

# A Program Evaluation of Alive to the World

Prepared for Alliance for the Family

by

Danielle Peregoy

Erin Wilson

The Thomas Jefferson Program in Public Policy at the College of  
William and Mary

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Executive Summary	4
Initial Project	6
USAID’s goals and programs in the region	6
USAID and Democracy	7
Importance of Civic and Character Education Programs	8
Efficacy of Civic and Character Education Programs	9
Components of Democracy	10
Methods for Teaching Democratic Values	11
Model of Democratic Values	12
Preparation of Existing Data	14
Data Analysis Methods	14
Data Analysis Results	16
Critique of the Original Survey Instrument	17
Creation of the New Survey Instrument	19
Revised Methodology	24
Quantitative Limits	25
Recommendations	28
The AAQ Program	30
Conclusion	30
Appendix A. Data Analysis	31
Appendix B. New Survey Instrument	86
Appendix C. Sample Press Release	92
Works Cited	93

## Acknowledgements

The following individuals assisted in the research, preparation, organization, and editing of this report.

John Baltes

Visiting Instructor, The College of William and Mary

David Finifter, Ph.D.

Professor, The College of William and Mary

Eric Jensen, Ph.D.

Director, The Thomas Jefferson Program in Public Policy at the College of William and Mary

Arielle Seidman

MPP Candidate 2010, The College of William and Mary

## Executive Summary

Alive to the World, *Aprendiendo a Querer* (AAQ), is a character education program developed by Alliance for the Family (AFF). It is currently in use by 65,000 students in Latin America. This study assesses the potential of the program in promoting democratic values. Specifically, the study looks at three countries: Mexico, Peru and Venezuela. Current data exists for 9,000 students in these three countries over three school years; specifically data exists for 1,500 students in both Mexico and Venezuela and 6,000 students in Peru. Some of this data has not yet been digitized. Furthermore, limitations with the data only allowed the analysis of the Peruvian students over the age of eight with both a unique pre- and post-survey. Once the remainder of the data is digitized and the survey methodology improved, there will hopefully be sufficient matches for analysis of Mexican and Venezuelan students. Furthermore, with improved data collection, conducting time series analysis could be a potential next step for AFF.

The existing literature illustrates the importance of educating citizens to maintain and develop liberal democratic society. Further, behavioral scientists have long known that habits and values can be taught and that they are offered in social contexts such as school, home, church, and other peer and social groups. As such, we believe it is both important and possible to promote character and civic education that supports liberal democratic values.

Pre- and post- surveys were conducted on a group of students who are currently enrolled in the AAQ program. The initial evidence shows that the program has a positive impact on the development of democratic values, though this evidence must be approached skeptically given the methodological problems discussed below. Children in all three grades analyzed (four, five and six) evinced statistically significant differences pre- and post-test in four attitude statements related to democratic values:

1. Everyone has a right to their own opinions (more agreement)
2. Rules are important sometimes but not always (less agreement)
3. When playing games with my friends, I prefer to have things my way (less agreement)
4. It's okay to disagree with others (more agreement)

Furthermore, in dividing students by grade and gender, statistically significant differences could also be found for other attitude statements, such as more agreement in grade four with the statement “I like living in a community that includes people who are different than me.”

While the initial results show a positive impact, these results must be interpreted with great caution as the original survey several methodological concerns. These concerns are that:

- The survey was administered in two different ways: some children completed the survey on paper and some completed it online.
- The survey was administered to children under eight years old, and they are generally less verbally developed than older children and therefore do not produce high quality data. Though we ignored respondents under the age of eight in our analysis, discrepancies in the data may have led to the inclusion of younger respondents.
- The scales used for agreement/disagreement questions were not fully labeled and lacked a mid-point or a ‘do not know’ option.
- Some questions were vague or captured only relative (not absolute) values.
- Questions about classroom and school environment were omitted.
- The survey lacked adequate comparison groups.

To address these issues, we developed a new survey instrument and methodology plan to be used for further analysis of the AAQ program. These tools can be used to test the strong hypothesis that the program is having a positive impact on the development of democratic values. However, even with these changes there are limits to quantitative analysis. Factors such as differing educational systems, socio-political environments, and religious backgrounds can never be captured fully. However, these factors do not mean a quantitative analysis cannot be informative; it simply means that the data should be interpreted in context and with the caveat that an unspecified portion of the change (or lack thereof) must be attributed to environmental factors that are not related to the AAQ program.

There is evidence to support the theory that the AAQ program should have a positive impact on democratic values in Latin America. While further testing is needed for a more concrete quantitative conclusion, we believe that AAQ has potential to be a successful part of efforts to increase the prevalence of liberal democratic values throughout Latin America.

## Initial Project

Alive to the World, *Aprendiendo a Querer* (AAQ), is a character education program developed by Alliance for the Family (AFF), a nonprofit organization based in Washington, DC. The program, which includes 12 textbooks for each year of primary and secondary schooling, follows a group of characters as they encounter different scenarios and age-appropriate situations. With a combination of classroom instruction and the stories in the text, the program strives to encourage the development of certain character traits and values among children and adolescents. Implementation of AAQ has occurred throughout Latin America and 65,000 students in the region are currently enrolled. This report is an evaluation of the program's impact on children in Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela.

AFF received grants from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Templeton Foundation to assess the impact of the AAQ program on the development of democratic values in children. In order to evaluate the impacts of AAQ on the development of democratic ideals, we examine the relevant scholarly literature, construct a working definition of "democratic values" and use this to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the previous survey instrument and inform our analysis of the current data. In addition to preliminary analysis, this report also contains a revised survey instrument and methodology plan to be implemented in the future. Finally, this report presents a discussion of the limits of a quantitative review of AAQ's impact on the development of democratic values and a path forward for AFF as it continues to assess the impact of AAQ.

## USAID's prior history and goals in the region

The USAID has outlined specific goals for the development of democracy in Latin America. These goals fall under four broad categories: strengthening the rule of law, promoting genuine and competitive election processes, increasing development of a politically active civil society, and encouraging honest, transparent, and accountable governments. In order to promote these goals, USAID

appropriated \$963 million to projects in the region for fiscal year (FY) 2008. Specific issues addressed with regard to democracy included strengthening institutions, increasing participation in elections and government, advocating the independence of the judiciary, and decreasing corruption. USAID also has several ongoing projects in the countries included in this study.

In Mexico, a portion of the nearly \$25 million in assistance is dedicated to improving the rule of law, including legal reform and effectiveness of justice systems. Implementation of the Merida Initiative, a program to improve law enforcement in several countries in Central America, is also a part of USAID programs in Mexico, though funding is determined by the Department of State.

USAID goals in Peru include anti-corruption programs and strengthening local governments, especially in rural areas. Peru has also made compacts with the Millennium Challenge Corporation to reduce corruption in the public sector.

As relations between the United States and Venezuela remain tense, USAID currently conducts a Transition Initiative program to foster democratic election processes and increase participation of civil society. Through work with political parties and local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), the program strives to influence democratic development and participation among Venezuelan citizens.

### USAID and Democracy

In order to inform a quantitative analysis of AAQ, it was necessary to determine the tenets required for the development of democratic values. During the course of this study, we decided to look to the USAID definitions for guidance. Their goals include promoting the rule of law, competitive and fair election processes, developing an active civil society, advancing accountable governments, and promoting free media. Within these goals, we found that promotion of the rule of law fit best within the goals of AAQ. The USAID states that:

The rule of law is the cornerstone for all other elements of democracy. A free and fair political system, protection of human rights, a vibrant civil society, public confidence in the police and the courts, and economic development all depend upon accountable governments, fair and accessible application of the law, and respect for international human rights standards. In post-conflict settings, reestablishing the rule of law is the first step in the rebuilding process. Establishing peace and security and rebuilding justice institutions can help to develop the necessary climate for reconciliation, public confidence, and subsequent economic growth.

Their goals concern promoting laws that are the result of consensus, general governmental stability, separation of powers, effective enforcement of laws, and ensuring that laws are applied fairly and consistently. In determining a model for democratic values, we looked in part to the USAID goals for guidance.

#### The Importance of Civic and Character Education Programs

There has been a recent revival of interest in civic education programs (Levinson, 1999 p.39). While much of the interest focuses on the maintenance of existing liberal democracies, there is also a strong interest from developing nations in Latin America, Africa, and Asia in establishing and vivifying liberal democracy. To achieve these goals, it is important to understand and employ the relationship between education and democratic values (Levinson, 1999).

There is a general consensus that character and/or civic education is important for democracy though there is little agreement on what should be included substantively (Levinson, 1999). However, Levinson insists that democratic principles rest on the character of citizens and that if citizens behave in ways antithetical to democracy, there is no hope for the preservation or development of a liberal democratic state. The task then becomes to instill children with values that are favorable to democracy.

## The Efficacy of Civic and Character Education Programs

Behavioral scientists have long known that values can be taught by training children in habits that correspond to prescribed values (Dewey, 1909). Furthermore, attitudes and values are learned from one's immediate social context, so to the extent that these social contexts can be manipulated, so too can the values and attitudes that individuals hold. However, this is true not only for the school or the home but for all social contexts in an individual's life as well. Where individuals receive similar messages from multiple social environments, there is a greater probability that they will retain these habits and values (Binford, 1983). In fact, Locke and later Foucault (1996, 1997; 1995) believe it is possible to habituate an individual so deeply that the practices and behaviors one learns become natural.

Slomczynski and Shabad (1998) highlighted a case in Poland where civic education was successful in positively impacting democratic values. After the fall of communism in Poland, new political leaders were eager to create an educational program that would teach the benefits of democracy and a free market economy to children who had grown up under communist governments (Slomczynski and Shabad, pp.755-756). The program involves two class hours a week in the last two years of elementary school and focuses on teaching skills and habits in a variety of social situations with an emphasis on practical rather than theoretical knowledge. The program also uses an active style of teaching ensuring that students get the chance to actually practice democratic skills and behaviors. The course aims to teach principles of democracy, human rights, participation, and institutions of a democratic government.

The results of the study are quite encouraging. First, Slomczynski and Shabad found that the curriculum had positive impacts on feelings of political efficacy, tolerance and the desire to participate in the political system. Second, the program also appears to reduce extremist views on both ends of the political spectrum which in the long run will create a more moderate society. While all democracies

need a certain amount of balance to thrive, moderate citizenship is especially important for emerging democracies as it allows for a certain level of stability needed to establish a legitimate democratic government (Diamond, 1990). Slomczynski and Shabad, like other authors previously mentioned, stress the importance of multiple influencers in a child's life such as family, peer groups, church and other social groups. It is critical that children learn the same lessons from a variety of social groups if they are to adopt values in the long term.

### Components of Democracy

As we have illustrated, teaching democratic and civic values plays a vital role in the development of democratic citizens. However, we have yet to determine what behaviors a program such as AAQ should attempt to instill to have an effect on the development of democratic values. Bearing in mind USAID's position on the subject, we undertook a review of literature to determine these types of values.

Diamond (1990) conducted a study to determine what democratic ideals and institutions are necessary in developing countries in order to establish effective democracies. His explanations focused on the many paradoxes that comprise democracy. Critical analysis of authority is crucial to democracy, yet only within certain boundaries; i.e. people must think that the government is legitimate even when holding it accountable (56). Other components he lists are tolerance of opposing views, trust in other political actors, a willingness to compromise, and overall participation in the system (56).

In a review of a Labour Party initiative in the late 1990s, Kerr (1999) analyzed the British government's program to implement civic education. This curriculum was divided into four categories: key concepts, values and dispositions, skills and aptitudes, and knowledge and understanding (p.279). Among the key concepts necessary to democratic values are the notions of equality and diversity, fairness and rule of law, human rights, freedom and order, the relationship between the individual and the community, power and authority, and rights and responsibilities. The second and third tiers of the

curriculum are composed of certain 'values and dispositions' and 'skills and aptitudes,' such as a commitment to active citizenship and the ability to produce a cogent argument in speech or writing. The last component of the curriculum included the civics education related directly to British and European political institutions..

Slomczynski and Shabad's (1998) examination of civics education in Poland suggested several values and ideals that would potentially orient youth toward free markets and democratic principles. These include respect for individual rights and the rule of law, political and social pluralism, respect for property, accountability of government, respect for legitimate government, and participation in the system.

