As a means of investigating the current status of citizenship education in the schools, this exploratory study was designed to study graduating high school seniors' perceptions of their citizenship experiences. A questionnaire was distributed to four schools in Texas, Minnesota, California, and Arkansas and data were analyzed using Boos's procedures modified for the use of Likert scale values. The three areas of investigation were: (1) the perceived qualities of the good citizen (10 qualities surveyed); (2) the perceived sources of citizenship influence (12 sources surveyed); and (3) the perceived contribution of courses and programs on citizenship (5 surveyed). "Participation in community or school affairs" was not considered by students to be an important contributor to good citizenship, while "concern for the welfare of others" and the "ability to make wise decisions" were. "Parents" and "friends" ranked highest as having the greatest influence on citizenship formation, with "coaches," "religious leaders," and "television and/or movies" ranked the lowest. "American History" and "Government" were seen by the students as being the most beneficial courses for citizenship education, and "elementary school social studies program" as the least beneficial. Each surveyed value was presented by a bar chart with scaled values, differentiated by state, with inferences on the data and a discussion of those survey results given. Each of the three investigation areas concludes with a cumulative Boos summary analysis, cluster ranking, and data analysis. Recommendations, three references, and a copy of the questionnaire are included. (PPB)
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In recent years, the United States has been the scene of a tidal wave of immigration from every culture and society in the world. Languages and cultures are so numerous that they form a conglomerate of diversity that would swamp and paralyze most other societies. Assimilation is the test of the survivability of democracy and a continuing process that contributes to the vitality of democracy. Historically, American citizenship has been affected by the consequences of culturally pluralistic society, but never to the extent that pluralism exists today. Since the days of Jefferson, political leaders have addressed three fundamental factors as the means to forge diversity within the united pluralism. These factors have included a democratic ideology, a common educational experience that promotes unity in the face of social differences, and a shared willingness to accept diversity as a perceived good in society.

American citizenship is the by-product of three factors that include democratic government, public education, and a culture that is characterized by pluralism. The interaction among these factors has produced a socialization process quite different from most socialization processes found in other nations or societies, a process which makes American citizenship different and vital. In order to understand the mechanisms of the socializing processes associated with citizenship development in the United States, we are required to study the interactions of ideology, education, and cultural pluralism as they are manifested in educational programs and in the processes of child development. The means and methods for understanding these complex social phenomena consist of exploratory research approaches. The main goal of this inquiry is to explore the current status of citizenship education and to come to an understanding of the dynamic social processes that influence its development.

A research interest of Citizenship Development Study Center investigators is to acquire information regarding the current status of citizenship education within the educational community in the United States. This monograph consists of an exploratory study of the opinions and practices of students who were about to be graduated from high schools in four different geographic areas of the United States. Because these students have recently experienced both the social and educational influence of citizenship, their opinions and concerns are an important source of information regarding the current status of citizenship education and citizenship development in the United States.
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THE PROBLEM

Citizenship education has been considered one of the constant educational goals since the founding of the republic and the concomitant need to educate youth for their democratic responsibilities. Unfortunately the educational commitment to citizenship education has been taken for granted to the extent that it can no longer be considered a serious goal of the schools.

Educators have experienced constant pressure to accommodate various educational movements including a multitude of demands that tend to occupy the attention of school leaders. As a consequence of the constant barrage of charges and demands levelled against the schools, educational leaders spend much of their time dealing with temporary problems and issues. In other words, citizenship education has been neglected in order to satisfy the most recent demands of special interest groups, pressure from state or federal mandates, and the shifting curricular innovations that gain the spotlight of public attention.

When asked about meeting the needs of citizenship education, school leaders typically will point to specific courses such as American government, extracurricular activities, special programs that mark specific holidays, and playground activities, etc. Citizenship education now has a low - or no priority - in public education. To a great extent, it has become an aspect of the hidden curriculum that does not require a comprehensive plan, nor does it any longer hold a primary place in the immediate priorities of the school.

As a means of investigating the current status of citizenship education in the schools, an exploratory study was designed to study student perceptions related to their citizenship experiences. These experiences tend to leave the students with perceptions about the meaning and importance of their citizenship. Project researchers believe that perceptions can be measured and analyzed through survey research and the results may provide valuable insights into the qualities of good citizenship, student conceptions of the influences that have affected their citizenship development, and student assessments of the importance of social studies courses and programs related to citizenship education. In addition, the investigation focused on citizenship and instructional approaches that would become the subject of the third research monograph in this series. Possibly, the insights gained from these exploratory studies may provide a better understanding of the means whereby citizenship values and behaviors are being developed in American society.
THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The investigators attempted to acquire the opinions of senior students from four different regional areas and backgrounds to gain information about their perceptions of the influences and experiences that have affected their citizenship. The research team collected student responses from these four groups and compared the responses in order to identify patterns of similarity and difference. By making some general inferences regarding the similarities and differences, the researchers hope to present an account of the factors that contributed to the production of these patterns. The results of this survey may provide additional insight into the complex phenomena of the contribution of social and educational factors on the development of American citizenship as well as pose further questions.

Through the survey of the four regional student groups, we can gain new insights into citizenship education and development in the following areas of concern:

1.) The Perceived Qualities of the Good Citizen
While educators have long debated the qualities of good citizenship, student reactions to a large number of listed citizenship attributes may provide new insights into perceptions of the attributes most strongly associated with the American image of a good citizen.

2.) The Perceived Sources of Citizenship Influence
In recent years, educators have lamented the decline of the family as the main source of the individual’s values and behaviors. In addition, a great number of educators credit media (television and movies in particular) with tremendous influence over minds of youth. By listing a relatively large number of perceived sources of influence regarding citizenship, the study may shed new light on these and other influences that shape American citizenship.

3.) The Contribution of Courses and Programs of Study to Citizenship
Educators historically have identified citizenship education as an important goal of the social studies curriculum; therefore, student perceptions may help to provide new insights into the contribution that the social studies actually is making to citizenship education. In addition, the perceptions and opinions of students regarding the citizenship influences of social studies programs and courses may provide additional insight into the students’ overall assessment of the k-12 social studies curriculum.
GOALS OF THE STUDY

The goals of the study are as follows:

1.) To determine the extent to which respondent groups support similar perceptions and opinions regarding the qualities of a good citizen.

2.) To determine the extent to which respondent groups from different geographical regions and sociological backgrounds support similar perspectives and opinions regarding the societal influences that have affected their citizenship development.

3.) To determine the extent to which respondent groups from different geographical regions and sociological backgrounds support similar perspectives and opinions regarding the influence of social studies courses and programs on the development of citizenship.

4.) To gain additional information and insights about other, perhaps hidden, educational factors that contribute to the development of citizenship.
DEFINITIONS

Because this report is part of a larger and multifaceted project, three important terms will appear throughout this report of the project; therefore, ample space is used here to clarify and describe in fairly precise language the meanings of the terms citizenship, citizenship development, and citizenship education.

Citizenship

According to Julius Gould and William L. Kolb in A Dictionary of the Social Sciences, "Citizenship may be defined as a state of relationship existing between a natural person and a political society, known as a state, by which the former owes allegiance and the latter protection."

After interviewing a large number of citizens from every part of the United States, Robert Bellah, writing in Habits of the Heart, identified three types of understandings related to politics and citizenship—understandings that reflect a variety of meanings that may not be compatible with one another. The first type he identifies as "... a matter of making operative the moral consensus of the community, reached through free face-to-face discussion." The second understanding is a general type of citizenship in which "... politics means the pursuit of differing interests according to agreed-upon rules." The third understanding he describes as "... the politics of the nation, which exalts politics into the realm of statesmanship in which the high affairs of national life transcend particular interests." (Bellah, pp. 200-201)

Citizenship Development

Citizenship development consists of the study of social and cultural influences that contribute to a child's acquisition of citizenship values and behaviors. In 1987, Dynneson and Gross completed work on a citizenship development theory that contained a description of six stages of citizenship development. According to this theory, there are six stages of citizenship development in which social relationships contribute to the formation of the individual's perspective of his overall relationship with community and society (Dynneson and Gross, 1987, p. 1). These six stages of citizenship development theory are undergoing scrutiny through various field research projects sponsored by The Citizenship Development Study Project under the direction of Professors Dynneson and Gross.
The Six Stages of Citizenship Development:

**Stage One:** Biological Citizenship: Infant Dependency and Maternal Shaping -- Birth to Three Years of Age

**Stage Two:** Family Citizenship: Expanding Kinship Influences -- Four and Five Years of Age

**Stage Three:** Formative Social Citizenship: The Initiation of Nonbiological Dependencies -- Five through Nine Years of Age

**Stage Four:** Stratified Social Citizenship: The Development of Social Categories and Group Membership Behaviors -- Ten through Twelve Years of Age

**Stage Five:** Chronological Age Group Citizenship: Horizontal Social Relationships Within and Between Groups -- Thirteen through Fifteen Years of Age

**Stage Six:** Complex Social Citizenship: A Search for Accommodation and Adult Identity -- Sixteen Years of Age to Adulthood

(Dynneson and Gross, 1985 and 1987)

**Citizenship Education**

Citizenship education consists of the related educational programs provided by the schools to help youth acquire an understanding of their citizenship roles as members of American society. In 1985, Dynneson and Gross conducted a survey of social studies instructors in which the researchers provided a definition of citizenship education. The following statement provided by the authors received a 70% affirmation from responding participants:

While an important and central element of the social studies, citizenship education is a responsibility of the entire school (as well as of family and community). It includes the means by which individuals are prepared to gain the knowledge, skills, and values that enable them to understand, examine, decide and participate in public affairs and in (the means for) forwarding the well-being of other individuals and of their society.

