12.9	11	33.3	20	19.4
Rarely	16	22.8	7	21.2	23	22.3
Sometimes	28	40.0	9	27.3	37	35.9
Often	13	18.6	5	15.2	18	17.5
Don't know	4	5.7	1	3.0	5	4.9
Total	70	100.0	33	100.0	103	100.0
With parents or other adult family members						
Never	6	8.6	7	21.9	13	12.7
Rarely	13	18.6	7	21.9	20	19.6
Sometimes	25	35.6	10	31.3	35	34.4
Often	24	34.3	6	18.8	30	29.4
Don't know	2	2.9	2	6.3	4	3.9
Total	70	100.0	32	100.0	102	100.0
With teachers						
Never	5	7.1	3	9.1	8	7.8
Rarely	10	14.3	1	3.0	11	10.7
Sometimes	21	30.0	16	48.5	37	35.9
Often	29	41.5	11	33.3	40	38.8
Don't know	5	7.1	2	6.1	7	6.8
Total	70	100.0	33	100.0	103	100.0

Missing	With people of your own age	
	NJROTC	1
	Regular education	4
	With parents or other adult family members	
	NJROTC	1
	Regular education	5
	With teachers	
	NJROTC	1
	Regular education	4

APPENDIX S

Cross-tabulation of Discussion About International Politics by Group

	Group					
	NJROTC		Regular Education		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
With people of your own age						
Never	18	25.7	18	54.5	36	35.0
Rarely	19	27.2	10	30.3	29	28.2
Sometimes	17	24.3	2	6.1	19	18.4
Often	8	11.4	2	6.1	10	9.7
Don't know	8	11.4	1	3.0	9	8.7
Total	70	100.0	33	100.0	103	100.0
With parents or other adult family members						
Never	14	20.0	17	51.5	31	30.1
Rarely	15	21.4	5	15.2	20	19.4
Sometimes	23	32.9	10	30.3	33	32.0
Often	12	17.1	0	0.0	12	11.7
Don't know	6	8.6	1	3.0	7	6.8
Total	70	100.0	33	100.0	103	100.0
With teachers						
Never	10	14.3	4	12.1	14	13.6
Rarely	13	18.6	2	6.1	15	14.6
Sometimes	20	28.6	17	51.5	37	35.9
Often	19	27.1	9	27.3	28	27.2
Don't know	8	11.4	1	3.0	9	8.8
Total	70	100.0	33	100.0	103	100.0

Missing	With people of your own age	
	NJROTC	1
	Regular education	4
	With parents or other adult family members	
	NJROTC	1
	Regular education	4
	With teachers	
	NJROTC	1
	Regular education	4

REFERENCES

Aguirre International. (1999). *Making a difference: Impact of Americorps state/national direct on members and communities.* 1994-1995 & 1995-1996. San Mateo, CA: Author.

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological assessment.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

American Federation of Teachers, (2000). *AFT call for sweeping changes in teacher training and more rigorous requirements for new teachers*. aft.org/press/index.html.

American University (2008). Class project: Young voters' take on election 2008. *Washington Post*. Retrieved on March 25, 2008, from http://www.newswise.com/p/articles/view/538297/

Avrahami, A., & Dar, Y. (1993). Collectivistic and individualistic motives among kibbutz youth volunteering for community service. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 22*(6), 697-714.

Beck, P.A., & Jennings, M.K., (1982). Pathways to participation. *American Political Science Review 76* (1), 94-108.

Bennett, M. (2008). 2008 election captures attention of young voters. *Effingham Daily News*. Retrieved on March 26, 2008 from http://www.effinghamdailynews.com/statenews/cnhinsall_story_037085803.html

Billig, S. (2000). Research on K-12 school based service learning. The evidence builds. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(9), 658-664.

Bowes, C.F., Csapo, J. J. B., & Sheblanova, E. (1998). Ties that bind, Correlates of adolescents' civic commitments in seven countries. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(3), 457-475.

Brannan, L. (2005). Information Resources Manager, *Mid Continent Research for Education and Learning*. Aurora, CO. Retrieved May 15, 2006 from lbrannan@mcrel.org

Branson, M. S. (1998). *The role of civic education*. Washington, DC: Center for Civic Education. Retrieved May 14, 2006 from http://www.mdk12.org/instruction/curriculum/social_studies/civic_ed.html.

