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Abstract

While much attention is given to the extent to which P-12 students are sufficiently prepared to pass requisite standardized tests and accountability measures, far fewer questions have been asked about how well P-12 education prepares those same students to step into their roles as adult citizens in a democratic society. In the same vein, while there are myriad discussions about democracy, there is little conversation about what constitutes a democratic citizen.

In an attempt to explore both the phenomenon of democratic citizenship, this multi-method study attempted to explore how state-level policymakers from the Ohio Senate, the Ohio House of Representatives, and the State Board of Education conceptualize democratic citizenship. Further, the study sought to investigate the extent to which the policymakers believed that there is or should be an intersection between democratic citizenship and state education policy. In particular, the study addressed policy that governs state-mandated accountability measures, such as the Ohio Achievement Test (OAT), curriculum standards, such as the Ohio Academic Content (OAC) standards, and school and classroom learning experiences where students can learn and develop democratic behaviors and characteristics.

The study explored policymakers’ perspectives on democratic citizenship through
the use of Q-methodology, which is designed for use in the study of subjectivity by forcing the P-set (study participants) to rank order descriptors of the phenomenon under consideration. In this case, the P-set was asked to rank order the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship as described by Westheimer and Kahne (2004). In an attempt to understand the reasons and motivations behind their rankings, the qualitative aspect of the study asked participants to articulate their reasons for ranking those items that they identified as the behaviors and/or characteristics that were the three most important and the three least important to democratic citizenship. The final aspect of the study was quantitative. The purpose of this section was to investigate where, how, and to what extent policymakers’ perspectives on democratic citizenship were reflected in the education policy that they set.

Results of the study indicated that the policymakers who took part in the study conceptualize democratic citizenship on the basis of character, law abiding behavior, and personal responsibility. The findings also indicated that policymakers generally agreed that each of the policy areas (accountability, standards, and classroom practices) should be aligned with and/or include the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. However, an element of disagreement concerning the alignment of accountability measures with the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship was also quite strong.
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Chapter 1

Introduction and Statement of the Problem

The impetus for initiating this study grew out of a lifelong fascination with politics. What has continually captured my attention about the American political system and the democratic process has been how the government functions on both the macro and micro levels, how policy is informed and influenced by special interests and research rather than constituents, and how political trends develop, appear, and then fade away.

What I find particularly fascinating is citizen disengagement from or apathy toward the democratic process along with its often limited interpretation of what actually constitutes engagement in it. Even more intriguing is the way in which citizens often become more politically vocal or increase grassroots efforts in support of or opposition to a given policy issue only after the policy has been enacted or after various segments of the population begin to feel as if some aspect of their civil liberties has been encroached upon or eroded. So, the questions that most immediately come to my mind are: a) what are the causes of the reticence toward civic behavior, and b) to what extent do citizens value their right to participate in our democratic process. I also wonder if citizens actually understand this right as being the bedrock of democratic citizenship and if they have had the opportunity to develop the critical thinking, reasoning, and analytical skills that are required in order to assume their responsibilities as eligible citizens.
Germane to the relationship between education and democracy, is whether American education systems consider democratic citizenship in their accountability, standards, and classroom practices for pre-Kindergarten through 12th grade (P-12). Or, as a rule, does American education opt to apply accountability measures and academic content standards that may or may not emphasize the development of democratic citizenship and that may or may not reflect an understanding of the need to prepare P-12 students for their future role as eligible citizens in a democracy?

Disengagement from or apathy toward governance in a democracy often manifests itself in behaviors and characteristics, such as a lack of interest in civic affairs, low voter turnout, and voluntarily remaining uninformed about public policy and governance issues. According to Dahl (1998), enlightened understanding, which means being informed about civic issues and policies, is one of the six criteria for a democratic process. He defined it as the requirement for each member to have “equal and effective opportunities for learning about the relevant alternative policies and their likely consequences” (p.37). However, if a sense of democratic citizenship is not developed in young citizens during the years of mandatory schooling, enlightened understanding, along with Dahl’s other criteria for a democratic process, may fall by the wayside (Neumann, 2008). Effective participation¹, the ability to discern differences among varying points of view, and engagement in civil debate to arrive at a policy that reflects the wishes of the majority and/or that benefits the whole society involve deliberations. Deliberations, in turn, require the ability to think critically, analyze, and draw

¹Before a policy is adopted by the association, all the members must have equal and effective opportunities for making their views known to the other members as to what the policy should be (Dahl, 1998).
conclusions. Gutmann (1987) referred to this process as deliberative democracy. So, since one of the primary aims of publicly mandated schooling is to cultivate the skills and virtues of deliberation (Gutmann, 1987) and because deliberation is a primary part of democracy, a logical conclusion to be drawn is that P-12 public education must include as part of its overarching goals the assurance that all students have the opportunity to gain the knowledge and skills necessary for the development of democratic citizenship.

Over the past several years, my interest in the characteristics and behaviors of American citizens of voting age has been heightened as a result of the number of policies, foreign and domestic, which have sparked considerable controversy. That same interest has caused me to wonder why so many of the policies, which have evoked such severe responses from large segments of the voting public, were able to pass from bills into laws with little comment or reaction from the public until the policies brought an unwelcomed outcome, a restriction, and/or a financial burden to individual citizens or the nation as a whole.

These musings, along with my experience as a professional educator, have led me to ponder the cause of the public’s seeming disengagement from active participation in the American political process and an overall misunderstanding of the United States’ form of government: democracy. In a democracy, the entire governance structure is predicated and wholly dependent upon the participation of all eligible citizens to function as intended (Pateman, 2003). Thomas Jefferson (1787), who also weighed in on the role of participation in a system of democratic governance, contended that without the input of citizens in a democracy, this form of governance ceases to exist and, ultimately, invites
every form of tyranny and other types of authoritarian government. Under authoritarian rule, the ideas and input of a nation’s citizenry not only remain unheard, but are unwelcome and uninvited as well, leaving the people with no reliable or even safe way to share ideas, to criticize, or for individuals to make sure your voice is heard.

As critical as participation is to a healthy democracy, however, there may be other, more fundamental reasons for individual participation in the political process in democratic societies, one of which is autonomy or ‘freedom as political participation’ (Swift, 2006). Describing an idea that he attributed to Rousseau, he described this freedom as ‘obedience to a law we give ourselves’ and explained that even in situations where the law may not be to the liking of some or where there is a similar or identical law in a non-democratic society, people living under democratic governance still enjoy a freedom because it is a law that was imposed on them by the people themselves. They are free from the will of others in the establishment of their own code of conduct, which, as Swift (2006) noted, is what is fundamentally at issue in a democracy: a type of self-determination.

This is not to say that those living under alternative forms of governance will neither develop nor experience the feeling of being in charge of their own destinies, but that because of participation, democratic citizens experience a unique form of independence that comes from knowing that while the governance of the state remains democratic, the people and the people alone have the opportunity through participation to inform and influence the laws under which they will live and that they will not be subjected to externally imposed regulation. They alone will decide what is best for them
and they do not worry that others from outside their society will be able to decide what is best for them and, through externally imposed laws, control them.

In addition to the sense of freedom that comes from autonomy, a sense of contentment and stability may also be outgrowths of the political autonomy that is intrinsic to democracy. It is reasonable to conclude that some level of happiness must come from just knowing that as there is every possibility for an eligible adult in a democratic society to inform and influence public policy and the outcome of elections. In the same vein, this same knowledge must also bring about a sense of empowerment as well as a sense of political efficacy (Thompson, 1970) where adult citizens finally realize that they really can “influence the system” (Thompson, 1970). Given these myriad outcomes, it would appear that participation in the political process in a democratic society is not limited to desired policy outcomes alone as it enhances the individual, fostering not only his/her growth, but his/her sense of self-worth as well.

I have considered that much of the nation’s civic disengagement and generally limited understanding of the American governance system and policymaking process may be the result of pervasive voter apathy. I have also considered that this apathy may emanate from a number of sources, such as public and private scandals, media hype of non-sociopolitical or economic issues, and a general perception that individual votes do not count and individual voices are neither valued nor heard.

I have also contemplated the role that public education, pre-Kindergarten through 12th grade, may play in what I have identified as the civic disengagement and the dearth of political knowledge and interest among the citizens in our democratic society. Perhaps
it is that students at the P-12 level do not have the opportunity to engage in democratic discourse in their classrooms and schools and, as a result, are not well acquainted with the level of public participation required by a democratic form of government. Perhaps democracy and the inner workings of the government are not included in most P-12 curricula, leaving students unfamiliar with democratic processes and the roles of the elected as well as the electorate. It could be that the responsibility for the development of citizenship in P-12 students has been relegated to Social Studies Departments alone. Equally as possible is that requirements for the courses within Social Studies, such as Civics, Government, and American History have been drastically reduced in both breadth and depth in the average high school curriculum. As a result, students have only a minimal opportunity to learn about American democracy and governmental processes and an even smaller chance to apply democratic principles or see them in action in their schools or classrooms.

All in all, there could be many reasons for such a paucity of classes and other learning experiences dedicated to the practice and development of democracy and democratic citizenship in school-age children and adolescents. Some likely causes for this scarcity of classes include external pressures emanating from state imposed accountability measures, curriculum standards, and/or district financial constraints. On the other hand, citizen apathy in our democratic society could be the result of a decreasing percentage of the American population whose P-12 schooling included an education that was dedicated both to the preparation of students for further education and their place in the workforce as well as for their role as adult citizens in a form of
government whose very health and survival depend upon a well-educated, well-informed citizenry (Jefferson, 1787; Dewey, 1916).

This is not to say that quality education has always been available to all segments of the American population. What it does say is that as a result of curricular requirements that have been imposed on schools due to various policy decisions, including accountability, the public education of American students in recent history has been predicated more on testing than on learning, more on mastering discreet facts and tasks than on the development of critical thinking skills, and more on subject matter deemed critical by private industry than on a liberal education that includes social studies, civics, and history that would prepare students for their roles as adults in a democratic society. Swift (2006) argued that deliberation has the capability to bring out the best in citizens as it forces them to a) listen to and consider competing ideas and/or divergent points of view, and b) reflect and better understand their own position on a given issue. While deliberation may indeed offer these opportunities, they are not likely to occur without the ability to reason, think critically, and analyze multiple arguments and points of view.

Students whose P-12 educational experiences are comprehensive and who are taught to make connections across the many subjects that they study are far more apt to become citizens who have the ability to think critically. Further, they are more likely to have an awareness and understanding of the world around them and to pursue alternative sources of information and an opportunity to control the agenda as well as to ensure their own enlightened understanding (Dahl, 1998). Practices such as these support the
likelihood of free, fair, and frequent elections (Dahl, 1998), without which democracy would not exist.

In “American Democracy at Risk”, Neumann (2008) argued in favor of protecting democracy from the assault that he sees occurring on multiple fronts. However, no aspect of democracy is as assailed, he wrote, as that where education and democracy intersect. Citing the results from the 1998 and 2006 NAEP\(^2\) civics assessments\(^3\) for 12\(^{th}\) graders, Neumann (2008) noted that 37 percent of public high school seniors lacked even basic knowledge of how the American government runs and how bills become laws.

Among those same 12\(^{th}\) graders, Neumann (2008) added, fewer than 10 percent were able to answer completely the question that asked how a democratic society benefits from citizens actively participating in the process. Worrying as the results of the NAEP civics assessment results may be, the findings from the American National Election Studies (ANES) (2000) signaled an equally disturbing trend of young adults aged 18-29 having significantly less political knowledge than their counterparts from previous generations.

According to an ANES survey, only 26 percent of college freshmen surveyed in 2002 said that “keeping up with politics” was important to them. This was in contrast to the 59 percent of college freshmen in 1970 who identified politics as an important in their lives. Despite any alarm that they may raise, the results of the NAEP civic assessments and the ANES study findings are also curious, especially given the recent resurgence of public

---

\(^2\) National Assessment for Educational Progress

\(^3\) The NAEP civics assessment measures students’ knowledge of civic life, politics, government, and civil society. The assessment is administered in grades 4, 8, and 12 to students who were statistically representative of the entire nation. Students’ performance on the national assessment is described in terms of their average civics score on a scale of 0 to 300 and in terms of the percentage of students who attain achievement at the following levels: Basic, Proficient, and Advanced.
participation in populist and grassroots movements, such as MoveOn.org, the Human Rights Campaign (HRC), and Pastors for Family Values (PFV) in the 2004 and 2008 Presidential elections. This lack of civic and political knowledge among young voters also begs the question as to whether the upswing in grassroots movements in particular is the outcome of an understanding of and appreciation for civic involvement and the role of citizens in a democracy or is purely emotional, fueled by media hype. Even though it may be argued that media hype may be standard to contemporary politics, the key question is whether citizens have sufficient analytical and reasoning skills to differentiate fact and plausible policy concerns from hype.

Perhaps 10 years from now, an inquiry into the issue of civic engagement might be warranted, depending on on-going voter turn out, the extent to which involvement in grassroots movements continues to grow or dissipates, and the age range of those who are most engaged in American political processes. The purpose of such a study would be to see if, a decade later, young voters of today had: a) developed further knowledge about and a deeper understanding of governmental structures and processes, b) developed the analytical and reasoning skills with which to deliberate on policy issues, and/or c) developed and maintained a higher value for their rights and duties as a democratic citizen to participate in the political process.

We as a nation are at the beginning of new national leadership. Regardless of our respective political affiliations, the change in administration has already brought and, no doubt, will continue to bring about some level of redirection of policies and practices in education and other aspects of our daily lives. It was my belief at the time of this study
that a research inquiry designed to examine policymakers’ perspectives on democratic citizenship could bring to the forefront the importance of understanding the intersection of education and democracy in our contemporary society. Further, such an investigation could provide some idea as to what compels policymakers to conceptualize democratic citizenship as they do and where their conceptualizations intersect and/or diverge with current state education policy governing accountability, standards, and daily classroom practices. While it is important to know the extent of the deficit in the knowledge of civics among P-12 students in categorical terms as reported by the NAEP, it is even more critical to understand the influences and overall pathways that led to the deficiency, if there are any. Delving into policymakers’ thoughts, ideas, and perspectives about democratic citizenship and how their views are translated into policy could likely provide such insight.

Like Dewey (1916), Pateman (1970) maintained that participation is the linchpin of democracy without which it cannot survive. Additionally, she added that the desire to participate in the process and to fulfill the responsibilities that are required of citizens in a successful democratic state is not necessarily innate in an individual. Rather, she contended, they are behaviors and, as such, must first be acquired, and then honed to perfection. Pateman (1970) suggested that “social training” for democracy should take place in spheres other than those which are legislative and governmental, such as school clubs, church organizations, and/or neighborhood associations. She asserted that when
considering the theory of participatory democracy\(^4\), the primary reason to present opportunities for participation, decision-making, and governance to children and adolescents in various settings is to provide them with a type of clinical practice in democratic knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Pateman, 1970). The idea is that by practicing democratic behaviors in childhood and adolescence, citizens will understand and be prepared for participation, decision-making, and governance as they enter adulthood and assume their responsibilities in a democratic society.

Gutmann (1987) asserted that political education prepares citizens to participate in the conscious reproduction of their society, and is the ideal of democratic education and democratic politics. Political education embodies the idea that individuals in a democratic society are empowered to influence education, curricula, policies, and practices, which, ultimately impact P-12 students and their political behaviors and characteristics. Political education, as used by Gutmann (1987), refers to civic education or to the preparation of school-age children for democratic practices in adulthood, such as voting, advocacy, and participation in grassroots movements of choice. Taking civic education one step further, Pateman (1970) identified the result of such political education as “democratic efficacy”, maintaining that there is a clear connection between a participatory environment and the development of a sense of ownership and responsibility for governance, social and legislative practices, and the welfare of fellow

\(^4\) The theory of participatory democracy refers to those multiple theories on the role and function of participation in a democracy. Not all theories are identical with some theorists identifying participation in a democracy as a protective function while others cited it as being “central to the establishment and maintenance of a democratic polity” (Pateman 1970). In the theory of participatory, major function of participation is to educate the individual in democratic skills and procedures as well as to ensure development of democratic dispositions (Pateman, 1970). Aside from Pateman, theorists of participatory democracy include Bentham, Mill, Rousseau, Locke, and Cole.
citizens. To that end, deliberation must become an integral part of the democratic process as it ensures that citizens who have the good of the association, community, and/or nation in mind, but who disagree on what is best and how to reach the desired ends, have sufficient skills to understand and analyze differing points of view. Above all, deliberative skills ensure the ability to negotiate, compromise, and reach consensus. Each of these is essential in a healthy and functional democratic state.

When taking into account the results of the NAEP study and polls of civic attitudes, beliefs, and practices, a logical conclusion is that most Americans, regardless of age, currently have insufficient knowledge and skills to engage in civil deliberation over sociopolitical issues. Further, it appears as if Americans have little value for their rights as democratic citizens to participate in the political and governmental processes of this country. As a result of these implications, additional questions about democratic knowledge, skills, and dispositions could be raised: a) how well the next generation of eligible citizens is prepared to assume their civic duties; b) how well they are prepared to engage in civil deliberations; and c) how willing they are to accept these civic obligations. Although these questions are not the primary focus of this study, they do represent aspects of democratic citizenship. Above all, I find it vital to explore, describe, and understand what policymakers consider to be the most and least important behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship since they are the ones who are charged with the crafting and drafting of legislative bills that often become education policy and state law. Understanding what compels policymakers to deem certain behaviors and
characteristics as more or less important to democratic citizenship is not just a high priority, it is a necessity.

An additional goal of this study was to provide an initial glimpse into the often overlooked intersection of teaching, learning, and governance. P-12 schools are the training ground for the next generation of eligible citizens. In order to ensure that students are prepared for the level of sociopolitical involvement that they are obliged to accept, it stands to reason that understanding the connection between education and a healthy democracy is the key to the survival of this unique form of government. Darling-Hammond (1997) sums it up this way:

> At some level, Americans understand the importance of public education to democracy – the necessity for all children to have at least a minimal education, learning the rudiments of citizenship and a means of making a livelihood. However, the more fundamental need is to prepare people for active participation in social decisions and for a productive shared life with fellow citizens (p. 141).

**Significance of the Study**

Pateman (1970) argued that participatory democracy is “central to the establishment and maintenance of a democratic polity”. She also stated that in the theory of participatory democracy the primary purpose of participation is to educate the individual in democratic skills and procedures as well as to ensure the development of democratic dispositions (1970). Equally in concert, Gutmann (1987) asserted that the primary aim of publicly mandated education is to cultivate the skills and merits of deliberation, which is also an essential component of democratic behavior. Deliberation is the ability to debate all sides of an argument, and requires critical thinking, analysis,
and reasoning skills, which are all grounded in teaching and learning at the primary level of education (P-12). If, as Pateman and Gutmann implied, a healthy democracy depends upon both civic participation and deliberation as two of its key elements, and if participation and deliberation are, in turn, dependent upon input from citizens who have the ability to think and question critically, as well as analyze and reason, then it can be concluded that just as Thomas Jefferson (1781, 1782) asserted in his Notes on the State Virginia, popular education, which aims at deliberation, is one of the basic needs of a democratic society.

In response to the above stated implications, along with the questions raised by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) in What Type of Citizen?: Educating for Democracy, this research study will serve to provide information about Ohio state-level policymakers’ conceptualization of democratic citizenship and the underlying ideas that contribute to the formulation of those views. It will also offer some insight about the extent to which those same policymakers believe that state education policies governing accountability, standards, and classroom practices should be aligned with and/or inclusive of the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

Along with the findings that could be applied during the policy decision-making process, this study will provide insight to P-12 and teacher educators about the various types of democratic citizenship and the behaviors and characteristics of each type. In addition, this study will have the capacity to serve as a tool to teach and remind all of us of what constitutes quintessential citizenship in all its myriad forms. Ultimately, it will

---

5 denotes schooling of the general public
set the stage for a discussion about the educational needs of school-age children in order for them to become effective citizens in a democratic society in adulthood.

A further significance of this study will result from its discussion of a) the relationship between education and democracy, b) the impact of participation in a system of democratic governance, and c) the extent to which policymakers believe that state education policies governing accountability, standards, and classroom practices should be crafted to ensure that P-12 students are prepared to act as democratic citizens. However, the most valuable aspect of this study may be the insight into how Ohio policymakers view democratic citizenship and, as a result, democracy. What it also offers is the opportunity to see how and where those same policymakers see the intersection of education and democratic citizenship and the extent to which they believe that state mandated education policy and the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship should be aligned. Thomas Jefferson (1781, 1782), who also saw a relationship between education and a successful democracy, stated his views about the perils of an undereducated citizenry as follows:

> Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves are its only safe depositories. And to render even them safe, their minds must be improved to a certain degree ... An amendment of our constitution must here come in aid of the public education. The influence over government must be shared among all the people. If every individual ... participates of the ultimate authority, the government will be safe. (Jefferson, 1781, 1782)

Finally, this study will serve to inform education policy. It is also meant to stimulate a dialogue about democratic citizenship and its needs. The findings of this study will also add dimensions to Westheimer and Kahne’s (2004) work on democratic
citizenship and educating for democracy. Perhaps the study will ultimately spark some level of civic debate that prompts the general public to give more thought about their own conceptualization of democratic citizenship, the behaviors and characteristics that support it, and the educational practices that are needed to develop it in children and adolescents, grades P-12.

**Research Questions**

In response to the discussion in the previous pages, the current trends and patterns in American civic engagement, the role of citizen participation in a democratic society, and the part that education plays in that participation, the ensuing research inquiry was proposed. The following list of questions shepherded the investigation. These questions served a) to probe how policymakers’ conceptualize democratic citizenship, b) to help understand the reasoning for their conceptualizations, c) to investigate the extent to which policymakers believe that the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship should be aligned with Ohio’s education policy governing accountability, content standards, and student learning experiences, and d) to inform state education policy.

The specific questions that guided the research were as follows:

1. How do Ohio state-level policymakers conceptualize democratic citizenship?
2. What compels policymakers to rank some behaviors and characteristics higher than others in terms of their importance to democratic citizenship?
3. What compels policymakers to rank some behaviors and characteristics lower than others in terms of their importance to democratic citizenship?
4. To what extent do Ohio state-level policymakers believe that Ohio’s state education policies governing accountability, content standards, and student learning experiences should be aligned with and/or inclusive of the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship?