Levinson (1999) postulates that the values associated with a successful civics education program should include participation in the system, respect for the institutions and ideals that form the foundation of democracy, and mutual respect and toleration

#### Methods for Teaching Democratic Values

After establishing the values that should comprise a civics education program, it is necessary to determine the proper methods of teaching that will yield desirable outcomes. Many scholars have provided research describing the best methods for instilling democratic values. Galston (2003) stresses focusing on civic outcomes, such as participation in the system, in the curriculum of any values education (33). Galston also emphasizes offering active democratic learning opportunities inside and outside of the classroom and maintaining an emphasis on principles and ideals behind liberal, democratic political systems. In his examination of the British civics program goals, Kerr suggests that setting specific learning outcomes for civic education at measurable stages rather than promoting a broad program ensures that progress is being made overall (Kerr, 1999). Rimmerman (1991) focuses on the learning environment, encouraging increased participation in decision making by teaching how to

overcome barriers to participation. Similarly, Binford (1983) also suggests developing a democratic learning environment, stressing that the classroom environment is an important component to the development of democratic ideals and that learning about values develops in one's social contexts. Sehr (1997) also emphasizes the value of the learning environment and suggests using these environmental factors to promote student participation through group work and critical analysis. In the promotion of democratic values, it is necessary to consider the classroom elements of the curriculum and encourage these methods for the best outcomes. That is, the manner in which the lessons are learned can be as important as the substance of the lessons themselves. We practice what we do.

### Model of Democratic Values

The following is our hypothesized model of democratic values:  $\text{Democratic Values} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Respect for Equality}) + \beta_2(\text{Respect for Diversity}) + \beta_3(\text{Respect for Individual Rights and Free Speech}) + \beta_4(\text{Critical of Authority}) + \beta_5(\text{Participation}) + \beta_6(\text{Power Sharing}) + \beta_7(\text{Democratic Society Experience}) + \beta_8(\text{Politico-social Environment}) + \beta_9(Y) + \epsilon$

Where  $Y$  = an aggregate of immeasurable effects

$\epsilon$  = an error term

This model represents a theorized concept of democratic values. The equation is in the form of a simple ordinary least squares regression where  $\beta_0$  is a constant term and  $\epsilon$  is a random error term, both of which are standard results of the computations needed to estimate the equation. The additional  $\beta$  terms are what the equation estimates and act as multipliers for the individual components, showing their strength of impact on democratic values.

The remaining nine terms are components of democratic values. We brainstormed the first six (Respect for Equality, Respect for Diversity, Respect for Individual Right and Free Speech, Critical of

Authority, Participation and Power Sharing) after reviewing the relevant literature. These six components cover the large majority of what scholars believe is important to liberal, democratic society or liberal, democratic values.

The next two components address the theory that environment affects development. The seventh term, Democratic Society Experience, refers to the experience individuals have in their day to day life in liberal, democratic society. For children, this might mean the degree to which their classrooms or homes operate in a liberal, democratic fashion. The eighth term addresses environment on a larger scale in terms of the socio-political environment of the country where the individual lives.

The final term,  $Y$ , is a collection of factors which impact democracy but are not known or are not measurable. It cannot be said for certain what would go into this term, but as democracy and democratic values are complicated concepts, there is almost certainly some factor not covered by the eight components listed in the equation. Due to the way regression estimation works, leaving out any term will render the estimates of the  $\beta$  coefficients inconsistent. Thus the term, however vague, must be left in the equation.

However, since it will never be possible to estimate  $Y$ , the equation cannot be estimated in full. This has been set up as a theoretical model to show the components of democracy. Although limited, this model can still be useful in quantitative analysis. Data from evaluations of AAQ can be examined to see if the program has had an effect on any of the different components of liberal, democratic values. Since we know from existing theory and literature that these components are positively linked to democratic values, it follows that if AAQ can increase any of these components, it can positively impact democratic values.

### Preparation of Existing Data

The original survey supplied by AFF contained 19,547 cases spread across four grades. The data were delivered in eight separate files, one for each grade for both the pre and the post-test. However, all eight files contained cases where the respondent's self reported grade did not match the grade specified by the file. This analysis errs on the side of caution. Thus, any case where the respondent reported a different grade than expected from the file designation was excluded from analysis. Next, pre- and post-test cases were matched based on the unique respondent identification number. Any case where the respondent did not complete both a pre- and post- test in a given year was not included in the analysis.

The original design called for comparing differences in pre- and post- test scores of the experimental group to differences in a comparison group. This could not be done for two reasons. First, the comparison group is not a representative group, meaning that it cannot be used for valid comparison. This will be discussed below in detail. Second, once the data were cleaned, there were too few comparison cases left in any grade to use. As such, the analysis in this paper is restricted to describing the difference in the mean scores of students in the program before and after participation.

### Data Analysis Methods

After restricting the data to those respondents with corresponding pre- and post-tests, there were 5,996 Peruvian respondents remaining and only 26 Mexican respondents. Because the sample size was not large enough to conduct analyses on the Mexican respondents, this analysis is restricted to Peruvian students.

In order to determine if there were measurable differences between the pre- and post-surveys for 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> graders, a difference of means test was performed for each attitude statement. In this test, the average response is calculated for each attitude statement (somewhere between 0 and 5) in

the pre-and post-surveys for each grade. The table below illustrates the average response to the statement, “I like living in a community that includes people who are different than me” for pre- and post-tests, divided by grade. In most statements, respondents overwhelmingly indicated answers on the scale’s end points. In future analyses, it would be desirable to have greater variation among responses, which will be discussed later in relation to the revised survey response scale.

Next, the difference between each mean is calculated for each attitude statement. Finally, a statistical test is conducted using the variations of responses to the attitude statement which determines if the calculated difference between means is significant. This denotes that the difference between means most likely results from something other than random error. The following table illustrates this process, with significance illustrated by an asterisk.

Table 1. Example of Calculation for Democratic Component of Diversity

Statement	Grade	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean
I like living in a community that includes people who are different than me.			
	4	2.92	3.13**
	5	3.48	3.36
	6	3.28	3.43

\* denotes significance at the 0.01 level.

As illustrated above, grade four shows the only significant difference between the pre- and post-tests for this attitude statement, meaning there was a change between pre- and post-tests for this attitude statement for grade four. The remainder of these tables may be found in Appendix A organized by the different components of democratic values.

## Data Analysis Results

As a result of the difference of means test, eight attitude statements show significant differences between pre- and post-tests for grade four, nine attitude statements show significant differences for grade five, and seven attitude statements show significant differences for grade six. Overall, four attitude statements show significant differences for all three grade levels. These are: Everyone has a right to their own opinions (more agreement between pre- and post-tests); Rules are important sometimes but not always (less agreement); When playing games with my friends, I prefer to have things my way (less agreement); and It's okay to disagree with others (more agreement).

Two attitude statements concerned the issue of gender equality:

1. I think that boys and girls have equal rights
2. Boys and girls deserve equal respect and treatment

For these statements, separate tests were run for boys and girls in each grade. Statement 1 is significant for grade four boys and girls and grade five girls. Statement 2 is significant for grade four girls and grade five girls. Neither of these statements are significant when looking at a combined group with both genders.

Although several of these statements demonstrated statistical significance, the limits of the prior survey instrument as well as the methodology greatly impede the process of drawing legitimate conclusions from this data and we must stress that these are only preliminary conclusions. We do, however, believe this data gives evidence to suggest there is some positive impact and that AFF should continue to conduct analysis of the AAQ program with a revised survey and methodology to capture the true magnitude of this impact. AFF has a supportable hypothesis that there could be significant changes between the pre- and post-tests and thus differences from the AAQ program which now needs to be rigorously tested.

## The Critique of the Original Survey Instrument

The original survey instrument collected data informing the effectiveness of the AAQ Program but was not designed to model democracy as set forth in this analysis. Additionally, there are some methodological concerns with the original instrument which we will discuss below.

Before turning to the weaknesses of the original survey, the limitations of its survey methodology demand attention. The data collection methods were especially problematic. Approximately 70% of the respondents completed the survey on a computer and these data were submitted directly to the final database. The remaining 30% of the respondents completed the survey on paper and their data were entered into the electronic database by intermediaries (Daniel Kelley 2009). Numerous studies (Dillman 2000, Carini et al. 2003, Sax et al. 2003) have shown that significant differences in responses can result from using different methods of data collection in the same sample. Specifically, research has found that respondents answer more favorably when participating online (Carini et al. 2003). Carini et al. found absolute differences between responses to web and paper surveys in their study, but the size of these differences cannot be extrapolated to other studies. Though we cannot ascertain the size of the variance in this case, we can say with certainty that there are serious flaws in this methodology that call any results into question. This means there is a potential bias in the data which cannot be corrected.

Furthermore, the previous survey was given to students in grades three through seven, which roughly corresponds to ages seven through eleven. However, Borgers et al. argue that children between the ages of four and eight are still developing the basic skills needed for successful verbal exchange. Additionally, children in this age range are very suggestible and generally hesitant to express their true feelings or opinions as they still strongly practice deference to adults (Borgers et al. 2000). Thus, surveying children below the age of eight can lead to inaccurate data.

The comparison group poses additional concerns. In the current data, all but four of the 1,553 comparison group observations are from Peru. Additionally, the comparison group does not match the experimental group on key demographic characteristics such as gender or religion. This makes it impossible to tell if differences between the two groups are due to participation in the AAQ Program or to differences in the underlying sample (Langbein 2006).

In addition to weaknesses in the methodology, the design of some of the original survey questions cause concern. In surveys among respondents of all ages, ambiguity is problematic (Borgers et al. 2000; Lybert et al. 1997; Benson and Hocebar 1985). Ambiguity will lead to measurement error, meaning data may reflect a concept different from the one that is intended to be measured (Rea and Parker 1992). This effect is magnified even further among young children as they are more likely to find questions unclear (Borgers et al. 2000). The existing survey evinces these problems in two areas. First, the scale used by respondents to indicate agreement is a six point scale where the lowest point (0) indicates no agreement and the highest point (5) indicates complete agreement. Of the six points on the scale, only the two extremes are anchored with verbal descriptions. These unanchored points confuse young children who are then hesitant to use any of the middle scale points. In the existing data, analysis reveals that a disproportionate percentage of the respondents favored the extremes, supporting the idea that the undescribed scale points were confusing or otherwise off-putting. See Appendix B for examples of how the data clustered around the end points.

Second, there are two questions in the survey which ask the child respondents to assess themselves on relative criteria. The first question asks the respondent to represent the strength of her religious feelings on a five point scale from very strong to none. The second question asks the respondent to report her success as a student; i.e. a good student, an average student or a poor student. These questions present striking ambiguities. What strong religious feelings are or what defines a good student is never conveyed to the respondents. In either case, each child will interpret

the question as she sees it, differing not only from what the researchers intend, but also from her classmates. This renders meaningful comparison impossible (Borgers et al. 2000).

Furthermore, children suffer from the same social desirability bias present in adult surveys and are reluctant to answer they are a poor student or that their religious feelings are weak if they live in a society where religion plays a large role. (Lyberg et al. 1997) For example, in the current AAQ data, 46% of students claim they are good (above average) students, 44% of students claim they are average students and only 10% of student claim to be poor students. If this question was based on a more concrete measure, it would be expected that roughly 33% of students would fall into each category. Since the data are so skewed toward the responses that indicate being a better student, there is evidence that the questions suffers from a social desirability bias.

Survey length may be an issue in the current instrument. Feedback from the first implementation of the survey suggests that the children had difficulty answering the number of questions presented in the survey without becoming restless and bored (Stephanie Loayza Malca, 2007). Questionnaires for all respondents, and especially children, should be as concise as possible (Rea and Parker 1992).

Finally, the equation above specifies a model of democratic values and a number of key variables. However, the current survey is missing a way to collect data on some of these variables, most notably questions which would show the type of environment children are exposed to in the classroom. Without this information, it will be difficult to tell what, if anything, is driving and increase in the prevalence of liberal, democratic values.

### The Creation of New Survey Instrument

Before beginning an explanation of the new survey instrument, it is important to discuss the plausibility of surveying children in general. While interviewing children has historically been left out of

social science research, the practice is becoming more common and more people believe it to be fruitful (Lyberg et al. 1997). Research by Riccards shows that children first become aware of political authority before the age of seven and from there develop political understanding suggesting that surveying children for political attitudes is not a futile effort (Riccards 1973).