Brody, R.A. (1993). *Secondary education and political attitudes: Examining the effect of the "We the People" curriculum*. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.

Brooks-Boyd, F. (1997). Department of Juvenile Justice, South Carolina, letter to Major General Stewart Wallace, Commanding General. U.S. Army Cadet Command.

Campbell, D. E. (2001) *Making democratic education work in charters, vouchers and public education* (edited by P.E. Peterson & E.E. Campbell. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Campbell, D.E. (2005). *Environment facilitates adolescents' civic development*. University of Notre Dame.

Carnegie Corporation, & CIRCLE (2003). *The civic mission of schools*. Retrieved August 15, 2005 from www.cicivmissionofschools.org.

Carruthers-Day, J. Middleton, J., & Wolfley, P. (1990). *A Study of JROTC: A comparison of JROTC cadets with high school seniors*. Master's thesis. Webster University, St. Louis, MO.

Carter, L. H., & Elshtain, J. B. (1997). Task force on civic education statement of purpose,. P.S. *Political Science and Politics*. Retrieved May 14, 2007 from http://www.mdk12.org/instruction/curriculum/social_studies/civiced.html

Center for Civic Education (1994). *National standards for civics and government*. Calabasas, CA: Author.

Center for Civic Education Policy. (2004). *No child left behind: Misguided approach to school accountability for English language learners*. Retrieved August 15, 2006 from http://www.cep-dc.org/pubs/Forum14September2004/CrawfordPaper.pdf.

Center for Civic Education. (2001). *An assessment of we the people…project citizen: Promoting citizenship in classrooms and communities.* Retrieved May 20, 2005 from http://www.civced.org/projcitz_assess.html

Center for Strategic and International Studies. (1999). 1800 K Street, NW Washington, DC. Retrieved May 15, 2006 from http://www.csis.org/

Chambliss, S. (1997). U.S. Representative, letter to Major General Morris Boyd, Chief Legislative Liason. U.S. Army.

Chesney, R., & Feinstein, O. (1997). *Building civic literacy and citizen power*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Chief of Naval Education and Training Institution. (1990). 1533. 9J. *Regulations governing administration of the Naval Junior Reserve Officer's Training Corps*. Pensacola, FL: United States Government.

Child Trends. (2002). On-line databank. Retrieved September 15, 2006 from http:www.childtrends.org.

Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology: A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1992, Vol. 112. No. 1,155-159. American Psychological Association.

Colby, A., & Damon, W. (1999). The development of extraordinary moral commitment. In M. Killen & D. Hart (Eds.) *Morality in everyday life: Developmental perspectives*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coles, R. (1997). *The moral intelligence of children*. New York: Random House.

Comber, M. K. (2003). *Civics curriculum and civic skills: Recent evidence*. Circle: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning & Engagement. Retrieved on March 30, 2006 from www.civicyouth.org

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. (1982). The impact of experiential education on adolescent development. *Child and Youth Services, 4*(3-4), 57-76.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeler, S. (1996). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Department of the Army, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, (1986). *Reserve officers' training corps study group final report, (Vol.11)*. Washington, D.C.

Devin, P. D., & Abbey, E. R. (1997). *Evaluation of the NJROTC multimedia instructional system.* (MR-832-NAVY). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Dunham, D., & Bengston, V. (1992). The long-term effects of political activism on intergenerational relations. *Youth & Society, 24*, 31-51.

Ebel, R. L., & Frisbie, D. A. (1991). *Essentials of educational measurement.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Education Commission of the States. (2004). *ECS Report to the nation: State implementation of the no child left behind act.* Retrieved May 15, 2006 from http://www.ecs.org/htmlspecial/nclb/reporttothenation/reporttothenation.htm

Ehrle, J., & Moore, K. (1999). *1997 NSAF benchmarking measures of child and family well-being:* Report No. 6. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute.

Eisenberg, N. (2003). Empathy, sympathy and prosocial behaviors. In M. Bornstein, L. Davidson, C. Keyes, &, K. Moore, (Eds.). *Well-being: Positive development across the lifespan.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Engle, S. H., & Ochoa, A.S. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Fasion, N., & Flanagan, C. (2001). *Youth civic development: Implications of research for social policy and programs.* Social Policy Report, Vol. XV. Ann Arbor, MI: Society for Research in Child Development.