**Operational Definitions of the Study**

This research study focused on the phenomenon of democratic citizenship. Like education, democratic citizenship holds different meanings for different individuals. In order to ensure a common understanding of this and other complex concepts discussed throughout the study, the following terms were defined.

These terms served as the operational definitions for this research study.

**Academic Content Standards** – 1) The knowledge and skills that students should attain in a given subject area. They indicate the ways of thinking, working, communicating, reasoning and investigating, and important and enduring ideas, concepts, issues, dilemmas, and knowledge essential to the discipline, and

2) Standards for grades K through 12 to which public, K-12 school curricula in the following content areas must adhere: Career-Technical, Early Learning, English Language Arts, Fine Arts, Foreign Language, Mathematics, Physical Education, Science, Social Studies, and Technology (Ohio Department of Education 2009).

**Assessments of Student Achievement** – The Ohio Achievement Test (OAT) measures students on what they know and are able to do in the following subject areas: mathematics, reading, science, social studies, and writing. Tests in mathematics and
reading are taken in grades 3-8. Science and social studies tests are taken in grades 5 and 8. Writing tests are taken in grades 4 and 7 (Ohio Department of Education 2009).

**Characteristics** – Distinguishing traits or qualities (Merriam-Webster, 2009); attributes.

**Classroom and school learning experiences** – 1) Teaching and learning that occurs formally in a classroom or school setting. They are planned parts of the curriculum with set goals, objectives, and intended performance or knowledge outcomes, and

2) Teaching and learning that occurs informally in a classroom, school or other settings, such as museums, lectures, exhibits, or music, dance, film, or theatre performances. They are not a planned part of the curriculum and do not have planned goals and objectives nor intended performance or knowledge outcomes. Informal learning often occurs through receptive skills, such as observation or listening.

**Conceptualization** – An individual's vision or understanding of an idea or phenomenon.

**Democracy** - 1) A constitutionally limited government that is representative in nature. It is created by a written Constitution that is adopted by the electorate and changeable from its original meaning only through amendment made by the electorate; a republic (Long, 1976), and

2) A form of government whose powers are divided between three separate branches of government: the executive, the legislative, and the judicial (Dahl, 1971), and
3) A form of government, of which the required criteria are a) effective participation of eligible members, b) voting equality of all eligible members, c) enlightened understanding, d) control of the agenda, and e) the inclusion of all adults (Dahl, 1998), and

4) A political system that contains the following six institutions: a) elected officials, b) free, fair, and frequent elections, c) freedom of expression, d) access to alternative sources of information, e) associational autonomy, and f) inclusive citizenship (Dahl, 1998).

**Democratic citizen** – 1) An adult, eligible member of the community, association, or nation who understands the concepts of the common good and civic responsibility (Rousseau 1787),

2) A community member who is engaged civically by a) voting, b) seeking to understand fully all issues prior to making a decision, c) controlling the agenda, and d) including all other adult permanent residents or eligible members in the democratic process (Dahl 1998), and

3) An eligible adult or permanent resident of the community whose behaviors and characteristics include some or all of the following (Westheimer and Kahne 2004):
   • knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks
   • organizes community efforts to care for those in need
   • critically assesses social structures to see beyond the surface causes of social stratification
   • seeks out and addresses areas of injustice
   • volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis
• critically assesses political structures to see beyond the surface causes of political inequality
• knows about democratic social movements
• obeys laws
• critically assesses economic structures to see beyond the surface causes of economic disparity
• knows how government agencies work
• works and pays taxes
• is an active member of community organizations
• recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries
• organizes community efforts to clean up the environment
• actively participates in community improvement efforts
• knows how to effect systemic change
• organizes community efforts to promote economic development
• acts responsibly in his / her community

**Dispositions** – The values, attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions demonstrated through verbal and non-verbal behaviors.

**Education accountability measures** – Annual or semi-annual summative measurements that are administered at specific grade levels between Kindergarten and twelfth grade; the intent of the measurements is to determine student academic achievement relative to curriculum standards established by a state education agency usually at the behest of state-level policy bodies. Subject areas typically measured include language arts,
reading, mathematics, science, and social studies. Measurements are typically state-mandated, standardized, and administered simultaneously around the state.

**Justice-oriented citizenship** – Citizenship that is predicated on social justice, equity, and equality for all citizens in a democratic society. Justice-oriented citizens critically assess the underlying socio-political and economic structures in order to identify, understand, and address the root causes of social injustice, inequity, and inequality. They understand the history and inner workings of social/grassroots movements and also understand the notion of systemic change. They see the goal as to solve social problems and ultimately improve society through question and debate or deliberative democracy (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004).

**Knowledge** – Information that has been learned, acquired, and applied both formally and informally across an individual’s lifespan.

**Least important** – Any behavior or characteristic that is described, identified, or considered to be the lowest priority.

**Most important** – Any behavior or characteristic that is described, identified, or considered to be the highest priority.

**Ohio state-level policymakers** – All members of the Ohio General Assembly (the Senate and House of Representatives) and Ohio’s State Board of Education.

**Participants** – 1) Individuals who were asked to provide data to the researcher by completing and returning the survey questionnaire developed for this study, and 2) Respondents.
**Participatory citizenship** – Citizenship that is predicated on active community involvement and improvement efforts. Participatory citizens are proactive and organize community efforts to care for those in need, promote economic development, and/or clean up the environment. They know how government agencies work and know strategies for accomplishing collective tasks (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004).

**Personally responsible citizenship** – Citizenship that is predicated on acting responsibly in the community. Personally responsible citizens are a) of good character, b) honest, and c) law abiding, which combine to solve social problems and improve society. They work, pay taxes, and obey laws, which are considered to be their primary civic responsibilities. They are not proactive, but do respond to need (recycling, blood donation, or food pantry contributions) when asked to volunteer or in times of crisis (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004).

**Respondents** – 1) Individuals who were asked to provide data to the researcher by completing and returning the survey questionnaire developed for this study, and 2) Participants.

**Q-methodology** – a research methodology that offers a theoretically grounded, and quantitative tool for examining subjectivity, such as opinions and attitudes. It is neither a wholly quantitative nor qualitative methodology as it shares features and attributes with each. An emphasis on study’s depth instead of its breadth is typical of this methodology (Thomas and Watson, 2002).

**Skills** – Abilities to perform certain tasks; the tasks may be physical or mental in nature. Skills often require knowledge in order to carry them out fully.
Limitations of the Study

The primary limitation of the research study may lay with the lack of generalizability of the results of the study. The subjects of the study were selected as a convenience sample and were, therefore, not randomly selected. Because the sample was a non-probablistic one, the results of the research study were limited in generalizability. However, with Q-methodology, “the ability to generalize sample results to the general population, is of less concern” (van Exel, 2005). Therefore, while it is recognized that the results of studies that are conducted using Q-methodology are not intended to be generalized to any other populations aside from the participants who supplied usable data to the researcher, the same is also true about qualitative research.

Given that both Q-methodology and qualitative inquiry constituted two of the three methodologies used in this research study and were used to a greater extent than the quantitative methodology used in Section III of the survey questionnaire, the researcher concluded that the results pertained only to the members of the General Assembly and State Board of Education who responded to the researcher by completing and returning the survey questionnaire with usable data.

While the results of studies using Q-methodology and qualitative inquiry are never generalizable to populations aside from those who provide usable data to the researcher, the results of studies using quantitative methodologies may or may not be generalized to populations similar to those of a study’s participants. In the case of this study, because the sample is non-probablistic, the results from the section employing only
quantitative methods are also not generalizable to anyone beyond the 20 policymakers who supplied usable data to the researcher.

A limitation due to sample size emerged in Section III (Quantitative Investigation) of the survey questionnaire where the investigation was conducted through the use of quantitative research methods. The sample size of 20 used with the three Likert-scale questions could pose a potential problem in the analysis of the data for Section III of the questionnaire. A sample size of 20 was used as the Q-methodology in Section I and the qualitative inquiry in Section II neither require large sample sizes that are typical of quantitative research studies. Additionally, it is recommended that large sample sizes be avoided in conducting studies with Q-methodology. The size becomes unmanageable in that Q-methodology emphasizes depth over breadth in a study (Brown, 1980).

Additional limitations of the study resulted from the use of a survey questionnaire to collect the data for the study. This may have impacted findings due to a lack of candor from respondents. In addition, the researcher was not present at the time of the administration of the survey questionnaire. The absence during data collection could be seen as a potential problem because the researcher was not present to answer questions raised by the subjects, extend discussion emanating from the responses in Section II (the qualitative section) of the questionnaire, or check her own interpretation of the subjects’ responses. Even though the researcher made earnest attempts to ensure clarity on the survey questionnaire, some statements in Sections I and II may have carried some
unintended ambiguity. Such ambiguity may have impacted the findings of the study in that not all respondents may have understood each item in the same way.

The investigation was also limited as a result of the size of both the P-set and Q-set. Although it is recommended that the Q-set contain more statements or items to be rank ordered than the P-set contains participants in a Q-methodology study (Carr 1992). However, the opposite occurred in this study, which led to two fewer statements than respondents.

A further limitation of the study may have come about because the parameters within which policymakers were directed to construct their conceptualization of democratic citizenship was limited by having to use only those behaviors and characteristics that were identified and described by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) in *What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy*.

**Delimitations**

The research study was conducted by using a combination of three different research methodologies: 1) Q-methodology, which has features of both quantitative and qualitative research, 2) qualitative inquiry situated in the interpretivist paradigm, and 3) quantitative methodology using three Likert-scale questions. The study was descriptive survey research, and was designed to explore study participants’ perspectives and ideas about democratic citizenship. Study participants were comprised of members of the Ohio Senate and Ohio House of Representatives as well as Ohio’s State Board of Education.
Policymakers’ conceptualizations of democratic citizenship were explored and described as were their views about the extent to which state accountability measures, academic content standards, and P-12 classroom learning experiences should align with and/or include the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. As the study also sought to understand policymakers’ reasons for ranking the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship as they did, descriptions of their qualitative comments was also collected.

The study was constructed within and confined to the framework of democratic citizenship as identified by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) in “What Kind of Citizen: Educating for Democracy”, a study on P-12 education and democratic citizenship.

The following explanations represent further delimitations of the study.

1. The study focused only on state-level policymakers in the Ohio General Assembly and State Board of Education. Participants were limited to the Ohio Senate, the Ohio House of Representatives, and members of Ohio’s State Board of Education, both elected and appointed, who held office at the time of the study. Office holders considered current at the time of the study included those who a) began his/her term in January 2009, b) were continuing a term that commenced prior to the general election in November 2008, c) were completing a partial term in a seat to which they were appointed, or d) had been appointed to a seat by the current Governor or his predecessor.

---

6 Eight of 19 members of the State Board of Education are appointed by the Governor who is in office at the time of appointment. All appointed seats are “at-large” and all such State Board members have the identical voting rights as the members who are elected from the 11 legislative districts. All appointments are made for full terms of three years. Terms run on a calendar year from January to December.
2. A survey questionnaire was used as the lone instrument of data collection. An assumption was made that it was possible to prioritize the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship identified by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) and that their relationship to democratic citizenship would be reasonably evident to the subjects. It was also assumed that the questionnaire statements were clear and easy to understand and that the questionnaire was a length commensurate with the phenomenon of democratic citizenship.

3. It was assumed that Ohio state-level policymakers’ views on democratic citizenship were sufficiently static to be captured at one moment in time. As a result, the researcher sought to collect data from the subjects only once and assumed that the data provided by the subjects (state-level policymakers) were indicative of their true views on democratic citizenship.

4. It was assumed that the study’s participants were familiar with the phenomenon of democratic citizenship, the Ohio Achievement Test (OAT), the subject areas that it is designed to measure as well as its component parts and the Ohio Academic Content Standards (OAC).

5. While this study of democratic citizenship could have included an exploration of policymakers’ conceptualization of democracy as well, it did not.
Chapter 2  
Review of the Literature  

Democracy, Its Forms, and Criteria  

There are as many definitions of democracy as there are countries, city states, and civilizations that have practiced it as a form of government over the centuries. Cited by Elshtain (1995), Pericles (447), Athenian general and chosen leader of the City State credited with propelling Athens into a democratic form of government, presented an indepth definition of democracy. He remarked that:

“Our constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people. When it is a question of settling private disputes everyone is equal before the law; when it is a question of putting one person before another in positions of public responsibility, what counts is not membership of a particular class, but the actual ability which the man possesses.

Regardless of Athens’ participatory form of democracy, however, the primary method of selecting most Athenian public officials was through a lottery, which Dahl (1998) notes still gave each eligible citizen an equal chance to be chosen to serve in the Assembly at least once in his lifetime via random selection. While it can be implied that the Athenian system of electing representatives was fair in that each man had as equal a chance as any other to be selected for service, it is still clear that the process failed to
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embrace other key democratic principles, such as the use of popular vote to select those who governed.

Rome, on the other hand, was a representative form of democracy where participation in governance occurred through the election of representatives to a central legislative body. The questionable aspect of Roman democracy lay in the limitations of citizens who were eligible to represent the public. Where originally the upper class alone was permitted to be elected to the Senate, male citizens from other social strata eventually became eligible, ensuring a more comprehensive representation of Roman citizens in the legislature.

Dahl (1998) would likely see the restriction from public service based on social class as a failure to ensure effective participation of all citizens as well as their equality in voting, both of which he cites as part of five criteria essential to the democratic process. According to Dahl (1998), prior to policies being adopted, all members must have equal and effective opportunities for making their views known to others as to what the policy should be. Gutmann (1987) refers to this process as deliberation, where all members of the society or organization have equal opportunity to persuade others to their point of view before voting takes place. Implied further in both Gutmann’s and Dahl’s arguments is the need for enlightened understanding of those citizens who will deliberate. Without general knowledge plus an understanding of the issues, no individual can share his perspectives, evaluate the consequences of accepting or rejecting legislation, or try to persuade others to his/her point of view. In addition, enlightened understanding of the issues and processes also ensures that participants understand the importance of
controlling the agenda, which Dahl (1998) also cites as a key criterion in the democratic process. If only select segments of the population, understand that there is an agenda, know how to control it and which issues are or should be included in it, then they will be the ones who have the opportunity to deliberate. Consequently, it could be concluded that ignorance or a lack of awareness of the political process stymies democracy by eliminating the political participation of all eligible members of the community, a practice described by Jefferson (1787, 1813) as a certain pathway to tyranny.

More modern views of democracy, such as that of James Madison (1788), define democracy along the same lines. Both Madison (1788) and Jefferson (1781, 1782, & 1787) emphasize the overarching principle that power in a democracy must rest with the people and that without popular power, the governance will almost certainly return to autocratic rule. Madison writes:

If we resort for a criterion ‘to the different principles on which different forms of government are established, we may define a republic to be ... -a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people’; and is administered by persons holding their offices during ‘-pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior. It is essential to such a government that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable-proportion of it, or a favored class of it.” (1788)

Jefferson (1787) concurred with Madison (1788), and advocated that all men not only should, but had the right to control the government under which they lived. He argued that the people must have a voice in the laws and policies that they were to obey, and that anything less was tantamount to tyranny.

Like the French philosopher Rousseau in certain respects, Jefferson, too, was a proponent of majority rule, to which Dahl’s (1998) criterion of voting equality alludes.
In other words, Jefferson argued that as a clear majority of votes are cast by eligible voters, their decision must and will be honored by the government and its outcome cannot and should not be overridden. If it is, then the process fails to be democratic, leaving, what Jefferson (1788) identified as a road to the peril of absolute rule.

In his 1949 inaugural address, Truman stated that democracy is based on the conviction that man has along with his intellectual capacity, an inalienable right to govern himself with reason and fairness. Echoing the beliefs and ideas of 18th century philosopher Rousseau, Truman added that democracy maintains that government is established for the benefit of the individual and is charged with the responsibility of protecting the rights of that individual and his freedom to exercise of those abilities. Kennon (1995) sees no accident in the alignment between the visions of Rousseau and Truman who lived in very different societies and in time periods that were nearly two hundred years apart. Kennon (1995) holds that regardless of the lapse of nearly two hundred fifty years, most people in the developed world today would likely define or identify democracy in a manner that would still be recognizable to the framers of the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Declaration of Independence from 1776. Kennon (1995) continues:

“Such a definition would be based on the election of representatives, under broad suffrage, to make laws and carry out policy. It would also include some guarantee of “natural rights” (essential beyond the reach of the democratic process) to protect unpopular individuals and groups.”

What seems to be the consensus concerning democracy is that regardless of societal changes and social sensibilities across the centuries, most people who have lived in a
democratic society agree on a) certain characteristics of democracy, b) what is required to sustain it, i.e. participation and an educated citizenry, and c) that failure to meet its essential criteria will likely lead to authoritarian rule.

**Democracy and Education**

In his explanation of democracy, Dahl (1998) identifies five criteria which he sees essential to the democratic process: effective participation, voting equality, enlightened understanding, control of the agenda, and the inclusion of all adults. As he observes, these five criteria are the cornerstones of democracy and the democratic process, ensuring that decision- and policymaking rest on the opportunity for participation of the full membership of the society or association. Further, governance that involves its members on such a basic level, creates a situation of reciprocal reliance where each member must depend upon the others to make decisions of governance, finance, health, and education among other issues, each of which will contain a certain level of personal impact (Dewey 1916; Dahl 1998). That is to say that decisions concerning governance, finance, health, and education are all made for the good of society or, as described by Rousseau (1755), for the common good.

Because these issues will likely entail the establishment of regulations and guidelines surrounding taxes, standards of health and safety, and standards and regulations for schooling, each area has a direct impact on each and every individual citizen. The policies agreed on, the bonds and levies adopted will have an effect on every individual who is a member of the organization or the society (Edmundson, 1997).
Although it may mean an increased financial burden for some, it may for others, be only a minor inconvenience. However, to all members, the adoption of policies, bonds, and levies can also mean improved services, better standards of living with which to attract new families and businesses to the community and also to better schools. In short, such important decision-making can lead to an improved community or to a community that is allowed to stagnate or a community which permits some of its members to prosper while others are left in a downward spiral without options.

What Dahl (1998) suggests here is that if the democratic process is to run according to its intent, which is to involve all members of the society, association, or organization in decision- and policymaking, and if all members will feel the effects of those decisions, both collectively and individually, then it is imperative that all members of the society be educated to be able to participate fully and with enlightened understanding in the democratic process, including deliberations, the analysis of issues, options, and consequences of outcomes, and bringing pertinent issues to the agenda.

Gutmann (1987) refers to such equality of educational opportunities as nondiscrimination where it is required that “all educable children be educated adequately to participate as citizens in shaping the future of their society”. Further, she adds, the participation of these same children as adults will continue to form educational opportunities of the next generation in regards to nondiscrimination. While it would seem from Gutmann’s comments that nondiscrimination in education must be an American value that is held in high esteem, it is more the idea that through nondiscrimination the largest possible segment of the school-age population will have the
opportunity for quality education. The outcome of this opportunity will, in turn, lead them to be better decision makers and better able to question and consider the consequences of and the extent to which they are equitable and/or serve each member equally, and are in the best interest of the community, the country, and the society as a whole.

That adults who experienced the inequality of educational opportunities as children will be less able to govern through informed decision-making is almost certain. Beyond that, however, these same adults will also be seen as less trustworthy, less deserving of being included in the process. For who among us is willing to turn over critical decision-making affecting daily life to those whose literacy skills are slender and, who, as a result, did not have the opportunity to develop critical thinking, reasoning, or connection-making skills? These are all key to effective participation. An effective participation is key to a functioning democracy. Is it likely, then, that if a democratic society fails to offer an education which will ensure that all of its citizens meet or exceed their learning potential, that the society will cease being democratic? Will it begin to drift, slowly and deliberately, to an oligarchic governance system where the few (the educated) lord over the many (the under- and uneducated)? Inferring from Dahl (1998), Gutmann (1987), and Chomsky (2001), the likely answer is yes.

Through criterion number four, controlling the agenda, Dahl (1998) points out that all participants, all members must have the right and opportunity to decide what is to be placed on the agenda. Those participants or members whose primary education did see discrimination and would therefore not have been considered high quality, would be
far less apt to a) know that there is an agenda or b) how to ensure that matters of importance to them and others of similar backgrounds are placed on the agenda to be addressed by the society as a whole. While these same members may not be prevented from participation in the form of equal voting, their input may still been lessened because of their lack of access to the agenda as well as their lack of the critical thinking and analytical skills required to engage actively and effectively in political discourse.

Such political disparity, of course, invites every non-democratic faction to step into the void and wrest control so that governance becomes the rightful business of those who have been well educated. And, as the well-educated have been described here as the privileged who have social and cultural capital, the business of governance, then, soon becomes the business of the elite instead of the business of the people at-large.

The most dangerous aspect of this scenario is its insidiousness. While there is the appearance of correctness, even responsibility, that those with more education should govern those with less, it is the fact that such practice is born from discrimination and gate-keeping in the equality of educational opportunities that goes against the grain of democracy. Such approaches lead to a conscious transmission of social and cultural capital, but the transmission is only hereditary, with no opportunities for those outside the bloodline to gain entrance to the pathways to education. Such practices make it clear to everyone from childhood through adulthood that those citizens without certain knowledge, skills, common dispositions, and credentials who did experience an inequality of educational opportunities are doomed to be governed by others.
Likewise, citizens who support full participation in the quest for balance and enlightened understanding, also fall prey to those in favor of governance outside the confines of democracy. Unequal education leads to unequal governance and, according to Jefferson (1787) invites the opportunity for every kind of tyranny. As Dahl (1998) states, “the principle of political equality assumes that ... members are all equally well qualified to participate in decisions provided they have adequate opportunities to learn about matters ... by inquiry, discussion, and deliberation”. This raises the question, of course, as to how citizens are able to make inquiries, discuss the issues, and deliberate alternatives and consequences if they have never had an education that included such skills? Education is the foundation of a democracy (Jefferson 1787, Dewey 1916). If it is undemocratic or has undemocratic aims at its core, the process will soon be manipulated and the community’s democratic principles will be lost.