However, there are restrictions one must keep in mind when designing a survey for child respondents. First, as mentioned above, children have a very difficult time with ambiguity. Questions for children must be written in the clearest manner possible. Ideally these questions will be pretested with a small group of potential respondents to ensure the desired meaning is being conveyed. Second, young children have difficulty with negative statements. Children do not understand that they can use a double negative (disagreeing with a negative statement) to produce a positive response. Therefore, attitude statements should be phrased only in positive terms. Additionally, children are unsure how to respond to depersonalized questions such as “people my age” or “among my peers.” Young respondents should always be asked specifically for their opinions and not asked to extrapolate to a larger population. Finally, young respondents are very literal. When writing questions, it is prudent to pay attention to the literal meaning of words as that is how children will interpret them. (Benson and Hocevar 1985).

Keeping the parameters of the model of democratic values, the weaknesses of the original survey and the restrictions to surveying children discussed above in mind, we developed a new survey **(APPENDIX B)**.

The new survey relied heavily on the outline of the original survey although there have been substantial changes. The first grouping of questions on the revised survey are not for the child respondents but are designed to capture key administrative information. These questions include respondent identification number, teacher identification code, school identification code, country code, status of the child as being either part of the experimental group using the AAQ program or part of the

comparison group not using the program and status of the survey as being either a pre-test or a post-test. Given past difficulties in organizing the data, we believe it is important to include this information in the actual data set. Ideally, these questions will be automatically answered by the computer through entering a unique student code. If this is not possible, a third party such as a teacher or survey administrator should enter this information before the child begins the survey.

The next part of the survey shows introductory text explaining the survey and ensuring respondents that their answers will be confidential and that there are no correct responses. This text seeks to ease any uncertainty respondents might feel in participating (Rea and Parker 1992). The statement that there are no right answers is especially important for children who might view the questionnaire as a test (Riccards 1973). There are small sections of text throughout the survey to continually reassure respondents and keep them engaged in the exercise.

The first section of questions is modeled after the attitude statement section from the original survey. In total there are 22 statements which fall into six different categories. These categories correspond to different values that affect the holding of democratic values from the model above. In each category there are multiple questions and some are virtually identical while others are virtually opposites. This is purposeful: a reliability check. By asking very similar or opposite questions, a pattern of responses can be identified and it can be verified that the respondents' answers are consistent with each other, showing a true attitude or opinion (Rea and Parker 1992).

Respondents will use a five point scale ranging from completely disagree to completely agree. It is important to note that in order to avoid the ambiguity all five points are anchored by descriptions. Points two and four are labeled "somewhat disagree" and "somewhat agree" respectively. The midpoint is labeled "neither agree or disagree." While experts disagree about the use of a midpoint, research suggests it is appropriate when a respondent could feel neutral about an issue. Additionally, it is recommended to give children a neutral or "don't know" response to avoid obtaining an answer which

doesn't reflect the child's attitudes but is simply a "best guess" (Lyberg et al. 1997). In this case, we believe it is plausible a child will either not have an opinion about some of the issues raised in this survey or simply not be familiar enough with an issue to give a meaningful response. Results showing a large number of neutral responses will also inform the research team that certain messages from the AAQ program are not being effective.

In the next section, students are given five statements about the dynamic in their classroom and asked to describe how often those statements apply. This is to inform the Democratic Society Experience variable in the model. As simply being in a certain type of school environment can lead to an increase in democratic values, it is important to have some measure of the environment within any given respondent's classroom (Binford 1983; Rimmerman 1991). The results from this section will be combined with questions asked of the teacher to obtain a full picture of the classroom environment. Once again, this series of statements uses a five point, fully labeled scale.

The last section of the survey for the student respondents includes a few demographic questions. These questions are largely similar to the original survey although two changes have been made. First, the question about student performance has been eliminated. In addition to the problems with this question as discussed above, we have no reason to believe performing well in traditional subjects is related to how well a student can learn and internalize character education. Second, the question on religious strength was taken out of the survey and replaced with two different questions. The original question can be viewed as ambiguous and if the child is in a highly religious environment, she might feel pressure to describe feelings as strong even if they are not. By using an absolute measure, we will obtain a better measure of true feelings. The first new metric asks how frequently a child attends church. The second asks children to tell us how often they think of their religion in their day to day life which aims to identify children with strong religious feelings who simply do not attend church.

One section absent in our revised survey is one containing questions specific to the AAQ program. First, as students might already be worried the survey is an exam in disguise, placing material learned in class on the survey could reinforce this fear and pressure children to give the “right” answer instead of what they truly believe. Second, as questionnaire length is an important issue when surveying children, any questions not vital to the purpose should be omitted. Testing story specific lessons from the AAQ books does not aid in discerning if a child holds democratic values or if there has been any change in those values over time and should therefore be left out.

In addition to the questions asked of students, we added questions to be answered by a school administrator and the classroom teacher. The four questions for the school administrator ask characteristics of the school on the whole including the status of the school (public or private), the religious affiliation, the type of area in which the school is located (urban, rural etc.), and the level of violence typically present in the school. The two questions for teachers attempt to distinguish how the classroom is set up and the style in which most lessons are taught. This information will compliment the classroom information collected from students in their questionnaire. Teacher codes will allow this information to be appended to each student case.

There is reason to believe school administrators and teachers will not want to answer questions about their schools and classrooms for fear of information being used against them in the future. These individuals, like the children, might fear the survey is some sort of test of their ability to properly do their jobs (Daniel Kelley 2009). An alternative to distributing surveys to adults in the schools is to send an interviewer or survey administrator to each school. While the survey administrator is at the school, he can go to each participating classroom and note conditions which can be entered into the database once the school visit is complete. This visit can serve a secondary purpose of ensuring there are no problems with managing the survey. Additionally, the information needed from the school administrators should already be available to researchers through other means and can be entered by

someone who is not affiliated with each school. This will allow for the collection of vital data without putting pressure on unwilling participants.

### The Revised Methodology

The most critical revision to the methodology is to ensure all students complete the survey via the same method; either online or on paper. As previously stated, the lack of a consistent methodology can lead to undetectable biases in the data collected. We recommend all students complete the survey in a computerized format as it is much easier to administer and manage data. However, it is understood that not all schools have access to computers. One possible alternative is to send a survey administrator with laptops to each school without computer access. The survey program can be loaded onto these computers and data can be uploaded to a central database after leaving the school.

Another option would be to have all students complete the surveys on paper. This is not ideal as we believe it will feel more “test like” to students. However, it is crucial that all students complete the survey in the same format. If computers simply aren’t available in some schools, having all students complete the exercise on paper will alleviate the potential bias of different survey methods.

If two different survey methods must be used, it is critical that a variable be added to the dataset that reveals if students completed the survey online or on paper. This will allow researchers to compare answers from the two groups to determine if there is a bias and the magnitude of that bias.

The original survey was taken by seven to eleven year old students. As discussed above, there is reason to believe children younger than eight are not good survey respondents because of a large cognitive gap between children under and over eight years old. The AAQ Program includes a curriculum for every grade in primary and secondary school. This means the program evaluation could occur at any grade between one and twelve. As older children will produce higher quality data, it is our recommendation that the age range for participating in this survey be shifted from between seven and eleven to between nine and thirteen or even between ten and fourteen if possible.

Comparison groups in the original methodology were not appropriately matched to the experimental respondents. Going forward, we recommend including several different comparison groups in the study which match up with experimental schools on key demographics such as environmental factors, religious affiliation and resources.

### Quantitative Limits

While quantitative methods can help discover many benefits and weaknesses of a program like AAQ, several environmental factors influencing the development of democratic values cannot be accounted for in this type of analysis. Many of these factors are simply immeasurable in reliable ways. This section will discuss three such factors in detail to illustrate some of the challenges present in quantitative analysis. We have determined that three of the largest factors are differences in educational systems, socio-political differences, and the effects of religion in the sample countries. This analysis is not comprehensive but should serve as an example of the types of difficulties that exist.

### The Educational Environment

In developing a quantitative method for analyzing the impact of AAQ, one must consider the differences between the educational systems of each country as well as the challenges in implementing an educational system that yields desirable outcomes for students.

The World Bank has played a significant role in implementing education reforms in Peru. As expressed by Benavides et al. (2007) in a case study undertaken by the Independent Evaluation Group, Peru's education outcomes are somewhat uncharacteristic of many developing countries. Monetary investment in students has been relatively low over time yet the country has achieved near universal coverage of primary education. However, the small investment in education has not yielded high educational outcomes among students, shown by consistently poor performance on international

educational measures (Cotlear 2006). Furthermore, improvements are needed in secondary education to increase student retention. Most disparities in education occur between rural and urban populations as well as between social classes. In a quantitative analysis of AAQ, it would be highly desirable to analyze the differences between schools located in various regions of the country due to the remaining disparities in educational access and outcomes.

Mexico's educational system is decentralized. The structure of primary schooling in Mexico is quite casual, with children largely working in groups, incorporating leisure time into the school day, and attending school for approximately four hours per day (Eric Development Team 2002).

In Venezuela, President Chavez's general authoritarian reforms have also impacted the education sector. Recently, Chavez proposed a new organizational structure for the schools which critics argue would place jurisdiction of operations under the arm of the ruling socialist party. Reforms would also limit media input on children and implement new curriculum based on Bolivarian principles. The development and impact of AAQ would most likely be affected should these reforms be fully implemented.

### The Political Environment

The process of democratization in Latin America has varied dramatically between countries and presents an interesting environmental study for the development of the institutions and behaviors critical to democratic transformation. Although most of Latin America gained colonial independence during the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the process of economic and democratic growth has often languished due to military and authoritarian regimes, environmental disasters, conflict between indigenous and non-native cultures, and success of illegal markets.

The three countries in which the original Alive to the World student survey was conducted serve as current indicators of differing governing structures in Latin America. Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela are

in many ways *sui generis*; they are unique environments that hinder comparative analysis. It is generally agreed that Venezuela operates with the most authoritarian political institutions of the three countries. Peru and Mexico, both of which underwent reforms in the early part of this century, have strong ties to the US government and are progressing in the enhancement of democratic values.

Mexico's current challenges include a burgeoning drug war dramatically impacting its security. Its more recent democratic transition is ongoing and still requires institutional evolution in order to continue (Edmonds-Poli 2005). Mexico's history of executive branch dominance has only recently been challenged with the rise of oppositional political parties. President Calderon has introduced reform for many sectors of the Mexican government and economy, including strengthening the criminal justice system, intensifying the fight against organized crime and instituting freedom of information laws.

Peru has a tumultuous history of military and authoritarian regime structures but more recently has become a prime example of democratic reform in Latin America. The administration of Toledo in the early part of this decade as well as the subsequent administration of Alan Garcia Perez saw the institution of many substantive reforms in response to the policies of the authoritarian Fujimori government of the 1990s. Free trade agreements have augmented strong economic performance and poverty has generally decreased over the past several years. Institutionally, term limits on the executive have been passed to prevent the rise of authoritarian regimes.

Widely considered the most stable government in Latin America throughout the twentieth century, Venezuela has recently severed many diplomatic ties under the ruling government of Hugo Chavez. Chavez's form of socialism, an *homage* to revolutionary Simon Bolivar, holds majorities in the legislative and executive branches of government. As his administration continues, nationalization of industry as well as political control of most of the country's local government has served to centralize power in his regime. A recent rise in military activity along the Colombian border also threatens stability in the region.

The difference political environments and hindrances to democracy present in each of these countries provide challenges to conducting a quantitative analysis of the AAQ program. Cross-country comparisons cannot easily be made due to these differences. Furthermore, after further analysis of the AAQ program, AFF may find that the program's effects vary significantly between countries and curriculum needs to be adjusted to account for these variations.

### Religion

As the AAQ program promotes character traits and prescribed values, it is important to bear in mind that religion may also play a role in promoting any one of the components that comprise our model of democratic values. While attempting to control for religious strength in the revised survey instrument, simply knowing a respondent's religious affiliation is not sufficient. Furthermore, it is infeasible to ask respondents for a description of past teachings or religious beliefs. While religious views alone may impact the development of character traits, it is impossible to tell to what extent and how much social groups, religious strength of one's family, and organizational affiliations may also contribute to this development. It is important to bear in mind that the impact of religion is not easily controlled for in any quantitative analysis and is especially difficult with children, who may not have a fully developed sense of their faith.