Feldman, A.F. and Matjasko, J.L. (2005). The role of school-based extracurricular activities on adolescent development: A comprehensive review and future directions. *Review of Educational Research, 75*, pp. 159-210.

Flanagan, C., Bowes, J. Jonsson, B., Csapo, B. & Sheblanova, E. (1998). Ties that bind; Correlates of adolescents' civic commitments in seven countries. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(3) 457-475.

Fletcher, A., Elder, G., & Mekos, D. (2000). Parental influences on adolescent involvement in community activities. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 10*(1), 29-48.

Freiberg, J. (1999). *School climate: Measuring, improving, and sustaining healthy learning environments*. London: Falmer.

Gagnon, P. (2003). *Educating democracy: State standards to ensure a civic core*. Washington, D.C.: Albert Shanker Institute.

Galston, W. A. (2003). Civic education and political participation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(1), 29-33.

Gordon, T. Holland, J., & Lahelma, E. (2000). *Making spaces: Citizenship and differences in schools*. NY: St. Martin's Press.

Grolier multimedia encyclopedia (2002). New York: Scholastic Corp.

Gronlund, N.E. (1993). *How to make achievement tests and assessments*. (5th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Gunnoe, M.L., Hertherington, E.M., & Reiss, D. (1999). *Evaluation of the quantum opportunities program: Did the program work?* Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, Heller Graduate School Center for Human Resources.

Hanks, M. (1981). Youth, voluntary associations, & political socialization. *Social Forces, 60* (1), 211-223.

Harris Interactive (2001). *Study shows teens' top ten causes, readiness to get involved and make a difference.* Retrieved April 30, 2006 from http://www.harrisinteractive.com/newsallnewsbydate.asp?NewsID=353

Hart-Teeter, (1997). *Public service and government effectiveness: The view of young Americans.* Washington, DC: Partnership for Trust in Government,

Hashway, R. (1998). *Assessment and evaluation of developmental learning: Qualitative individual assessment and evaluation models.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Hoffman, M.L. (1975). Moral internalization, parental power, and the nature of the parent-child interaction. *Developmental Psychology,* 11, 228-239.

Howard, M.M. (2003). *The weakness of civil society in post-communist Europe*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and post-modernization: Cultural, economic and political change in 43 societies.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), 2004-05-13, "IEA Civic Education Study, 1999: [United States]", http://hdl.handle.net/1902.2/3892 Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Janoski, T. Musick, M., & Wilson, J. (1998). Being volunteered? The impact of social participation and pro-social attitudes on volunteering. *Sociological Forum, 13*(3), 459-519.

Johnson, M., Beebe, T. Mortimer, J., & Snyder, M. (1998). Volunteerism in adolescence: A process perspective. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 8*(3), 309-331.

Kahne, J. & Middaugh, E. (2008). Democracy for some: The civic opportunity gap in high school. University of Maryland. The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. Retrieved from http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP59Kahne.pdf

Killen, M. & Hart, D. (Eds.) (1999). *Morality in everyday life: Developmental perspectives.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kirlin, M. (2002). Civic Skill Building: The missing link in service learning programs? PS: *Political Science and Politics, 35*(3): 571-576.

Klingemann, H. (1999). Mapping support in the 1990's: A global analysis. In P. Norris (Ed.), *Critical citizens: Global support for democratic governance.* (pp. 40-44). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Kurtz, K., Rasentha., A., & Zurkin. (2003). *Citizenship: A challenge for all generations*. National Conference of State Legislatures. Retrieved on March 30, 2006 from www.ncsl.org

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning*: *Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Levi, M., & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science* 3, 475-507.

Levine, P., & Lopez, M.H. (2002). *Youth voting has declined by any measure.* College Park: Center for information & research on civic learning & engagement.

Markus, H.R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Martineau, S., & Dehlin (2001). *Predictors of growth on a standardized achievement test: Implications for evaluating instructional effectiveness.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Michigan Association of School Psychologists: Lansing, MI.