(Dynneson, Gross, and Nickel, p. 8)
THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The survey of four student groups is an important component of a broader research attempt to study the status of citizenship education in the United States. An earlier project survey focused on the study of the thoughts and practices of social studies instructors concerning the current status of citizenship education in the social studies. This earlier study was published by the Center for Educational Research at Stanford in 1987 as an independent research monograph. Like the 1987 study (research monograph #1), the researchers' intent was to identify those specific issues and problems that pertain to citizenship education in the social studies as seen through the eyes of those surveyed. The current study grew out of Cheryl Green's graduate study which was designed to explore student reactions to citizenship development in a small Texas town. Green's study consisted of survey research in which a survey instrument was perfected. This preliminary study gave rise not only to the questionnaire but also to many of the procedures and practices adopted by the research team.

The Questionnaire

Working with student in a small Texas town, Cheryl Green administered a series of questions designed by Dynneson as a survey of social studies instructors. Green's study was aimed at investigating the students' understanding of citizenship and the influences that contributed to the students' perspectives. Three forms of the questionnaire were field-tested before the final survey instrument was accepted by Green and Dynneson. The first survey contained ten questions in which items were to be rank ordered or selected from multiple lists of responses. Green administered the questionnaire to a group of students who responded by completing the questionnaire. After completing the questionnaire, the students were asked to offer comments including their interpretations of what was being asked for in the questionnaire. As a result, there was some general renaming of specific educational terms in order to make them more meaningful to students.

Revisions led to the development of another questionnaire and this questionnaire was administered to student groups who had not been involved in the initial survey. Green also asked students who had been involved in the initial to take the second survey and to comment on the difference between the two surveys in terms of clarity and ease of response. Student responses indicated that few problems remained; therefore, an outside consultant was asked to check the instrument in terms of the analysis of data and the validity and reliability of the instrument.

Green and Dynneson produced a final field test for the questionnaire which took on the form of a seven point Likert scale instrument. In addition, the final survey was simplified for respondent convenience. One item was removed from the final instrument because it was deemed inappropriate in light of student knowledge or experience.
Green administered the questionnaire to all seniors near the end of the school year, and upon completion of the instrument, each student had an opportunity to comment on the questionnaire in a debriefing session. The students offered a few comments regarding the improvements that had been made in the instrument. As a consequence of student remarks, Dynneson and Green made some minor changes in the questionnaire prior to preparing it for use with the four student groups in the current study.

Checks on Questionnaire Reliability and Validity

Green attempted to audit the reliability of the questionnaire by addressing the consistency of interpretation given to each survey item. Students were interviewed following the administration of each form of the questionnaire. In order to check on the consistency of each item, Green interviewed students for interpretations and meanings. In addition, Green encouraged students to make comments, ask questions, and to make specific suggestions to clarify meanings and interpretations. Items that were deemed unclear, open to several interpretations, or misleading were either modified or eliminated by Green and Dynneson.

Green tested the validity of the questionnaire through the piloting process described above. The researchers correlated related items in order to provide a general indication as to whether or not the instrument was actually measuring the intended factors. For example, when responses indicated that a knowledge of current events was an important characteristic of a good citizen, a check was taken to see if this response correlated with an item that credited current events as having influence on citizenship. In addition, the researchers queried the parents of students involved in the survey in order to determine the parent perceptions and to check to see if these were in agreement with those of their sons’ and daughters’ responses. While there were some discrepancies, parents were in general agreement that their sons and daughters had responded in thoughtful and reasonable ways, ways consistent with and appropriate for their children.

Four Student Groups

In the fall of 1986, project researchers identified four school districts that would cooperate by allowing their graduating seniors to participate in the study. The following criteria were used in seeking groups of graduating seniors:

1.) Student groups from different geographic regions of the United States.

2.) Students groups from different social, political and economic backgrounds.

3.) Students groups from different urban, suburban, and rural backgrounds.
These criteria were satisfied by the four school districts that agreed to cooperate in the study. The four school districts included a small rural community in Arkansas (a small class providing 39 questionnaire returns), a middle class suburban school district in northern California (50% of graduating seniors enrolled in American government with 111 questionnaire returns), an upper middle class suburban school district in Minnesota (moderately sized graduating class providing 279 questionnaire returns), and an urban high school in Texas (moderately sized graduating class providing 342 questionnaire returns). Each school district provided a contact person who would be responsible for the administration of the questionnaire in the spring of 1987. With the exception of the California group (50% of the senior class), over 90% of the graduating seniors completed the questionnaire.

The Analysis of the Data

Data Processing

Processing Questionnaire Results

As the survey questions returned to the research team from the participating school districts, computer center personnel entered the responses on the Likert scale into a computerized data file. The project statistician organized the data from each school district into a summary form that provided frequency and probability (percentage) tables for each item as a function of the scaled values. So as not to rely entirely on subjective interpretations, the nonparametric test presented by Dennis D. Boos seemed a suitable instrument to be used to further the analysis. (Dennis D. Boos, "Comparing K Populations with Linear Rank Statistics," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, December 1986, Vol. 81, No. 396, Theory and Methods, pp. 1018-1025.

Boos Summary Statistical Tables

In 1986, Dennis D. Boos of North Carolina State University published a non-parametric procedure for comparing K populations with linear rank statistics. This procedure incorporated the Kruskal-Wallis and Mood statistics (generalization of the Mood statistic) for comparing the measures of central tendency and scatter respectively. Boos’ procedure also incorporated tests of skewness and kurtosis with those of place and scale in a single procedure. The four measures and a composite of all four provide a procedure for determining whether the distributions of the K populations are approximately equivalent. Boos’ summary tables were calculated for each question across the four student groups used in the exploratory survey. Some of these are not reproduced in this report, but the consequences of this analysis are given with the discussion of each graphical representation.
To analyze the data, the project statistician had to make some modifications in the test as described by Boos. This was necessary because the measurements from the survey instrument were Likert scale values. Because multiple ties were frequent, some provisions had to be made. The limitation of the Mood statistic when the measures of central tendency or location measurements are not equivalent causes a problem that was resolved when the data from a first pass is translated giving new rank values which are then compared. In a similar manner, the test for skewness is sensitive to variations in the scatter of the data. The project statistician attempted to resolve this problem by changing the scale on the translated data. This approach is different from that proposed by Boos. With the Likert scaled data, as used in this analysis and the large number of ties, the project statistician felt that a symmetrical trimming of the data distorts the data and would, as proposed by Boos, not be a practical approach to solving the problem.

The values of the test statistics are found in the last column of the data output. The first four approximate the Chi-square statistic with K-1 degrees of freedom, where K is the number of populations in the analysis. The last value also follows a Chi-square distribution, but this time with 4(K-1) degrees of freedom.

The researchers were concerned about the asymptotic behavior of this test, particularly with the modifications used to account for ties. However, the programmed output as presented provides a means of limitedly ranking the populations relative to a given statistic within the analysis. If the data values are approximately equal, it is not practical to assert an ordering in spite of the large sample sizes used. If the measures of location are not equivalent, as determined by the first pass of the Boos test, the location parameters can be grouped into subsets which can be assumed to be equivalent.

Charts
The data from the probability tables was converted by the project statistician into a graphics program (Hewlett Packard Series 100/Graphics) to create bar charts illustrating the comparison of the responses from each school district for the observed percentages for each survey item. These charts provided a way of subjectively assessing the students' responses.

Rank Orders
A simple set of rank orders was obtained by measuring the lengths of each of the bars in the bar charts, followed by a calculation of their sums. There was no attempt to contribute significance to these rank orders, other than to illustrate a detectable difference between group responses. In addition, the combined sums of the measured bars provided a combined rank order for all four student groups as a means of detecting potential variations that might exist between regional groups of respondents.
Inferences
Project researchers attempted to formulate a reasonable set of inferences based upon their interpretation of the analyzed data. Values such as including low, moderate, important, etc. were assigned to the responses of the four student groups. These values were assigned to student responses based on an observation of the bar charts, rank orders, and the Boos analysis tables and charts. The equivalence cluster rankings were especially useful in assigning inference values.