### Recommendations

In order to mitigate the effects of these environments when conducting a quantitative analysis of AAQ, we have developed several methodological recommendations to be used with the revised survey instrument. To address educational differences, it is imperative to establish comparison groups in schools that closely mirror schools that have implemented the AAQ program. We recommend

establishing comparison groups based on the environments of each country. For instance, rural and urban comparison groups in Peru would be necessary as educational discrepancies exist there. In order to better facilitate the process of establishing the comparison groups, it is recommended that schools that will begin the program in the following year be surveyed the year prior to AAQ implementation. Surveys will be more easily administered as AFF will have already established a relationship with the school.

In order to assess the impact of the political climate on students, it will be necessary to analyze survey data by country in order to account for political differences that exist in Latin America. However, specific political environments of each country must also be taken into account. While no easily-implemented quantitative means exists to control for this, differentiating between countries can provide an explanation to account for the environments in which respondents live and relate this information to the values that have been impacted by AAQ.

To account for the effects of religion on the development of values, we will attempt to control for that using survey questions designed to measure respondents' strength of religious views. The revised survey has three questions that will control for religion, one that asks respondents to identify their religious views, another that asks them how often they attend church, and a final question that asks children how often they think of their faith in everyday life.

These measures should alleviate some of the environmental influences that will also affect the development of democratic values in these three countries. However, it is also important to bear in mind that these controls cannot possibly account for every environmental factor that may impact children along with AAQ, thus the results from this study must be interpreted with caution.

## The AAQ Program

Finally, it is important to note that while the AAQ program would like to promote democratic values, this is not the purpose for which it was originally designed. While many of the lessons in the program (especially in the younger years) focus on character building that will aid the development of democratic values, it is important to review the entire program carefully to ensure that the message is consistent. As previously stated, children are more likely to internalize values when they are reinforced clearly from multiple facets of their life and getting contradictory messages from one source is clearly a violation of this principle. Specifically, the later years of the program, the focus shifts to moral education aimed at teenagers and newly developing relationships. It is important these later books are revisited to ensure the curriculum does not give children differing messages of topics important to the development of democratic values.

## Conclusion

Alive to the World is a character education program which has strong potential to positively impact the development of democratic values in Latin America. Our analysis shows the importance and potential effectiveness of these types of programs in promoting values which support democracy.

This conclusion is based on existing literature and a preliminary analysis of quantitative data from a previous survey conducted for the purposes of evaluating the AAQ program. The data show initial evidence to support the claim that AAQ has a positive impact on the development of democratic values. However, concerns about the original survey instrument as well as the method of administration mean current data must be interpreted cautiously and that more data is needed before making a final conclusion. A new survey instrument and methodology plan have been provided for future work which address these concerns. With these new tools, the AAQ program can be analyzed to test the hypothesis coming out of this study that the program has a positive impact on the promotion of democratic values.

Appendix A. Data Analysis

These tables represent the analysis of the data from the prior survey instrument. Statements are divided by components with reference to our hypothesized model. Difference of means tests were conducted in each grade for the total number of respondents. Significant differences between pre- and post-tests are noted by an asterisk.

\* denotes significance at a .05 level

Component of Democratic Values: Respect for Equality

Statement: Differences among people can be a positive thing.

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	107	10.0	67	6.2
1	33	3.1	25	2.3
2	45	4.2	47	4.4
3	71	6.6	89	8.3
4	99	9.2	117	10.9
Complete Agreement	719	67.0	729	67.9
Total	1074	100	1074	100
Mean	4.03		4.19*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	59	11.1	34	6.4
1	26	4.9	19	3.6
2	26	4.9	24	4.5
3	38	7.1	49	9.2
4	53	9.9	73	13.7
Complete Agreement	332	62.2	335	62.7
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	3.87		4.08*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	48	8.9	33	6.1
1	7	1.3	6	1.1
2	19	3.5	23	4.3
3	33	6.1	40	7.4
4	46	8.5	44	8.2
Complete Agreement	387	71.7	394	73
Total	540	100	540	100
Mean	4.19		4.29	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	118	10.8	92	8.4
1	31	2.8	25	2.3
2	45	4.1	36	3.3
3	103	9.4	95	8.7
4	136	12.5	201	18.4
Complete Agreement	658	60.3	641	58.8
Total	1091	100	1090	100
Mean	3.91		4.03*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	67	12.0	61	11
1	19	3.4	18	3.2
2	22	3.9	18	3.2
3	62	11.1	52	9.3
4	66	11.8	107	19.2
Complete Agreement	322	57.7	301	54.0
Total	558	100	557	100
Mean	3.80		3.85	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	51	9.6	31	5.8
1	12	2.3	7	1.3
2	23	4.3	18	3.4
3	41	7.7	43	8.1
4	70	13.1	94	17.6
Complete Agreement	336	63.0	340	63.8
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	4.02		4.23*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	77	9.3	73	8.8
1	21	2.5	24	2.9
2	33	4.0	30	3.6
3	60	7.2	80	9.6
4	98	11.8	128	15.4
Complete Agreement	541	65.2	495	59.6
Total	830	100	830	100
Mean	4.05		3.99	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	46	11.2	46	11.2
1	11	2.7	17	4.1
2	22	5.4	16	3.9
3	33	8.0	54	13.1
4	41	10	61	14.8
Complete Agreement	258	62.8	218	52.9
Total	411	100	412	100
Mean	3.91		3.99	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	31	7.4	27	6.5
1	10	2.4	7	1.7
2	11	2.6	14	3.4
3	27	6.4	26	6.2
4	57	13.6	67	16.0
Complete Agreement	283	67.5	277	66.3
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	4.19		4.22	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	172	11.4	141	9.4
1	56	3.7	54	3.6
2	71	4.7	58	3.9
3	133	8.8	156	10.4
4	160	10.6	241	16.0
Complete Agreement	912	60.6	854	56.8
Total	1504	100	1504	100
Mean	3.85		3.90	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	130	8.7	91	6.1
1	29	1.9	20	1.3
2	53	3.6	55	3.7
3	101	6.8	109	7.3
4	173	11.6	205	13.8
Complete Agreement	1006	67.4	1011	67.8
Total	1492	100	1491	100
Mean	4.13		4.25*	

Statement: I like living in a community that includes people who are different than me.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	278	25.9	202	18.8
1	52	4.8	66	6.1
2	82	7.6	82	7.6
3	140	13.0	154	14.3
4	114	10.6	186	17.3
Complete Agreement	409	38.1	385	35.8
Total	1075	100	1075	100
Mean	2.92		3.13*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	139	26.0	111	20.8
1	34	6.4	34	6.4
2	49	9.2	49	9.2
3	68	12.7	85	15.9
4	50	9.4	81	15.2
Complete Agreement	194	36.3	174	32.6
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	2.82		2.96	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	139	25.7	91	16.8
1	18	3.3	32	5.9
2	33	6.1	33	6.1
3	72	13.3	69	12.8
4	64	11.8	105	9.4
Complete Agreement	215	39.7	211	39.0
Total	541	100	541	100
Mean	3.01		3.29*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	142	13.0	124	11.4
1	40	3.7	69	6.3
2	83	7.6	86	7.9
3	184	16.9	482	16.7
4	170	15.6	273	25.0
Complete Agreement	472	43.3	357	32.7
Total	1091	100	1091	100
Mean	3.48		3.36	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	81	14.5	73	13.1
1	23	4.1	32	5.7
2	45	8.0	47	8.4
3	106	19.0	98	17.6
4	82	14.7	140	25.1
Complete Agreement	221	39.6	168	30.1
Total	558	100	558	100
Mean	3.34		3.26	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	61	11.4	51	9.6
1	17	3.2	37	6.9
2	38	7.1	39	7.3
3	78	14.6	84	15.8
4	88	16.5	133	25.0
Complete Agreement	251	47.1	189	35.5
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	3.63		3.46	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	138	16.6	93	11.2
1	39	4.7	49	5.9
2	58	7.0	58	6.7
3	131	15.8	141	17.0
4	146	17.6	185	22.3
Complete Agreement	319	38.4	305	36.7
Total	831	100	831	100
Mean	3.28		3.43	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	76	18.5	51	12.4
1	26	6.3	25	6.1
2	25	6.1	31	7.5
3	60	14.6	62	15.1
4	70	17.0	109	26.5
Complete Agreement	155	37.6	134	32.5
Total	412	100	412	100
Mean	3.18		3.35	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	62	14.8	42	10.0
1	13	3.1	24	5.7
2	33	7.9	27	6.4
3	71	17.0	79	18.9
4	76	18.1	76	18.1
Complete Agreement	164	39.1	171	40.8
Total	419	100	419	100
Mean	3.38		3.52	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	296	19.7	235	15.6
1	84	5.6	91	6.1
2	119	7.9	127	8.4
3	234	15.6	245	16.3
4	303	13.4	330	21.9
Complete Agreement	570	37.9	477	31.7
Total	1505	100	1505	100
Mean	3.11		3.18	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	262	17.6	184	12.3
1	48	3.2	93	6.2
2	104	7.0	99	6.6
3	221	14.8	232	15.5
4	228	15.3	314	21.0
Complete Agreement	630	42.2	571	38.3
Total	1493	100	1493	100
Mean	3.34		3.41	

Component: Respect for Equality

Statement: I think boys and girls have equal rights.

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	135	12.6	123	11.5
1	28	2.6	27	2.5
2	32	3.0	28	2.6
3	71	6.6	56	5.2
4	48	1.5	73	6.8
Complete Agreement	761	70.8	767	71.4
Total	1075	100	1074	100
Mean	4.00		4.08	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	84	15.7	47	8.8
1	16	3.0	10	1.9
2	20	3.8	19	3.6
3	44	8.2	27	5.1
4	21	3.9	42	7.9
Complete Agreement	349	65.4	388	72.8
Total	534	100	533	100
Mean	3.78		4.20*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	51	9.4	76	14.1
1	12	2.2	17	3.1
2	12	2.2	9	4.7
3	27	5.0	29	5.4
4	27	5.0	31	5.7
Complete Agreement	412	76.1	379	70.1
Total	541	100	541	100
Mean	4.22		3.96*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	80	7.3	62	5.7
1	22	2.0	19	1.7
2	25	2.3	17	1.6
3	57	5.2	40	3.7
4	71	6.5	112	10.3
Complete Agreement	836	76.6	840	77.1
Total	1091	100	1090	100
Mean	4.31		4.42*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	38	6.8	31	5.6
1	7	1.3	10	1.8
2	17	3.1	9	1.6
3	33	5.9	24	4.3
4	36	6.5	60	10.8
Complete Agreement	427	76.5	423	75.9
Total	558	100	557	100
Mean	4.34		4.41	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	42	7.9	31	5.8
1	15	2.8	9	1.7
2	8	1.5	8	1.5
3	24	4.5	16	3.0
4	36	6.6	52	9.8
Complete Agreement	409	76.7	417	78.2
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	4.29		4.44	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	38	4.6	34	4.1
1	12	1.4	9	1.1
2	17	2.1	10	1.2
3	12	1.4	19	2.3
4	61	7.3	59	7.1
Complete Agreement	691	83.2	699	84.2
Total	831	100	830	100
Mean	4.55		4.60	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	25	6.1	17	4.1
1	7	1.7	5	1.2
2	9	2.2	5	1.2
3	6	1.5	13	3.2
4	34	8.3	37	8.9
Complete Agreement	331	80.3	335	81.3
Total	412	100	412	100
Mean	4.45		4.56	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	13	3.1	17	4.1
1	5	1.2	4	1.0
2	8	1.9	5	1.2
3	6	1.4	6	1.4
4	27	6.4	22	5.3
Complete Agreement	360	85.9	364	87.1
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	4.65		4.64	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	147	9.8	95	6.3
1	30	2.0	25	1.7
2	47	3.1	34	2.3
3	83	5.5	64	4.3
4	91	6.1	139	9.3
Complete Agreement	1107	73.6	1146	76.3
Total	1505	100	1503	100
Mean	4.17		4.37*	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	106	7.1	124	8.3
1	32	2.1	30	2.0
2	28	1.9	22	1.5
3	57	3.8	51	3.4
4	89	6.0	105	7.0
Complete Agreement	1181	79.1	1160	77.8
Total	1493	100	1492	100
Mean	4.37		4.32	