Labaree (1997) contends that schooling for democratic equality is essential to the health and longevity of a democratic society in that it is dedicated to preparing all school-age children for the responsibilities of citizenship, including voting, policy input, and the general upkeep of the community. However, as Labaree points out, schooling for democratic equality is not committed solely to educating all citizens for reasons of participation alone. He observes that without social equality, political equality will quickly tilt out of balance and likely spiral into despotism or tyranny, as also suggested by de Tocqueville in Democracy in America (in Blits, 1997) and Jefferson in Democracy (1813) and also as the author of the Declaration of Independence (1776). In order to maintain balance in governance and political equality, certain social equality must be
promoted through schooling and P-12 education. If schools become arenas for conscious reproduction of privilege and advantage for the elite few, it is to the peril of the democratic society as a whole. As the cycle will almost undoubtedly repeat itself, within subsequent generations, democratic structures and governance of full participation where all adult members vote and have input, the opportunity for deliberations and control of the agenda will have been rendered into the hands of a slender segment of the adult population. Consequently, it appears as if much of the health and well being of democracy rests on the equality of educational opportunities. Perhaps it is as de Tocqueville (1835, 1840) states, “‘it is the first duty of democratic leaders to educate democracy’”.

**Democracy and Responsibility**

Rousseau held that the best part of an individual’s education was that which came from experience. Of primary importance to him was the development of independent ideas, those that are worked out for personal purposes, addressing the need for individuals to make sense of the world in their own special way. Rousseau held that it was critical to learn reasoning and analytical skills so they may be applied in life situations for autonomous decision-making. Further, he argued, individuals should be encouraged to reason their way through to the conclusions that they draw and not rely on the authority of a teachers. Similar to some of the notions raised by Chomsky (2000) about the purposes of education and learning, Rousseau advocated that individuals must rely on their own ideas to avoid the inculcation and influence of other people’s ideas, which he identified as a particularly typical occurrence among teachers and students.
In his novel, *Émile* (1762), Rousseau’s main character of the same name has the opportunity to learn lessons and draw important conclusions from his personal experiences. One such situation arises when Émile intentionally breaks a window and then finds that he must endure the cold that comes into the room because no one magically appears to replace the glass. While the immediate lesson to be learned here concerned the need to preserve shelter against the elements, the larger issue addressed the consequences of [impetuous] behaviors when the outcomes are not fully considered in advance. Rousseau may also be commenting on the often made assumptions that restitution and/or the repair of problems or damages is the responsibility of someone else. Rousseau’s message appears to be that individuals like Émile must take responsibility for themselves, implying that individual citizens must take responsibility for their own governance. Dig a little deeper, however, and the educational lesson that Rousseau puts forth also includes his belief that experience is often a greater teacher than those who appear in the formal classroom. In effect, Rousseau’s very idea about experiential learning could be said to be the foundation of what is seen in today’s classroom as well as what Dewey (1916) identified as *discovery learning*. It was independent thinking that Rousseau valued above all else and saw as the most critical part of an individual’s education. This, he argued, was not to be gained from formal instruction where the curriculum rested on books and theory.

Along with the importance that Rousseau placed on the development of independent thinking, he also emphasized the importance of an individual’s duty. He asserted that from the first moments of life, man should begin learning to *deserve to live*. 
From the instant of birth, he held, citizens in a democratic society exercise the rights of citizenship. Consequently, he argued, from that same instant, man should begin to exercise his duty. To that end, Rousseau believed that just as reason should not be left to be the sole impetus behind man meeting his obligations to society and to himself, the government should not leave the education of youth (sons) to the whims, prejudices, and intelligence of the parents (fathers). Ultimately, Rousseau argued, the death of the father leaves the son with an incomplete education, which in turn deprives the student of a full education. The full ramification of this will eventually be felt by the State in that individuals with such an education, incomplete, biased, and/or inadequate, will not be able to reason, analyze, or to apply life experiences to the decision-making required of citizens in a democratic society.

Perhaps Rousseau’s emphasis on independent thinking and the need for each citizen to receive a full education is directly related to his belief that the goal of government must be to secure freedom, equality, and justice for everyone within the State. If, as Jefferson believed, a fair and just government can be sustained only if its power is placed in the hands of the people, then Rousseau’s urgency for a complete education can surely be understood. Further, his preference for experiential learning over formal, structured education where there is less opportunity to apply personal experience to lessons and decision-making practices can also be seen more clearly. What remains unanswered, however, is the meaning behind Rousseau’s statement that a man should be educated for himself instead of for others (public) as the development of individual nature can conflict with “public” development of citizens (1755). Following this line of
thinking, it would seem as if the intent of education should be for self before society. Rousseau strongly advocated for independent thinking and a complete education of youth that comes from both the parent and the State, the argument being that it was for the good of society to have a citizenry that was fully educated and therefore able to reason. To say that man should not be educated for the public and the good of society, then, seems to be a contradiction of all that was stated before. It leaves the reader wondering if Rousseau actually saw education as critical to the well-being of the state as did others who warned of the dangers of an uneducated public under the rule of a non-democratic government.

Partly in answer to the criticism that ordinary men could not govern themselves, Jefferson (1781, 1782) called for popular education, and declared it to be one of the most basic and urgent needs of a democratic society. He ascribed tyranny to ignorance and concluded that wherever ignorance was, freedom was not. Jefferson called for increased learning opportunities for all men in the society or a general diffusion of education. At its core, Jefferson’s proposed Constitutional amendment was to address the issues of numeracy and literacy, skills and knowledge, which he considered to be essential both to the particular prosperity of individual citizens as well as the public good as a whole. His ideas were predicated on ensuring that the best and brightest students in the counties and other districts were identified and provided with the opportunity for free, publicly funded further education in district schools in order for them to gain the advantage of reading, writing, and analytical skills.

Essentially, Jefferson’s intent was this: to capture the most talented and most intelligent students and future participants in the democratic process from all
backgrounds (social classes). They would be prepared to meet head on the competition for influence that had emanated from the privileged classes as a result of the social and cultural capital that was reproduced via education. Jefferson maintained that such education would open new doors and pathways to prosperity to individuals (men) from all social strata. Further, he held that increased educational opportunity was in the best interest of the country in that it supported the intellectual development of citizens from multiple socioeconomic levels and thus encouraged their participation in the new democratic society.

From Dahl’s (1997) perspective, Jefferson’s proposal on education would likely have meant that non-aristocratic men would have been able to access and influence the agenda for the first time. Perhaps it also meant that the less than privileged realized for the first time that an agenda even existed and that they had a right to be included in deciding what was to be placed on it. In expressing his belief that a general education made widely available to the public-at-large was all for the common good, Jefferson (1813) remarked “I have great hope that some patriotic spirit will ... call it [education] up, and make it the keystone of the arch of our government”. Jefferson’s comment leaves little doubt about how deeply he held that education was the one element without which the fledgling American or any democracy could survive.

Although Jefferson himself was a learned man and understood the notion of education for education’s sake, his primary interest in advocating for a general diffusion of education was as a safeguard against authoritarian forms of government (Padover, 1939). He argued that all governments degenerate when there is a lone ruler, and
asserted that into the hands of the people was the only safe place to put governmental power. Ultimately, he saw that the people themselves in control of their own government were the best defense against autocratic rule. To that end, Jefferson advocated for increased educational opportunities with which to “improve their minds”, their minds belonging to White male, American citizens. It was out of this belief that Jefferson called for a Constitutional amendment to advocate for mandatory, public education. Public education would, in turn, better prepare individuals to influence government, which was something Jefferson believed must be shared among all eligible citizens in a democratic society. He argued that his proposed amendment for mandatory public education was the most important aspect of the Constitution because it was the only true way to freedom and happiness. Above all, he noted, a people who are well-informed can be trusted with their own government. Jefferson also asserted that in order to lead the nation and society to an advantageous position, critical issues must be understood by those in positions of policymaking. Further, he held, it was not enough solely to understand the issues, but the consequences of any actions that were to be taken as well. Reasoning, analysis, and critical thinking, he argued, were the keys to rational decision-making. Decision-making must always be rational, not emotional.

Jefferson also advocated for education to be widely available as a weapon against ignorance, which to his thinking, always led to subjugation or the loss of autonomy. In addition to his belief in analysis and reason, he insisted that the people must be responsible for keeping current on political, societal, and economic events, along with government plans and policies. Unquestionably, these requirements could not be met
without literacy and the ability to understand oral intelligence and discern and challenge governmental discrepancies, contradictions, and lies. And although he saw a free press as the key to popular knowledge and information, he still held that without formal education of which literacy was a substantial part, the impact of a free press would be weakened considerably. Consequently, Jefferson’s view remained that the better educated and more literate the citizenry, the better and more stable the society was as a whole. Democracy would find increasing safety, while the risk of oppression, despotism, and tyranny would be significantly reduced. Above all, citizens would retain their self-directed freedom and moral independence.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Research Design

The study was designed as descriptive survey research, and was three-fold in nature as was the questionnaire used for data collection. The overarching purpose of this research study was to investigate Ohio state-level policymakers’ conceptualizations of democratic citizenship. Further purposes of the study were to a) understand policymakers’ reasons for ranking the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship as they did, and b) investigate the extent to which policymakers believed that state education policy governing accountability, standards, and classroom practices should be aligned with and/or inclusive of the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. A final purpose of the study was to inform state education policy.

The specific questions that guided the research were as follows:

1. How do Ohio state-level policymakers conceptualize democratic citizenship?
2. What compels Ohio state-level policymakers to rank some behaviors and characteristics higher than others in terms of their importance to democratic citizenship?
3. What compels Ohio state-level policymakers to rank some behaviors and characteristics lower than others in terms of their importance to democratic citizenship?
4. To what extent do Ohio state-level policymakers believe that the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship should be aligned with Ohio’s education policies governing accountability, content standards, and student learning experiences?

Methodologies

Methodology I: Q-Methodology

One of three methodologies used to conduct the study was Q-methodology. Q-methodology has been described by McKeown and Thomas (1988) as a “complete and distinctive approach with its own principles for analyzing human behavior”. Durning and Osuna (1994) referred to Q-methodology as unique because of its ability to provide “procedures for the empirical study of subjectivity”, which sets it apart from more traditional methods, such as R or ipsative measurements. In Political Subjectivity (1980), Brown explained Q-methodology as follows:

“a modified rank-ordering procedure in which stimuli are placed in an order that is significant from the standpoint of a person operating under specified conditions (p. 195).

Robinson (2007) described Q-methodology as a practical and engaging methodology for the scientific study of subjectivity. Citing Brown (2008) and Stainton-Rogers (2004), Ramlo (2009) contended that Q-methodology is a set of procedures, theory, and philosophy that focuses on the study of subjectivity. Traditionally, subjectivity has been typically associated with qualitative research, while objectivity has been linked with quantitative research. Because it is a combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods, Q-methodology serves to facilitate the interpretation of
individual people’s viewpoints, opinions, ideas, values, attitudes, and beliefs (Robinson, 2007) by means of the sorting process that is central to the methodology.

McKeown and Thomas (1988) noted that Q-methodology studies “adhere to the methodological axiom that “subjectivity is always self-referent”. One outcome of this circumstance is that Q is often confused with ipsative measurement (Block, 1978; Cattell, 1944) and the two are frequently considered synonymous with each other. However, where ipsative measurement is concerned with a pattern of scores in objective cases and, therefore, lacks the ability to measure subjectivity, Q-methodology’s purpose is subjectivity by enabling the person to represent his or her vantage point for purposes of holding it constant for inspection and comparison (Brown, 1980, p. 174; Brown, 1993). In short, Q-methodology does not measure variables, it measures states of mind (Brown, 1993). It is a highly person-centered methodology that minimizes researcher bias. Because of this and its ability to explore the subject, Q-methodology is seen as “useful in the attitudinal, value, and evaluative based components of research where an intense personal perspective is required” (Robinson, 2007).

Q-methodology is typically conducted by presenting study participants (the P-set) with a set of cards, statements, or items (the Q-sample or Q-set) to arrange in a rank order that is determined solely by each respondent. This rank ordering process is known as a Q-sort. The order in which the respondents place the cards, statements, or items

---

7 Denotes that study participants in a Q-methodology study are referred to as the P-set
8 The composition of a Q-sample or Q-set is not restricted to the written word that is given to study participants in hard copy form. Example items that could constitute a Q-sample are pictures, smells, samples of music, websites, and/or colors.
reflects the importance that he/she attributes to them relative to a given phenomenon. In other words, the rank ordering is the respondents’ expression of their subjectivity on the phenomenon, topic, or issue under consideration.

The Q-sample of cards, statements, or items that the participants are given to place in rank order may have been developed for a previous study or taken from an already existing framework (Block, 1978; McKeown and Thomas, 1988; Bracken & Fischel, 2006). McKeown and Thomas referred to this type of Q-sample as a “ready-made sample”. Alternatively, cards, statements, or items may be generated by respondents who have a background or practical or professional experience and/or knowledge about a phenomenon that the researcher wishes to investigate (Daniel, 2000; van Exel, 2005; Bracken, et al., 2006). McKeown and Thomas (1988) call this a naturalistic [Q-]sample. In this scenario, the researcher convenes participants in order to, pose questions to them, interview them, or conduct focus group sessions revolving around a given phenomenon or construct. Participants’ responses to the questions and/or comments during the discussions are collected and recorded by the researcher. Prominent and/or recurring themes are extracted by the researcher and are, ultimately, checked by the participants for accuracy and omissions. In the end, these statements and/or items are used to construct the Q-sample, which is the pool of cards, statements, or items to be arranged in rank order (Exel, 2005; Bracken and Fischel, 2006). The process of gathering input from participants in the form of opinions, attitudes, viewpoints, or beliefs on a given subject of interest to the researcher is referred to as a concourse. During the Q-sort process, all items that have been included in the Q-sample must be
ranked, ranked individually, and ranked only once. In addition, all items must be ranked most or least, highest or lowest, so no item in the Q-set\(^9\) can be omitted.

Citing Thompson (1981), Carr (1992) noted that there are alternative strategies for data collection in Q-methodology studies and that data collection need not be bound to cards, statements, and items alone. One strategy suggested by Carr (1992) was the use of unmarked graphic scales in collecting data in a Q-methodology study\(^{10}\). According to Carr (1992), an unmarked graphic scale is a line drawn between two polar opposites on a continuum, where polar opposites might be strongly disagree and strongly agree, for example. In this data collection strategy, individual study participants respond to questionnaire items by marking the scale where they think individual items should fall. Participants judge each questionnaire item relative to a given phenomenon, such as democratic citizenship. Once all members of the P-set have indicated where they think individual questionnaire items should fall on the continuum, the researcher can then observe the rank order of the items to get the rank order scores for each item for each participant.

The Westheimer and Kahne (2004) framework that delineated three different types of democratic citizenship\(^{11}\) was used as the source from which the Q-sample of 18 statements about the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship for this study were constructed. A Q-set is comprised of the total cards, statements, or items that are

---

\(^9\) Denotes that Q-set is used interchangeably with Q-sample throughout the study

\(^{10}\) Unmarked graphic scales are mentioned here as an alternative strategy only. This method of data collection was not used in this study.

\(^{11}\) In “What Kind of Citizen: Educating for Democracy”, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) identified three types of democratic citizenship: Personally Responsible Citizenship, Participatory Citizenship, and Justice-Oriented Citizenship. The three types represent a range on a continuum from the least proactive to the most proactive. All three overlap.
presented to respondents for manipulation (Block 1978). In the case of this research study, manipulation consisted of rank ordering the 18 statements by writing the number of one of the 18 statements in each of the 18 boxes provided in a continuum. The position of each of the boxes represented a respondent’s viewpoint of the importance of a given behavior or characteristic relative to other behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

As with the Q-set in this study, many Q-set items are particular to the focus of the investigation being undertaken. Q-sets are often named to reflect the phenomenon, construct, or other pertinent aspect of the inquiry, such as the location, the content, or the population of the study (Block, 1978; Bracken and Fischel 2006). As it investigated policymakers’ conceptualization of democratic citizenship, this Q-set was referred to as the Democratic Citizenship Q-set or DC Q-set.

Citing Brown (1974b), Baas and Brown (1973), and Lasswell (1938), McKeown and Thomas (1988) noted that Q-methodology prefers small sample sizes and single case studies to the large numbers of study participants that are typically seen in quantitative research. This inclination is largely due to its intensive orientation (Brown, 1974b; Baas and Brown, 1973; Lasswell, 1938), which may be the result of its hybrid nature that has features of both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Sample sizes in Q-methodology can be as small as a single participant to be studied in a case study of one, where the data are collected from the lone participant at a set number of intervals as opposed to a single moment in time.
The results of studies using Q-methodology pertain only to the participants of the study who provide usable data to the researcher. Results are not generalizable even to those who were selected as part of the sample, but who failed to respond with usable data.

Methodology II: Qualitative Inquiry

The second methodology used in this study was qualitative inquiry. The focus of qualitative research is on understanding the person or phenomenon being studied. In the case of this study, it was used as a vehicle through which to search for meanings and to try to understand the interpretations, nuances, and meanings that a given individual places on an event, a situation, a behavior, or other people (Patten, 2007). Qualitative research is predicated on the assumption that reality is subjective and is, therefore, dependent on context.

Qualitative research is an umbrella term under which there are many methods and approaches (Patten, 2007). In this case, the qualitative portion of the study was phenomenological in nature and was conducted from the perspective of the interpretivist paradigm. (Patten, 2007) identified phenomenology as the philosophical basis for all qualitative research. Further, and like Q-methodology, the study of subjectivity is at its core, adhering to the idea that subjectivity is essential in order to understand deeply.

Lester (1999) stated that the purpose of phenomenology is to identify how people perceive phenomena in a given situation and to understand the multiple ways in which they experience and interpret events, situations, other people, or social constructs. According to Lester (1999), a phenomenological approach to a qualitative study is based
in a paradigm of personal knowledge and subjectivity and emphasizes the importance of personal perspective and interpretation. The underlying assumption is that people experience and interpret the same event, situation, or phenomenon in many different ways. It is the discrete meaning of a phenomenon for each individual that constitutes their reality (Patten, 2007).

As the intent of this study was to explore and describe policymakers' conceptualizations of the phenomenon of democratic citizenship, it was determined that a phenomenological approach to the qualitative inquiry was the most appropriate. The researcher also determined that conducting the qualitative inquiry through an interpretivist lens was the most appropriate in terms of attempting to understand the disparate viewpoints about the phenomenon of democratic citizenship. It was also deemed appropriate because interpretivism “is also about contextualized meaning” (Greene, 1994) and subjectivity in the same way that Q-methodology is. Q-methodology was the methodology used in the first section of the research study.

In the case of this study, conducting inquiries from the interpretivist paradigm afforded the researcher the opportunity to explore and understand the reasons that compelled individual policymakers to rank the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship as they did in the Q-methodology portion of the survey questionnaire. Proceeding in this manner was designed to help identify and understand the interpretation of citizenship as defined by the 20 policymakers (study participants). It also provided a glimpse into how policymakers experienced democratic citizenship,
which, in turn, colored and informed the reality or their own versions of the phenomenon in question. As stated by Barone (1992b),

“‘Reality’ resides neither with an objective external world nor with the subjective mind of the knower, but within dynamic transactions between the two” (p. 31).

Finally, situating this aspect of the investigation in the interpretivist paradigm afforded the researcher the opportunity to discern collective thinking of the participants in the sample. As a result, the researcher was able to try to understand both a collective and individual view of democratic citizenship as well as why specific behaviors and characteristics are seen as either critical to it or have little or no bearing on it at all. In addition, the researcher believed that trying to understand study participants’ experiences and interpretations of the phenomenon under consideration in the qualitative portion of the study would add depth to the exploration initiated in the Q-methodology section where participants were asked to rank order the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship from most important to least important.

To conduct a qualitative inquiry in this study, each participant was asked to review the behaviors and characteristics that they had ranked as most and least important in the first section of the survey. They were then asked to explain why they had ranked certain behaviors and characteristics in the top three and bottom three positions of the continuum. The respective positions on the continuum represented the importance that was accorded to each of the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. Although using the interpretivist paradigm to understand participants’ thinking about a phenomenon or the way in which they experience it clearly adds depth to a study, it also
serves to supplement participant responses that may emerge during the interview or group discussion phase of concourse construction. However, as this study grew out of an existing framework that was developed by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) in their article “What Kind of Citizen?: Educating for Democracy”, the need for a concourse was eliminated. Consequently, the qualitative inquiry part of this study provided a mechanism through which participants could extend their discussion about democratic citizenship and an opportunity for open response where they were free to offer as much detail as they desired about their ideas, beliefs, and perspectives about and/or experiences with democratic citizenship.

Methodology III: Quantitative Investigation

The third and final methodology used in this study was quantitative and was carried out through the use of three Likert-scale questions addressing areas of state education policy governing accountability, standards, and classroom practices respectively.

The primary intent of the quantitative investigation was to explore and describe the extent to which policymakers disagreed or agreed that state education policy governing accountability and standards should be aligned with the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. This same section also sought to explore and describe the extent to which policymakers agreed or disagreed that state education policy should mandate certain classroom practices designed to provide to students the
opportunity to practice and develop the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

**Study Participants and the Sampling Plan**

As discussed earlier in this chapter, the overarching goal of this research study was to explore and describe Ohio state-level policymakers’ conceptualization of democratic citizenship. The study itself was three-fold in nature and also sought to understand policymakers’ reasons for ranking the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship as they did. An additional intent was to explore and describe the extent to which policymakers agreed or disagreed that state education policy governing accountability, standards, and classroom practices should be aligned with and/or inclusive of the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

Given the phenomenon of the investigation, the researcher determined that the appropriate populations to be studied would be members of Ohio’s state-level policy bodies: the Ohio General Assembly and Ohio's State Board of Education. Both Houses of the General Assembly, the Ohio Senate and the Ohio House of Representatives, were included in the study and were investigated as independent policy bodies. The members of the General Assembly and State Board of Education were selected as the participants of the study because of the roles they play as those who craft, draft, and set state education policy, and/or the Ohio Revised Code (ORC) and the Ohio Administrative Code (OAC). State law, through both the Ohio Revised and Administrative Codes, governs state accountability measures for P-12 education, such as Ohio’s current
assessment of student achievement, the Ohio Achievement Test (OAT), state-level education benchmarks, and state-level P-12 curriculum guidelines and standards, such as the Ohio Academic Content Standards (OAC).

Respondents from the Ohio General Assembly were identified through the respective internet websites of the Ohio Senate (www.senate.state.oh.us) and the Ohio House of Representatives (www.house.state.oh.us). Members of the State Board of Education were identified through the internet website of the Ohio Department of Education (www.ode.state.oh.us), Office of Board Relations. To ensure that no policymaker was listed more than once, the two websites belonging to the Ohio Senate and the House of Representatives along with the Board Relations link of the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) were checked and reviewed for duplicate listings. No policymaker was found to be listed in more than one policy body.