McFarland, D.A., & Thomas, R.J. (2004). *How youth voluntary associations influence adult political participation.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.

Meyers, L., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. (2006). *Applied multivariate research: Design and interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Michigan Association of School Psychologists (2002). *MASP response to Education YES proposal*. Retrieved May 14, 2007 from http://www.masponline.org/masp_response_to_education_yes_proposal.htm.

Michigan Department of Education (1996). *Michigan curriculum framework.* Lansing, MI: Author.

Miller, W.E., & Shanks, J.M. (1996). *The new American voter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

National Association of Secretaries of State (1999). *New Millennium Project phase I: A nationwide study of 15-24 year old youth.* Washington, DC: Author.

National Association of Secretaries of State C *New millennium survey:* New millennium press kit. Retrieved May 15, 2006 from http://ww.stateofthevote.org/medialkit.html

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1999). *The civic education study*. Retrieved on January 2, 2007 from http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/cived/

Neimi, R. G., & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education: What makes students learn*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Newton, K. (2001). Trust, social capital, civil society, and democracy. *International Political Science Review, 22*(2), 201-214.

Nie, N.H., Junn, J., & Stehlik-Barry, K. (1996). *Education and democratic citizenship in America.* Chicago IL: University Chicago Press.

Olivia, P. F. (1992) *Interpretations of curriculum.* Glenview, IL: Addison Wesley Publishers.

Omoto, A., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(4), 671-686.

Patrick, J. J. (1996). Civil society in democracy's third wave: Implications for civic education. *Social Education, 60*(7), 414-417.

Patrick, J.J. (2002). *Defining, delivering and defending a common education for citizenship in a democracy*: a paper presented at the Summit on Civic Learning in Teacher Preparation. Boston, MA.

Patrick, J.J. (1996). Constitutionalism in education for democracy. In A. Oldenquist (Ed.), *Can democracy be taught?* (pp. 91-108). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Patterson, O. (1999). Liberty against the democratic state: On the historical and contemporary sources of American distrust. In M.E. Warren (Ed.), *Democracy and Trust* (pp. 151-207). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Perkins, D. Brown, B., & Taylor, R. (1996). The ecology of empowerment: Predicting participation in community organizations. *Journal of Social Issues, 52(*1), 85-110.

Perry, W. (1996). Wes Livingston (Cadet Major, Army JROTC). Letter to Secretary of Defense, William Perry.

Powell, C.L. (1995). (with Joseph Perisco). *My American journey.* New York: Random House.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1991). *Assessment* (5th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Sanders, W.L., Saxon, A.M., & Horn, S.P. (1997). The Tennessee value-added assessment system: A quantitative, outcomes-based approach to educational assessment. In J.Milman (ed.). *Grading teachers, grading schools: Is student achievement a valid evaluation measure?* (pp. 137-162). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Seiverling, R. F. (1973). *Study to measure the effectiveness of Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps. Programs in Pennsylvania's public secondary schools.* Dissertation. Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA.

Stroupe, K. S., & Sabato, L. J. (2005). *Politics: The missing link of responsible education*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Center for Politics.

Smith, E.S. (1999). The effects of investments in the social capital of youth on political and civic behavior in young adulthood. A longitudinal analysis. *Political Psychology 20* (3) 553-580.

The Civil Rights Project. (2004). *Listening to teachers: Classroom realities and no child left behind.* Harvard University. Retrieved October 12, 2006 from http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu/research/artilces/NCLB_Survey_Report.pdf

The Department of the Navy. (1996). 1533.96. Title?

Tolo, K.W. (1999). *The civic education of American youth: From state policies to school district practices*. (Policy Research Project Report Number 133). Dallas, TX: Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs.

Torney-Purta, J. (2002). The school's role in developing civic engagement: A study of adolescents in twenty-eight countries. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(4) 203-212.

Torney-Purta, J., & Amadeo, J. (2004). *Strengthening democracy in the Americas: An empirical analysis of the views of students and teachers*. Washington, DC: Organization of American States.

Torney-Purta, J. Lehmann, R. Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen.* Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Torney-Purta, J. Richardson, W. K., and Barber, C. H. (2004). *Trust in government-related institutions and civic engagement among adolescents: Analysis of five countries from the IEA civic education study*. Circle Working Paper. Retrieved August 31, 2006 from www.civicyouth.org

Travis, J.E. (1996). Meaningful assessment. *The Clearing House, 69,* 308-312.