Statement: Boys and girls deserve equal respect and treatment

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	52	4.9	34	3.2
1	20	1.9	15	1.4
2	20	1.9	27	2.5
3	48	4.5	29	2.7
4	56	5.2	95	8.9
Complete Agreement	877	81.7	874	81.4
Total	1073	100	1074	100
Mean	4.49		4.57	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	20	3.8	16	3.0
1	10	1.9	11	2.1
2	11	2.1	20	3.8
3	27	5.1	18	2.4
4	38	7.1	59	11.1
Complete Agreement	428	80.2	410	76.8
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	4.50		4.48	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	32	5.9	18	3.3
1	10	1.9	4	.7
2	9	1.7	7	1.3
3	21	3.9	11	2.0
4	18	3.3	36	6.7
Complete Agreement	449	83.3	464	85.9
Total	539	100	540	100
Mean	4.47		4.66*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	22	2.0	11	1.0
1	18	1.7	9	.8
2	21	1.9	14	1.3
3	35	3.2	35	3.2
4	93	7.6	89	8.2
Complete Agreement	912	83.6	931	85.5
Total	1091	100	1089	100
Mean	4.64		4.73*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	13	2.3	8	1.4
1	10	1.8	6	1.1
2	11	2.0	11	2.0
3	21	3.8	24	4.3
4	48	8.6	54	9.7
Complete Agreement	455	81.5	453	81.5
Total	558	100	556	100
Mean	4.59		4.64	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	9	1.7	3	.6
1	8	1.5	3	.6
2	10	1.9	3	.6
3	14	2.6	11	2.1
4	35	6.6	35	6.6
Complete Agreement	457	85.7	478	89.7
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	4.68		4.83*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	11	1.3	5	.6
1	2	.2	6	.72
2	11	1.3	5	.6
3	26	3.1	19	2.3
4	55	6.6	60	7.2
Complete Agreement	725	87.4	764	88.5
Total	830	100	829	100
Mean	4.76		4.80	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	8	2.0	3	.7
1	1	.2	2	.5
2	7	1.7	3	.7
3	12	2.9	12	2.9
4	27	6.6	41	10.0
Complete Agreement	356	86.6	350	85.2
Total	411	100	411	100
Mean	4.72		4.76	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	3	.7	2	.5
1	1	.2	4	1.0
2	4	1.0	2	.5
3	14	3.3	7	1.7
4	28	6.7	19	4.6
Complete Agreement	369	88.1	384	91.9
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	4.79		4.84	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	41	2.7	27	1.8
1	21	1.4	19	1.3
2	29	1.9	34	2.3
3	60	4.0	54	3.6
4	113	7.5	154	10.3
Complete Agreement	1240	82.5	1214	80.8
Total	1504	100	1502	100
Mean	4.60		4.62	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	44	2.3	23	1.5
1	19	1.3	11	.7
2	23	1.5	12	.8
3	49	3.3	29	2.0
4	81	5.4	90	6.0
Complete Agreement	1275	85.5	1326	88.9
Total	1491	100	1491	100
Mean	4.64		4.77*	

Component: Participation

Statement: If something I am doing gets too hard for me, I usually give up.

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	573	53.4	564	52.5
1	69	6.4	101	9.4
2	77	7.2	59	5.5
3	99	9.2	113	10.5
4	87	8.1	101	9.4
Complete Agreement	168	15.7	136	12.7
Total	1073	100	1074	100
Mean	1.59		1.53	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	277	51.9	266	49.8
1	41	7.7	58	10.9
2	35	6.6	29	5.4
3	54	10.1	60	11.2
4	40	7.5	52	9.7
Complete Agreement	87	16.3	69	12.9
Total	534	100	100	100
Mean	1.63		1.59	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	296	54.9	298	55.2
1	28	5.2	43	8.0
2	42	7.8	30	5.6
3	45	8.4	53	9.8
4	47	8.7	49	9.1
Complete Agreement	81	15.0	67	12.4
Total	539	100	540	100
Mean	1.56		1.47	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	489	44.8	557	51.2
1	131	12.0	124	11.4
2	93	8.5	76	7.0
3	131	12.0	133	12.2
4	104	9.5	106	9.7
Complete Agreement	143	13.1	93	8.5
Total	1091	100	1089	100
Mean	1.69		1.44*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	259	46.4	288	51.8
1	68	12.2	64	11.5
2	47	8.4	34	6.1
3	60	10.8	64	11.5
4	54	9.7	55	9.9
Complete Agreement	70	12.5	51	9.2
Total	558	100	556	100
Mean	1.63		1.44	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	230	43.2	269	50.5
1	63	11.8	60	11.3
2	46	8.6	42	7.9
3	71	13.3	69	13.0
4	50	9.4	51	9.6
Complete Agreement	73	13.7	42	7.9
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	1.75		1.44*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	362	43.6	394	47.5
1	123	14.8	102	12.3
2	71	8.7	83	10.0
3	98	11.8	108	13.0
4	74	8.9	82	9.9
Complete Agreement	101	12.2	60	7.2
Total	830	100	829	100
Mean	1.64		1.47*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	195	47.5	204	49.6
1	53	12.9	48	11.7
2	34	8.3	39	9.5
3	41	10.0	53	12.9
4	31	7.5	39	9.5
Complete Agreement	57	13.9	28	6.8
Total	411	100	411	100
Mean	1.59		1.41	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	167	39.9	190	45.5
1	70	16.7	54	12.9
2	38	9.1	44	10.5
3	57	13.6	55	13.2
4	43	10.3	43	10.3
Complete Agreement	44	10.5	32	7.7
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	1.69		1.53	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	731	48.6	758	50.5
1	162	10.8	171	11.4
2	116	7.7	102	6.8
3	156	10.4	177	11.8
4	125	8.3	146	9.7
Complete Agreement	214	14.2	148	9.9
Total	1504	100	1502	100
Mean	1.62		1.48*	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	693	46.5	757	50.8
1	161	10.8	157	10.5
2	126	8.5	116	7.8
3	183	11.6	177	11.9
4	140	9.4	143	9.6
Complete Agreement	198	13.3	141	9.5
Total	1491	100	1491	100
Mean	1.66		1.47*	

Component: Critical Analysis of Authority

Statement: It's ok to disagree with others.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	243	22.6	137	12.8
1	28	2.6	35	3.3
2	51	4.7	46	4.3
3	124	11.5	123	11.5
4	131	12.2	169	15.8
Complete Agreement	498	46.3	563	52.5
Total	1075	100	1073	100
Mean	3.27		3.72*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	117	21.9	61	11.4
1	15	2.8	16	3.0
2	27	6.1	30	5.6
3	69	12.9	72	13.5
4	66	12.4	84	15.8
Complete Agreement	240	44.9	270	50.7
Total	534	100	533	100
Mean	3.26		3.71*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	126	23.3	76	14.1
1	13	2.4	19	3.5
2	24	4.4	16	3.0
3	55	10.2	51	9.4
4	65	12.0	85	15.5
Complete Agreement	258	47.7	293	54.3
Total	541	100	540	100
Mean	3.28		3.72*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	209	19.2	108	9.9
1	41	3.8	38	3.5
2	63	5.8	39	3.6
3	151	13.8	114	10.5
4	176	16.1	233	21.4
Complete Agreement	451	41.3	558	51.2
Total	1091	100	1090	100
Mean	3.28		3.83*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	85	15.2	54	9.7
1	18	3.2	20	3.6
2	34	6.1	17	3.1
3	86	15.4	63	11.3
4	95	17.0	114	20.5
Complete Agreement	240	43.0	289	51.9
Total	558	100	557	100
Mean	3.45		3.85*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	124	23.3	54	10.1
1	23	4.3	18	3.4
2	29	5.4	22	4.1
3	65	12.2	51	9.6
4	81	15.2	119	22.3
Complete Agreement	211	39.6	269	50.5
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	3.11		3.82*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	108	13.0	58	7.0
1	24	2.9	29	3.5
2	38	4.6	33	4.0
3	98	11.8	104	12.5
4	150	18.1	175	21.1
Complete Agreement	412	49.6	431	51.9
Total	830	100	830	100
Mean	3.68		3.93*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	57	13.9	29	7.0
1	10	2.4	15	3.6
2	14	3.4	20	4.9
3	52	12.7	62	15.1
4	78	19.0	82	19.9
Complete Agreement	200	48.7	204	49.5
Total	411	100	412	100
Mean	3.66		3.86	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	51	12.2	29	6.9
1	14	3.3	14	3.4
2	24	5.7	13	3.1
3	46	11.0	42	10.1
4	72	17.2	93	22.3
Complete Agreement	212	50.1	227	54.3
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	3.69		4.00*	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	259	17.2	144	9.6
1	43	2.9	52	3.5
2	76	5.1	67	4.5
3	207	13.8	197	13.1
4	239	15.9	280	18.6
Complete Agreement	680	45.2	763	50.8
Total	1504	100	1503	100
Mean	3.44		3.80*	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	301	20.2	159	10.7
1	50	3.4	51	3.4
2	77	5.2	51	3.4
3	166	11.1	144	9.7
4	218	14.6	297	19.9
Complete Agreement	681	45.6	789	52.9
Total	1493	100	1491	100
Mean	3.33		3.84*	

Component: Democratic Society Experience

Statement: In my classroom, the teachers encourage me to express myself.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	47	4.4	36	3.4
1	23	2.2	14	1.3
2	40	3.7	27	2.5
3	91	8.5	68	6.3
4	107	10.0	143	13.3
Complete Agreement	764	71.3	786	73.2
Total	1072	100	1074	100
Mean	4.31		4.45*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	16	3.0	23	4.3
1	17	3.2	11	2.1
2	29	5.4	17	3.2
3	56	10.5	43	8.1
4	56	10.5	73	13.7
Complete Agreement	360	67.4	367	68.7
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	4.25		4.31	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	31	5.8	13	2.4
1	6	1.1	3	.6
2	11	2.0	10	1.9
3	35	6.5	25	4.6
4	51	9.5	70	13.0
Complete Agreement	404	75.1	419	77.6
Total	538	100	540	100
Mean	4.38		4.58*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	29	2.7	17	1.6
1	13	1.2	11	1.0
2	47	4.3	26	2.4
3	101	9.3	77	7.1
4	162	14.9	186	17.1
Complete Agreement	739	67.7	772	70.9
Total	1091	100	1089	100
Mean	4.36		4.50*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	21	3.8	12	2.2
1	6	1.1	8	1.4
2	32	5.7	14	2.5
3	53	9.5	44	7.9
4	86	15.4	105	15.9
Complete Agreement	360	64.5	373	67.1
Total	558	100	556	100
Mean	4.25		4.41*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	8	1.5	5	.9
1	7	1.3	3	.6
2	15	2.8	12	2.3
3	48	9.0	33	6.2
4	76	14.3	81	15.2
Complete Agreement	379	71.1	399	74.9
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	4.47		4.59*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	15	1.8	7	.8
1	7	.8	21	2.5
2	20	2.4	23	2.8
3	75	9.0	58	7.0
4	131	15.8	140	16.9
Complete Agreement	582	70.1	581	70.0
Total	830	100	830	100
Mean	4.47		4.47	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	7	1.7	3	.7
1	4	1.0	8	1.9
2	10	2.4	13	3.2
3	31	7.5	32	7.8
4	66	16.1	76	18.5
Complete Agreement	293	71.3	280	68.0
Total	411	100	412	100
Mean	4.49		4.45	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	8	1.9	4	1.0
1	3	.7	13	3.1
2	10	2.4	10	2.4
3	44	10.5	26	6.2
4	65	15.5	64	15.3
Complete Agreement	289	69.0	301	72.0
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	4.44		4.48	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	44	2.9	38	2.5
1	27	1.8	27	1.8
2	71	4.7	44	2.9
3	140	9.3	120	8.0
4	208	13.8	254	16.9
Complete Agreement	1014	67.4	1020	67.9
Total	1504	100	1503	100
Mean	4.32		4.39	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	47	3.2	22	1.5
1	16	1.1	19	1.3
2	36	2.4	32	2.2
3	127	8.5	84	5.6
4	192	12.9	215	14.4
Complete Agreement	1072	72.0	1119	75.1
Total	1490	100	1491	100
Mean	4.43		4.55*	