A census of each of the three policy bodies was deemed to be an appropriate sample for this study, even though bills, rules, and changes to the Ohio Revised Code (ORC) or Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) are crafted and introduced by individual or small coalitions of Senators, Representatives, and/or Board Members. Further, in both the Ohio Senate and Ohio House of Representatives, each member is ultimately required to accept or reject legislation that has been introduced, passed through Conference Committee, and brought to the floor for a vote to become public law or part of the ORC or OAC. Members of the State Board of Education, both elected and appointed, are also required to cast votes to add, repeal, or amend rules and regulations that govern teacher education, teacher licensure, and the professional development of in-service teachers,
school operating standards, and student services, among other areas of P-12 public education in the State of Ohio.

As previously stated, the researcher determined that a census was the most appropriate sampling plan for her research study due to the study’s focus and the legislative process of the State of Ohio. However, as also stated earlier, Q-methodology, which was one of three methodologies used in the research study, does not accommodate large sample sizes. According to Brown (1991) and Robinson (2007), when using Q-methodology, larger sample sizes may become unwieldy and prevent the researcher from making a detailed inquiry into respondents’ subjectivity about the phenomenon in question. Keeping in mind both the sample size constraints and the need for balanced representation across the entire population of potential respondents from the Ohio General Assembly and the State Board of Education, the researcher opted to send out a survey questionnaire to all members of the three state-level policy bodies. At the time of the study, the combined population of the Ohio Senate, the Ohio House of Representatives, and the State Board of Education numbered 151 and members of each of the respective policy bodies were considered as potential respondents. In the end, the researcher determined that the 20 questionnaires providing usable data were appropriate for a Q-methodology study exploring individual policymakers’ views of democratic citizenship. All three state-level policy bodies were represented by the 20 participants in the data sample or 13.25 percent of the total population, as illustrated in Table 3.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Body</th>
<th>Population in Each Policy Body</th>
<th>Representation in the Study</th>
<th>Percentage of Representation in the Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Senate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio House of Representatives</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1  Breakdown of Ohio State-level Policymakers by Policy Body

The 20 participants who supplied usable data for the study were part of the original 151 state-level policymakers who received survey questionnaire packets from the researcher in June 2009. It should be noted that the researcher did receive 21 survey questionnaires all together. However, only 20 were completely filled out and provided usable data to the researcher. As a result, only those 20 questionnaires could be included in the data sample. It should also be noted that one individual in the data sample did fail to respond to the item in Section IV (Demographic Information) concerning Political Affiliation. Since survey questionnaires were confidential, it was not possible to identify and subsequently contact the participant to obtain this datum. Thus, it was treated as Missing/System in the summary of these demographic data.

A summary of the sampling plan that is described in the preceding paragraphs is illustrated in Figure 3.1.
Summary of the Sampling Plan

TARGET POPULATION / CENSUS SAMPLE

N = 151
All policymakers belonging to Ohio’s three state-level policy bodies\(^{12}\) who were sworn into office on or before January 5, 2009.

ACCESSIBLE POPULATION / ACCESSIBLE CENSUS SAMPLE

N = 151
All available members of Ohio’s three state-level policy bodies who were sworn into office on or before January 5, 2009.

ACCEPTING SAMPLE

n = 21
All members of Ohio’s three state-level policy bodies who responded to the survey on or before August 31, 2009.

DATA SAMPLE

n = 20
All members of Ohio’s three state-level policy bodies who supplied usable data for the research study.

Figure 3.1 Sampling Plan

---

\(^{12}\) Denotes that the phrase “state-level policymakers” refers to members of the Ohio Senate, the Ohio House of Representatives, and the State Board of Education.
Within the data sample of 20 respondents, the researcher was also able to ensure variance in each of the following categories:

- Gender
- Race/Ethnicity
- Level of education
- Policy Body Membership
- Political Affiliation

Tables 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, and 3.6 provide cumulative frequency distributions for each of the above mentioned categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Frequency Distribution of Respondent Demographic Factor of Gender
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White / non-Hispanic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial (two or more ethnicities)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Frequency Distribution of Respondent Demographic Factor of Race / Ethnicity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education / Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School: Grades 7-12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degree: JD, MD, DDS, &amp; DVM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD / EdD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Frequency Distribution of Respondent Demographic Factor of Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Body</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Senate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio House of Representatives</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5 Frequency Distribution of Respondent Demographic Factor of Policy Body of Membership
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Conservative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Liberal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing / System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6 Frequency Distribution of Respondent Demographic Factor of Political Affiliation

**Construction of the Instrument**

The survey questionnaire that was used in the research study consisted of four sections. There were 18 items in Section I (Q-methodology), two items in Section II (Qualitative Inquiry), three items in Section III (Quantitative Investigation), and five items seeking demographic information in Section IV.

Section I consisted of 18 statements about the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship (Westheimer and Kahne 2004) that respondents were asked to place in rank order (Table 3.7).
A Democratic Citizen:

- knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks
- organizes community efforts to care for those in need
- critically assesses social structures to see beyond the surface causes of social stratification
- seeks out and addresses areas of injustice
- volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis
- critically assesses political structures to see beyond the surface causes of political inequality
- knows about democratic social movements
- obeys laws
- critically assesses economic structures to see beyond the surface causes of economic disparity
- knows how government agencies work
- works and pays taxes
- is an active member of community organizations
- recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries
- organizes community efforts to clean up the environment
- actively participates in community improvement efforts
- knows how to effect systemic change
- organizes community efforts to promote economic development
- acts responsibly in his / her community

Table 3.7 The Behaviors and Characteristics of Democratic Citizenship (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004)
The respondents were to determine the order of the statements according to the importance they placed on the behaviors and characteristics of each relative to their conceptualization of democratic citizenship. Respondents were directed to rank all 18 statements in descending order. Statements describing a behavior or characteristic that respondents considered to be the most important to their idea of democratic citizenship were to be given the highest rankings and were ranked starting with 1, 2, 3, and so on. The values of the numbers increased as respondents worked their way toward identifying the behaviors and/or characteristics that they felt were least important to democratic citizenship. The three least important behaviors and characteristics were to be ranked 16, 17, 18 respectively with the absolute least important behavior or characteristic among all of the statements being ranked number 18.

Respondents were to continue ranking the statements in this manner until all 18 were placed in order according to the respondents' individual perspectives on democratic citizenship. All 18 statements were to be ranked individually and no two statements were to receive the same rank. The position of the box selected for each number represented the level of importance that the respondent gave to the statement that corresponded to the recorded number.

The top box in the continuum was designated for the number of the statement that the respondent identified as the behavior or characteristic that is most important to democratic citizenship. The bottom box was set aside for the number of the statement with the behavior or characteristic that the respondent believed to be the least important to democratic citizenship. As in all Q-sorts, the construction of the continuum was
contingent upon the number of statements in the Q-sample. In this case, the number of boxes in the continuum was 18.

The Qualitative Inquiry section contained two items. In this section of open ended response, the researcher sought qualitative information as she attempted to understand policymakers’ reasons for rank ordering the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship as they did. Participants were asked to return to Section I and the statements that they had identified as the three most and the three least important behaviors and/or characteristics of democratic citizenship. Respondents were then asked to consider the items that they had ranked in the top three positions in Section I and to articulate their reasons for identifying those items as the behaviors and characteristics that are most important to democratic citizenship. Respondents’ explanations for the reasons behind their rankings were to be recorded in the designated spaces on page six of the survey questionnaire.

On page seven of the survey questionnaire, respondents were asked to repeat the same process, but to articulate the reasons behind their selection of the three least important behaviors and/or characteristics of democratic citizenship. Respondents were directed to consider the items that they had ranked in the bottom three positions of the continuum on page five and then to discuss the reasons that prompted them to identify those three items as being the least important to democratic citizenship.

Respondents were to record their answers in the spaces provided on page seven of the survey questionnaire and were also encouraged to provide as much detail as possible for both parts of Section II (Qualitative Inquiry).
Section III (Quantitative Investigation) of the survey questionnaire contained three items, all of which were Likert-scale questions and quantitative in nature. Respondents were asked to respond to all three questions in Section III. Questions one and two revolved around the extent to which policymakers agreed or disagreed that Ohio’s state-mandated assessments of student achievement and state academic content standards respectively should be aligned with the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. Question three asked about the extent to which policymakers agreed or disagreed that state education policy mandating learning opportunities where students could practice and develop democratic citizenship should be included as part of daily classroom practice. Respondents were directed to respond to the questions using a six-point Likert-scale that was constructed as follows:

1 = very strongly disagree   4 = agree
2 = strongly disagree       5 = strongly agree
3 = disagree               6 = very strongly agree

Section IV (Demographic Information) asked the respondents for demographic information. Included in this section were questions and statements about each of the following: each policymaker’s gender, race/ethnicity, and level of education plus identification of the policy body in which he/she served at the time of the study. Respondents were also asked to identify their political affiliation. All five items were designed as short answer items, and were to be answered by checking the blank in front of the most appropriate of the options in the list provided.
Descriptors found in the race and ethnicity category were designed to mirror descriptors found on the official United States census form while response options in the level of education category were constructed from the standard education credentials in the United States ranging from the high school diploma through the terminal degree (PhD or EdD). The decision to include the gradation of “moderate” in question five (political affiliation) was made so respondents could better make a distinction between the extreme ends of political views, which were conservative and liberal, and the middle point of the continuum, which was independent.

Following Section IV (Demographic Information) and prior to the conclusion of the survey questionnaire, respondents were provided with an opportunity to add final comments, reactions, and reflections about democratic citizenship, its related behaviors and characteristics, the survey questionnaire itself, and/or any other aspect of the research study. All comments, reactions, and reflections were to be recorded in the box provided on page 10 of the survey questionnaire. This final comment box took up the majority of the page, but was preceded by the header: COMMENTS, REACTIONS AND REFLECTIONS, and directions.

The final page of the survey questionnaire, page 11, contained further directions for returning the instrument to the researcher. Respondents were asked to return their completed survey questionnaires to the researcher by using the pre-addressed, stamped envelope that was enclosed in the original packet that was sent or hand-delivered to each subject. The researcher's full address was also provided on page 11 in the box underneath the directions. A statement of gratitude was included on page 11 as well and
appeared underneath the box with directions for returning the survey questionnaire and the researcher's name and address.

A copy of the complete survey questionnaire is included in the Appendix A of this document.

Section I (Q-methodology) of the survey questionnaire was based on the framework found in “What Type of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy” by Westheimer and Kahne (2004). In their article, the researchers proposed the existence of three types of democratic citizens: the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen, and the justice-oriented citizen. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) suggested that each category of citizenship has specific criteria, along with certain representative behaviors and characteristics. Survey questionnaire items in Section I were constructed from the behaviors and characteristics found in the Westheimer and Kahne (2004) framework article. The researcher lifted them as they appeared in the article and then wrote them as the statements to be rank ordered that were used in the survey questionnaire.

In order to avoid the risk of influencing respondents as they sought to rank order the statements, the 18 items were numbered on individual slips of paper and placed in a basket. The researcher then blindly drew the item numbers one by one from the basket and used the order in which they were selected to construct their order in Section I (Q-methodology) of the survey questionnaire.

The design of the questionnaire was a 12 page booklet printed on professional grade paper and constructed from standard legal sized pages measuring 8 ½ inches wide.
by 14 inches long. Because the booklet was constructed from legal sized paper, the actual survey questionnaire booklet was larger than the standard sized booklet constructed from paper measuring 8½ inches wide by 11 inches long. The intent of using a larger paper size was to create a larger booklet with more space and a less cluttered appearance. This consideration was especially important due to the graphic representation of the continuum on page five that was required as part of the Q-methodology research design.

Page two of the questionnaire booklet contained a) a box of bulleted items explaining the purpose of the study, b) general instructions for the survey questionnaire, and c) a table of contents, which provided a list of all of the survey’s sections and corresponding titles. Page two also listed the estimated time that each respondent would need to complete the survey questionnaire: 20-25 minutes. Page three provided instructions for Section I: Ranking the Behaviors and Characteristics of Democratic Citizenship. Beneath the text directions on the upper one-third of the page, the researcher included a box with a disclaimer about the degree of difficulty of the rank ordering task. The box also contained three directives reminding the respondents to rank all statements individually, place only one number in each box of the continuum, and to rank each statement only once.

On the same page, the researcher also provided an example for the respondents to follow. An example of the type of statements that respondents would be asked to rank order appeared below the box with the three directives. Under the heading “EXAMPLES”, four statements were listed that were similar to those found in Section I
of the survey questionnaire. Further, an example of a continuum like the one on page five of the survey was also provided. The four example statements were dummy statements created by the researcher and were not part of the actual statements that came from the Westheimer and Kahne (2004) article. This was done to avoid influencing respondents as they placed in rank order the 18 items in Section I. The four example statements were preceded by the phrase “A Democratic Citizen:”. The four dummy phrases combined with the prefix “A Democratic Citizen” to form a complete statement by providing a behavior or characteristic of democratic citizenship similar to those suggested by Westheimer and Kahne (2004).

Directions stating “Place statements in rank order!” immediately followed the four example statements and appeared underneath the fourth and final dummy statement. To illustrate the task of rank ordering that respondents were supposed to undertake, two descriptive phrases appeared in the lower left-hand part of the page. The upper statement (MOST IMPORTANT BEHAVIOR OR CHARACTERISTIC) was separated from the lower statement (LEAST IMPORTANT BEHAVIOR OR CHARACTERISTIC) by a single downward pointing block arrow. The arrow was designed to remind respondents of their task to prioritize the four example statements in descending order from most important to least important and in a vertical fashion.

A continuum of boxes appeared to the right of the two phrases that were separated by the vertical, downward pointing arrow on page three. The continuum was divided into four boxes of equal size, and inside of each box was a single number from one to four. Each number corresponded to the number of one of the example statements, and was
placed in a box to indicate the level of importance that the researcher gave to the statement relative to democratic citizenship. The statements were arbitrarily ranked for the sake of providing an example for respondents to follow while completing Section I of the survey questionnaire. Because the example statements and their rankings had no relationship to the actual items in Section I, the researcher believed that there would be no interference with the respondents’ rank ordering of statements 1-18 in the survey questionnaire.

Step I of the questionnaire directed respondents to read all 18 statements in Section I of the survey questionnaire, which were found on page four of the instrument. Directions for Step II, on page five of the survey questionnaire booklet, instructed respondents to rank order the 18 statements from Step I and to record their rankings by writing the number of each statement in a box in the continuum provided. The position of the box in which they recorded each number was to correspond to the level of importance that the respondent placed on any given statement. Like the example on page three of the survey questionnaire booklet, the boxes in the continuum on page five were of equal size.

To remind respondents that rankings were to be made in descending order, a downward pointing, block arrow appeared to the immediate left of the continuum and ran its entire length. Above the arrow and in bold face type, the researcher also included directions to write the number of the statement with the most important behavior or characteristic in the top box. Immediately below the block arrow, the researcher directed respondents to write the number of the statement with the least important behavior or
characteristic in the bottom box. Each directional phrase was accompanied by a black arrow pointing to the respective box in question: Top Box (First Box) and Bottom Box (Last Box). For the top box, the arrow pointed upward to the top of the continuum while its counterpart pointed downward to the bottom box in the continuum.

Section II (Qualitative Inquiry), which was found on pages six and seven of the survey questionnaire booklet, focused on policymakers' reasons for rank ordering the 18 statements in Section I (Q-methodology) as they did. In this section, participants were asked to review the statements [from page four] that they had ranked as first, second, and third (top three positions) and sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth (bottom three positions) in the continuum on page five of the survey questionnaire booklet. On page six, respondents were then asked to articulate their reasons for ranking the behaviors and/or characteristics in the top three boxes as the most important. Their explanations were to be written in the spaces provided on page six of the survey questionnaire booklet. Next, respondents were asked to explain their reasons for ranking the behaviors and/or characteristics in the bottom three boxes as the least important. Similar to their explanations for the reasoning behind the rankings of the most important behaviors and/or characteristics, respondents were to write their rationales in the spaces provided on page seven of the questionnaire booklet.

The spaces on pages six and seven where participants were directed to record their responses for Section II were rectangles divided into three sections of equal size. In the left margin of page six, each divided section was labeled: top box—most important, second box from top, and third box from top respectively. The divided sections on page
seven were also labeled in the left margin, but reflected an emphasis on the least important behaviors and characteristics of the bottom three boxes. The divided sections on page seven were as follows: third box from bottom, second box from bottom, and bottom box – least important.

The rectangular spaces on pages six and seven were labeled in an attempt to prompt respondents to confine their qualitative comments about an individual behavior or characteristic to a single dedicated space with a corresponding label. The researcher contended that by directing respondents to write their comments about each behavior or characteristic individually and in a designated area, discernment of respondents’ reasons for their prioritization would be more accurately attributed to the intended behavior and/or characteristic and generally clearer than global comments whose attribution would be left to the researcher’s interpretation.

Section III (Quantitative Investigation), which appeared on page eight of the survey questionnaire booklet, consisted of three questions that address democratic citizenship and P-12 public education policy in the state of Ohio. Respondents were to select the level of disagreement or agreement that they felt most closely corresponded to their reaction to each statement. Each question was followed by a six-point scale with 1, 2, 3 ranging from very strongly disagree to disagree and 4, 5, 6 ranging from agree to very strongly agree. An example of how to mark each answer was provided. It appeared immediately after the directions and immediately before the first item in the section.

Section IV was found on page nine of the questionnaire booklet and asked respondents’ for five pieces of demographic information: gender, race/ethnicity, level of
education, policy body of membership, and political affiliation. Questions in this section directed respondents to place a check mark in the blank to the left of each response option that the respondent found to be the most appropriate.

One of the response options for question two in Section IV provided space for respondents to explain their selection of “other” in the checklist. It was anticipated that the explanation would also be brief and consist of no more than one to four words.

The precise demographic information that was sought in Section IV was: gender (Male, Female, Other), race/ethnicity (American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, non-Hispanic, Hispanic, White/non-Hispanic, Multi-racial, Other: Please Identify), the level of educational attainment (Secondary School: Grades 7-12, Associate’s degree, Bachelor’s degree, JD/MD/DDS/DVM, Master’s degree, PhD/EdD), the policy body of membership (Ohio Senate, Ohio House of Representatives, State Board of Education), and the political affiliation with which the respondent most closely associated himself/herself (Conservative, Moderate Conservative, Independent, Moderate Liberal, Liberal).

The researcher included the five demographic questions in the survey questionnaire in order to have the opportunity to explore trends and patterns in the similar or disparate conceptualizations of democratic citizenship along gender, racial/ethnic, and party lines as well as according to respondents’ levels of education and/or the legislative bodies in which they served at the time of the study.

Page 10 of the survey questionnaire booklet served as the space where respondents could provide additional information, extend comments from previous
sections of the questionnaire, and/or articulate further reflections or reactions about any aspect of the study, its intent, and/or its questions. Page 10 also provided space for the final reminder to respondents not to leave any identifying information, such as name, address, telephone number, district number, or place of employment at any place in the survey. The reminder was made in an attempt to ensure and protect the anonymity and confidentiality of the study’s respondents. Comments, reflections, and reactions to the phenomenon of democratic citizenship, the study, or the survey questionnaire were to be written in the box provided on page 10.

On page 11 of the survey questionnaire, the researcher provided instructions to respondents about returning the questionnaire booklet to her.

The back cover of the survey questionnaire booklet contained a box with the logo of The Ohio State University next to the title of the College of Education and Human Ecology.

The title of the questionnaire, *How Ohio Policymakers Conceptualize Democratic Citizenship: A Survey*, was printed on the front cover of the questionnaire booklet. In addition to the title, there was a single large graphic that was the dominant feature of the cover. It was selected because of its eye-catching quality and obvious and clear connection to the focus of the research study, which was democratic citizenship. The main graphic, as well as The Ohio State University (OSU) logo, which appeared at the foot of the cover page, were both in color. The name of the researcher and her status as a doctoral candidate along with the name and address of her academic affiliation, The Ohio State University, were also included in the cover design. The intent behind the use of the
graphics was to capture respondents’ attention and to suggest the study’s topic to them before they began to read the content of the survey questionnaire. A further intent of the inclusion of the OSU graphic was to show the origin and affiliation of the study as being a well-known, research-based, accredited institution of higher education.

A copy of the complete survey questionnaire is included in Appendix A of this document.

Validity, Trustworthiness, and Reliability of the Instrument

I. Validity and Utility

When talking about face validity, Anastasi (1988) described it as referring “not to what the test actually measures, but to what it appears to measure superficially”. She added that “face validity pertains to whether the test ‘looks valid’ to the examinees who take it”. An instrument that has face validity has a general appearance of acceptability to those who take the tests or who are participants in a research study.

Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, and Sorenson (1996) took the definition of face validity further by saying that “it should appear valid for its intended purpose” and that test takers as well as participants in research studies are more inclined to answer questions that they perceive to be relevant and meaningful as opposed to questions that they either do not understand or that are ambiguous. The Statistical Glossary (StatSoft, 2008) refers to face validity as a “ cursory review” by untrained individuals. Because this type of validity is not quantified by statistics, it is a qualitative measure of validity and does not depend on established theories for support (Fink, 1995).
For this research study, the verification of face validity was undertaken by professional educators and those in allied professions, such as library science. Those six individuals acting as the Panel of Experts were affiliated with institutions of higher education, P-12 school districts, or libraries in Ohio, North Carolina, and Wisconsin. They were selected for their ability to analyze the survey questionnaire critically according to the given criteria, which were provided on the comment form included in the packet of reviewer materials (Appendix B).

Face validity checkers were asked to consider the instrument's general appearance at first glance and how appealing it seemed as a whole. Particular attention was to be given to the cover of the survey questionnaire and its appropriateness for the proposed study, its clarity, and the extent to which it represented the focus of the research being undertaken. The panel was also asked to evaluate the extent to which the instrument would look valid to respondents and if it seemed like a reasonable way to acquire the information sought by the researcher.

Face validity checkers were also asked to determine if the instrument seemed to measure what was important about democratic citizenship, which was the phenomenon under consideration in the research study, as well as the education policy related to it, which was addressed in Section III of the questionnaire. It should be noted that the assessments of the instrument’s ability to address the important aspects of democratic citizenship was to be made within the confines of the Westheimer and Kahne (2004) framework upon which the study was based. Face validity checkers were not to make assessments and/or comments about any aspects that they may have felt were salient to
democratic citizenship, but that were missing. Panel members were also asked to respond to the instrument’s relevance to democratic citizenship and if all sections of the survey questionnaire appeared to come together to measure what was intended.