Discussion
The discussion section following the analysis of each item is an extended interpretation of the data in light of the researchers' perceptions of the condition of citizenship education within the school setting. These perceptions are provided in order to shed some additional light on student reactions. While the readers may disagree with the explanations and interpretations contained within these sections, they are encouraged to challenge these contentions by formulating substitute or additional perceptions regarding student reactions.
SURVEY RESULTS:

Item #1:
The following characteristics are important qualities of a good citizen:

a. knowledge of current events

chart

QUALITIES OF A GOOD CITIZEN
knowledge of current events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Composite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percents</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percents of no responses

a. rank orders

Arkansas    (SA 1, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 4 SD)
California  (SA 3, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 6 SD)
Minnesota   (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Texas       (SA 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Composite   (SA 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in Arkansas and Minnesota were in general agreement that an interest in current events is an important quality of a good citizen.
2.) Respondents in California and Texas were in general agreement that an interest in current events is a moderately important quality of a good citizen.
3.) Composite ranks of all four groups of respondents indicate that an interest in current events is perceived as a moderately important quality of a good citizen.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that interest in current events is generally perceived by respondents as a moderately important quality of good citizenship. An interest in current events is often perceived by educators and the general public as a measurement of the individual’s quality of citizenship. Should this be the case, the student responses seem to indicate that a modest interest in the current events will suffice as a good citizenship quality. Social studies teachers traditionally have spent some class time promoting an interest in current events as a means of encouraging students to become interested in the affairs of society. Expanded current events activities, especially in the elementary grades, might help students acquire an interest in the broader affairs of the community. This contention is based on the conviction that current events can be presented to elementary children according to the appropriate levels of cognitive development. The overall goal related to the study of current events is the development of the habit of seeking information about community, state, nation and the world. The acquisition of the habits and skills associated with an interest in the broader affairs of society may occur at an early age, making use of classroom activities that value this type of knowledge a necessity.

The distribution of ranking across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
b. participation in community or school affairs

chart

QUALITIES OF A GOOD CITIZEN
participation in community or school affairs

Arkansas  California  Minnesota  Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First column gives percents of no responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. rank orders

Arkansas  (SA 2, 1, 4, 3, 5, 0, 0 SD)
California  (SA 5, 3, 2, 1, 4, 6, 7 SD)
Minnesota  (SA 4, 2, 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Texas  (SA 3, 1, 4, 2, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Composite  (SA 4, 1, 3, 2, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in Arkansas rated participation in community or school affairs as of moderate importance as a quality of a good citizen.
2.) Respondents in California, Minnesota, and Texas rated participation in community or school affairs as of low importance as a quality of a good citizen.
3.) Composite ranks of all four groups of respondents indicate that participation in community or school affairs is generally perceived as of low importance as a quality of a good citizen.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that respondents perceive participation in community and school affairs as of low importance as a quality of good citizenship. Participation in community or school affairs may be perceived as more important among respondents living in small rural communities, while larger and more urban communities are less concerned about this aspect of citizenship. Small rural communities may tend to require the participation of most citizens in community affairs in order to provide the types of support systems that are needed to maintain the social life of the community. The extent of the need for participation may be a characteristic difference between large and small schools and communities. The responses seem to indicate that teachers either have not addressed or promoted student awareness and student activities aimed at participation in community affairs or that students have simply chosen not to participate in student activities. Undoubtedly a fairly large number of students has deemed school activities as basically worthless. Also it is obvious that students generally either have not had the opportunity to experience classroom activities that include community affairs or they have chosen to avoid them for any number of reasons, including disinterest and the conclusion of worthlessness.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boo test.
c. accepts an assigned responsibility

chart

QUALITIES OF A GOOD CITIZEN
accepts an assigned responsibility

Arkansas
California
Minnesota
Texas

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no responses

C. rank orders

Arkansas (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 0, 0, 5 SD)
California (SA 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6 SD)
Minnesota (SA 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Composite (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Inference:

Respondents in all four groups indicated that the acceptance of assigned responsibilities is an important quality of a good citizen.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that respondents perceive the acceptance of assigned responsibilities as an important quality of good citizenship. This perception tends to focus on the extent to which the individual is willing to accept an assigned responsibility in the family, the school, the job, and the community. The willingness to fulfill one's obligations may be one of the most agreed upon qualities of a good citizen, regardless of all other considerations. Teachers tend to play an especially important role in the development of values and behaviors related to the acceptance of assigned responsibilities. Classroom assignments are ultimately an outgrowth of the extent to which students are willing and able to meet their assigned responsibilities on a daily, monthly, and yearly basis. While not every student develops this sense of responsibility, it seems that the schools can claim a degree of success in the enhancement of this aspect of citizenship education.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
d. concern for the welfare of others

chart

QUALITIES OF A GOOD CITIZEN
concern for the welfare of others

Arkansas
California
Minnesota
Texas

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percents of no responses

d. rank orders

Arkansas (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 0, 0, 0 SD)
California (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 0 SD)
Minnesota (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 0, 0 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Composite (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)

21
Inference:

Respondents in all four groups indicated that a concern for the welfare of others is a very important quality of a good citizen.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that a concern for the welfare of others was perceived as a very important quality of a good citizen. This importance relates to the need for individuals to belong to groups and to accept the conditions of group association. In essence, the importance of this aspect of good citizenship may signal the need for individuals to be willing to lend their support to others in order to help develop and maintain important social relationships. The reciprocal nature of group relationships is an important aspect of citizenship within the school and the community. The underlying importance of this response spotlights the need for individuals to develop and maintain a supportive social environment. While this aspect of citizenship often has been ignored by curriculum planners when designing courses and programs, teachers can play an important role in the development of values and behaviors that address this vitally important quality of good citizenship. By creating a supportive and reinforcing classroom atmosphere, the teacher can have a direct influence on the development of this quality of good citizenship. The concern for the welfare of others begins with a concern for classroom members and extends to the broader community of humankind.

The distribution of the ranks agree in location at the 5% level across the four regional groups but not in any of the other statistical parameters.
e. moral and ethical behavior
chart

QUALITIES OF A GOOD CITIZEN
moral and ethical behavior

ARKANSAS    CALIFORNIA    MINNESOTA    TEXAS

Percents

LIKERT SCALED VALUES 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no response

e. rank orders

Arkansas    (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 0, 5, 0 SD)
California  (SA 2, 1, 3, 4, 6, 5, 6 SD)
Minnesota   (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Texas       (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Composite   (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, 7 SD)
Inference:

Respondents in all four groups indicated that moral and ethical behavior is an important quality of a good citizen.

Discussion:

Survey results indicated that respondents are in general agreement regarding their perception of the importance of moral and ethical behavior as a quality of a good citizen. These results tend to support the idea that students generally associate good citizenship with moral and ethical conduct. The responses indicate that most students judge good or bad behavior according to standards of human conduct and the social rules that are an important part of the social setting, since formal and informal codes of conduct contribute to the regulation of individuals in all kinds of social circumstances. Evidently, these respondents are well aware of this aspect of human behavior as a result of years of experience within the school and the community. Teachers could make a greater contribution to this perceived quality of a good citizen by emphasizing moral and ethical issues and events related to the teaching of content. In recent years, teachers have grown more reluctant to deal with moral and ethical questions in light of the growing trend towards relativism that has come to dominate the perspective of the liberally educated. Classroom lessons and activities that deal with moral and ethical issues generally are not included within the curriculum.

The distribution agree in location at the 5% level and scale at the 1% level across the four regional groups, but not in the other statistical parameters.
f. acceptance of authority of those in supervisory roles

chart

QUALITIES OF A GOOD CITIZEN

acceptance of authority of those in supervisory roles

ARKANSAS CALIFORNIA MINNESOTA TEXAS

Percents

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no responses

f. rank orders

Arkansas (SA 3, 1, 2, 4, 5, 0, 6 SD)
California (SA 3, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Minnesota (SA 3, 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 5 SD)
Composite (SA 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents were in general agreement regarding the modest importance of the acceptance of authority of those in supervisory roles as a quality of good a citizen.
2.) The respondent group in Texas more strongly supported the acceptance of authority of those in supervisory roles as a quality of a good citizen than did the groups in the other states.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that respondents generally perceive acceptance of authority differently in regard to its significance as an important citizenship quality. This result may be complicated by the different attitudes that exist between different social relationships. For example, the acceptance of authority in the school and the acceptance of authority on the job may be different from the acceptance of political authority. In a democratic society, citizens must decide whether or not an elected leader of the community is competent to continue in office; on the other hand, school and job relationships tend to be characterized by a subordinate/supervisory relationship. As a result, the acceptance of authority is generally a qualified acceptance of authority in light of basic social circumstances. Teachers as a group tend to operate their classes within a subordinate/supervisory relationship. As a result, students are seldom able to experience the democratic relationship either in the home or in the school prior to becoming adults. Consequently, most Americans are aware of democratic relationships, but most are not provided an opportunity to actually experience a democratic relationship prior to the attainment of adult status.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
g. ability to question ideas

QUALITIES OF A GOOD CITIZEN
ability to question ideas

Arkansas
California
Minnesota
Texas

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no responses

g. rank orders

Arkansas (SA 3, 1, 2, 4, 6, 5, 0 SD)
California (SA 1, 3, 2, 4, 5, 5, 5 SD)
Minnesota (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Composite (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in all four groups were in general agreement that the ability to question ideas is a very important quality of a good citizen.
2.) Respondents in the Arkansas group expressed slightly less support for the ability to question ideas as a quality of a good citizen, while respondents in the California group expressed very strong agreement on this same quality.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that the respondents perceived the ability to question ideas as a very important quality of a good citizen. This result may lend support to the perception that good citizenship in a democratic society is based on the ability of citizens to question and possibly to challenge ideas, proposals, and programs of those in leadership positions. The ability to question and challenge ideas requires certain types of educational experiences in which teachers tolerate confrontations over ideas in the classroom. Teachers vary in their willingness to accept this type of interaction between students and ideas. The reluctance to develop this student ability in students may be due mainly to two troubling pedagogical factors: (1) teacher inexperience with teaching strategies that encourage student ability to question and challenge ideas, and (2) the depth of content knowledge that is required by the teacher in order to exercise questioning and challenging activities. These types of strategies require a greater than average knowledge on the part of the teacher. In some cases, the teacher may find that promoting questioning and challenging skills are too threatening to the traditional teacher/student relationship.