Component: Power Sharing

Statement: When playing games or talking to my friends, I prefer to have things my way.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	524	48.7	582	54.1
1	124	11.5	147	13.7
2	97	9.0	114	10.6
3	115	10.7	104	9.7
4	55	5.1	49	4.6
Complete Agreement	160	14.9	79	7.4
Total	1075	100	1075	100
Mean	1.57		1.19*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	242	45.3	255	47.8
1	60	11.2	94	17.6
2	54	10.1	61	11.4
3	56	10.5	51	9.6
4	37	6.9	27	5.1
Complete Agreement	85	15.9	46	8.6
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	1.70		1.32*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	282	52.1	327	60.4
1	64	11.8	53	9.8
2	43	8.0	53	9.8
3	59	10.9	53	9.8
4	18	3.3	22	4.1
Complete Agreement	75	13.9	33	6.1
Total	541	100	541	100
Mean	1.43		1.06*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	479	43.9	564	51.7
1	155	14.2	171	15.7
2	135	12.4	112	10.3
3	116	10.6	136	12.5
4	72	6.6	42	3.9
Complete Agreement	134	12.3	65	6.0
Total	1091	100	1090	100
Mean	1.59		1.19*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	231	41.4	277	49.7
1	82	14.7	92	16.5
2	72	12.9	63	11.3
3	69	12.4	66	11.9
4	38	6.8	22	4.0
Complete Agreement	66	11.8	37	6.6
Total	558	100	557	100
Mean	1.64		1.24*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	248	46.5	287	53.9
1	73	13.7	79	14.8
2	63	11.8	49	9.2
3	47	8.8	70	13.1
4	34	6.4	20	3.8
Complete Agreement	68	12.8	28	2.3
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	1.53		1.14*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	348	41.9	410	49.3
1	110	13.2	145	17.5
2	127	15.3	117	14.1
3	117	14.1	97	11.7
4	64	7.7	31	3.7
Complete Agreement	65	7.8	31	3.7
Total	831	100	831	100
Mean	1.56		1.14*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	158	38.4	187	45.4
1	58	14.1	68	16.5
2	64	15.5	66	16.0
3	60	14.6	63	15.3
4	30	7.3	14	3.4
Complete Agreement	42	10.2	14	3.4
Total	412	100	412	100
Mean	1.69		1.25*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	190	45.4	223	53.2
1	52	12.4	77	18.4
2	63	15.0	51	12.2
3	57	13.6	34	8.1
4	34	8.1	17	4.1
Complete Agreement	23	5.5	17	4.1
Total	419	100	419	100
Mean	1.43		1.04*	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	631	41.9	719	47.8
1	201	13.4	254	16.9
2	190	12.6	190	12.6
3	185	12.3	180	12.0
4	105	7.0	64	4.3
Complete Agreement	193	12.8	97	6.5
Total	1505	100	1504	100
Mean	1.68		1.27*	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	720	48.2	837	56.1
1	189	12.7	209	14.0
2	169	11.3	153	10.3
3	163	10.9	157	10.5
4	86	5.8	59	4.0
Complete Agreement	166	11.1	78	5.2
Total	1493	100	1493	100
Mean	1.47		1.08*	

Statement: Rules are important sometimes, but not always.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	464	43.2	497	46.3
1	39	3.6	72	6.7
2	64	6.0	68	6.3
3	100	9.3	98	9.1
4	88	8.2	89	8.3
Complete Agreement	318	29.6	250	23.3
Total	1073	100	1074	100
Mean	2.25		1.96*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	211	39.5	242	45.3
1	23	4.3	38	7.1
2	37	6.9	40	7.5
3	59	11.1	56	10.5
4	42	7.9	48	9.0
Complete Agreement	162	30.3	110	20.6
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	2.34		1.93*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	253	46.9	255	47.2
1	16	3.0	34	6.3
2	27	5.0	28	5.2
3	41	7.6	42	7.8
4	46	8.5	41	7.6
Complete Agreement	156	28.9	140	25.9
Total	539	100	540	100
Mean	2.15		2.00	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	427	39.1	496	45.6
1	62	5.7	84	7.7
2	56	5.1	83	7.6
3	111	10.2	142	13.0
4	107	9.8	107	9.8
Complete Agreement	328	30.1	177	16.3
Total	1091	100	1089	100
Mean	2.36		1.83*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	237	42.5	239	43.0
1	32	5.7	48	8.6
2	30	5.4	48	8.6
3	63	11.3	80	14.4
4	55	9.9	54	9.7
Complete Agreement	141	25.3	87	15.7
Total	558	100	556	100
Mean	2.16		1.86*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	190	35.7	257	48.2
1	30	5.3	36	6.8
2	26	4.9	35	6.6
3	48	9.0	62	11.6
4	52	9.8	53	9.9
Complete Agreement	187	35.1	90	16.9
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	2.57		1.79*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	348	41.9	404	48.7
1	57	6.9	70	8.4
2	59	7.1	64	7.7
3	111	13.4	95	11.5
4	78	9.4	90	10.9
Complete Agreement	177	21.3	106	12.8
Total	830	100	829	100
Mean	2.05		1.66*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	159	38.7	187	45.5
1	23	5.6	39	9.5
2	29	7.1	40	9.7
3	61	14.8	50	12.2
4	42	10.2	44	10.7
Complete Agreement	97	23.6	51	12.4
Total	411	100	411	100
Mean	2.23		1.70*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	189	45.1	217	51.9
1	34	8.1	31	7.4
2	30	7.2	24	5.7
3	50	11.9	45	10.8
4	36	8.6	46	11.0
Complete Agreement	80	19.1	55	13.2
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	1.88		1.61*	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	607	40.4	669	44.5
1	78	5.2	125	8.3
2	96	6.4	128	8.5
3	183	12.2	186	12.4
4	139	9.2	146	9.7
Complete Agreement	401	26.7	248	16.5
Total	1504	100	1502	100
Mean	2.25		1.84*	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	632	42.4	729	48.9
1	80	5.4	101	6.8
2	83	5.6	87	5.8
3	139	9.3	149	10.0
4	134	9.0	140	9.4
Complete Agreement	423	28.4	285	19.1
Total	1491	100	1491	100
Mean	2.22		1.82*	

Statement: When someone doesn't see it my way, I get mad.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	534	49.7	528	49.1
1	91	8.5	110	10.2
2	99	9.2	88	8.2
3	83	7.7	124	11.5
4	66	6.1	87	8.1
Complete Agreement	202	18.8	138	12.8
Total	1075	100	1075	100
Mean	1.69		1.58	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	255	47.8	245	45.9
1	51	9.6	61	11.4
2	54	10.1	52	9.7
3	38	7.1	61	11.4
4	34	6.4	44	8.2
Complete Agreement	102	19.1	71	13.3
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	1.72		1.65	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	279	51.6	283	52.3
1	40	7.4	49	9.1
2	45	8.3	36	6.7
3	45	8.3	63	11.7
4	32	5.9	43	8.0
Complete Agreement	100	18.5	67	12.4
Total	541	100	541	100
Mean	1.65		1.51	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	449	41.2	470	43.1
1	131	12.0	135	12.4
2	132	12.1	114	10.5
3	142	13.0	138	12.7
4	87	8.0	97	8.9
Complete Agreement	150	13.8	136	12.5
Total	1091	100	1090	100
Mean	1.76		1.69	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	231	41.4	230	41.3
1	64	11.5	72	12.9
2	68	12.2	65	11.7
3	79	14.2	74	13.3
4	35	6.3	49	8.8
Complete Agreement	81	14.5	67	12.0
Total	558	100	557	100
Mean	1.76		1.71	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	218	40.9	240	45.0
1	67	12.6	63	11.8
2	64	12.0	49	9.2
3	63	11.8	64	12.0
4	52	9.8	48	9.0
Complete Agreement	69	13.0	69	13.0
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	1.76		1.67	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	311	37.4	344	41.5
1	105	12.6	123	14.8
2	103	12.4	82	9.9
3	120	14.4	104	12.5
4	71	8.5	78	9.4
Complete Agreement	121	14.6	99	11.9
Total	831	100	830	100
Mean	1.88		1.69*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	164	39.8	164	39.8
1	47	11.4	65	15.8
2	48	11.7	47	11.4
3	64	15.5	54	13.1
4	29	7.0	40	9.7
Complete Agreement	60	14.6	42	10.2
Total	412	100	412	100
Mean	1.82		1.68	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	147	35.1	180	43.1
1	58	13.8	58	13.9
2	55	13.1	35	8.4
3	56	13.4	50	12.0
4	42	10.0	38	9.1
Complete Agreement	61	14.6	57	13.6
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	1.93		1.71	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	650	43.2	639	42.5
1	162	10.8	198	13.2
2	170	11.3	164	10.9
3	181	12.0	189	12.6
4	99	6.6	134	8.9
Complete Agreement	243	16.2	180	12.0
Total	1505	100	1504	100
Mean	1.76		1.68	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	644	43.1	703	47.1
1	165	11.1	170	11.4
2	164	11.0	120	8.0
3	164	11.0	177	11.9
4	126	8.4	129	8.7
Complete Agreement	230	15.4	193	12.9
Total	1493	100	1492	100
Mean	1.77		1.62*	

Statement: I think it's important to listen to other people.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	66	6.1	48	4.5
1	20	1.9	12	1.1
2	26	2.4	25	2.3
3	62	5.8	45	4.2
4	74	6.9	139	13.0
Complete Agreement	827	76.9	804	74.9
Total	1075	100	1073	100
Mean	4.36		4.45	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	28	5.2	21	3.9
1	14	2.6	7	1.3
2	16	3.0	16	3.0
3	42	7.9	29	5.4
4	42	7.9	82	15.4
Complete Agreement	392	73.4	378	70.9
Total	534	100	533	100
Mean	4.31		4.40	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	38	7.0	27	5.0
1	6	1.1	5	.9
2	10	1.9	9	1.7
3	20	3.7	16	3.0
4	32	5.9	57	10.6
Complete Agreement	435	80.4	426	78.9
Total	541	100	540	100
Mean	4.42		4.50	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	31	2.8	25	2.3
1	9	.8	9	.8
2	22	2.0	22	2.0
3	66	6.0	59	5.4
4	150	13.8	176	16.2
Complete Agreement	813	74.5	799	73.3
Total	1091	100	1090	100
Mean	4.51		4.52	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	21	3.8	18	3.2
1	6	1.1	6	1.1
2	15	2.7	12	2.2
3	43	7.7	44	7.9
4	77	13.8	106	19.0
Complete Agreement	396	71.0	371	66.6
Total	558	100	557	100
Mean	4.40		4.38	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	10	1.9	7	1.3
1	3	.6	3	.6
2	7	1.3	10	1.9
3	23	4.3	15	2.8
4	73	13.7	70	13.1
Complete Agreement	417	78.2	428	80.3
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	4.62		4.67	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	22	2.7	14	1.7
1	5	.6	7	.8
2	16	1.9	6	.7
3	47	5.7	36	4.3
4	111	13.4	140	16.9
Complete Agreement	630	75.8	627	75.5
Total	831	100	830	100
Mean	4.54		4.60	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	11	2.7	6	1.5
1	2	.5	5	1.2
2	7	1.7	3	.7
3	26	6.3	19	4.6
4	48	11.7	88	21.4
Complete Agreement	318	77.2	291	70.6
Total	412	100	412	11
Mean	4.55		4.55	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	11	2.6	8	1.9
1	3	.7	2	.5
2	9	2.2	3	.7
3	21	5.0	17	4.1
4	63	12.0	52	12.4
Complete Agreement	312	74.5	336	80.4
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	4.53		4.66*	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	60	4.0	45	3.0
1	22	1.5	19	1.3
2	38	2.5	31	2.1
3	111	7.4	92	6.1
4	167	11.1	276	18.4
Complete Agreement	1107	73.6	1040	69.2
Total	1505	100	1503	100
Mean	4.41		4.43	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	59	4.0	42	2.8
1	12	.8	10	.7
2	26	1.7	22	1.5
3	64	4.3	48	3.2
4	168	11.3	179	12.0
Complete Agreement	1164	78.0	1190	79.8
Total	1493	100	1491	100
Mean	4.52		4.60*	