The most helpful comments that emerged from the initial panel review revolved around the appearance of the cover, including the title of the study, and the questionable relationship of Section III (Quantitative Investigation) to the other sections (Q-methodology and Qualitative Inquiry) of the questionnaire. As a result, it was thought that the questions in Section III looked as if they were an afterthought and did not belong to the study as it was then designed. Based on the panel members' comments about the graphic representation on the cover of the questionnaire, the researcher felt that a change in graphic would increase the appeal of the instrument for adult professionals, such as state-level policymakers, who were the intended respondents of the study. The initial graphic was a color cartoon illustration of middle school age students conducting an election at their school and placing ballots in a ballot box. Although the researcher saw school-age children as an ultimate population to be impacted by her study and its findings, she also agreed with various comments from the panel that the graphic was too juvenile for the intended audience of the study and that the cartoon diminished the appearance of validity, relevance, and professionalism. The researcher replaced the cartoon with a reproduction of a WPA poster featuring the forearm, hand, and torch of

---

13 Denotes Works Progress Administration (WPA), a Depression-era public project created by the Roosevelt administration as one of several programs designed to create jobs in all sectors of the US workforce and, ultimately, to begin to stimulate and revive the national economy. The WPA was created specifically to provide work for graphic artists, photographers, poets, novelists, essayists, composers, musicians, and others in the fine and performing arts.
the Statue of Liberty superimposed over the field of stars of the American flag and undergirded by the slogan *Democracy ... a challenge.*

To increase the relevance of Section III to the rest of the survey questionnaire, the researcher re-tooled the questions from the section so they connected directly to the 18 behaviors and characteristics that respondents were to rank order in Section I, which was the Q-methodology section of the study. In each of the three questions in Section III, the alignment and/or inclusion that was mentioned referred directly to the behaviors and characteristics on page four of the survey questionnaire, which, in turn, created a clear link to the rest of the study while tying the study of the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship to state education policy. Because of the described revision and the change in graphic on the survey cover, all panel members involved in a second review of the instrument were satisfied with the instrument’s appearance, its clarity, seeming validity, professional appeal, and relevance.

Initial concerns that were raised about the instrument’s title were addressed by reversing its order so the word “survey” appeared last. There were several concerns among members of the panel that 18 statements of the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship were too many to rank order at once and that Section I would possibly be overwhelming to respondents. After reviewing the instrument and further literature on Q-methodology and Q-samples (cards, statements, or items to be rank ordered by participants in a Q-methodology study), the researcher opted not to reduce the number of items in Section I. The researcher also felt compelled to leave the Q-set items untouched as they were taken directly from an existing framework found in *What Type*
Face validity checkers who participated in a second round of instrument reviews included teacher educators, P-12 district administrators, post-secondary faculty from the humanities, and P-12 teachers. All together, six panel members participated in the two face validity checks. A list of the names and professional affiliations of those who served as face validity checkers in rounds I and II as well as a copy of the face validity check comment form and letter of invitation are included in Appendix B of this document.

Colman (2001) identified construct validity as the extent to which a test measures a specified or hypothetical construct. However, Ary, et al. (2006) argued that abstract constructs or, in this case, phenomena, such as democratic citizenship, cannot be measured directly. As a result, they contended that indicators, which are also known as operational definitions, must be used to represent the construct under consideration. Ultimately, Ary, et al. (2006) defined construct validity as "the extent to which a test is measuring the ... construct it is intended to measure".

To measure the construct of democratic citizenship in this study, the researcher derived and used the 18 indicators identified by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) in their article *What Kind of Citizen?: The Politics of Educating for Democracy*. According to Westheimer and Kahne (2004), these 18 indicators represent the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship across three categories of citizen types, which is the focus of their study: the Personally Responsible Citizen, the Participatory Citizen,
and the Justice-Oriented Citizen. The intent of this research study was to explore how Ohio state-level policymakers conceptualize democratic citizenship through their ranking of the 18 indicators suggested by Westheimer and Kahne in their 2004 study. It should be noted that the researcher contended that construct validity was established through the use of the Westheimer and Kahne (2004) framework from a previous research study that was vetted and subsequently published in the *American Educational Research Journal* in 2004. The *American Education Research Journal* is the primary publication of the American Educational Research Association (AERA).

To establish the instrument's construct validity further, a field test was conducted. Field test reviewers were asked to evaluate the instrument for its accuracy in measuring the construct of interest: democratic citizenship. The field test reviewers were also asked to assess the extent to which the instrument accurately measured the construct's salient aspects that it purported to measure. In this case, the salient aspects meant what each study participant considered to be the most and least important behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship including their alignment with and inclusion in state education policy.

The field test instrument and accompanying comment form were distributed to reviewers either by the researcher directly or in the US mail. A form was provided to each reviewer in order to offer guidance in giving feedback about the instrument and its component parts. The formal letter that was sent to each reviewer served as a) an invitation to serve as a panelist, b) a vehicle through which the researcher provided an overview of the study and its intent, and c) a means through which the researcher
provided an overview of the purpose of the field test and the tasks that reviewers were to
carry out. The researcher also sought input and feedback from reviewers on the survey
questionnaire’s readability.

The feedback from the field test on the instrument’s construct validity led the
researcher to make revisions that were essentially cosmetic. Suggested changes included
a reorganization of the presentation of directions for completing the survey questionnaire,
an addition of graphics in an effort to draw respondents’ attention to a given section or
specific content, and the use of more neutral language throughout the survey in order to
ensure that participants’ thinking and answers would be influenced as little as possible.
Concern was also expressed about the number of statements that the researcher intended
to present to the study’s participants to rank order. However, as the study was
constructed from a pre-existing framework (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004), the
researcher retained all 18 statements as they appeared in the field test instrument and
made no changes from their original appearance in the 2004 article.

The field test reviewers were selected from among P-12 educators and
administrators at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels. Post-secondary
teaching faculty from the Humanities also comprised part of this group. Professionals
outside of education were also included as reviewers. These included life coaches and
education consultants from the Ohio Department of Education (ODE). All were selected
for their ability to read critically and to infer meanings from larger contexts to discreet
items as well as to analyze and understand abstract concepts. All reviewers held at least
an advanced degree and were accustomed to reading complex materials as a routine part
of their daily professional duties. All members regardless of profession were thought to bring the level of expertise needed to determine the accuracy, completeness, and the relative importance of the instrument's items and component parts, Sections I-IV, as well as the survey questionnaire's length and its appearance of measuring the construct that was intended.

Finally, as part of evaluating the extent to which the instrument appeared to be a reasonable way to capture the desired data, the researcher asked that the field test reviewers also look at the utility of the instrument. Particular attention was to be given to Sections I (Q-methodology) and II (Qualitative Inquiry) where respondents would be directed to a) rank order a battery of 18 statements about the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship and b) articulate their reasons for ranking the statements as they had.

Copies of the instrument and completed forms were returned to the researcher in person or, again, through the US mail.

All written correspondence to reviewers, including a copy of the letter of invitation to participate in the field test, can be found in Appendix C at the end of this document. In addition to the letter of invitation, a copy of the evaluation form that was provided by the researcher and used by the reviewers during their evaluation of the instrument is also attached in Appendix C. A complete list of field test reviewers can be found in Appendix C of this document.

Ary, et al. (2006) contended that content validity is evidence that the items in a test or treatment given to respondents in a research study is both balanced and inclusive.
of the knowledge, skills, and dimensions comprising the content domain. As the battery of 18 items or indicators in this research study was constructed from the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship described by Westheimer and Kahne (2004), and as those same indicators were considered by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) to represent fully their conceptualization of democratic citizenship, the researcher concluded that content validity was established. In addition, the researcher ensured that no indicator was altered in terms of the wording or the intent of its original use and that indicators were neither added nor deleted when developing the current instrument in order to maintain the balance and comprehensive nature of Westheimer’s and Kahne’s (2004) representation of democratic citizenship. By replicating the indicators exactly, the current instrument was able to measure the complete content as it was originally represented.

II. Trustworthiness: Section II, Qualitative Inquiry

Trustworthiness

Creswell and Miller (2000) stated that despite diverse perspectives of validity in qualitative research, there is general consensus that qualitative researchers should and must demonstrate that their studies are credible (p. 124). One of the primary issues surrounding the issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research is the myriad labeling of each depending on the perspective and/or personal preference of the researcher and his/her type of research. For the purposes of this and ensuing discussions, the term trustworthiness shall be used. Throughout this study, trustworthiness shall be the umbrella term under which validity, reliability, generalizability, and objectivity will
be subsumed. Also for the duration of this study, the following additional terms will be used in the manner indicated (Lincoln & Guba, 1989; Shenton, 2004):

- Credibility (Internal Validity)
- Transferability (External Validity/Generalizability)
- Dependability (Reliability)

**Credibility**

Credibility is defined as the extent to which the data, data analysis, and results of the study are accurate (Lincoln & Guba, 1989; Patten, 2007) and trustworthy or the extent to which the data and analysis “accurately ... represent participants’” realities of the social phenomena and is credible to them (Schwandt, 1997). Particular threats to the credibility of qualitative inquiry are instrumentation and researcher bias. Patten, 2007 argued that credibility will be strong “if there is a good fit between the intent of the research (foreshadowed questions) and what was actually studied” (p. 96). Credibility is also enhanced by the appropriate selection of study participants, repeated patterns that emerge in the data and sufficient detail in the data and depth of the analysis.

The researcher believed that for the current study, credibility was established and maintained in the following ways. All data as written by study participants were reviewed by outside reviewers as well as the researcher herself. Discrepancies in the interpretation of the data were documented and taken into consideration by the researcher.
The participants of the study were Ohio state-level policymakers. As the study revolved around democratic citizenship and state education policy, the researcher felt that the population from which the sample of 20 study participants was taken was appropriate for this study in knowledge and expertise. The researcher also felt that the population was appropriate in that all participants at the time of the study were a) American citizens residing in the State of Ohio, b) eligible to vote, and c) 18 years of age or older.

The researcher also believed that credibility for the qualitative aspect of the study was established and maintained through the persistent referral to the overarching research question being pursued. The study was conducted using three methodologies, each of which had a separate and specific aspect / purpose in looking at the individual policymakers’ views of democratic citizenship. Because of the unique research design, study participants were introduced to and engaged in questions and activities revolving around their personal perspectives on democratic citizenship in the Q-methodology section of the study that precedes the qualitative inquiry. The overarching intent of the study is communicated consistently in all three sections of the survey questionnaire, including the cover, and, therefore, throughout the entire study. As a result, a framework and focus was provided for the beginning of the study and enabled the researcher to revisit it on a regular basis to ensure that she remained open to a variety of interpretations and meanings of the study’s intent as well as of the phenomenon under consideration.
Transferability

Merriam (1998) stated that external validity “is concerned with the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations”. In talking about external validity, (Patten, 2007) referred to it as taking on a completely different meaning because, just as in Q-methodology, there is no intention to generalize from the sample to a parent population. The issue at hand is to understand the phenomenon, not the participants, and not to generalize to other populations similar or different. Referred to as transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1989; Shenton, 2004) in this study, external validity is also known as translatability and comparability. Patten (2007) maintained that the core issue with transferability is not the generalizability of the findings with similar populations or similar environments or settings, but that the study can teach the researcher and the others (Patten, 2007) about various phenomena, people, events, and situations found in everyday lives.

To that end, the researcher contends that the current study has transferability in that democratic citizenship is pertinent on a local, state, and national level and to all members of the American population. Further, as the study also concerns both the role of participation in citizenship and P-12 education policy, the researcher also maintains that while the results of the current study will not be generalizable because of a non-probablistic sample as well as the application of Q-methodology and phenomenology, they will offer information to be used by citizens and policymakers in the governance of the state and nation and the education of future adult citizens who are currently P-12 students.
Dependability

Dependability is the extent to which what is recorded is what actually occurred in the setting (Patten, 2007). The researcher contends that dependability was established in the current study through the use of outside reviewers of the data and data summaries. In this study, all qualitative comments were supplied in writing by the study participants in writing and written directly in the data collection instrument. To ensure the dependability of the researcher’s rendering of the data collected as well as of the summaries of the collective thinking, outside reviewers read both the data and summaries and checked them against summaries written by the researcher. As in the process of establishing credibility, all discrepancies in data summaries were documented and added in the researcher’s final summary. While the parts of the process used to establish credibility appeared similar or identical to that used to establish dependability, there were differences in the two processes and procedures. However, it should be noted that attention has been drawn to the interdependency of credibility and dependability and that “a demonstration of the former goes a long way in ensuring the latter” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

III. Reliability: Section III, Quantitative Methods

Reliability is described as the extent to which an experiment, test, or any measuring procedure yields the same result on repeated trials (The Writing Project, Colorado State University, 2009). Trochim (2008) contended that it has to do with the
quality of measurement, and that, in short, reliability can be seen as the “consistency” or the “repeatability of any given set of measures” (Trochim, 2008).

Echoing Trochim (1996), Exel (2005) stated that the most important type of reliability in studies conducted using Q-methodology is their replicability. The key test of reliability in Q-methodology studies, according to Exel (2005), is if the researcher will find the same or similar strands of opinion or viewpoints (factors) on a given topic or issue when using the same conditions of instruction. In short, for similarly structured studies with like, but not identical Q-sample items that are used with a variety of P-sets (different individuals) comprised of participants who are similar to those of the original P-set, will the resulting factors be schematically reliable (represent similar points of view).

In commenting on results from Snow’s (1963) study of interpretations of Golding’s *The Lord of the Flies*, Brown (1980) contended that:

> “it is not the case that each reader reaches his own unique ... interpretation, each different from all others. Instead, the factors point to a more limited variety of independent viewpoints and to a ‘defined set of interpretations’ ...” (p.84)

In other words, Brown (1980) saw that there are a limited number of differing opinions or viewpoints (factors) on any given topic, issue, or subject, and that the factors that emerged from Snow’s study on the interpretations of *The Lord of the Flies* pointed to a more limited *variety of independent viewpoints* and to a “defined set of interpretations”. At the same time, the factors preserved “the re-creative response of the individual minds”. All together, the defined set of interpretations and the simultaneous preservation
of the individual re-creative response served to correct two methodological errors: a) the
tendency to equate subjectivity with idiosyncrasy and random error, and b) the
assumption that subjectivity cannot be held steady for scientific regard (Brown, 1980,
p.84).

Brown (1980) also maintained that the alleged finite number of factors and,
therefore, of opinions or viewpoints can clearly be seen in the results of a Q-sort that is
well-structured and that offers to study participants a wide range of existing opinions on
the topic under consideration. Likely evidence in support of this contention is the
establishment of test-retest reliability of Q-sorts that has been demonstrated to range from
.80 and higher (Brown, 1980).

Thomas and Baas (1994) found the concerns raised about the reliability of results
from studies conducted using Q-methodology to be unwarranted and unnecessary after
considering the findings of two pairs of tandem studies as the concern was seen as having
been based on the traditional definition of reliability. They contended that the ability to
generalize sample results to the general population, which is the widely accepted idea of
statistical reliability, is not the primary concern for Q-methodology studies. According
to Thomas and Baas (1994), “the results of a Q methodological study are the distinct
subjectivities about a topic that are operant, not the percentage of the sample (or the
general population) that adheres to them”.

In order to establish the reliability of Section III (Quantitative Investigation), a
pilot study was conducted on Section III (Quantitative Investigation) only of the survey
questionnaire. Because the population to be investigated in the actual research study was
comprised of Ohio’s state-level policymakers, the researcher determined that the most appropriate population for the pilot study would be ordinary Ohio adult citizens who met the following four criteria: people who a) were US citizens, native-born or naturalized, a) were 18 years or older, b) were able to vote (current registration notwithstanding), and c) they were eligible to run for office in Ohio if they so desired. The researcher determined that this population was the most appropriate for the study as Ohio legislators are also US/Ohio citizens and were required to meet the same criteria as the population of the pilot study in order to run for office: citizenship and voter and age eligibility.

Participants for the pilot test were randomly selected from patrons of the main branch of the Columbus Metropolitan Library, located at 96 South Grant Avenue in downtown Columbus, Ohio. The researcher also randomly sought out participants for the pilot study from visitors to Schiller Park, which is city-owned park belonging to the Columbus Metro Park system. Because both the main library and Schiller Park are located in the middle of or near downtown Columbus and in or near neighborhoods ranging from poor and working class to upper middle class, the researcher determined that the two locations would offer a pool of potential pilot study participants whose backgrounds\textsuperscript{14} would provide variance similar to that found across the three state-level policy bodies.

The researcher administered the pilot study to 38 participants over a period of two weeks, and all 38 administrations produced usable data. The level of reliability for the pilot was calculated by running Cronbach’s Alpha on the data collected from responses

\textsuperscript{14} Denotes age, race/ethnicity, level of educational attainment, occupational status, and socioeconomic status
given to the three Likert-scale questions in Section III (Quantitative Investigation) of the survey questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha, which is a measure of internal consistency, is widely accepted as the appropriate statistic to use when calculating reliability. For the pilot study, reliability was calculated at .911, which the researcher found to be a satisfactory indication that the Quantitative Investigation aspect of her study was indeed reliable. The researcher's conclusion about the reliability of Section III was supported by Nunnally (1978). In *Psychometric Theory* he stated that:

"instruments used in basic research have a reliability of about .70 or better ... with instruments used in applied settings, a reliability of .80 may not be high enough".

After collecting data from the 20 state-level policymakers in the data sample, the researcher ran Cronbach’s Alpha on the data collected in Section III (Quantitative Investigation) of the survey questionnaire to determine the level of reliability for the actual study. The reliability for the actual study was slightly higher than that of the pilot and was calculated at .920. As in the pilot study, the researcher determined that the Quantitative Investigation section of the actual study had a high degree of internal consistency (George & Mallery, 2007) and could, therefore, be considered highly reliable.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The study, which was descriptive survey research, was approved by The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The study was approved as exempt
research using educational tests or survey procedures to collect data from study participants.

The target population for this investigation consisted of Ohio state-level policymakers in the Ohio Senate, the Ohio House of Representatives, and the State Board of Education. Only those individuals who had been sworn into office on or before January 5, 2009 were eligible for inclusion in the target population.

The total population of the Ohio Senate, the Ohio House of Representatives, and the State Board of Education was 151 at the time of the study. The researcher determined that a census sample of the three state-level policy bodies was the most appropriate for this study as it afforded all members the opportunity to respond to the survey questionnaire on democratic citizenship. The researcher considered the decision to use a census sample as particularly critical as members of the Ohio General Assembly and State Board are those who draft and, ultimately, pass bills into laws that impact education and other aspects of the lives of Ohio citizens.

All 151 members of the three state-level policy bodies were available at the time of the study, and were, therefore, also considered the accessible population.

The 21 members across the Ohio Senate, the Ohio House of Representatives, and the State Board of Education who responded to the researcher’s survey questionnaire were the accepting sample.

The 20 respondents from the Ohio General Assembly and the State Board of Education who completed the survey questionnaire and provided usable data to the researcher served as the data sample.
The researcher accessed the names of the members from each of the three policy bodies from the three legislative websites. The websites provided the researcher with any necessary contact information, such as policymakers’ respective office addresses, telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses. Policymakers’ contact information was used by the researcher to ensure proper delivery of the survey questionnaire and the accompanying materials to the proposed study participants.

As all study participants were elected or appointed public officials, the researcher was able to contact each participant or his/her office directly. Because the researcher was able to access all 151 policymakers over the telephone, on e-mail, in person, or via the US mail, the need to involve a third party to facilitate participation in the study was eliminated.

Concerning the issue of non-response of participants in the study, it was speculated that it may have resulted from the timing of the delivery of the survey questionnaire and accompanying materials to the policymakers. The survey questionnaire was delivered by hand or US mail to all members of the Ohio General Assembly and State Board of Education during the first half of June 2009. At that same time, the study participants from the Ohio Senate and the Ohio House of Representatives were also charged with setting and passing the state’s biennial budget prior to the beginning of the state’s new fiscal year on July 1, 2009. A situation of conflicting deadlines soon emerged between the due date to pass the state budget and the due date to complete and return the survey questionnaire for this research study. In recognition of the conflict between the two deadlines confronting members of the Ohio General
Assembly, the researcher made allowances so participants could complete and return their questionnaires up to three weeks beyond the due date printed on the cover of the survey questionnaire instrument (June 18, 2009). Ultimately, the researcher continued to accept completed survey questionnaires through the first 10 days in July.

Although the State Board of Education was not involved in state budget negotiations and, therefore, did not have the same competing deadlines as the Ohio General Assembly, the researcher determined that questionnaires from the members of the Board of Education should also be accepted beyond the original date of June 18, 2009.

For this study, the instrument was delivered to respondents in two ways: hand delivered to participants’ individual offices or central mailroom or sent through the US mail to a specified business or home address.

The research packets were taken by the researcher to each of the 33 Senate offices located in the Ohio Statehouse. Packets were given directly to office staff who were present when the researcher visited the respective Senators’ offices or were left on the reception desk if the office was unoccupied at the time of the researcher’s visit.

The researcher hand-delivered the survey questionnaires and accompanying materials for members of the Ohio House of Representatives’ to the official administrative offices in the Riffe Office Tower. Once vetted for appropriate content, all research packets were placed in the Representatives’ individual mailboxes by a member of the House of Representatives administrative staff.
All members of the State Board of Education received the research packets through the US mail. Packets containing the research instrument and related materials were mailed to State Board members at the addresses listed on the Board Relations link on the website of the Ohio Department of Education (ODE).

All completed survey questionnaires from study participants were to be returned to the researcher via US mail. To that end, each packet of research materials included a pre-addressed, stamped envelope in which participants could mail the instrument back to the researcher.

Because the participants from the General Assembly maintain individual offices and come together as a collective body only during legislative sessions or the Governor’s state of the State address, which are both times when official state business is conducted, it was not possible for the researcher to administer the instrument to all 132 members of the Ohio Senate and House of Representatives simultaneously. As each policymaker’s schedule was different, the researcher did not know precisely when the instrument was self-administered. Therefore, the researcher accepted that it was necessary to be flexible concerning instrument administration owing to of the nature of the Senators’ and Representatives’ obligations as well as legislative emergencies and public and professional activities and events.