The distributions in ranks agree in location at the 5% level and scale at the 1% level, but not in skewness or kurtosis according to the Boos test.
h. ability to make wise decisions

chart

QUALITIES OF A GOOD CITIZEN
ability to make wise decisions

ARKANSAS        CALIFORNIA        MINNESOTA        TEXAS

First column gives percents of no responses

h. rank orders

Arkansas        (SA 1, 2, 4, 3, 0, 0, 0 SD)
California      (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 0, 5 SD)
Minnesota       (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 5 SD)
Texas           (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Composite        (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Inference:
Respondents in all four groups indicated that the ability to make wise decisions is a very important quality of a good citizen.

Discussion:
Survey results indicated that students are convinced that the ability to make wise decisions is a very important quality of a good citizen. The strength of this response is indicative of the perceived need of individuals living in a democratic society to make sound decisions based on a careful consideration of issues and concerns. This result may indicate that a good citizen is able to exercise good judgment. Teachers should play a critical role in helping youth become better decision makers by providing classroom lessons and activities that allow them to develop their decision making abilities. This recommendation is based on the belief that the ability to make wise decisions develops through time and experience. Because of the often authoritarian nature of many schools and of many classrooms, decision making opportunities and experiences are limited by the reluctance of educators to allow students to participate in the decisions that directly affect student activities. Teachers and administrators commonly agree that students are too young to make critical decisions and that students need guidance when making decisions. These views are supported by experience and by common reason; however, decision making must begin at some appropriate age in order to teach the lesson of consequences.

The distribution in rank agree in location at the 5% level of significance but in none of the other parameters according to the Boos test.
i. knowledge of government
chart

QUALITIES OF A GOOD CITIZEN
knowledge of government

ARKANSAS
CALIFORNIA
MINNESOTA
TEXAS

First column gives percents of no responses

i. rank orders

Arkansas (SA 1, 2, 3, 2, 4, 0, 0 SD)
California (SA 3, 1, 2, 2, 4, 5, 6 SD)
Minnesota (SA 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6 SD)
Texas (SA 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6 SD)
Composite (SA 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 SD)
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Inference:

Respondents in all four respondent groups agreed that knowledge of government is a moderately important quality of a good citizen.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that knowledge of government is considered a moderately important quality of a good citizen. While this survey item did not attempt to acquire information regarding what was perceived as an adequate level of knowledge of government, the results on this item seem to indicate that knowledge of government is not as important a quality of good citizenship as one would expect, especially in light of the role that government plays in citizenship education programs. Future investigation might shed light on this issue by exploring the differences between a practical understanding of government and an individual's book knowledge of government. For example, students might consider a practical knowledge about day-to-day dealings with the agencies and officials of government of much greater importance as a quality of a good citizen than an individual's understanding of political systems, principles, or theories. Could it be that students are expressing the attitude that is based on the belief that much of what is taught in government courses does not have much to do with citizenship?

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
j. patriotism

cart

QUALITIES OF A GOOD CITIZEN

patriotism

ARKANSAS    CALIFORNIA    MINNESOTA    TEXAS

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no responses

j. rank orders

Arkansas (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 0, 0, 0 SD)
California (SA 2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 SD)
Minnesota (SA 2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6 SD)
Composite (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6 SD)

33
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in the Arkansas and Texas groups agreed that patriotism is an important quality of a good citizen.
2.) Respondents in the California and Minnesota groups agreed that patriotism is only moderately important as a quality of good citizen.
3.) The composite distribution of all four groups signified a generally strong agreement that patriotism is only a moderately important quality of a good citizen.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that the respondents perceived patriotism as only moderately important as a quality of a good citizen. The variations in the rank order distributions suggest that the respondents have an uneasiness about the meaning of the term patriotism. The term was not defined or described in the questionnaire; therefore, respondents were required to apply their own meaning to this survey item. In the future, more of a probing investigation into student perceptions of patriotism and its importance to citizenship in a democratic society may help to clarify meanings and perceptions. The influences of individual teachers and the issues and concerns of the times evidently influence the extent to which the qualities of a good citizen are associated with patriotic values and behaviors. Is it possible that there is a reservoir of patriotic emotions and commitments that can be tapped under certain conditions? If it exists, does this reservoir of patriotism have an influence on our perceptions of the qualities of good citizenship?

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The questionnaire contained seven separate questions with multiple components (see Appendix A) that were rated on a seven point Likert scale. The first three questions are reported in this monograph.

Boos Summary Statistical Tables for Q1

The researchers addressed a basic hypothesis regarding the responses of students on the component parts of question #1 (Q1). The hypothesis is stated below:

\[ H: \text{Student responses were the same across all components of a question within a given school district.} \]

Rejection of this hypothesis would be anticipated if the students gave any thought to their responses. Each of the questions was subjected to a statistical test based on an adaptation of a Linear Rank Test proposed by Boos. This test subsequently will be referred to as the Boos Test. It addresses measures of location, scale, skewness, and kurtosis in a single test making it suitable for assessing equivalence of distributions. A failure of the test strongly indicates that a partial ranking of the attributes in the questions exists. Though one may take the weighted rank values as calculated for the assumed ordering, it is considered more reasonable to group the attributes in clusters hypothesized to be equivalent. Subsequent investigations will be necessary to determine if these clusters are indeed statistically equivalent.

The Boos summary data derived from the questionnaire provides the means for ranking the individual components of question #1. These components are presented according to alphabetical letters in the order that they were presented following the question statement. The assigned letters were used in the ranking table instead of writing out the item.

Question 1. The following characteristics are important qualities of a good citizen:

a. knowledge of current events
b. participation in community or school affairs
c. accepts an assigned responsibility
d. concern for welfare of others
e. moral and ethical behavior
f. acceptance of authority of those in supervisory roles
g. ability to question ideas
h. ability to make wise decisions
i. knowledge of government
j. patriotism.
## Boos Summary Table for Arkansas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>19.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-3.47</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>-2.64</td>
<td>36.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Item</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>77.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Boos Summary Table for California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>-3.56</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>-4.48</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>124.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>23.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-2.62</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-6.10</td>
<td>-3.95</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>69.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Item</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>70.99</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>54.93</td>
<td>39.07</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>232.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Boos Summary Table for Minnesota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>-6.81</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>-5.45</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>220.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-4.27</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>36.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>52.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-4.63</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>-5.38</td>
<td>-4.87</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-5.87</td>
<td>-5.94</td>
<td>-3.98</td>
<td>-4.59</td>
<td>166.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Item</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>95.51</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>100.49</td>
<td>34.82</td>
<td>44.78</td>
<td>78.43</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>477.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Boos Summary Table for Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>-6.17</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>-2.79</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-5.10</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>190.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>-4.33</td>
<td>-3.78</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>-2.49</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>59.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>197.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-5.54</td>
<td>-4.55</td>
<td>-9.65</td>
<td>-7.11</td>
<td>-5.73</td>
<td>-6.81</td>
<td>-6.58</td>
<td>-11.10</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>-8.10</td>
<td>908.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the location parameter from the Boos Test, the responses from each of the four school districts can be ordered with the following hypothesized equivalence clusters:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Rank</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>h, g</td>
<td>d, h</td>
<td>c, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>h, c, e</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e, a, g, c, i</td>
<td>e, f, d, g, j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>a, b, j</td>
<td>c, e</td>
<td>j, f</td>
<td>a, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>f, g, i</td>
<td>f, j, a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. knowledge of current events  
b. participation in community or school affairs  
c. accepts an assigned responsibility  
d. concern for welfare of others  
e. moral and ethical behavior  
f. acceptance of authority of those in supervisory roles  
g. ability to question ideas  
h. ability to make wise decisions  
i. knowledge of government  
j. patriotism.