Component: Respect for Rights and Free Speech  
Statement: Everyone has a right to their own opinion.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	25	2.3	21	2.0
1	29	2.7	17	1.6
2	21	2.0	15	1.4
3	53	4.9	26	2.4
4	65	6.1	76	7.1
Complete Agreement	882	82.1	920	85.6
Total	1075	100	1075	100
Mean	4.56		4.68*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	11	2.1	12	2.3
1	18	3.4	10	1.9
2	12	2.3	10	1.9
3	29	5.4	23	4.3
4	37	6.9	40	7.5
Complete Agreement	427	80.0	439	82.2
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	4.52		4.60	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	14	2.6	9	1.7
1	11	2.0	7	1.3
2	9	1.7	5	.9
3	24	4.4	3	.6
4	28	5.2	36	6.7
Complete Agreement	455	74.1	481	88.9
Total	541	100	541	100
Mean	4.60		4.76	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	17	1.6	8	.7
1	17	1.6	5	.5
2	23	2.1	7	.6
3	51	4.7	29	2.7
4	109	10.0	102	9.4
Complete Agreement	874	80.1	939	86.2
Total	1091	100	1090	100
Mean	4.60		4.78*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	10	1.8	5	.9
1	8	1.4	4	.7
2	14	2.5	7	1.3
3	35	6.3	11	2.0
4	57	10.2	62	11.1
Complete Agreement	434	77.8	468	84.0
Total	558	100	557	100
Mean	4.55		4.74*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	7	1.3	3	.6
1	9	1.7	1	.2
2	9	1.7	0	0.0
3	16	3.0	18	3.4
4	52	9.8	40	7.5
Complete Agreement	440	82.6	471	88.4
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	4.66		4.82*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	13	1.6	2	.2
1	3	.4	5	.6
2	19	2.3	10	1.2
3	25	3.0	13	1.6
4	69	8.3	80	9.6
Complete Agreement	702	84.5	721	86.8
Total	831	100	831	100
Mean	4.70		4.80*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	6	1.5	1	.2
1	3	.7	3	.7
2	8	1.9	6	1.5
3	13	3.2	7	1.7
4	37	9.0	50	12.1
Complete Agreement	345	83.7	345	83.7
Total	412	100	412	100
Mean	4.69		4.76	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	7	1.7	1	.2
1			2	.5
2	11	2.6	4	1.0
3	12	2.9	6	1.4
4	32	7.6	30	7.2
Complete Agreement	357	85.2	376	89.7
Total	419	100	419	100
Mean	4.70		4.84*	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	27	1.8	18	1.2
1	29	1.9	17	1.1
2	34	2.3	23	1.5
3	77	5.1	42	2.8
4	131	8.7	152	10.1
Complete Agreement	1207	80.2	1252	83.2
Total	1505	100	1504	100
Mean	4.58		4.69*	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	28	1.9	13	.9
1	20	1.3	10	.7
2	29	1.9	9	.6
3	52	3.5	27	1.8
4	112	7.5	106	7.1
Complete Agreement	1252	83.9	1328	89.0
Total	1493	100	1493	100
Mean	4.65		4.80*	

Statement: In the classroom, I feel comfortable expressing myself.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	93	8.7	55	5.1
1	25	2.3	21	2.0
2	46	4.3	37	3.5
3	107	10.0	93	8.7
4	156	14.5	186	17.3
Complete Agreement	646	60.2	682	63.5
Total	1073	100	1074	100
Mean	4.00		4.22*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	43	8.1	29	5.4
1	16	3.0	12	2.3
2	28	5.2	18	3.4
3	67	12.6	57	10.7
4	87	16.3	109	20.4
Complete Agreement	293	54.9	309	57.9
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	3.91		4.12*	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	50	9.3	26	4.8
1	9	4.7	9	1.7
2	18	3.3	19	3.5
3	40	7.4	36	6.7
4	69	12.8	77	14.3
Complete Agreement	353	65.5	373	69.1
Total	539	100	540	100
Mean	4.09		4.31*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	41	3.8	39	3.6
1	24	2.2	16	1.5
2	49	4.5	37	3.4
3	129	11.8	111	10.2
4	180	16.5	218	20.0
Complete Agreement	668	61.2	668	61.3
Total	1091	100	1089	100
Mean	4.19		4.26	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	21	3.8	25	4.5
1	15	2.7	7	1.3
2	25	4.5	22	4.0
3	76	13.6	52	9.4
4	89	16.0	120	21.6
Complete Agreement	332	59.5	330	59.4
Total	558	100	556	100
Mean	4.14		4.20	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	20	3.8	14	2.6
1	9	1.7	9	1.7
2	24	4.5	15	2.8
3	53	9.9	59	11.1
4	91	17.1	98	18.4
Complete Agreement	336	63.0	338	63.4
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	4.24		4.31	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	34	4.1	16	1.9
1	13	1.6	20	2.4
2	34	4.1	30	3.6
3	86	10.4	86	10.4
4	139	16.8	166	20.0
Complete Agreement	524	63.1	512	61.7
Total	830	100	830	100
Mean	4.23		4.29	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	19	4.6	8	1.9
1	8	2.0	12	2.9
2	15	3.7	17	4.1
3	43	10.5	45	10.9
4	66	16.1	89	21.6
Complete Agreement	260	63.3	241	58.5
Total	411	100	412	100
Mean	4.21		4.23	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	15	3.6	8	1.9
1	5	1.2	8	1.9
2	19	4.5	13	3.1
3	43	10.3	41	9.8
4	73	17.4	77	18.4
Complete Agreement	264	63.0	271	64.8
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	4.26		4.35	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	83	5.5	62	4.1
1	39	2.6	31	2.1
2	68	4.5	57	3.8
3	186	12.4	154	10.3
4	242	16.1	318	21.2
Complete Agreement	886	58.9	881	58.6
Total	1504	100	1503	100
Mean	4.08		4.18*	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	85	5.7	48	3.2
1	23	1.5	26	1.7
2	61	4.1	47	3.2
3	136	9.1	136	9.1
4	233	15.6	252	16.9
Complete Agreement	953	63.9	982	65.9
Total	1491	100	1491	100
Mean	4.19		4.32*	

Statement: I like it when others share their thoughts and opinions with me.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	31	2.9	19	1.8
1	27	2.5	31	2.9
2	55	5.1	30	2.8
3	80	7.4	87	8.1
4	147	13.7	216	20.1
Complete Agreement	735	68.4	692	64.4
Total	1075	100	1075	100
Mean	4.32		4.35	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	17	3.2	10	1.9
1	16	3.0	19	3.6
2	34	6.4	22	4.1
3	51	9.6	59	11.1
4	74	13.9	106	19.9
Complete Agreement	342	64.0	318	59.6
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	4.20		4.22	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	14	2.6	9	1.7
1	11	2.0	12	2.2
2	21	3.9	8	1.5
3	29	5.4	28	5.2
4	73	13.5	110	20.3
Complete Agreement	393	72.6	374	69.1
Total	541	100	541	100
Mean	4.43		4.48	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	19	1.7	17	1.3
1	34	3.1	22	2.0
2	54	5.0	42	3.9
3	134	12.3	107	9.8
4	201	18.4	244	22.4
Complete Agreement	649	59.5	661	60.6
Total	1091	100	1090	100
Mean	4.21		4.32*	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	10	1.8	8	1.4
1	16	2.9	14	2.5
2	29	5.2	17	3.1
3	74	13.3	55	9.9
4	98	17.6	129	23.2
Complete Agreement	331	59.3	334	60.0
Total	558	100	557	100
Mean	4.20		4.31	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	9	1.7	6	1.1
1	18	3.4	8	1.5
2	25	4.7	25	4.7
3	60	11.3	52	9.8
4	103	19.3	115	21.6
Complete Agreement	318	59.7	327	61.4
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	4.22		4.33	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	15	1.8	1	.1
1	16	1.9	18	2.2
2	33	4.0	20	2.4
3	80	9.6	78	9.4
4	180	21.7	223	26.8
Complete Agreement	507	61.0	491	59.1
Total	831	100	831	100
Mean	4.30		4.38	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	8	1.9	1	.2
1	9	2.2	9	2.2
2	21	5.1	13	3.2
3	46	11.2	52	12.6
4	80	19.4	120	29.1
Complete Agreement	248	60.2	217	52.7
Total	412	100	412	100
Mean	4.25		4.26	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	7	1.7		
1	7	1.7	9	2.2
2	12	2.9	7	1.7
3	34	8.1	26	6.2
4	100	23.9	103	24.6
Complete Agreement	259	61.8	274	65.4
Total	419	100	419	100
Mean	4.36		4.49*	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	35	2.3	19	1.3
1	41	2.7	42	2.8
2	84	5.6	53	3.5
3	171	11.4	166	11.0
4	252	16.7	355	23.6
Complete Agreement	922	61.3	869	57.8
Total	1505	100	1504	100
Mean	4.21		4.26	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	30	2.0	15	1.0
1	36	2.4	29	1.9
2	58	3.9	40	2.7
3	123	8.2	106	7.1
4	276	18.5	328	22.0
Complete Agreement	970	65.0	975	65.3
Total	1493	100	1493	100
Mean	4.34		4.43*	

Statement: It is better not to say anything at all than to express a different opinion.

	4 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	301	28.0	267	24.9
1	59	5.5	60	5.6
2	64	6.0	70	6.5
3	112	10.4	141	13.1
4	91	8.5	127	11.8
Complete Agreement	448	41.7	409	38.1
Total	1075	100	1074	100
Mean	2.91		2.96	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	136	25.5	126	23.6
1	36	6.7	33	6.2
2	38	7.1	40	7.5
3	68	12.7	70	13.1
4	44	8.2	76	14.2
Complete Agreement	212	39.7	189	35.4
Total	534	100	534	100
Mean	2.91		2.94	

	4 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	165	30.5	141	26.1
1	23	4.3	27	5.0
2	26	4.8	30	5.6
3	44	8.1	71	13.2
4	47	8.7	51	9.4
Complete Agreement	236	43.6	220	40.7
Total	541	100	540	100
Mean	2.91		2.97	

	5 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	258	23.7	252	23.1
1	80	7.3	82	7.5
2	94	8.6	98	9.0
3	182	16.7	184	16.9
4	103	9.4	155	14.2
Complete Agreement	374	34.3	319	29.3
Total	1091	100	1090	100
Mean	2.84		2.79	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	127	22.8	126	22.6
1	42	7.5	41	7.4
2	52	9.3	58	10.4
3	96	17.2	98	17.6
4	46	8.2	80	14.4
Complete Agreement	195	35.0	154	27.7
Total	558	100	557	100
Mean	2.85		2.77	

	5 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	131	24.6	126	23.6
1	38	7.1	41	7.7
2	42	7.9	40	7.5
3	86	16.1	86	16.1
4	57	10.7	75	14.1
Complete Agreement	179	33.6	165	31.0
Total	533	100	533	100
Mean	2.82		2.82	

	6 <sup>th</sup> total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	197	23.7	235	28.3
1	57	6.9	78	9.4
2	101	12.2	83	10.0
3	115	13.9	122	14.7
4	117	14.1	112	13.5
Complete Agreement	243	29.3	200	24.1
Total	830	100	830	100
Mean	2.76		2.48*	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade boys			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	113	27.5	114	27.7
1	29	7.1	35	8.5
2	54	13.1	41	10.0
3	57	13.9	60	14.6
4	53	12.9	66	16.0
Complete Agreement	105	25.6	96	23.3
Total	411	100	412	100
Mean	2.54		2.53	

	6 <sup>th</sup> grade girls			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	84	20.1	121	29.0
1	28	6.7	43	10.3
2	47	11.2	42	10.1
3	58	13.8	62	14.8
4	64	15.3	46	11.0
Complete Agreement	138	32.9	104	24.9
Total	419	100	418	100
Mean	2.96		2.43*	

	Boys total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	376	25.0	366	24.3
1	107	7.1	109	7.3
2	144	9.6	139	9.2
3	221	14.7	228	15.2
4	143	9.5	223	14.8
Complete Agreement	513	34.1	439	29.2
Total	1504	100	1504	100
Mean	2.79		2.76	

	Girls total			
	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No Agreement	380	25.5	388	26.0
1	89	6.0	111	7.4
2	115	7.7	112	7.5
3	188	12.6	219	14.7
4	168	11.3	172	11.5
Complete Agreement	553	37.0	489	32.8
Total	1493	100	1491	100
Mean	2.89		2.77	

Appendix B – New Survey Instrument

Democratic Values Study  
Alliance for the Family

**BOLD CAPS NOT MEANT TO BE SHOWN TO SURVEY RESPONDENT**

---

- A. Respondent ID \_\_\_\_\_ **TO BE ASSIGNED TO EACH STUDENT AND ENTERED BY TEACHER OR AUTOMATICALLY THROUGH A UNIQUE STUDENT CODE**
- B. Teacher ID \_\_\_\_\_ **TO BE ENTERED BY TEACHER OR THROUGH A UNIQUE STUDENT CODE**
- C. School ID \_\_\_\_\_ **TO BE ENTERED BY TEACHER OR THROUGH A UNIQUE STUDENT CODE**
- D. Country Code \_\_\_\_\_ **TO BE ENTERED BY TEACHER OR THROUGH A UNIQUE STUDENT CODE**
- E. Comparison Group **TO BE ENTERED BY TEACHER OR THROUGH A UNIQUE STUDENT CODE**
  - 1. Yes
  - 2. No
- F. Test Type **TO BE ENTERED BY TEACHER OR THROUGH A UNIQUE STUDENT CODE**
  - 1. Pre-test
  - 2. Post-test

**DISPLAY TEXT:** Today we are going to ask you a few questions. We want to know what you think and how you feel. There are no right or wrong answers. This is not a test and you will not be graded. Your answers will not be shared with anyone, including your teachers or parents.