Triandis, H.C. (1988). Collectivism v. individualism: A re-conceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural social psychology. In G. K. Verma, & C. Bagley (Eds.), *Cross-cultural studies of personality, attitudes and cognition,* (pp. 60-95). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

U. S. Army Cadet Command. (n.d.). *The history of the JROTC program* (report). Fort Monroe, VA.

U.S. Army Cadet Command. (1998). *Army Junior ROTC (JROTC) fact sheet*. (ATCCHS/4306).

U.S. Department of Education Budget Service. (2006). *Highlights of the FY 2007 education budget:* Retrieved February 1, 2007 from www.ed.gov.

Verba, S., Scholzman, K.L., & Brady, H.E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Volling, B. (2003). Sibling relationships. In M. Bornstein, L. Davidson, C. Keyes, &, K. Moore, (Eds), *Well-being: Positive development across the lifespan*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.

Walker, C. (2006). *High school graduation requirements: The Michigan Merit Curriculum Proposal*. Issue Paper: Papers Examining Critical Issues Facing the Michigan Legislature. Lansing, MI: Senate Fiscal Agency. Retrieved May 14, 2007 from www.senate.michigan.gov/sfa/Publications/Issues/GradReqs/GradRequirements.pdf

Walker, T. (2003). Services as a pathway to political participation: What research tells us. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(4), 183-188.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Youniss, J., & Yates, M. (1997). *Community service & social responsibility in youth.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Youniss, J., McLellan, J. A., & Yates, M. (1997). What we know about engendering civic identity. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*(5), 620-631.

Zaff, J.F., Moore, K.A., Papillo, A.R., & Williams, S. (2003). Implications of extracurricular activity participation during adolescence on positive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 18*(6), 599-630.

Zwartz, B. (1987). *National Catholic Reporter*, p. 14. Retrieved October, 2003 from http://ncronline.org/blogs/ncr-today

ABSTRACT

URBAN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ATTITUDES TOWARD DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP: A COMPARISON OF THE NJROTC CIVICS PROGRAM AND THE TRADITIONAL CIVICS CURRICULUM

by

RUTHANN BURNS-MC FADDEN

August 2011

Advisor: Dr. Marc H. Rosa

Major: Curriculum and Instruction

Degree: Doctor of Education

Conscientious and informed citizenry is essential in maintaining the integrity of American democracy. On the other hand, continued lack of engagement in and lack of positive attitudes towards civic participation can cause democracy to suffer. During the 21st century, schools are expected to prepare and motivate students to participate in their government. Research provides evidence that a positive relationship exists between civics education and increased civic and political knowledge; however, classroom instruction alone cannot provide all that is needed to promote a community of civic-minded individuals. Further, a survey of state level civics standards acknowledged the important relationship between participatory and intellectual skills, but was unable to assess the participatory skills in state standards.

This study compared students in the Naval Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (NJROTC) civics curriculum and students who took the traditional civics classes. Although NJROTC students scored higher in knowledge and attitudes towards participation in democratic

citizenship, the only statistically significant difference that emerged showed NJROTC students to discuss international politics with greater frequency than the students in traditional civics classes. On other comparisons, the two groups did not differ significantly based on group membership or grade level. New directions for research are suggested.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

RUTHANN BURNS-MC FADDEN

Education	2011 – Doctor of Education Wayne State University, Detroit, MI Major: Curriculum and Instruction 1992 – Master of Arts Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI Major: Leadership and Counseling 1989 – Bachelor of Science University of Michigan, Flint, MI Major: Political Science/History
Professional Certification	Secondary Teacher – State of Michigan
Professional Experience	1991 to Present Flint Community Schools, Flint MI Social Science Teacher
Professional Affiliations	Michigan Council for Social Sciences Michigan Education Association National Education Association Phi Delta Kappa International National Council for Social Studies United Teachers of Flint Toastmaster's Professional National Association of Multicultural Education National Council for Teaching About East Asia Genesee County Historical Society
Professional Study Tours	North America, Africa, Asia Europe