There was no attempt to establish before the fact a specific number of categories. Three of the school districts seemed to divide naturally into four, but California seemed to divide more naturally into six. If one surmises that the bottom ranks across all four school districts are somewhat comparable, the following remarks are possible:

Students generally do not feel that participation in community and school affairs (b) is an important contributor to good citizenship. Knowledge of government (i) has almost as low a ranking and is considered of little importance. At the other extreme, concern for welfare of others (d) and ability to make wise decisions (h) generally are considered to be highly significant.
Survey Result:

Item #2:
The following have influenced my citizenship:

a. parents

chart

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP
parents

Arkansas
California
Minnesota
Texas

COMPOSITE

LIKERT SCALED VALUES 1 - 7
First column gives percents of no responses

Arkansas (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 0, 6, 0 SD)
California (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 0, 5, 0 SD)
Minnesota (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5, 5 SD)
Composite (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Inference:

Respondents in all four groups indicated that parents have a great influence on their citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicated that the respondents perceive parents as the most influential source of student citizenship. The California students were a little more reserved in their responses, but were, at the time, in general agreement with the other groups. Student respondents seem to associate influences that are important to the child-rearing experience with citizenship development. In other words, those individuals who are the primary child caretakers may contribute the most to the development of the child's citizenship. These influences include both biological parents and other family members who care for the child during the formative years of life. The bonds that exist between parents and children are potentially the most important single source of citizenship influence.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
b. friends

chart

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP
friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Composite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percents</td>
<td>1, 2, 2, 3, 0, 4, 0 SD</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 SD</td>
<td>1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 4, 5 SD</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 5 SD</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, 7 SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First column gives percents of no responses

LUKER SCALED VALUES 1 – 7
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in the Arkansas, Minnesota, and Texas groups indicated that their friends were an important source of their citizenship.
2.) Respondents in California indicated that their friends were a moderate source of their citizenship.
3.) Respondent composite results indicated that friends were generally a very strong influence on citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that the student respondents viewed citizenship as greatly influenced by their friends. Citizenship attitudes and behaviors regarding what is appropriate and inappropriate may be greatly influenced by an individual’s friends. Decisions and choices are likely to be influenced by the attitudes and values held and expressed by an individual’s friends. The negative side of this influence may occur when anti-social behaviors such as alcohol and drug abuse, shoplifting, or unacceptable sexual conduct become a dominant influence in an individual’s life. Because the influence of friends is so profound, the issue for educators is to find ways to change negatively directed citizenship behaviors and values into forms of positive citizenship development. The influence of friends may contribute to both positive and negative perspectives regarding the individual’s attitude toward community and society.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
c. brothers and/or sisters

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP
brothers and/or sisters

Arkansas California Minnesota Texas

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no responses

Arkansas (SA 1, 2, 1, 4, 5, 0, 3 SD)
California (SA 2, 3, 3, 1, 5, 6, 4 SD)
Minnesota (SA 2, 2, 2, 1, 4, 5, 5 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 2, 3, 5, 5, 4 SD)
Composite (SA 1, 3, 2, 4, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in Arkansas and Texas groups indicated that brothers and sisters considerably influence their citizenship.
2.) Respondents in California and Minnesota groups indicated that brothers and sisters moderately influence their citizenship.
3.) Respondent composite results indicate that brothers and sisters have a moderate influence on citizenship development.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that there are some geographic variations in the respondents' perceptions of the extent to which siblings influence citizenship. The combined results of this item indicate that siblings do have a moderate influence on citizenship development. For example, older siblings may serve as models of behavior for younger brothers and sisters, while younger siblings may influence the citizenship of their older brother or sister through idealized expectations. In other words, sibling influences may be strongest when an older brother or sister serves as a model citizen for younger brothers and sisters. On the other hand, older brothers and sisters may be more careful of their conduct in light of this same influence.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
d. religious leaders

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP
religious leaders

ARKANSAS

CALIFORNIA

MINNESOTA

TEXAS

Percents

LIKERT SCALED VALUES 1 - 7
First column gives percents of no responses

Arkansas (SA 4, 3, 1, 2, 6, 3, 5 SD)
California (SA 5, 6, 6, 2, 4, 3, 1 SD)
Minnesota (SA 4, 2, 3, 1, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 3, 3, 2, 5, 6, 4 SD)
Composite (SA 4, 3, 2, 1, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in the Texas group indicated that religious leaders were a moderately strong source of citizenship influence.
2.) Respondents in Arkansas and Minnesota groups indicated that religious leaders were perceived as a moderate source of citizenship influence.
3.) Respondents in California indicated that religious leaders were not perceived as an important source of citizenship influence.
4.) Respondent composite results were generally in the low to moderate range in regard to the influence of religious leaders on student citizenship.

Discussion:

Student responses in this survey were not influenced by the more recent scandals regarding television evangelists since the surveys were executed in the 1986-87 school year. However, survey results indicate that student perceptions of the influence of religious leaders ranged from moderate to low, and this variation correlated with geographic regions. These differences were most profound between respondents in the Texas and California groups. This result may indicate that church leaders are not addressing citizenship issues and concerns. A more severe interpretation may be that church leaders simply do not have an important influence on the citizenship of youth. How important is the church in the lives of American youth? Are youth attending church?

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
e. televisions and/or movies

chart

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP
television and/or movies

ARKANSAS CALIFORNIA MINNESOTA TEXAS

Percents

Arkansas (SA 3, 4, 2, 1, 4, 6, 5 SD)
California (SA 5, 6, 2, 1, 4, 3, 7 SD)
Minnesota (SA 6, 3, 2, 1, 4, 5, 6 SD)
Texas (SA 4, 2, 2, 1, 3, 5, 3 SD)
Composite (SA 5, 3, 2, 1, 4, 6, 6 SD)

LIKERT SCALED VALUES 1 - 7
First column gives percents of no responses

Arkansas (SA 3, 4, 2, 1, 4, 6, 5 SD)
California (SA 5, 6, 2, 1, 4, 3, 7 SD)
Minnesota (SA 6, 3, 2, 1, 4, 5, 6 SD)
Texas (SA 4, 2, 2, 1, 3, 5, 3 SD)
Composite (SA 5, 3, 2, 1, 4, 6, 6 SD)
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Inference:

Respondents in all four groups indicated that television and/or movies exert a moderately low influence on student citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that respondents perceive the influence of television and/or movies on citizenship as being not very important. This is a surprising reaction in light of the widely perceived notion that media (television especially) is an important social influence in the lives of youth. While respondents were not asked about the time spent in watching or listening to media sources, they generally perceived media as an unimportant source of citizenship influence. In other words, they seem to be reflecting an attitude that in spite of the time spent watching or listening to media, we are capable of assessing media messages. While this may not be a realistic point of view, students in this study seem to be convinced that the other sources of citizenship influence were much more important than media sources. Looked at from another perspective, the results on this item should not be surprising given the negative nature of the media message, which often includes the rejection of basic family, community, and societal values and as a result does not contribute to the development of American citizenship.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are statistically equivalent at a 5% level of significance in all four parameters according to the Boos test.
f. grandparents and/or other relatives

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP
grandparents and/or other relatives

ARKANSAS  CALIFORNIA  MINNESOTA  TEXAS

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no responses

Arkansas  (SA 1, 2, 1, 3, 3, 4, 0 SD)
California  (SA 3, 4, 2, 1, 3, 6, 5 SD)
Minnesota  (SA 4, 3, 2, 1, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Texas  (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6 SD)
Composite  (SA 1, 4, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in Arkansas and Texas groups indicated that grandparents and/or other relatives were an important source of their citizenship.
2.) Respondents in California and Minnesota groups indicated that grandparents and/or other relatives were a moderately important source of their citizenship.
3.) Respondent composite results indicated that grandparents and/or other relatives were a moderate source of their citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that there were some important geographic variations in the respondents' perceptions of grandparents' and/or other relatives' influence on citizenship. These differences may be due to the strength of family ties according to geographic region. Respondents in the California and Minnesota groups may be experiencing the effects of some weakened family ties due to geographic distance, various economic influences, and/or social conditions which affect family relationships.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
g. guardians

chart

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP

Arkansas  California  Minnesota  Texas

First column gives percents of no responses

Arkansas  California  Minnesota  Texas

Composite

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
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Inferences:

1.) Respondents in the Arkansas and Texas groups indicated that guardians had an important influence on citizenship.
2.) Respondents in the California and Minnesota groups indicated that guardians had little influence on citizenship.
3.) Respondent composite ranks indicated a mixed reaction regarding the influence of guardians on citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that the students' perceptions of the influence of guardians were of a mixed nature and, therefore, difficult to interpret. Part of the confusion may be credited to a lack of description and definition in the questionnaire. Respondents may have identified guardians with such people as foster parents, step parents, or day care workers. The extent of mixed response suggests that additional inquiry is needed to clarify this item. If, for instance, respondents identified the influence of guardians with day care workers, the results of this response may indicate that respondents had varied day care experiences and that, for a large number of respondents, the day care experience may have had a negative influence on citizenship development.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
h. teachers

chart

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP

teachers

ARKANSAS  CALIFORNIA  MINNESOTA  TEXAS

Percents

LIKERT SCALED VALUES 1 - 7

Flat column gives percent of no responses

Arkansas    (SA 1, 2, 4, 3, 3, 5, 6 SD)
California  (SA 4, 2, 1, 3, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Minnesota   (SA 4, 2, 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 SD)
Texas       (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 6, 5 SD)
Composite   (SA 3, 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 6 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in the Arkansas and Texas groups indicated that teachers were an important citizenship influence.
2.) Respondents in the California and Minnesota groups indicated that teachers were a moderate citizenship influence.
3.) Respondent composite results indicated that teachers were a moderate citizenship influence.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that there are geographical and perhaps cultural differences regarding the respondents' perceptions of the citizenship influence of teachers. Students in the Arkansas and Texas groups credited teachers with a greater citizenship influence than did students in the Minnesota and California groups. This result may suggest that the influence of teachers diminishes according to a number of regional factors which may include such influences as population density, variations in cultural values and traditions, economic diversity, and community attitudes regarding the status of the teachers. The influence of teachers on the citizenship development of students may suggest that the role of education in citizenship development is not nearly as important as it should be.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
i. principals or other school officials

chart

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP
principals or other school officials