**DISPLAY TEXT:** First we are going to ask you a few questions about how you feel. For each statement, use the scale shown to describe how much you agree or disagree with the statement. Remember there are no right or wrong answers.

**USE SCALE:**

**5= COMPLETELY AGREE**

**4=SOMEWHAT AGREE**

**3=NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE**

**2=SOMEWHAT DISAGREE**

**1=COMPLETELY DISAGREE**

**(HEADINGS FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY, NOT TO BE SHOWN TO SURVEY RESPONDENT)**

**RANDOMIZE STATEMENTS**

**EQUALITY**

1. Boys and girls are different but equal.
2. Boys are better than girls.
3. People of all religions deserve to be treated the same way.
4. I like to play with people of other religions.

**DIVERSITY**

5. I like being around people who are different than me.
6. When I'm around people not like me, I feel uncomfortable.
7. Different types of people should be separated from each other.

**RESPECT FOR RIGHTS/FREE SPEECH**

8. It's ok to take something that doesn't belong to me without asking.
9. Having more of something than others doesn't mean I get to be the boss.
10. People have a right to believe anything they want.
11. Having beliefs different from most other people in the group is ok.
12. I like sharing my opinion with other people, even if they don't agree with me.
13. It's ok for newspapers and TV news to disagree with the government.

**FEELINGS TOWARD AUTHORITY**

14. My parents and teachers expect me to agree with them.
15. Sometimes the people in charge are wrong.
16. It is important to always listen to people in authority even if you don't think they are right.

**PARTICIPATION IN THE SYSTEM**

17. If I don't like the game, I should quit and go home.
18. Believing something strongly makes me right.
19. I will still play even if I can't win.

**POWER SHARING**

20. It's fair to do what the most number of people want to do.
21. It's best to have one person in charge and always listen to that person.
22. Decisions are better when everyone participates in making them.

**DISPLAY TEXT:** Good job! Now we would like to ask you a few questions about your classroom at school. Please tell us how often the statement describes your classroom. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers and your answers will not be shared with anyone including your teachers.

**USE SCALE:**

**1=NEVER**

**2=SOME OF THE TIME**

**3=HALF THE TIME**

**4=MOST OF THE TIME**

**5=ALL OF THE TIME**

**RANDOMIZE STATEMENTS**

23. I feel comfortable asking questions in the classroom.
24. Sharing different opinions in class is ok.
25. In the classroom, my teacher listens to what I think even if we disagree.
26. We work in groups in class.
27. Students have the chance to influence things that happen in the classroom.

**DISPLAY TEXT:** Great! We are almost done. Now we would like to ask you a few questions about you.

28. Are you...?

1. A boy
2. A girl

29. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_

30. What grade are you in? \_\_\_\_\_

31. In an average day, how many hours of television do you watch? \_\_\_\_\_

32. How many people live with you at your house? \_\_\_\_\_

33. Please tell us how you are related to the people who live with you at your house. Some examples are father, mother, brother, sister, uncle, cousin, grandfather or friend but you can give an answer that isn't listed here. Complete one line for every person.



7. Multiple times a day

**DISPLAY TEXT:** Thank you for answering our questions!

---

### **SCHOOL QUESTIONS**

School Code \_\_\_\_\_ **SO QUESTIONS CAN BE APPENDED TO STUDENT RESPONSES**

S1. Type of School

1. Private
2. Public

S2. Religious Affiliation

1. Christian, not Catholic
2. Catholic
3. None
4. Other, specify \_\_\_\_\_

S3. How would you describe the area served by the school?

1. Urban
2. Suburban
3. Rural

S4. How many violent incidents occur in your school in a given month? \_\_\_\_\_

---

### **TEACHER QUESTIONS**

Teacher ID \_\_\_\_\_ **SO QUESTIONS CAN BE APPENDED TO STUDENT RESPONSES**

T1. Which best describes the way your classroom is arranged?

1. Desks in rows with students facing the front
2. Desks in groups with students facing each other
3. Desks in groups with students facing the front
4. Desks in a big circle with students facing each other

T2. Please select the option that best describes the teaching style used in your classroom.

1. For the majority of lessons, I teach the lesson and the students listen and take notes
2. For some of the lessons, I teach the lesson and the students listen and take notes. For other lessons the students work in groups or are active participants in the lesson.

3. For the majority of the lessons, the students work in groups or are active participants in the lesson.

## Appendix C – Sample Press Release

The following is meant to serve as an example of the types of statements which are appropriate to publicize based on our findings. It is not a complete press release. While many variations of this could be released to the public, including a quote such as the example below which caveats that more research is necessary must be included.

### **FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

Alive to the World Program Linked to Promoting Democratic Values

*Washington, D.C. - December 18, 2009* – In a report released today by the College of William and Mary, the Alive to the World (AAQ) character education program has been linked to the promotion of democratic values in Latin America.

A review of relevant literature and preliminary data show that program such as AAQ can have a positive effect on the development of democratic values. Results indicate that attitudes regarding critical analysis of authority, power sharing and respect for free speech and individual rights may be the most affected by the AAQ program.

“While more research is necessary, our initial findings support the hypothesis that this program has a positive impact on the development of democratic values,” was a statement made by report co-author Erin Wilson of the College of William and Mary.

The AAQ program, developed by Alliance for the Family in Washington, D.C. is currently used by 65,000 students throughout Latin America.

Contact:

Daniel Kelley

[dpk@allianceforfamily.org](mailto:dpk@allianceforfamily.org)

(202) 232-1600

### Works Cited

1. Benavides, Martin; Carnoy, Martin; Cueto, Santiago and Gove, Amber. *Evaluation of the World Bank's Assistance to Primary Education in Peru*. Independent Evaluation Group. The World Bank 2007  
<[http://Inweb90.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/7AEB9EE607041B1A85257289007C674D/\\$file/peru\\_education.pdf](http://Inweb90.worldbank.org/oed/oeddoclib.nsf/DocUNIDViewForJavaSearch/7AEB9EE607041B1A85257289007C674D/$file/peru_education.pdf)>.
2. Benson, Jeri and Hocevar, Dennis. *The Impact of Item Phrasing on the Validity of Attitude Scales for Elementary School Children*. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, Vol. 22, No. 3, 1985.
3. Binford, Michael. *The Democratic Political Personality: Functions of Attitudes and Styles of Reasoning*. *Political Psychology*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1983.
4. Borgers, Natacha and Hox, Joop. *Response Effects in Surveys on Children and Adolescents: The Effect of Number of Response Options, Negative Wording, and Neutral Mid-Point*. *Quality & Quantity*, Vol. 38, 2004.
5. Borgers, Natacha; de Leeuw, Edith and Hox, Joop. *Children as Respondents in Survey Research: Cognitive Development and Response Quality*. *Bulletin de Methodologie Sociologique (Paris)*, No. 66, 2000.
6. Bronstein, Hugh. *Colombia takes Chavez war talk to the Security Council*. Reuters 11 Nov. 2009  
<<http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSN12242735>>.
7. Carini, Robert; Hayek, John; Kuh, George; Kennedy, John and Ouimet, Judith. *College Student Responses to Web and Paper Surveys: Does Mode Matter?* *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 44, No. 1, 2003.
8. Cotlear, Daniel ed. *A New Social Contract for Peru: An Agenda for Improving Education, Health Care, and the Social Safety Net*. The World Bank 2006.
9. Dewey, John. *Moral Principles in Education*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909.
10. Diamond, Larry. *The Three Paradoxes of Democracy*. *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 1990.
11. Dilliman, D.A. *Mail and Internet Surveys*. John Wiley and Sons, 2000.

12. Dougherty, Christopher. *Introduction to Econometrics*. Oxford University Press, 2007.
13. Edmonds-Poli, Emily. *Courting Democracy in Mexico: Party Strategies and Electoral Institutions, and: Mexico Under Fox (review)*. *Latin American Politics & Society*, Vol. 47, Number 2, Summer 2005, pp. 180-186.
14. Eric Development Team. *Schooling in Mexico: A Brief Guide for U.S. Educators*. 2002.
15. Foucault, Michel *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan, New York: Random House, 1995.
16. Galston, William. *Civic Education and Political Participation*. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 85, No. 1, 2003.
17. Kerr, David. *Changing the Political Culture: The Advisory Group on Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools*. *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 25, No. 1/2, Political Education, 1999.
18. Langbein, Laura. *Public Program Evaluation*. M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 2006.
19. Levinson, Meria. *Liberalism, Pluralism, and Political Education: Paradox or Paradigm?* *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 25, No. 1/2, Political Education, 1999.
20. Locke, John. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*. Ed. Ruth W. Grant and Nathan Tarcov, Indianapolis: Hackett, 1996.
21. Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Ed. Roger Woolhouse. New York: Penguin, 1997.
22. Lyberg, Lars (Editor). *Survey Measurement and Process Quality*. Wiley-Interscience, 1997.
23. Millennium Challenge Corporation. *Peru Threshold Program Component 1: Reduce Corruption in Public Administration*. 2008 <>.
24. Rea, Louis and Parker, Richard. *Designing and Conducting Survey Research: A Comprehensive Guide*. Jossey-Bass, 2005.

25. Riccards, Michael. *The Making of the American Citizenry*. Chandler Publishing Company, 1973.
26. Rimmerman, Craig. *Democracy and Critical Education*. Political Science and Politics, Vol, 24, No.3, 1991.
27. Sax, Linda; Gilmartin, Shannon and Bryant, Alyssa. *Assessing Response Rates and Nonresponse Bias in Web and Paper Surveys*. Research in Higher Education, Vol. 44, No. 4, 2003.
28. Sehr, David. *Education for Public Democracy*. State University of New York Press, 1997.
29. Slomczynski, Kazimierz and Shabad, Goldie. *Can Support for Democracy and the Market Be Learned in School? A Natural Experiment in Post-Communist Poland*. Political Psychology, Vol. 19, No. 4, 1998.
30. United States Agency for International Development. *Latin America and the Caribbean Overview*. USAID.
31. United States Agency for International Development. *Mexico Country Profile*. USAID.
32. United States Agency for Internatinal Development. *Peru Country Profile*. USAID.
33. United States Agency for International Development. *Democracy in Latin America and the Caribbean*. USAID < [http://www.usaid.gov/locations/latin\\_america\\_caribbean/issues/democracy\\_issue.html](http://www.usaid.gov/locations/latin_america_caribbean/issues/democracy_issue.html)>.
34. United States Agency for International Development. *Democracy and Governance Overview*. USAID < [http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/)>.
35. United States Agency for International Development. *Rule of Law*. USAID < [http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/technical\\_areas/rule\\_of\\_law/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/technical_areas/rule_of_law/)>.
36. United States Department of State. *Background Note: Mexico*. 2009 <<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/35749.htm>>.
37. United States Department of State. *Background Note: Peru*. 2009 < <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/35762.htm>>.

38. United States Department of State. *Background Note: Venezuela*. 2009  
<<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/35766.htm>>.
39. United States Department of State. *Merida Initiative: Fact Sheet*. 2009  
<<http://www.state.gov/p/inl/rls/fs/122397.htm>>.
40. *Venezuela's Dubious Education Reforms*. The Economist. 20 Aug. 2009  
<[http://www.economist.com/displaystory.cfm?story\\_id=14258760](http://www.economist.com/displaystory.cfm?story_id=14258760)>.