Members of the State Board of Education also self-administered the survey questionnaire at a time unknown to the researcher. The researcher determined that individual, self-administrations of the instrument constituted the most appropriate route to follow as most alternative options required addressing the Board of Education as a
collective body. Such action would have caused the researcher to seek and receive permission to be included on one of the State Board’s monthly meeting agendas. As permission was uncertain and also for the sake of timeliness, the researcher opted to mail the survey questionnaire and related materials to all State Board of Education members.

In addition to the survey questionnaire, the pre-addressed, stamped envelope in which to return the completed instrument to the researcher, and the confirmation postcard to be mailed back to the researcher upon the return of the instrument, the research packet contained a letter of notification (Appendix E). The letter introduced the researcher, outlined both the significance and purpose of the study, and solicited the potential respondent’s participation in it. The researcher handed packets directly to legislative aides or other office staff designated to receive constituent mail.

To ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of all study participants, no numbers or other identifying marks were placed on the survey questionnaires by the researcher. Respondents were directed and reminded to avoid making their own identifying marks, which also compromise their anonymity and confidentiality.

In order to track non-respondents, the researcher opted instead to include a pre-addressed, stamped postcard in each research packet. The postcard was to be returned to the researcher in a separate mailing after the respondent had completed and returned the survey questionnaire. Each postcard was printed with the following: The survey has been completed and returned. Beneath that sentence, the researcher attached a label with the name of the Senator, Representative, or Board Member. The address label and a
The researcher decided to deliver the survey questionnaire and related materials in person to members of the Ohio General Assembly in order to: a) verify her identity as an Ohio State University doctoral student with no political or journalistic agenda and/or malicious intent, b) establish her credibility with policymakers, and c) personalize her correspondence and invitation to participate in the study. The decision to provide personal delivery of the survey questionnaire packets was also due to the volume of general mail and solicitations for participation in various professional and political events and research studies that are typically sent to legislators’ offices.

**Follow up Procedures**

On July 14, the researcher mailed and/or hand delivered a follow up postcard to all non-responding members of the Ohio General Assembly and State Board of Education. The postcards served as reminders to all non-respondents and to inform them that completed questionnaires from the initial distribution in June 2009 were being accepted through August 10, 2009.

Postcards were sent to all state-level policymakers who had not returned a confirmation postcard to the researcher following the completion and return of the survey questionnaire. In a few cases, respondents had printed their own return address on the envelope mailed back to the researcher despite the request to leave no identifying marks on the survey questionnaire or accompanying materials. The researcher also used these
return addresses to identify participants to ensure as complete a list of non-respondents as possible.

In August, a final follow-up attempt was made, and the researcher hand delivered research packets to four members of the Ohio Senate. The Senators who were to be contacted a third time were selected on the basis of some or all of the following: they held a position of leadership in the Senate, they were identified by other education organizations as being engaged, involved, and interested in education issues, and/or they had previously communicated an interest in the research study, but had not yet responded to the researcher. All four Senators received a new research packet containing the original letter of notification, an illustrated postcard reminding the Senators that there was still time to respond to the questionnaire that they had received on June 11, the survey questionnaire, a pre-addressed, stamped confirmation postcard to mail to the researcher upon completion and return of the survey, and a pre-addressed, stamped envelope in which to return the completed survey to the researcher.

The research packets were hand delivered to each Senator’s office by the researcher. As in the delivery of the original research packet in June 2009, the researcher left the questionnaire and accompanying materials with the respective Senators’ office staff or legislative aides. In the case where no one was present, the packet was left on the reception desk.
How Completed Survey Questionnaires Were Handled

As completed survey questionnaires were received from respondents, the researcher numbered each booklet and labeled it according to the respondent’s policy body.

The rank order data from Section I (Q-methodology) were entered into a software program called PQMethod 2.11, which was specifically written for Q-methodology factor analysis. Data for this section were entered per each respondent and were recorded in the order of least important to most important.

The data from the three Likert-scale questions in Section III (Quantitative Investigation) were also entered per each respondent by the specific questionnaire item. In the cases where respondents did not answer or correctly mark the questionnaire item, the researcher reported the data as missing. Unlike Section I where Q-methodology was used, the Quantitative Investigation in Section III required the use of SPSS. Data for Section III provided the following information: mean, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, and standard error.

The researcher also used SPSS to record data for the five items seeking demographic information in Section IV. As in Section III, if participants failed to provide a response to any item, the researcher considered the data to be missing.

Nineteen of the 20 study participants answered the questions in Section III in their entirety. The researcher, therefore, was able to gather usable data for Section III for only 19 of the participants in the data sample. All 20 of the participants in the data sample provided complete responses for the five items seeking demographic information in
Section IV. The only exception was in the category of political affiliation where only 19 of the 20 study participants responded to the item.

The data in Section II (Qualitative Inquiry) were entered for each respondent. The number of each survey questionnaire was recorded with the qualitative data in order to ensure that they could be accurately matched with the corresponding data in Section I (Q-methodology). Responses were also entered according to the page and box in which they appeared on the survey questionnaire: most important, second most important, third most important or third least important, second least important, or least important. Any qualitative data that were provided at the end of the survey were also entered by the researcher, but were recorded and kept separately from data that were provided in response to specific questions.

A file of the hard copies of the survey questionnaire was maintained by the researcher. Copies were kept in order of their assigned numbers that were written on the outside cover of the returned survey questionnaire. Following data entry on Sections I, III, and IV of the survey questionnaires, the researcher randomly selected every third questionnaire to recheck the accuracy of the data that was recorded for Sections III & IV. To ensure the accuracy of data entry for Section I (Q-methodology), the researcher rechecked all 20 questionnaires (Gliem in class lecture, 2009).

The table in Appendix H provides a timeline of the researcher’s activities beginning with data collection and continuing through the final report of the study’s findings. The study took place across eleven months.
Data Analysis

For the purpose of exploring and describing Ohio state-level policymakers’ conceptualizations of democratic citizenship, centroid factor analysis using varimax rotation was conducted through the use of PQMethod 2.11 software (2002). The researcher then calculated the mean score of each Q-sample statement based on the responses of the 20 respondents of the P-set.

For the Qualitative Inquiry aspect of the study, the researcher analyzed respondents’ qualitative comments for collective thinking and/or emerging themes. Individual Q-sorts were identified according to and then compared with the factors on which they loaded. Qualitative data were ultimately analyzed relative to the factor on which they loaded. The analysis was carried out from the interpretivist paradigm.

For the Quantitative Investigation (Section III), the researcher reported the percentage of disagreement and agreement, the mean and the standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, and standard error. These descriptive statistics were reported for each of the three Likert-scale questions that comprised the Quantitative Investigation aspect of the research study in Section III.

Table 3.8 provides an overview of the statistical procedures used to analyze each research question. These analyses then led to data interpretation and subsequent reporting of research findings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question Number</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Statistics / Processes Used to Analyze Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How do Ohio state-level policymakers conceptualize democratic citizenship?</td>
<td>▪ Centroid factor analysis with varimax rotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Means of Q sorts for each of the Q-sample statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What compels Ohio state-level policymakers to rank some behaviors and characteristics higher than other behaviors and characteristics in terms of their importance to democratic citizenship?</td>
<td>▪ Individual Q-sorts were identified according to the factors on which they loaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Data were analyzed from the interpretivist paradigm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What compels Ohio state-level policymakers to rank some behaviors and characteristics lower than other behaviors and characteristics in terms of their importance to democratic citizenship?</td>
<td>▪ Individual Q-sorts were identified according to the factors on which they loaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Data were analyzed from the interpretivist paradigm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To what extent do Ohio state-level policymakers believe that Ohio’s education policies governing accountability, content standards, and student learning experiences should be aligned with the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship?</td>
<td>▪ Percentage of disagreement / agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Measures of central tendency and variability: mean and standard deviation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Deviation from normality: skewness, kurtosis, and standard error.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8 Data Analysis Strategies by Research Question
Chapter 4
Results of the Study

Introduction

In order to present the findings of this research study, the researcher organized the data around each research question.

For Research Question one (Q-methodology), the researcher’s intent was to present study participants’ viewpoints on democratic citizenship of the Q sorts that came to light during centroid factor analysis. Factor loadings on the three factors that surfaced during factor analysis were reported along with each factor’s distinguishing and consensus statements. The relevance of demographic characteristics was also explored in comparing factor loadings, distinguishing statements, and consensus statements. The mean score for each item in the P-sample was also reported and included the identification of the behaviors and characteristics that were ranked respectively as the most important and least important to democratic citizenship.

Reporting of Research Questions two and three (Qualitative Inquiry) were designed to support or contrast with the data reported for Research Question one. The data was also reported to explain the impetus behind study participants’ ranking of the behaviors and characteristics that they believed to be the three most important and the three least important to democratic citizenship. The qualitative inquiry and its
subsequent analysis were carried out from the perspective of the interpretivist paradigm. As such, qualitative comments were analyzed for insight into the realities, beliefs, and/or lived experiences of the study participants that may have contributed or wholly explained their reasons for ranking the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship as they did.

In presenting the data concerning Research Question four (Quantitative Investigation), the researcher’s intent was to exhibit the measures of central tendency and variability, such as the mean and standard deviation. Percentages of the levels of disagreement/agreement with the various aspects of education policy were also reported in this section.

**Research Question One: Q-methodology**

*RQ 1. How do Ohio state-level policymakers conceptualize democratic citizenship?*

Created by William Stephenson in the 1930s, Q-methodology is a methodology dedicated to the study of subjectivity. Brown (1980) stated that Q-methodology provides a foundation for the systematic study of subjectivity, such as an individual’s viewpoint, opinion, beliefs, and attitudes and other areas of subjectivity. Robinson (2007) described Q-methodology as highly person centered. Further, “it reduces researcher bias and, therefore, is particularly useful in the attitudinal, value, and evaluation based components of research where an intense personal perspective is required” (Robinson, 2007). It was because of the focus on individual views or opinions that the researcher believed that Q-methodology was one of three appropriate methodologies for the study.
In the sorting process, study participants are asked to place in rank order the P-sample or P-set of cards, statements, or items pertaining to a given topic, phenomenon, or issue, such as healthcare reform, a major league baseball team’s priorities in order to be a contender, how local tax revenue should be spent, or, in the case of this study, democratic citizenship. Individual study participants place the cards, statements, or items in an order that reflects their personal opinion or viewpoint about the topic under consideration. In the actual Q-sort, all cards, statements, or items have to be used and ranking is done individually according to each preference. As Brown (1980) explained it, Q-sorting is “a modified rank-ordering procedure in which stimuli are placed in an order that is significant from the standpoint of a person operating under specified conditions” (p. 195).

The sorting results in capturing the participants’ patterns of response (opinions, preferences, perspectives, attitudes, or beliefs) about the phenomenon under consideration. The response patterns are subsequently analyzed to identify groupings from which the various strands of opinion (factors) emerge and discreet opinions, preferences, perspectives, attitudes, or beliefs are uncovered. The emerging factors eventually lead to classifying study participants based on their perspectives on the phenomenon under consideration.

**PQMETHOD 2.11 Software**

Analysis of the Q-Methodology portion of the study was conducted using PQMethod 2.11 software. This software package was written in 1992 by John Atkinson
of Kent State University. Peter Schmolck
(http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~schmolck/qmethod/) of Munich, Germany further
developed the software program in 2002.

In order to analyze the Q-sort data using the PQMethod program the researcher
proceeded in the following manner:

Data from the 20 individual Q-sorts (the ranking of the 18 behaviors and
characteristics of democratic citizenship) were entered into the PQMethod software
program.

During data collection when participants ranked the behaviors and characteristics
of democratic citizenship, they were asked to record their rankings in a one column
continuum. Rankings were to be made from the top to the bottom with the numbers of
the items representing the most important behaviors and characteristics to be recorded
starting at the top box (most important). As P-sample items decreased in importance in
the opinion of each participant, they were to work their way down the continuum.
Participants were to continue ranking items in the continuum until they reached the
bottom box, which denoted the behavior or characteristic that was believed to be the least
important to democratic citizenship.

Figure 4.1 is a depiction of the continuum as it appeared on the survey
questionnaire at the time of data collection.
Figure 4.1  One Column Continuum
The researcher transferred to the standard grid formation (Figure 4.2), the data (the rankings of the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship) that were supplied by the study participants. The grid formation is standard for Q-methodology\textsuperscript{15} and necessary for scoring and data analysis.

As shown in figure 4.2, the grid used for this study was a seven-point scale. As such, the scoring was -3, -2, -1, 0, +3, +2, +1, and data were entered into the software program in reverse order, starting from least important (bottom box) to most important (top box).

Figure 4.2 illustrates that, unlike the continuum in which participants recorded their rankings (figure 4.1), the grid to which participant rankings were transferred consisted of seven columns instead of the single columned continuum. Each column in the grid had a specific number of cells, which represented a separate rank. The middle column with a value of zero, represented all items that participants viewed as neutral.

The grid that the researcher constructed was a stair step configuration of 18 cells which was equal to the number of Q-sample statements that participants were directed to sort. Figure 4.2 shows how the values of the columns of cells ranged from -3 to +3. The behavior or characteristic that individual members of the P-set ranked as least important and, therefore, recorded in the bottom box of the continuum on page five of the survey questionnaire instrument was transferred to the -3 cell on the grid. The behaviors and characteristics that participants ranked as second and third least important and that they

\textsuperscript{15} Although the above mentioned grid is often used during the actual Q-sorting process, it was not used during data collection in this study. However, since the grid is necessary for scoring and data analysis, the researcher was required to transfer manually the items from the continuum to the grid in order to be able to create the obligatory distribution of rankings.
recorded in the 17th and 16th boxes (second and third least important) of the continuum were placed in the -2 column of cells on the grid. The transfer continued in this pattern until reaching the behavior or characteristic that the study participants ranked as the most important and subsequently recorded in the top box of the continuum. This behavior or characteristic was placed in the +3 cell of the grid. Using the PQMethod 2.11 software, the researcher repeated this process for each study participant until a grid had been completed for the data collected from each respondent.

All three columns on either side of the middle column (neutral opinion) are polar opposites and the distribution should be normal or near normal. As a result, it should be possible to fold the grid in half and have an exact fit if the two halves were superimposed on each other.
The first step in analyzing the data with PQMethod 2.11 was the generation of a correlation matrix, which displayed the correlations between each of the 20 Q-sorts that were carried out by the study’s participants. Brown (1980) noted that correlation matrices have been generally passed over because of their position as the transitional phase between the raw data and factor analysis. In addition, the amount of data presented in the correlation matrix is considerable and, as such, provides little, if any, usable information. Typically, it is not possible to make direct inspection of all of the cases that would likely be generated from a realistic sample size (Brown, 1980, p. 207), such as the

**Correlation Matrix and Centroid Factor Analysis**

![Standard Q-sort Scoring Grid](image)

Figure 4.2 Standard Q-sort Scoring Grid
sample of 20 in this study, which would lead to 400 unique correlations to observe.

Overall, the correlation matrix provides the data set needed to conduct the factor analysis (Brown, 1980, p.207).

Where the first step of the correlation matrix assists in identifying variables that bear a resemblance, Brown (1980) explained factor analysis as the process that:

> "searches for family resemblances more generally, i.e. for groups of Q sorts which on the basis of their correlations, appear to go together as a group or type (p. 207)".

Lewicki and Hill (2006) added that factor analysis also serves to a) reduce the number of data, and b) detect structure in the relationships among the various data. In this study, that would mean that factor analysis served to reduce the number of Q-sorts (the data for this study) and to detect structure in the relationships among the various Q-sorts (the data for this study). More specifically, in this study, factor analysis reduced the number of Q-sorts from 20 to 16 and mined three structural factors that identified how individuals classified themselves (Brown, 1980) along lines of opinion, preference, perspective, attitude, or beliefs.

Brown (1980) noted that the classifications of Q-sorts typically fall into natural groupings due to their similarity or dissimilarity to each other. For example, he stated, “if two people are like-minded on a subject, their Q-sorts will be similar and they will both end up on the same factor”. Above all, it is important to remember that when applying factor analysis to Q-methodology studies, the analysis does not classify the study participants. It is the participants who, in the end, will classify themselves through the virtue of the opinions, preferences, perspectives, attitudes, or beliefs that they express.
through the process of sorting the cards, statements, or items of the Q-sample. It is the classification of the study participants that surfaces as factors (Brown, 1980). The factors that are eventually identified from the multiple sorts can be considered the “operational definitions” (Brown, 1980) of the opinions, preferences, perspectives, attitudes, or beliefs that produced them. As a result, the factors or strands of opinion that come to light relative to the given phenomenon are natural (Buchler, 1966) rather than arbitrary since they are tied directly to human behavior (Brown, 1980).

To carry out factor analysis for a Q-methodology study, Stephenson and his followers recommended that centroid factor analysis be used (Schmolck, 1992; Brown, 1980) as centroid factor analysis tends to be more permissive than other factor analytic methods (Brown, 1980), such as principal components. Also in support of the use of centroid factor analysis, Brown (1980) contended that “the number of ways of rotating through factor space is infinite” and that while the centroid method may be mathematically inexact, it is the only factor analytic method where:

“any and all solutions can be examined without violating any assumptions, no one centroid solution is more sacred than any other” (p. 56).

After running the centroid factor analysis for eight factors on the data in the correlation matrix, seven unrotated factors emerged. The next step was to determine the most appropriate number of factors to extract for rotation.

As proposed by Kaiser (1960), only factors with Eigenvalues >1 can be retained. An Eigenvalue indicates the “proportion of variance explained by each factor” (George & Mallery, 2007). When conducting centroid factor analysis for this study, only four
factors produced Eigenvalues >1. Table 4.1 displays these data (factors 4, 6, 7, and 8 all had Eigenvalues <1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5873</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7917</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1456</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0946</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Factor Extractions and Retentions, Eigenvalues, and Percent of Explained Variance

**Varimax Rotation**

While centroid factor analysis is mathematically correct, it is still difficult to interpret. Therefore, selected factors need to be rotated. To do this, the researcher chose to use varimax rotation. Lewicki and Hill (2006) described this particular rotation process as “variance maximizing (varimax) rotation” or varimax rotation, the name of which suggests the overall goal of the process: to maximize the variance of new factors, while minimizing the variance around new factors (Lewicki & Hill, 2006). In short, varimax rotation is used to ensure that all rotated factors are as orthogonal as possible.

As indicated in table 4.1, the seven unrotated factors that were extracted during centroid factor analysis produced four unrotated factors with Eigenvalues > 1. When those four extracted factors were rotated using varimax, the rotation produced three rotated orthogonal factors (Table 4.2). The table also aligns each Q-sort with its
corresponding demographics. The abbreviations used in Table 4.2 follow below. All number values represented in bold face type represent the loadings for each individual Q-sort. Q-sorts that failed to load on any factor are so designated and appear in the shaded areas.

TABLE ABBREVIATIONS:

- FI = Factor I
- FII = Factor II
- FIII = Factor III
- Gen = Gender
- Level of Educa = Level of Education
- Political Affilia = Political Affiliation
  - Conserv = Conservative
  - Mod Conserv = Moderate Conservative
  - Indep = Independent
  - Mod Liberal = Moderate Liberal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q- Sort #</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>FII</th>
<th>FIII</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Race/ Ethnicity</th>
<th>Level of Educa</th>
<th>Policy Body</th>
<th>Political Affilia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0.6668</td>
<td>0.0175</td>
<td>0.3131</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>HR\textsuperscript{16}</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0.1485</td>
<td>0.8672</td>
<td>-0.3336</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Conserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>0.5665</td>
<td>0.4294</td>
<td>-0.3286</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>Senate\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>0.6767</td>
<td>0.2270</td>
<td>0.0870</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>0.1844</td>
<td>0.7311</td>
<td>-0.1333</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.3176</td>
<td>0.3933</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>0.1869</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>0.4219</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>0.8742</td>
<td>0.1338</td>
<td>0.2477</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>0.2874</td>
<td>0.8404</td>
<td>0.02575</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>0.1838</td>
<td>0.9464</td>
<td>0.1298</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>0.2856</td>
<td>0.7314</td>
<td>0.4054</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Mod Conserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>0.1823</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>-0.7649</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Indep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>0.6682</td>
<td>0.5141</td>
<td>0.1601</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>0.4925</td>
<td>-0.4037</td>
<td>-0.0458</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>0.7004</td>
<td>0.1525</td>
<td>0.0545</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Mod Conserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>0.2663</td>
<td>0.1103</td>
<td>0.4665</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>0.6199</td>
<td>0.4286</td>
<td>0.4646</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>0.9325</td>
<td>0.3010</td>
<td>-0.0924</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Conserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>0.7501</td>
<td>-0.0717</td>
<td>0.2337</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Mod Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>0.2767</td>
<td>0.6558</td>
<td>-0.0785</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2   Factor Scores and P-set Demographic Information for the Three Ohio State-level Policy Bodies

\textsuperscript{16} Denotes Ohio House of Representatives
\textsuperscript{17} Denotes Ohio Senate
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In determining which Q-sorts loaded onto these three factors, the researcher opted to set the confidence level at $p < .05$ or, in the case of this study, .4623. To retain any factor as an outcome of factor analysis, there must be a minimum of two loadings on any given factor. Because of this, the third factor would have been eliminated due to having only one loading if the confidence level had been set at 99% or $p < .01$ (.6085). However, it should be noted that even though the researcher set the confidence level at $p < .05$, all but three of the 16 Q-sorts would have loaded at $p < .01$.

Of real interest in Q-methodology is whether the factors that are produced are independent of each other. Because of this desired independence among factors, correlations need to be as close to zero as possible (Brown and Hite telephone conference, 2009). Table 4.3 below provides a display of the correlations between factor scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.3777</td>
<td>-0.0104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>0.3777</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.0750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>-0.0104</td>
<td>-0.0750</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Correlations between Factors Scores

Johnson, Angerilli, and Gajdamaschko (2004) wrote that factor analysis in Q-methodology determines statistically the existence of different opinions, preferences, perspectives, attitudes, or beliefs. However, they cautioned, the researcher must look at a) which statements define each factor, b) how factors relate to other factors, and c)
which study participants (members of the P-set) loaded onto each factor in order to
determine the strand of opinion embedded in each factor. To that end, Table 4.4 provides
a display of each factor’s statements in rank ordered according to and including the
normalized factor score (Z-score). The statements in bold face type represent the
statement that were ranked as most important or least important to democratic citizenship
according to their Z-scores. All data displayed in the table that are not bolded, but appear
either in the top six positions represent the items that were ranked as the most important,
the second most important, or the third most important to democratic citizenship
according to the scoring grid. The data that appears in the bottom six positions represent
items that were ranked as the third least important, the second least important, or the least
important to democratic citizenship also according to the scoring grid. All data in Table
4.4 are presented on a factor by factor basis.