Arkansas
California
Minnesota
Texas

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no responses

Arkansas (SA 2, 1, 3, 5, 4, 4, 6 SD)
California (SA 6, 4, 4, 1, 3, 5, 2 SD)
Minnesota (SA 7, 6, 4, 1, 3, 5, 2 SD)
Texas (SA 2, 4, 3, 1, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Composite (SA 4, 3, 2, 1, 5, 5, 3 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in the Arkansas and Texas groups indicated that principals or other school officials had a moderate influence on citizenship.
2.) Respondents in the California and Minnesota groups indicated that principals or other school officials had little or no influence on citizenship.
3.) Respondent composite results indicated that principals or other school officials had slightly moderate to very low influence on citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that there are some geographical differences in the respondents' perceptions of the citizenship influence of principals or other school officials. While the groups in Arkansas and Texas credited principals with more influence than did the respondent groups in California or Minnesota, the variation in responses may be due to regional differences including attitudinal differences. According to student responses, principals are not perceived as educational leaders, nor are they associated with the development of citizenship. Evidently, students are reflecting an image of the principal in which he/she is viewed as record keeper, paper shuffler, disciplinarian, and a person mainly concerned with schedules and routines. These results may also reflect the point of view that citizenship education is not the province of the school and only exists in the classroom to the extent that it is of interest to individual teachers.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
j. extracurricular activities
chart

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP
extra curricular activities

Arkansas                 California             Minnesota             Texas

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percents of no responses

Arkansas (SA 4, 2, 3, 1, 5, 7, 6 SD)
California (SA 4, 3, 2, 1, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Minnesota (SA 4, 1, 1, 3, 6, 6, 7 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 3, 2, 5, 6, 4 SD)
Composite (SA 4, 3, 2, 1, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in the Texas group indicated that extracurricular activities had a moderate citizenship influence.
2.) Respondents in the Arkansas, California, and Minnesota groups indicated that extracurricular activities had little influence on citizenship.
3.) Respondent composite results indicate that extracurricular activities had a modest influence on citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that extracurricular activities including sports, clubs, orchestra, and band had a moderate influence on the students' citizenship development. Students may not realize the extent to which extracurricular activities have contributed to the social life of the school and to their citizenship development. In other words, the nature of extracurricular activities may be such that they fail to develop or provide conscious citizenship opportunities. Students may be participating in extracurricular activities without realizing the values of these activities from a citizenship perspective. Competition, elitism, and the development of exclusive social cliches are a few of the negative factors that may be associated with extracurricular activities, and these perceptions are being reflected in student responses. Should this be the case, large numbers of students may be avoiding these types of activities in favor of other outlets outside the school.

The distribution in the ranking are equivalent for the location parameter at the 1% level of significance. After a location adjustment, the scale parameters are also equivalent. Equivalence does not hold for skewness and kurtosis.
INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP

Arkansas
California
Minnesota
Texas
Composite

Arkansas (SA 2, 3, 1, 3, 4, 4, 5 SD)
California (SA 5, 3, 1, 2, 4, 6, 5 SD)
Minnesota (SA 3, 2, 1, 1, 3, 4, 5 SD)
Texas (SA 3, 3, 2, 1, 5, 6, 4 SD)
Composite (SA 4, 3, 1, 2, 5, 6, 6 SD)
Inference:

Respondents in all four groups indicated that other students have only a moderate influence on citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that students (other than their close friends) do not have an important influence on the development of student citizenship. All four groups of respondents are expressing the point of view that peer group influences may be of less importance than generally has been accepted by educators and developmentalists. At the same time, these mature respondents (seniors) may be reflecting the fact that they are in the process of breaking away from peer group influences, other than close friends, as they are preparing to move into the world of adulthood.

The distribution in ranks for the location parameter is equivalent across the four regional groups. The remaining three parameters are not statistically equivalent according to the Boos test.
1. coaches

chart

INFLUENCES ON CITIZENSHIP coaches

ARKANSAS

CALIFORNIA

MINNESOTA

TEXAS

Percents

LIKERT SCALED VALUES 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no responses

Arkansas (SA 4, 2, 4, 3, 6, 5, 1 SD)
California (SA 5, 3, 4, 1, 3, 5, 2 SD)
Minnesota (SA 6, 4, 2, 1, 4, 5, 3 SD)
Texas (SA 4, 3, 4, 1, 5, 6, 2 SD)
Composite (SA 5, 3, 4, 1, 6, 7, 2 SD)
Inferences:

Respondents in all four groups indicated that coaches exert little influence on student citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that there is a widely held perception between respondent groups that coaches do not contribute to the development of student citizenship. This suggests that coaches may also have little influence on citizenship development. The first job of the coach is to teach the skills involved with whatever sport is being coached. At the same time, the general perception of sports programs, including competitive sports activities, is to teach good sportsmanship. Good sportsmanship consists of values associated with good citizenship. From student responses, it seems that sports skills are at the core of the sports programs while sportsmanship is mainly window dressing that is used to gain community support for sports programs. Factors such as competition, elitism, and authoritarian modes of interaction with students may result in the perceptions expressed in this survey item. This result is also clouded by the fact that athletic and sports programs often project some important patriotic images such as flag raising, the playing of the national anthem, prayer, or the display of school colors. Student perceptions of coaches, on the other hand, may go beyond these images and cast a reflection on coach/student relationships which seem to be generally negative.

The distribution in rankings across the four regions are statistically equivalent at the 5% level of significance for all parameters except scale which is equivalent at the 1% level. The composite test, however, fails the equivalence test at both the 5% level and the 1% level.
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The questionnaire contained seven separate questions with multiple components (see Appendix A) that were rated on a seven point Likert scale. The first three questions are reported in this monograph.

Boos Summary Statistical Tables for Q 2

The researchers addressed a basic hypothesis regarding the responses of students on the component parts of question #2 (Q 2). The hypothesis is stated below:

\[ H: \text{ Student responses were the same across all components of a question within a given school district.} \]

### Boos Summary Table for Arkansas Q2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>-5.06</td>
<td>-4.30</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>63.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>24.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEWNESS</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>24.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>-4.19</td>
<td>-4.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>49.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST ITEM</td>
<td>47.12</td>
<td>41.29</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>162.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Boos Summary Table for California Q2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>-8.94</td>
<td>-5.77</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>208.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>51.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEWNESS</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>13.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST ITEM</td>
<td>91.49</td>
<td>39.83</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>58.60</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>287.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Boos Summary Table for Minnesota Q2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>-16.72</td>
<td>-9.48</td>
<td>-2.51</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>-3.99</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>607.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>-3.29</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-5.61</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-5.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>131.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEWNESS</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>29.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>-4.71</td>
<td>-3.34</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>43.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOOS SUMMARY TABLE FOR TEXAS Q2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>-15.30-5.47</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>-4.02</td>
<td>0.32-2.14</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>492.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE</td>
<td>3.58-3.18</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>-0.60-2.46</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-0.14-3.94</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>59.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEWNESS</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.69-1.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>83.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>-13.45-4.97</td>
<td>-5.85</td>
<td>-4.31-1.11</td>
<td>-6.61</td>
<td>-4.99-2.45</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>-4.07</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>337.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEST ITEM 471.5975.70 68.11 24.7696.99 68.22 28.9732.07 26.13 20.40 39.75 108.11 972.17

Q2: The following have influenced my citizenship.
   a. parents
   b. friends
   c. brothers and/or sisters
   d. religious leaders
   e. television and/or movies
   f. grandparents and/or other relatives
   g. guardians
   h. teachers
   i. principals or other school officials
   j. extra curricular activities
   k. other students
   l. coaches

Using the Boos Test, the responses to question 2 from each of the four school districts can be ordered with the following hypothesized clusters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster rank</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b, c, f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>c, h, f, g, k, i</td>
<td>h, k, j</td>
<td>h, c</td>
<td>h, g, j, d, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>j, d, e</td>
<td>c, f, e</td>
<td>j, k, f</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e, l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e, g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The components of question #2 were again placed in groups that seem to be statistically equivalent as viewed from the Boos tables. No analytical attempt was made to establish this perceived equivalence.
Uniformly across all sampled groups, parents (a) were considered to have the greatest influence, with friends (b) a close second. Teachers were generally in a lower position. At the other end of the scale, coaches, religious leaders, and television and/or movies ranked low as sources of citizenship influence. Though the patterns for religious leaders are not as strongly negative as those for coaches, the result is puzzling in light of student responses for 'welfare of others' from Q1 which ranked high and 'religious leaders' from Q2 which ranked low. This result seems to suggest that religious leaders are not perceived by these students as a source of concern for the welfare of others nor are they perceived by these students as a source of moral and ethical behavior. It should be observed that student profile which could have identified the extent to which individual students were involved in religious activities were not included in this exploratory study.
Survey Result:

Item #3:
The following courses influenced my citizenship:

a. American History

chart

COURSE INFLUENCE ON CITIZENSHIP
American History

Arkansas
California
Minnesota
Texas

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no responses

Arkansas  (SA 3, 2, 1, 2, 4, 6, 5 SD)
California  (SA 1, 3, 4, 2, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Minnesota  (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Texas  (SA 1, 2, 4, 3, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Composite  (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Inference:

Respondents in all four student groups indicated that courses in American history had greatly contributed to the development of their citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that American history is perceived by students as having a strong influence on citizenship. The extent of this importance may be due to the importance that American history is given in the school curriculum, taught in the elementary school, the junior high school, and the high school. Students in these groups may have responded to the importance of American history to the development of citizenship because of what students learn about American society. In particular, students learn ways in which heritage, people, and events have contributed to the formation of current citizenship values and behaviors.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
b. World History

chart

COURSE INFLUENCE ON CITIZENSHIP
World History

ARKANSAS  CALIFORNIA  MINNESOTA  TEXAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Response</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIKERT SCALED VALUES 1 - 7
First column gives percents of no responses

Arkansas  (SA 4, 3, 2, 1, 5, 0, 4 SD)
California (SA 4, 3, 2, 1, 5, 0, 4 SD)
Minnesota (SA 2, 1, 4, 3, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Texas (SA 2, 1, 4, 3, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Composite (SA 4, 2, 2, 1, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in the Minnesota and Texas groups indicated that world history courses had made an important contribution to their citizenship.
2.) Respondents in the Arkansas and California groups indicated that world history courses had made a moderate contribution to their citizenship.
3.) Respondent composite results indicate that world history had made a moderate contribution to citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that respondent groups had a varied perspective regarding the contribution of world history to the development of citizenship. The figures tend to indicate a rather mixed result for world history, which may reflect on the relatively low status of world history as a non-required course within the social studies curriculum. Perhaps the greatest contribution of world history courses to American citizenship is made in regard to the evolutionary study of democracy in Western Civilization and the accompanying struggle of generations of common people to acquire citizenship status.

The distribution in rankings are statistically equivalent for three parameters which include location at the 1% level significance, scale and skewness at the 5% level of significance, while kurtosis and the composite test failed to show equivalence.
c. Government chart

COURSE INFLUENCE ON CITIZENSHIP
Government

Arkansas (SA 3, 3, 2, 1, 4, 5, 4 SD)
California (SA 1, 3, 2, 1, 4, 5, 4 SD)
Minnesota (SA 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 5 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 2, 4, 3, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Composite (SA 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in the California, Minnesota, and Texas groups indicated that government courses had made an important contribution to their citizenship development.
2.) Respondents in the Arkansas group indicated that government courses had made only a moderate contribution to their citizenship development.
3.) Respondent composite ranks indicate that respondents generally acknowledged that government courses had made an important contribution to their citizenship development.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that government courses make an important contribution to the development of citizenship. These courses tend to focus on the structure, organization, and operation of governmental entities. While these courses tend to emphasize process and procedure, they also can be used to emphasize the social obligations of citizenship as well as the sources of the political ideology that is characteristic of the democratic way of life. An important contradiction appears in survey results between this item and an item in question #1 regarding "knowledge of government." Knowledge of government was considered only as of moderate importance as a quality of good citizenship. In addition, there seemed to have been a shared perception among students that what is taught in government courses does not have much to do with citizenship; yet, in this item, government courses are credited as strongly influencing "my" citizenship. This confusion may indicate that there is a difference between citizenship knowledge and behavior and that behavior is considered to be a very important aspect of citizenship.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are not statistically equivalent as demonstrated by the Boos test.
d. State History

COURSE INFLUENCE ON CITIZENSHIP

State History

Arkansas
California
Minnesota
Texas

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percents of no responses

Arkansas (SA 3, 2, 2, 1, 2, 4, 2 SD)
California (SA 5, 4, 2, 1, 6, 7, 2 SD)
Minnesota (SA 5, 3, 2, 1, 5, 6, 4 SD)
Texas (SA 1, 2, 4, 3, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Composite (SA 4, 3, 2, 1, 6, 7, 5 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in the Texas group indicated that state history courses had made an important contribution to their citizenship.
2.) Respondents in the Arkansas, California, and Minnesota groups indicated that state history courses had made a moderate contribution to the development of their citizenship.
3.) Respondent composite ranks indicate that state history courses had made a moderate contribution to citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that respondents in three of the four groups (the exception being the Texas group) did not consider state history as an important source of citizenship. The exception in the case of Texas is most likely due to the importance given to Texas state history in the social studies curriculum. The emphasis on Texas history may be explained in part because of its experiences as an independent republic from 1836 until 1845, in addition to other historical experiences that are widely known and celebrated within the state. The overall result of this survey item was its significance in identifying the role of state history in citizenship matters. It seems that state history is not as important as it could be in citizenship education and citizenship development; indeed, state history, with the exception of Texas, is not perceived as an important aspect of the social studies curriculum. Nevertheless, an individual's contact with the agencies of state government is every bit as significant as his or her contact with the national government. The result on this item may indicate the extent to which the social studies curriculum attempts to develop bonds between the individual and the national government while generally ignoring state governments.

The distribution in rankings across the four regional groups are statistically equivalent at the 5% level of significance as demonstrated by the Boos test.
e. Elementary school social studies program
chart

COURSE INFLUENCE ON CITIZENSHIP
Elementary school social studies program

Arkansas
California
Minnesota
Texas

Likert Scaled Values 1 - 7
First column gives percent of no responses

Arkansas (SA 4, 2, 2, 1, 3, 3, 2 SD)
California (SA 7, 6, 3, 1, 4, 5, 2 SD)
Minnesota (SA 5, 3, 2, 1, 4, 6, 7 SD)
Texas (SA 5, 3, 2, 1, 6, 7, 4 SD)
Composite (SA 7, 3, 2, 1, 5, 6, 4 SD)
Inferences:

1.) Respondents in all four groups indicated that elementary school social studies was not perceived as making an important contribution to their citizenship development.
2.) Respondents in the Arkansas and California groups were somewhat more negative in their assessment of the role of elementary school social studies as a contributor to their citizenship.
3.) Respondent composite ranks indicate that elementary school social studies is perceived as a rather low influence on citizenship.

Discussion:

Survey results indicate that students in all four groups perceive elementary social studies as not making a significant contribution to citizenship. This result may reflect the fact that elementary school social studies generally has not played an important role within the elementary school curriculum. Typically, elementary teachers spend little time on the social studies in comparison with other subjects. Instead, the first encounters with social studies mainly occur in the upper elementary grades or junior high school. Citizenship education in the elementary grades is included as a part of the study of the family, the neighborhood, and the community; while, the primary grade teacher is mainly concerned with other matters related to reading, language arts, and other skill areas. Consequently, citizenship vis-a-vis the social studies is neglected and not really addressed until the intermediate grades. The exceptions to this practice are the patriotic concerns and issues that arise as a result of national holidays or special events.

The distribution in rankings for the location parameter fails to show equivalence; however, on adjusting for variations in the location parameter the scale and skewness parameters seem to be equivalent.
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The questionnaire contained seven separate questions with multiple components (see Appendix A) that were rated on a seven point Likert scale. The first three questions are reported in this monograph.

Boos Summary Statistical Tables for Q3

The researchers addressed a basic hypothesis regarding the responses of students on the component parts of question #3 (Q 3). The hypothesis is stated below:

H: Student responses were the same across all components of a question within a given school district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEWNESS</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST ITEM</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All response distributions are statistically equivalent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>-4.19</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-3.87</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>64.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEWNESS</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST ITEM</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>42.53</td>
<td>77.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distributions are not statistically equivalent, but it can be shown that they share a common measure of scale (scatter).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>-8.96</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>-5.64</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>196.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCALE</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKEWNESS</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>24.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KURTOSIS</td>
<td>-3.46</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-2.62</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>-2.73</td>
<td>25.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST ITEM</td>
<td>109.87</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>48.10</td>
<td>69.03</td>
<td>79.56</td>
<td>251.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3: The following courses influenced my citizenship.
a. American History  
b. World History  
c. Government  
d. State History  
e. Elementary school social studies program

Question 3 was used to determine which courses and programs in the social studies had an important influence on the development of citizenship as perceived by students in the four groups. Little information was revealed as a result of this survey item. The small sample of Arkansas students indicated statistically no variation among the different courses. Among the students from the other three states, American History (a) and Government (c) ranked highest. Elementary school social studies courses (e) ranked lowest.