Statement numbers that were marked with an asterisk indicated that the
 corresponding statement was considered a “distinguishing statement”. Johnson, et al.
(2004) defined distinguishing statements as “those statements that best define the view
represented by the factor that emerged”. Further, distinguishing statements serve to
differentiate between factors or, in other words, to highlight the unique aspect or aspects
of a given factor relative to the other factors around it. A statement can also be
 considered distinguishing if its score is positive on one factor, but negative on others.
This is the case with statement number 12. In Factors I and II, statement 12 has a
positive Z-score of .495 and 1.375 respectively, while in Factor III, its Z-score is -0.936.
As a result of the difference between positive and negative scores, statement 12 was considered a distinguishing statement between Factors I and II and Factor III.

In addition to the distinguishing statements that were identified during varimax rotation, consensus statements were also highlighted. Serving a purpose that is the opposite of distinguishing statements, the identification of consensus statements indicates where factors are similar or alike. van Exel (2005) described consensus statements as a statement that “is not distinguishing between any of the identified factors”. In other words, statements that are common across factors are those of consensus and give insight about which aspects of the phenomenon under consideration the members of the P-set were particularly like minded. This like mindedness, in turn, surfaces during factor loadings and demonstrates across the emerging factors what participants collectively felt strongly positive or negative about or neutral about regardless of the respective factors’ overall focus or emphasis.

As can be seen in Table 4.4, each of the statements are accompanied by its individual Z-score. Z-scores that appear in the upper half of each table are all positive values, which represent the level of importance that participants afford to those items: high to neutral. However, in the lower half of the tables, the Z-scores typically become negative numbers. The change in sign from positive to negative before Z-scores indicates that the behavior or characteristic in the respective statements is considered to be of little or no importance to the phenomenon of democratic citizenship. In other words, a negative Z-score indicates that for members of the P-set who loaded on a given factor, the behavior or characteristic held no importance to democratic citizenship in their opinion.
It should also be noted that both the positive and negative Z-scores represent the normalized score reached for each statement in the Q-sample as a whole where each score was calculated from the total of all P-set members who loaded on the factor. Above all, it must be remembered that the Z-scores, positive or negative, do not represent the scores of either a single or all participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>acts responsibly in his/her community</td>
<td>2.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>obeys laws</td>
<td>1.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>works and pays taxes</td>
<td>1.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>is an active member of community organizations</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>knows how to effect systemic change</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>knows how government agencies work</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>actively participates in community improvement efforts</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>critically assesses political structures to see beyond the surface causes of political inequality</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>critically assesses social structures to see beyond the surface causes of social stratification</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>critically assesses economic structures to see beyond the surface causes of economic disparity</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>seeks out and addresses areas of injustice</td>
<td>-0.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to care for those in need</td>
<td>-0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>knows about democratic social movements</td>
<td>-0.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to promote economic development</td>
<td>-1.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to clean up the environment</td>
<td>-1.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries</td>
<td>-1.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Z-score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>acts responsibly in his/her community</td>
<td>1.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>is an active member of community organizations</td>
<td>1.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>obeys laws</td>
<td>1.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>works and pays taxes</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to promote economic development</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>actively participates in community improvement efforts</td>
<td>0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to care for those in need</td>
<td>0.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>seeks out and addresses areas of injustice</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to clean up the environment</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>critically assesses economic structures to see beyond the surface causes of economic disparity</td>
<td>-0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks</td>
<td>-0.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>critically assesses political structures to see beyond the surface causes of political inequality</td>
<td>-0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>knows about democratic social movements</td>
<td>-0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>knows how government agencies work</td>
<td>-1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>critically assesses social structures to see beyond the surface causes of social stratification</td>
<td>-1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>knows how to effect systemic change</td>
<td>-1.856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>obeys laws</td>
<td>1.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis</td>
<td>1.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>knows about democratic social movements</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>works and pays taxes</td>
<td>0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries</td>
<td>0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to clean up the environment</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>knows how government agencies work</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>seeks out and addresses areas of injustice</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to care for those in need</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>critically assesses economic structures to see beyond the surface causes of economic disparity</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>knows how to effect systemic change</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to promote economic development</td>
<td>-0.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>critically assesses social structures to see beyond the surface causes of social stratification</td>
<td>-0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>critically assesses political structures to see beyond the surface causes of political inequality</td>
<td>-0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>acts responsibly in his/her community</td>
<td>-0.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>is an active member of community organizations</td>
<td>-0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks</td>
<td>-1.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>actively participates in community improvement efforts</td>
<td>-2.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Normalized Factor Scores: A Factor I, B Factor II, C Factor III
Explanation of the Means

The researcher determined that the mean should be calculated for each of the 18 items in the Q-sort. By arriving at the mean, it was felt that the researcher would be able to identify which of the items had the highest and lowest independent scores for the entire population. It was also thought that the calculation of the mean of each Q-sample item would afford the opportunity to compare individual rankings of each statement according to its mean with how the statements ranked within each factor. It was also thought that such comparisons could shed light on points of convergence and divergence between the item rankings in terms of their means and the manner in which they were ranked within each factor. It would also likely provide an opportunity to identify Q-sample items that were possible outliers.

The mean was calculated by adding the score of 1-18 for each item in the continuum in the original survey questionnaire. The score was determined by a) the rank it received from each participant, and b) its position in the continuum. Reversed scoring was used to calculate the mean so items that were rated with a higher degree of importance were scored with higher numbers (18, 17, 16, and so on) even though they would have been ranked as 1, 2, 3, etc. By reversing the scoring, items ranked as most or more important to democratic citizenship would receive the higher numerical mean. Table 4.5 provides a display the means for each of the 18 items in the Q-sample. Items that are bolded represent those items that were ranked as the three most and the three least important to democratic citizenship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Q-sample Statement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>acts responsibly in his/her community</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>15.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>obeys laws</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>14.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>works and pays taxes</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>is an active member of community organizations</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>actively participates in community improvement efforts</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>seeks out and addresses areas of injustice</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>9.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>knows how government agencies work</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>knows how to effect systemic change</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>critically assesses political structures</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to care for those in need</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>critically assesses economic structures</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to promote economic development</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>critically assesses social structures</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>knows about democratic social movements</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>recycles, gives blood, and donates</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to clean up the environment</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Item Means
Research Questions Two and Three: Qualitative Inquiry

RQ 2. What compels Ohio state-level policymakers to rank some behaviors and characteristics higher than others in terms of their importance to democratic citizenship?

RQ 3. What compels Ohio state-level policymakers to rank some behaviors and characteristics lower than others in terms of their importance to democratic citizenship?

One of the primary virtues of a phenomenological study is its capacity “to identify phenomena through how they are perceived by the actors in a situation” (Lester, 1999). Typically, this means that phenomenological research allows the researcher to gather “deep” information and perceptions (Lester, 1999) through various qualitative methods, such as interviews, observation, or even probing used to follow up on responses to surface level questions. Ultimately, of course, the goal of phenomenological studies is to present the information gathered from the perspective of the research participant or how they interpret and/or experience the phenomenon.

A disadvantage of phenomenological approaches is the large amount of data that it generates in the form of field notes, audio recordings, personal jottings, and other data, all of which has to be analyzed (Lester, 1999). As such, data can be massive and disorganized; themes and categories can be difficult to identify. To analyze and manage the data collected in response to research questions two and three, which constituted the qualitative aspect of the research study, four steps were undertaken. All qualitative inquiry and analysis in this study were carried out from the perspective of the interpretivist paradigm. The focus of this paradigm is to understand and describe
people’s perceptions, personal perspectives, and interpretations of phenomena, events, or social reality as interpretivism “is about contextualized meaning” (Greene, 1994).

**Step I:**

The researcher reviewed the table of item means (Table 4.5) to identify the behaviors and characteristics that were ranked by members of the P-set as the three most important and three least important to democratic citizenship. Those items were as follows:
Table 4.6  Item Means Rankings: A Three Highest Ranked Items and their Means, B Three Lowest Ranked Items and their Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>Most important</td>
<td>acts responsibly in his / her community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Second most important</td>
<td>obeys laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Third most important</td>
<td>works and pays taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Third least important</td>
<td>knows about democratic social movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Second least important</td>
<td>recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Least important</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to clean up the environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step II:

Based on the items means, the researcher identified the Q-sample items that were ranked as the three most important to democratic citizenship. In descending order, they were 18, 8, and 11. All questionnaires where item 18 was ranked number one (most important) were identified and the corresponding qualitative comments were then typed up exactly as they had been recorded in the survey questionnaire and labeled according to the number of their corresponding sort.

The researcher repeated the above described process for all surveys where item number 8 had been ranked second and again for the questionnaires where item 11 was
ranked third until all qualitative comments relative to items 18, 8, and 11 in the rank
order of first, second, and third had been recorded.

**Step III:**

Following steps I and II, the researcher repeated the process for the Q-sample
items that had been identified as the three behaviors and/or characteristics that were
ranked least important to democratic citizenship. These items were, in descending order,
7, 13, and 14.

Similar to the process with the three highest ranked items, the researcher
identified all questionnaires where items # 7, 13, and 14 were ranked as the third, second,
and least important to citizenship. Qualitative comments where item #7 was ranked third
least important, item #13 second least important, and item #14 least important were typed
in exactly as study participants had written the in the questionnaire booklet and labeled
according to the corresponding sort.

Once all comments were typed up according to their respective ranking and Q-
sorts, the researcher summarized the reasons that each participant had written to explain
why they had ranked the top three and bottom three items as they had. Given that the
researcher had situated herself in the interpretivist paradigm, the intent of the analysis in
this section was to understand the various opinions, perspectives, and beliefs about
democratic citizenship of the various study participants. The analysis and subsequent
interpretation were both relative to the research questions that guided the qualitative
inquiry aspect of the research study.
Qualitative Comments:

Participants Who Ranked Item #18 as Most Important to Democratic Citizenship

Item #18: A democratic citizen acts responsibly in his/her community

A summary of the qualitative comments for item #18

Democratic citizenship is equated with a) responsible behavior individually and in the community, b) obeying laws, and c) self-control. Responsibility is seen as the foundation of democratic citizenship. It is intimated that many people lack sufficient intellectual sophistication to understand abstract behaviors and characteristics, such as "knows how to effect systemic change" or "critically assesses social structures". A question was raised as to why it would be desirable for all citizens to know how government agencies work.

Participants who ranked this item MOST IMPORTANT said:

Q-sort #3:
“Democracy is essentially individuals acting and interacting in a cooperative, orderly, and collective manner.”

Q-sort #8:
“A democratic citizen truly must act responsibly, which means being informed, voting, obeying laws, et al.”

Q-sort #10:
“While some of my lower rated items might be very important, not many citizens will approach a level of sophistication (either because of interest, time, education level, or
ability) required for such items as ‘knows how to effect systemic change’ or ‘critically assesses social structures ...’. Also, why would many need to know “how gov’t agencies work”? Therefore, my ratings are taking into account of everyone or the masses. Wouldn’t we like to have everyone ‘act responsibly in his/her community.’ What a start this would be to improve our society. I will be happy to discuss further, if necessary.”

**Q-sort #13:**

“most fundamental behaviors, common among many different ranges of societal experience.”

**Q-sort #16:**

“It is important to democratic citizenship to have a commitment to one’s community.”

**Q-sort #17:**

“Personal behavior and responsibility are at the foundation of democratic citizenship in one’s community. To live successfully in a democratic society you must behave and act responsibly.”

**Q-sort #18:**

“Key to success of any society is people taking personal responsibility for their own lives and actions and having respect for the rights of others. This enables one to be able to participate responsibly including sharing of one’s talents, time and resources in different situations and times.”
Q-sort #19:

“Controlling one’s own behavior and being responsible for one’s own action is most important in a civil society. If everyone behaved responsibly there would no need for additional laws.”

Q-sort #20:

“Critical to keeping society going but also correcting its flaws.”

Qualitative Comments:

Participants Who Ranked Item #8 as Second Most Important to Democratic Citizenship

Item #8: A democratic citizen obeys laws

A summary of the qualitative comments for item #8

Obeying the law is a presumed attribute of democratic citizenship and is essential for good citizenship. A democratic society requires that its people consent to obey the law. Obedience is a demonstration of respect for law makers and an appreciation for the rights of others. Obeying the law is also seen as active participation [in the community].

Participants who ranked item #8 as SECOND MOST IMPORTANT said:

Q-sort #4:

“one can’t be a good citizen w/o [without] obeying laws.”

Q-sort #8:

The italicized comment was originally made about another item that was ranked as most important. It was repeated as part of the participant’s articulation of why item #8 was
ranked second most important. “A democratic citizen truly must act responsibly, which means being informed, voting, obeying laws, et al.”

“Obeying laws is a given attribute of a democratic citizen.”

Q-sort #10:

“What is critical for all students to know to practice good citizenship?”

Q-sort #13:

unusable data

Q-sort #17:

“A democratic society requires the governed to consent to the rule of law. Government, to be legitimate, relies on the authorization by the people who consent to obey the law.”

Q-sort #18:

“Obedience to law demonstrates an appreciation for the rights of others and respect for the persons which has created the law.”

Q-sort #19:

“We must obey the laws to be a responsible member of society. If the laws are unjust or overly burdensome, then we should work to change them.”

Q-sort #20:

“I see active involvement as very important.”
Qualitative Comments:

Participants Who Ranked Item #11 as Third Most Important to Democratic Citizenship

Item #11: A democratic citizen works and pays taxes

A summary of the qualitative comments for item #11

Participation in a democracy is equated with working and paying taxes. Democratic citizens understand that a) to work is to accept and take responsibility to support oneself, and b) taxes pay for social and emergency services. Paying taxes is a way to a) help others, b) to make sure that your voice is heard, and c) to become a stakeholder.

Participants who ranked item 11 as third most important said:

Q-sort #8:
“Of course, paying taxes and working (if able until one retires) are ways of participating in a democracy.”

Q-sort #11:
“You must contribute to society to be heard and to help others.”

Q-sort #16:
“Working gives one independence, self-worth. Not paying taxes is not only a requirement, but it helps give one a stake in government.”

Q-sort #17:
“A democratic citizens understands that for govt to provide reasonable services and governance for the people, govt needs money, and govt obtains its funding through the
levy of taxes. A democratic citizen understands his or her personal responsibility to work to support him/herself, and legitimate govt. through taxes.”

**Q-sort #19:**

“Each member of society must contribute to the good of all as well as being responsible for caring for your own needs. That should be done to the best of his/her own abilities.”

**Qualitative Comments:**

**Participants Who Ranked Item #7 as Third Most Important to Democratic Citizenship**

**Item #7: A democratic citizen knows about democratic social movements**

A summary of the qualitative comments for item #7

“This item might merit a higher rank. Education, particularly in social studies, helps to provide skills [for democratic citizenship].”

Participants who ranked this item as THIRD LEAST IMPORTANT said:

**Q-sort #12**

“Probably could have rated this higher – being well educated @ history etc. contributes to overall skill set.”

**Qualitative Comments:**

**Participants Who Ranked Item #13 as Third Most Important to Democratic Citizenship**

**Item #13: A democratic citizen recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries**
A summary of the qualitative comments for item #13

There is no consensus of opinion as to why this item was rated as second least important to democratic citizenship. Some express concern about the inclusion of this item because it does not fit in with the other statements in terms of type. Concern was also expressed about a general inability to a) define democratic citizenship, and b) identify its behaviors and characteristics.

Participants who ranked this item as SECOND LEAST IMPORTANT said:

**Q-sort #1**

“Even though #13 is important, I do not feel it makes someone a democratic citizen, but, then again, I am not sure what a democratic citizen is.”

**Q-sort #5**

“These come as the outgrowth of the earlier learning. They build a ladder, rung upon rung, they move us along the desired path.”

**Q-sort #6**

“these are nice things to do.”

**Q-sort #15**

“This is a stray-in-the-herd statement. All the others are broad statements of philosophy – this one is a random list of three specific outcomes one might take to help others or society at-large. But there could be hundreds of versions of this statement (such as, “volunteers as a Scout leader, build Habitat for Humanity houses on Saturdays, chaperones at the orphanage socials, etc.). I ranked it low because it is a listing of possible examples rather than a general statement of democratic behavior.”
Qualitative Comments:

Participants Who Ranked Item #14 as Third Most Important to Democratic Citizenship

Item #14: A democratic citizen organizes community efforts to clean up the environment

A summary of the qualitative comments for item #14

No usable data was supplied for this item.

Participants who ranked this item as LEAST IMPORTANT said:

**Q-sort #13**

Respondent supplied unusable data

**Observations from within the data**

There were 10 Q sorts that ranked item 18 as most important. There were eight Q sorts that ranked item 8 as second most important. All but one of the eight Q sorts where item #8 is ranked second belong to the original Q sorts that ranked item 18 as most important.

There were five Q sorts that ranked item #11 as third most important. All five of those Q sorts also ranked #18 as most important, three Q sorts ranked #8 as second most important, and three ranked item combination #18/#8 respectively as most and second most important. Four Q sorts ranked item combination #8/#18 as either most or second most important, while only one of five Q sorts ranked a different item (#13) as most or second most important to democratic citizenship.
There were six Qsorts that had a combination of at least two of the three items that were ranked as the least important to democratic citizenship. Four of the six Qsorts ranked item #13 as the least important, 50% ranked item #14 as second least important, but only one Q-sort actually ranked item #14 as least important. No Q-sort ranked the three least important items in order of their means. The three least important items were as follows in descending order: #7, #13, and #14.

**Research Question Four: Quantitative Investigation**

*RQ 4. To what extent do Ohio state-level policymakers believe that the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship should be aligned with Ohio’s education policies governing accountability, content standards, and student learning experiences?*

In analyzing the data for research question four, three types of measurements were calculated. They were as follows: a) the percentage of disagreement/agreement with the extent to which state education policy should be aligned with and/or inclusive of the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship, b) the mean and standard deviation (measures of central tendency), and c) the skewness, kurtosis, and standard errors, which comprise the deviation from normality.

In Section III (Quantitative Investigation) of the survey questionnaire, study participants were asked about their views on three distinct aspects of state education policy and the extent to which it should be aligned with and/or inclusive of the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. Table 4.7 displays the levels of disagreement/agreement for each item as indicated by respondents. All answers were
made on a six-point scale and ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6).

The response receiving the greatest percentage for each of the three items is noted in bold face type. This response is also considered the mode or the response that was most frequently given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= very strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 = strongly disagree</th>
<th>3 = disagree</th>
<th>4 = agree</th>
<th>5 = strongly agree</th>
<th>6 = very strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>42.1</strong></td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q1) Ohio education policy governing accountability measures should seek to foster an alignment with the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= very strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 = strongly disagree</th>
<th>3 = disagree</th>
<th>4 = agree</th>
<th>5 = strongly agree</th>
<th>6 = very strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td><strong>57.89</strong></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q2) Ohio education policy should ensure that state-mandated P-12 Academic Content Standards are aligned with the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= very strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 = strongly disagree</th>
<th>3 = disagree</th>
<th>4 = agree</th>
<th>5 = strongly agree</th>
<th>6 = very strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td><strong>36.8</strong></td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q3) Ohio education policy should mandate the inclusion of classroom and school learning experiences where students have the opportunity to practice and develop the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

Table 4.7 Percent of Respondent Disagreement/Agreement that State Education Policy Should Be Aligned with and/or Inclusive of the 18 Behaviors and Characteristics of Democratic Citizenship
The measures of central tendency and variability that were used to analyze research question four were the mean and standard deviation. Like the other measures of central tendency and variability, their “purpose is to provide a single summary figure that best describes the central location of an entire distribution of observations” (King & Minium, 2003, p. 66). In addition, numerical descriptions of central tendency and variability, such as the mean and standard deviation, are important in that they portray “the average value of the distribution” (George & Mallery, 2007) and the average amount the scores deviate from the mean (King, et al., 2003).

The following table (4.7) illustrates the mean and standard deviation for the three items in Section III (Quantitative Investigation).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= very strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 = strongly disagree</th>
<th>3 = disagree</th>
<th>4 = agree</th>
<th>5 = strongly agree</th>
<th>6 = very strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q19) Ohio education policy governing accountability measures should seek to foster an alignment with the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

(Q20) Ohio education policy should ensure that state-mandated P-12 Academic Content Standards are aligned with the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

(Q21) Ohio education policy should mandate the inclusion of classroom and school learning experiences where students have the opportunity to practice and develop the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

Table 4.8  Measures of Central Tendency and Variability: Mean and Standard Deviation

King and Minium (2003) defined kurtosis as the level of peakedness of a given distribution (p. 60). The range of peakedness extends from platykurtic, which represents a more flattened distribution, to leptokurtic or a distribution that is highly peaked. The level of kurtosis that most closely represents a normal distribution is said to be mesokurtic, which would have a value of zero. The peakedness of a mesokurtic distribution is likely most commonly recognized as being identical or nearly identical to a normal distribution (King, et al., 2003), which is bell-shaped.
The range of normality for kurtosis in this study was -2.028 to +2.028 (twice the standard error). As the calculated kurtosis for each item fell within this range, the researcher determined that the level of kurtosis for each was non-problematic (School of Psychology, University of New England, 2000). Furthermore, the level of kurtosis for each item (.239, 1.519, and -.113) was determined to be acceptable since the values were between +/- 2 (George & Mallery, 2007). Table 4.9 below depicts the level of kurtosis, the standard error, and the range of normality for each item in Section III of the survey questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Range of Normality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q19) Ohio education policy governing accountability measures should seek to foster an alignment with the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>-2.028 to 2.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q20) Ohio education policy should ensure that state-mandated P-12 Academic Content Standards are aligned with the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>-2.028 to 2.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q21) Ohio education policy should mandate the inclusion of classroom and school learning experiences where students have the opportunity to practice and develop the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>-2.028 to 2.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 Deviation from Normality: Kurtosis/Range of Normality, and Standard Error
Skewness concerns the distribution of scores and, ultimately, symmetry. If a distribution is said to be symmetrical, then the two halves of the distribution would be identical or mirror images of each other (School of Psychology, University of New England, 2000). If the distribution is asymmetrical, which is more often the case (School of Psychology, University of New England, 2000), the distribution is said to be skewed (Gliem class lecture, 2009; King, et al., 2003; School of Psychology, University of New England, 2000). Distribution can be skewed either to the left or to the right, positive or negative as can be determined by the tail on the curve and/or by the high part (the mode) of the curve where the majority of the scores are clustered (Gliem class lecture, 2009). Positively skewed distributions indicate that scores are clustered at the left side of the continuum where the lower numbers are found. Negatively skewed distributions, then, indicate the reverse and find their scores clustered to the right of the curve, in the area of the numbers of higher value. The range of normality for the skewness in this study was -1.048 to +1.048 or twice the standard error. As the skewness for this study was -.359, -.645, and -.603 respectively, the researcher concluded that the distributions for the items in Section III was approximately normal (School of Psychology, University of New England, 2000). Further, skewness for each distribution of scores was considered to be excellent since the values were between +/- 1.0 (George & Mallery, 2007).