A previous investigation (Green), provided some evidence that students generally ranked their present course high. Whether this result occurs because the teacher of that course administered the questionnaire, or because the students weren't influenced significantly by past courses to warrant a more critical assessment, or actually preferred the course that they were currently studying, could not be determined. This item...
social studies has been and continues to be the weakest component of the social studies curriculum and, therefore, the weakest aspect of citizenship education and citizenship development.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of the survey tend to support the contention that the commitment to the education of youth for their citizenship responsibility is not a significant priority of the schools. It seems that citizenship education is not a priority within the school curriculum and does not exist in the form of a cohesive program throughout the k-12 grades. While students do credit social studies courses and programs with a contributing influence on their citizenship, their overall perception is that much of what is taught in these courses has little to do with citizenship. This impression lead researchers to suggest that while educators tend to pay lip service to the importance of citizenship education, the programs that are so critically important for the future of American society are so badly fragmented and often neglected that citizenship development in the schools is left to chance and to the whims of individual teachers.

Perceptions of a Good Citizen

Student perceptions across the four regional groups were quite uniform in regard to what is and what is not a quality of a good citizen. In the what is not category, students were in agreement that participation in community and school affairs and knowledge of government were not important as characteristics or qualities of a good citizen. In the what is category, students were in agreement that a concern for the welfare of others and the ability to make wise decisions were the most important qualities of a good citizen. In addition, students in all four groups identified four items as related to the characteristics of a good citizen. According to student perceptions, a good citizen is a person who cares about the welfare of others, is moral and ethical in his dealing with others, is able to challenge and critically question ideas, proposals, and suggestions, and in light of existing circumstances, is able to make good choices based upon good judgment.

The student perception of a good citizen is surprising because of the absence of political elements of citizenship. Political elements of citizenship are often central to the definition and goals of citizenship education programs in the schools. Students seem to be expressing a perception of citizenship that is based upon social relationships rather than political relationships. Should this be the case, the results of this survey indicate again that existing citizenship programs within the school have not reached their important political goals. This lends further evidence to support the contention that citizenship education is not, in fact, a serious goal of the school curriculum indicating that there is a need to develop citizenship education programs that effectively teach the political side of human relationships.
Sources of Citizenship Influence

The sources of citizenship influence, as perceived by all four student groups, support the contention that the schools are not perceived as an important influence in the development of citizenship values and behaviors. Students were in general agreement across all four groups that the most important sources of citizenship influence were their parents or family and their close personal friends. Teachers were perceived as a moderate source of citizenship influence, and school administrators and coaches tended to be perceived as an unimportant source of citizenship influence. In addition, religious leaders and media, such as television and the movies, were not considered as important to citizenship education or the development of citizenship. Because of the importance of the family as a source of citizenship influence, the development of American citizenship is in a state of jeopardy if, according to recent media reports, the traditional American family is in a state of deterioration.

The Citizenship Influence of Social Studies Programs and Courses

Students were in general agreement that, with the exception of elementary school social studies programs, the social studies had influenced their citizenship. The most critical issue to surface in regard to the social studies curriculum was the lack of influence credited to elementary social studies programs (keeping in mind that senior students had distanced themselves from elementary school social studies). Evidently, all student groups perceived the influence of citizenship education in elementary social studies as ineffective and of little importance as an influence of citizenship development. At the same time, it must be recognized that what elementary teachers do does contribute to the development of citizenship; however, the programs that elementary teachers teach in the social studies, if they teach any at all, are not perceived by students as contributing to the development of citizenship. The results of Question #1 indicate that what is taught in such courses as government and possibly all other social studies courses is not perceived by the students as not developing the qualities of a good citizen.

The following recommendations (Needs) are presented as an attempt to propose actions to address some of the problems that have been identified by the findings of the survey:

1.) The Need for Additional Studies
There is an immediate need to develop scientific studies that can either support or discredit the findings of this exploratory survey. These studies should be designed and executed by independent researchers working in different regions of the country.
2.) The Need for Dialogue Among and Between Educators and National Leaders
There is an immediate need to establish a dialogue among and between educators and national leaders regarding the status of citizenship education in American schools.

3.) The Need for a Delineated set of Citizenship Development Goals for American Society
There is a need for a delineated set of citizenship development goals that are appropriate for students living in American society. These goals should reflect the means for a positive adaptation to living in a multiethnic society and participating in a democratic way of life.

4.) The Need for a Common Citizenship Identity in a Multiethnic Society
There is a need to work out the elements of a common identity that can serve as the basis for developing citizenship education courses and programs that will help strengthen the cohesion of American society.

5.) The Need to Explore the Roles of Family, School, and Community in the Achievement of the Delineated Goals
There is a need to explore and identify the roles of the family, school, and community in the achievement of the delineated goals of American citizenship.

6.) The Need to Investigate the Developmental Influences that Shape Citizenship Values and Behaviors
There is a need to investigate the influences and conditions that shape citizenship during the child rearing years of life.

7.) The Need for a Coherent k-12 Citizenship Education Program
There is a need to develop a coherent k-12 citizenship education program (all grades and all subjects) that will support the delineated set of citizenship development goals for the schools.

8.) The Need to Define the Role of the Social Studies within the Delineated Goals
There is a need to determine the specific responsibilities of the social studies within the citizenship education commitment of the schools.

9.) The Need for Family Study Projects to Identify the Influences that Develop Positive Citizenship Values and Behaviors.
There is a need to initiate studies aimed at analyzing the family unit as the most significant influence in the development of citizenship values and behaviors in American society.
APPENDIX A
CITIZENSHIP APPROACH QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

INTRODUCTION
This survey is being conducted in an effort to collect and assess data regarding the status of citizenship education in the public schools. The information you provide will help determine how citizenship is being taught and which methods of teaching citizenship are effective. Your time and effort in completing this questionnaire are appreciated.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1. Please list the extra curricular activities in which you are involved.

2. Please list any community activities in which you are involved.

3. What type of a career do you think you would like to have as an adult?

DIRECTIONS FOR CITIZENSHIP QUESTIONS
For each response on the questionnaire, you will be asked to place a check (✓) on a line. The far left end of the line represents strong agreement (SA) with the statement, while the far right end of the line represents strong disagreement (SD). You may place a check any place on the line to show the extent to which you agree or disagree with a statement. If your feelings are neutral, the mark would be near the center.

CITIZENSHIP QUESTIONS
1. The following characteristics are important qualities of a good citizen.

   knowledge of current events                      SA    SD
   participation in community or school affairs     SA    SD
   accepts assigned responsibility                  SA    SD
   concern for the welfare of others                SA    SD
   moral and ethical behavior                       SA    SD
   acceptance of authority of those in supervisory roles SA    SD
   ability to question ideas                        SA    SD
   ability to make wise decisions                   SA    SD
   knowledge of government                         SA    SD
   patriotism                                       SA    SD

2. The following have influenced my citizenship.

   parents                                          SA    SD
   friends                                          SA    SD
   brothers and/or sisters                          SA    SD
   religious leaders                                SA    SD
   television and/or movies                         SA    SD
   grandparents and/or other relatives              SA    SD
   guardians                                        SA    SD
   teachers                                         SA    SD
   principals or other school officials             SA    SD
   extra curricular activities                      SA    SD
   other students                                   SA    SD
   coaches                                          SA    SD
3. The following courses influenced my citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school social studies program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I prefer to study citizenship through the following activities.

- an activity in which I learn about the traditions and values that shaped my community and country
- an activity dealing with current events
- an activity in which I learn about the history and government of my country
- an activity in which I work on a community project with community leaders
- an activity in which I am asked to solve problems
- an activity in which I learn to use constitutional and legalistic processes
- an activity aimed at my individual needs and interests
- an activity in which I look at worldwide needs and responsibilities

5. My teachers tend to use the following activities when teaching citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an activity in which I learn about the traditions and values that shaped my community and country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an activity dealing with current events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an activity in which I learn about the history and government of my country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an activity in which I work on a community project with community leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an activity in which I am asked to solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an activity in which I learn to use constitutional and legalistic processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an activity aimed at my individual needs and interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an activity in which I look at worldwide needs and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. In looking back over my experiences in elementary school (K-6), the following did have an important influence on my current citizenship.

SA       SD

activities in which students learn about the traditions and values that shaped their community and country ....................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities dealing with current events ........................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities in which students learn about the history and government of their country ................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities in which students work on a community project with community leaders ................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities in which students are asked to solve problems ........................................................................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities in which students learn to use constitutional and legalistic processes ................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities aimed at individual student needs and interests ........................................................................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities in which students look at worldwide needs and responsibilities ................................................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

7. I feel that the following activities would be effective with secondary students (grades seven through twelve.)

SA       SD

activities in which students learn about the traditions and values that shaped their community and country ....................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities dealing with current events ........................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities in which students learn about the history and government of their country ................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities in which students work on a community project with community leaders ................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities in which students are asked to solve problems ........................................................................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities in which students learn to use constitutional and legalistic processes ................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities aimed at individual student needs and interests ........................................................................................................... [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
activities in which students look at worldwide needs and responsibilities ................................................................................................. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
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