Table 4.10 below depicts the skewness, the standard error, and the range of normality for each item in Section III of the survey questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Range of Normality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q19) Ohio education policy governing accountability measures should seek to</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>-1.048 - 1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foster an alignment with the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizenship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q20) Ohio education policy should ensure that state-mandated P-12 Academic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.645</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>-1.048 - 1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Standards are aligned with the 18 behaviors and characteristics of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democratic citizenship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q21) Ohio education policy should mandate the inclusion of classroom and school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.603</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>-1.048 - 1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning experiences where students have the opportunity to practice and develop the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 Deviation from Normality: Skewness, Range of Normality, and Standard Error

The following histograms (Figures 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5) provide visual representations of the breakdown of the scores for the three items addressing research question four in Section III of the study. Also indicated in Figures 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5 are the skewness and the levels of kurtosis. Gliem (2009) identified histograms as graphic displays of quantitative data, such as frequency, skewness, or kurtosis.

In the following histograms, the X axis displays the various response options to the three items in Section III (Quantitative Investigation) of the study, while the Y axis
displays the frequency. The overlay depicts a normal distribution with the mean and standard deviation indicated for each of the three questionnaire items. The role of the overlay is to assist in determining the extent to which a normal distribution exists for these data.

**Figure 4.3**
Breakdown of Scores, Skewness, and Kurtosis
Mean = 3.68
Standard Deviation = 1.376
N = 19
Question 19
Figure 4.4
Breakdown of Scores, Skewness, and Kurtosis
Mean = 3.79
Standard Deviation = 1.273
N = 19
Question 20

Figure 4.5
Breakdown of Scores, Skewness, and Kurtosis
Mean = 4.05
Standard Deviation = 1.545
N = 19
Question 21
Chapter 5

Discussion of the Results

Introduction

In moving toward the conclusion of my investigation, I have found it to be increasingly necessary to return to its beginning and to explore once again that which compelled me to initiate this study in the first place. I retraced my steps and revisited the early stages of my research, which included the brainstorming of which social or political aspect of education I wanted to explore. I recalled the excitement that I felt in reading the feature story in the January 2008 issue of the *Phi Delta Kappan* that began with “Conditions in American society do not bode well for the health of democracy”. In reviewing the article for use in the conclusion of this study, I also observed some of my preliminary notes that asked further on in the same article “what does this say about the relationship between education and democratic participation?”. Clearly, this was education’s most pressing sociopolitical issue: an exploration of the intersection of the quality and content of American P-12 public education and the health of our unique form of government. The issues raised in the *Phi Delta Kappan* (volume 89, number 5) captivated me and perhaps even called me to action, prompting me to ask those who are charged with guiding our democracy and setting policy for our public schools “*how do Ohio state-level policymakers conceptualize democratic citizenship?*”.

In addition to an exploration of the larger and more global issues raised in this study, I have included an interpretation of data that was presented in an earlier chapter.
In discussing the findings from the study, the results of state-level policymakers’ rankings of the characteristics that are most and least important to democratic citizenship will be synthesized from the Q-methodology portion of the study. The similarities and dissimilarities among the factors where individual members of the P-set loaded during centroid factor analysis and varimax rotation will also be discussed in terms of the factors’ respective distinguishing statements and the consensus statements found across all of the factors. Further insight into the results of the Q sorts will come from a summary and interpretation of P-set members’ qualitative comments that articulated their reasons for ranking Q-sample items (the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship) as they did. A final aspect of the discussion of the findings will be a summary of the results from the quantitative investigation on education policy relative to the alignment with and inclusion of the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

I also offer some reflections and/or recommendations concerning a) the use of Q-methodology as a viable option for exploring subjectivity, including dispositions, b) a healthy democracy and its needs, c) the relationship between education and democracy, d) the development of democratic citizenship in school-age children, and e) the extent to which education policy ensures that P-12 students are both well-educated and prepared for their role and obligations as an adult citizen in a democratic society.

Finally, a number of implications are tendered in areas ranging from democratic citizenship and political partisanship to P-12 and teacher education to future research.
The Multiple Methodologies of this Study

This research study was conducted by using three distinct methodologies: Q-methodology, qualitative inquiry, and quantitative investigation. Although each methodology addressed a single specific aspect of the study, they were interconnected and worked together to delve deeply into the issue of how policymakers view democratic citizenship by 1) forcing participants to rank order behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship from most important to least important, 2) soliciting an explanation for their rank ordering of the top three and bottom three items, and 3) asking participants to apply the indicators they had ranked earlier to education policy at both the macro level of state-mandated accountability and standards as well of the micro level of the classroom. While employing only one or two of the methodologies in the study would still have produced findings worth considering, the use and integration of all three provided richer and deeper results. These results ultimately shed light on personal opinions and viewpoints, the application of which, in the policy arena, impacts citizens of all ages and our democratic society on multiple levels.

Brown (1980) explained Q-methodology as providing a foundation for the systematic study of subjectivity. As such, it provides an opportunity to explore an individual’s opinions, perspectives, preferences, attitudes, and beliefs. It is because of Q-methodology's ability to explore subjectivity, that I considered it to be highly appropriate for a study designed to explore policymakers' conceptualization of democratic citizenship.
By including a qualitative aspect to the study that provided an opportunity for each member of the P-set to reflect and then articulate their reasons for ranking the behaviors and characteristics that they saw as the three most important and three least important to democratic citizenship, I was able to probe beyond subjective opinion and perspective alone. Participants’ qualitative comments provided a glimpse as to what drove their subjectivity in a certain direction. The interpretivist lens that guided the qualitative inquiry afforded me the opportunity to understand policymakers' various reasons for ranking the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship as they did in the initial part of the study. Situating myself in the interpretivist paradigm also helped me to understand how policymakers view democratic citizenship based on how they have experienced it. Their realities and experiences, in turn, likely informed and influenced their versions of what constitutes democratic citizenship and, ultimately, their rankings of its behaviors and characteristics. In the end, by exploring policymakers' conceptualizations of democratic citizenship through the Q-sorting process in tandem with a qualitative inquiry, the findings of the study presented a deeper and more complete picture of how the study participants viewed democratic citizenship than I may have gotten otherwise.

By including the qualitative inquiry, I was able, as well, to hear the voices of the study participants that typically emerge at the beginning of the study during the concourse or gathering of initial thoughts, ideas, or opinions from which Q-sample items are taken. Since the 18 behaviors and characteristics that were used for this study were extracted from an existing framework that appeared in What Type of Citizen?: The
Politics of Educating for Democracy by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) the need for a concourse was, therefore, precluded. I found that pursuing a qualitative follow up to the sorting process to be essential not only for the purpose of understanding the compelling forces behind the rankings, but also for replacing the concourse and rounding out the study in order to delve as deeply as possible into policymakers' views on democratic citizenship, which naturally led to some insight into their perspectives on democracy as well.

Although it was not a part of the original design, the quantitative investigation was added in order to take an objective look at the intersection of Ohio P-12 education policy and state-level policymakers' opinions, attitudes, and beliefs about democratic citizenship. Ostensibly, it was the aspect of the study that represented the practical application of subjective opinions, attitudes, and beliefs to tangible policy and, therefore, tied the whole study together. It also represented the most concrete facet of the study as the three areas of P-12 education policy that were addressed in the quantitative investigation (education accountability measures, Ohio Academic Content standards, and classroom practices) are familiar to most people: policymakers and citizens alike, students and non-students, educators, and those outside of the profession. Above all, these areas of education policy have direct impact on families with school-age children and/or parents who are teachers at the P-12 level. As a result, they have meaning to most people because they can be felt or experienced in a very personal way. By attaching the quantitative investigation to Q-methodology and a qualitative inquiry, it yielded an objective view of where policymakers stood on P-12 education policy and the extent to
which and how frequently their respective positions on policy align with their subjective views on citizenship.

Finally, by approaching the study through the use of the three combined methodologies, the extent to which policymakers' own connection making was revealed, which allowed us to see how well policymakers understood the issue of the alignment between their perspectives on democratic citizenship and the way they see and advocate for or against policies governing the three areas addressed in the study. In short, the combined use of the three methodologies that I have discussed at length provided a picture that would likely not have been nearly as complete had I used only one or two of them. Combined, I found that Q-methodology, qualitative inquiry, and quantitative investigation were truly greater than the sum of their parts.

**Interpretation of the Findings**

In considering how best to interpret the findings from chapter four, I decided that the most appropriate course would be to compare the outcomes of the policymakers’ perspectives on democratic citizenship with the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship as identified by Westheimer and Kahne (2004). In order to round out and finalize my interpretation, I felt that returning to the origin of the study and compare the findings with those issues raised by Neumann (2008) in American Democracy at Risk: How Well are We Preparing our Children to be Citizens? was also warranted. It seemed only right to go back to the article that put the research study in motion.
Before attempting to discuss the overall findings from this study, I would first like to look at democratic citizenship as identified by Westheimer and Kahne in their 2004 study. This will provide a basis for my ensuing comments while providing a reference point for those not familiar with the three types of democratic citizenship that their study brought to light.

Westheimer and Kahne (2004) began by saying that while democracy is seen as desirable by almost everyone, there is little consensus among the underlying beliefs about it. In their article “What Kind of Citizen?: The Politics of Educating for Democracy (2004), they set out to highlight the numerous points of view about what constitutes good citizenship and what good citizens do. To that end, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) studied ten programs across the United States, the aims of which were to advance the democratic purposes of education. In analyzing the data from their two year, mixed methods studies, three types of citizenship emerged: personally responsible citizenship, participatory citizenship, and justice-oriented citizenship. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) described each type of citizen in a progression that mirrored a continuum starting from those who were the least civically engaged, the least participatory, and who focused most on personal behaviors and characteristics relative to democratic citizenship to the most civically and societally engaged, the most participatory, and who focused most on civic and socially just behaviors and characteristics when defining democratic citizenship. It is against these three types of citizenship that the findings of my own study will be compared and interpreted. It is the final logical step in this study as the 18 behaviors and characteristics used in the Q-sample for this study were the findings from Westheimer
and Kahne’s study in 2004. Table 5.1 illustrates the 18 behaviors and characteristics and the types of citizenship with which they are affiliated as per the findings of Westheimer and Kahne (2004).

The findings for Research Question Four (quantitative investigation) appear in a separate discussion. However, to conduct an effective and clear discussion of the findings on education policy, Research Question Four was deconstructed, interpreted, and, then, considered as a whole. Finally, the findings and interpretation of Research Question Four were related back to the three research questions that preceded it in an attempt to tie the four questions together as intended at the outset of the study.

---

18 Some indicators from the original Westheimer and Kahne (2004) study were disaggregated in order to address each behavior or characteristic individually and not as a bundle. This was necessary as study participants may have seen each behavior or characteristic at varying levels of importance to democratic citizenship and would, therefore, have been unable to rank bundled items accurately.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personally Participatory Justice-oriented Responsible Citizens:</th>
<th>Participatory Citizens:</th>
<th>Justice-oriented Citizens:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• act responsibly in his/her community</td>
<td>• actively participate in community improvement efforts</td>
<td>• critically assess social structures to see beyond surface causes of social stratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• work and pay taxes</td>
<td>• organize community efforts to care for those in need</td>
<td>• critically assess political structures to see beyond surface causes of political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• obey laws</td>
<td>• organize community efforts to promote economic development</td>
<td>• critically assess economic structures to see beyond surface causes of economic disparity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• volunteer to lend a hand in times of crisis</td>
<td>• organize community efforts to clean up the environment</td>
<td>• seek out and address areas of injustice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• recycle, give blood, and donate to food pantries</td>
<td>• know how government agencies work</td>
<td>• know strategies for accomplishing collective tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• know about democratic social movements</td>
<td>• know how to effect systemic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• are active members of community organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Three Types of Democratic Citizenship (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004)
Personally Responsible Citizenship

Personally Responsible Citizens (PRC) act responsibly in the community and contribute by picking up litter, staying out of debt, or other personal activities, such as those listed in Table 5.1. A salient feature of the Personally Responsible Citizen is that he/she will contribute when asked or volunteer in extreme circumstances, such as disaster or emergency. As a rule, however, they do not typically identify societal needs, or diagnose and take the initiative to help resolve social issues or problems.

Those who define democratic citizenship from the PRC lens, see character as most important. For PRC, volunteerism is frequently a substantial part of democratic citizenship and a way to “help solve serious social problems” (www.pointsoflight.org, 2000).

Participatory Citizenship

The key words to describe Participatory Citizens (PC) are active participation and civic engagement, along with involvement in local, state, and national affairs (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004). In addition, the PC is proactive and not only volunteers time or donates money to a cause, but will typically organize help or improvement efforts to address the cause.

Democratic citizenship from the standpoint of PC revolves around civic engagement and action. To that end, they see educating P-12 students about democracy, democratic social movements, and grassroots activity and how government works, including its agencies, as essential. In addition, PC place an emphasis on collective
efforts in the community and maintain that this type of citizenship promotes common understandings, trust, and collective commitments (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004) that is reminiscent of the participation in collective endeavors advocated by Dewey (1916) in *Democracy and Education*.

**Justice-Oriented Citizenship**

Democratic citizenship from the position of Justice-oriented Citizens (JOC) shares certain attitudes and beliefs with Participatory Citizens (PC), such as a the “vision of the participatory citizen with an emphasis on collective work related to the life and issues of the community” (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004). The core element around which JOC revolves is social justice, which envisions democratic citizenship through a lens described by Westheimer and Kahne (2004) as that of critical theory. JOC seeks to improve society and ensure comprehensive inclusion in the democratic process by critically analyzing and addressing social issues and injustices.

The primary element that constitutes the difference between Justice-oriented Citizens (JOC) and PRC and PC is its focus on social criticism as a means to induce social change, particularly concerning areas of stratification, economic disparity and/or political inequality. Like PC, JOC is proactive. However, where PC acts to address an immediate need, such as organizing a clothing and food drive for the homeless, JOC would also seek out and address the underlying reasons for the economic disparity that led to homelessness in the first place.
Research Questions One, Two, and Three (Q-Methodology and Qualitative Inquiry)

Z-scores are normalized scores that allow multiple raw scores, ratings, or rankings to be standardized by reducing the mean to zero, calculating the standard deviation, and using the standard deviation to measure a score’s distance from the mean. The raw data from the 20 Q-sorts were converted to Z-scores and the new Z-scores were used to rank the 18 Q-sample items in each factor.

In order to mirror the procedures followed in Sections I and II of the survey instrument used in this study, I looked at the items that were ranked as the top three and the bottom three in each factor (Tables 5.2). These three sets of behaviors and characteristics were ranked as most and least important to democratic citizenship according to the Z-scores in their respective factors. Scores ranged from 1.108 for item #11 in Factor One to a high of 2.051 for item #18 also in Factor I. There were several statements that appeared in each factor and were, therefore, statements of consensus. Certain other statements ranked in the top three in each factor, however, were distinguishing statements and served to highlight a behavior or characteristic that typified each factor. Additionally, the role of distinguishing statements was also to identify a factor’s differentiating behaviors and/or characteristics relative to democratic citizenship when compared to other factors. Although three distinguishing statements (items #12, 14, and 13) surfaced in Factor I, none of them appeared among the three items ranked as

---

19 In Section I of the survey questionnaire, participants were directed to place in rank order the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. They were to rank them from most important to least important, going from the top to the bottom of the continuum. In Section II, participants were asked to articulate their reasons for ranking the top three behaviors and characteristics (most important to democratic citizenship) and the bottom three behaviors and characteristics (least important to democratic citizenship) as they did.
third, second, or most important to democratic citizenship in that factor. In Factor II, items #12, 17, 13, 10, 3, and 16 were all identified as distinguishing statements, yet only item #12 (is an active member of the community) was ranked among the top three items in this factor. A similar situation occurred in Factor III where items #7, 13, 18, 12, , and 15 were all found to be distinguishing statements and only item #7 (knows about democratic social movements) was ranked in third place for the factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #18:</td>
<td>acts responsibly in the community</td>
<td>2.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #8:</td>
<td>obeys laws</td>
<td>1.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #11:</td>
<td>works and pays taxes</td>
<td>1.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #18</td>
<td>acts responsibly in the community</td>
<td>1.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #12*</td>
<td>is an active member of community organizations</td>
<td>1.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #8</td>
<td>obeys laws</td>
<td>1.241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #8</td>
<td>obeys laws</td>
<td>1.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #5</td>
<td>volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis</td>
<td>1.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #7*</td>
<td>knows about democratic social movements</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C

Table 5.2 Most Important Behaviors and Characteristics by Z-score: A Factor I, B Factor II, C Factor III *denotes distinguishing statements
What this scarcity of distinguishing statements among the items ranked as most important to democratic citizenship implies is that there is little difference among the factors where opinion about the elements that are most critical to democratic citizenship are concerned. In fact, and as will be presented in a discussion to appear shortly, there are actually three times as many consensus statements as there are distinguishing statements among the items ranked as most important to democratic citizenship across all factors. If we look even further and return to the scoring grid, which allows us to include the items ranked in the top six slots of each factor, the rate of consensus increases yet again to include items #5 (volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis) and item #11 (works and pays taxes). In this case, items #5 and #11 would have the distinction of appearing in each factor and also of becoming a Consensus statement.

So, based on Z-scores, it is reasonable to conclude thus far that the members of the P-set in this study vary little in how they see democratic citizenship and what they feel is important to it. It should also be noted that in the case of item #12 (is an active member of community organizations), it became a distinguishing statement only because it was ranked high in two factors: I and II, and then low in the remaining factor: Factor III. Consequently, aside from this single note of dissonance in Factor III regarding the importance of activity in the community, item #12 may not have been a distinguishing statement at all.
Consensus Statements

As stated earlier, consensus statements are statements that appear across all factors and are ranked either all positively, showing that the behaviors and/or characteristics in the statements of consensus were considered to be of great importance, or all negatively, which indicates that overall little or no importance was attributed to the given behavior and/or characteristic relative to the phenomenon under consideration. In the case of this study, that phenomenon was democratic citizenship and the indicated behavior and/or characteristic of importance was item #8 (obeys laws) and was followed closely by items #11 (works and pays taxes) and #5 (volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis).

The two remaining consensus statements, items #4 (seeks out and addresses areas of injustice) and #9 (critically assesses economic structures) were scored either as neutral or negatively. Item #4 was ranked negatively and neutrally, which says that it generally evoked little or no response and was seen as a negligible behavior or characteristic relative to democratic citizenship. Item #9, on the other hand, was ranked as neutral across factors, so the P-set as a whole had no opinion either positively or negatively for this item. In looking at the five items that emerged as consensus statements and also taking into consideration the dearth of distinguishing statements that appeared among the items that were ranked at some high degree of importance to democratic citizenship, I was left to conclude that obeying the law (item #8) was deemed the most essential form of conduct of a democratic citizen along with working and paying taxes (item #11), and
lending a hand in times of crisis (item #5). Each one of the three behaviors and characteristics is representative of Personally Responsible Citizenship.

Qualitative comments seemed to bear out and support the conclusions drawn at this point concerning consensus statement items #8, #11, and #5. The following transcript of select remarks that were entered by study participants in Section II (Qualitative Inquiry) of the survey questionnaire provided some insight into their ideas about obeying the law relative to democratic citizenship.

Item #8 (obeys laws):

Q-sort #4: “one can’t be a good citizen w/o [without] obeying laws”

Q-sort #8: “A democratic citizen truly must act responsibly, which means being informed, voting, obeying laws, et al.”

Q-sort #17: “A democratic society requires the governed to consent to the rule of law. Government, to be legitimate, relies on the authorization by the people who consent to obey the law.”

Q-sort #18: “Obedience to the law demonstrates an appreciation for the rights of others and respect for the persons which have created the law.”

Q-sort #19: “We must obey the law to be a responsible member of society.”

Item #11 is similarly supported by the following comments made about working and paying taxes (#11).

Q-sort #8: “Of course, paying taxes and working ... are ways of participating in a democracy.”

Q-sort #11: “You must contribute to society to be heard and to help others.”
Q-sort #16: “Working gives one independence, self-worth ... it helps give one a stake in government.

Q-sort #17: “A democratic citizens understands that for govt to provide reasonable services and governance for the people, govt needs money... A democratic citizen understands his or her personal responsibility to work to support him/herself, and legitimate govt. through taxes.”

Q-sort #19: “Each member of society must contribute to the good of all as well as being responsible for caring for your own needs. That should be done to the best of his/her own abilities.”

It should be noted that while item #5 (volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis) did emerge as a consensus statement, it was in Factor III alone where this item had one of the top three Z-scores. However, the general theme of helping out and sharing personal resources, talents, and time consistently runs throughout the qualitative comments written in response to item #18. The following qualitative comments reflect study participants’ perspectives on item #5.

Q-sort #3: “Democracy is essentially individual acting and interacting in a cooperative, orderly, and collective manner.”

Q-sort #16: “It is important to democratic citizenship to have a commitment to one’s community.”

Q-sort #18: “Key to success of any society is people taking responsibility for their own
lives ... and having respect for the rights of others. This enables one to ... participate responsibly including sharing ... one’s talents, time, and resources in different situations and times.

In many of these comments, democratic citizenship is likened to personal responsibility or individual behaviors or characteristics as they pertain to civic behavior and society as a whole. So while many understand working and paying taxes as a personal responsibility, there is also an indication that working and paying taxes are individual behaviors that do not address societal issues, such as those of concern to PC or JOC, various members of the P-set see them as ways to participate and engage. And because they are seen as forms of participation and engagement, they are also considered critical to democratic citizenship.

The first and most striking aspect of the items that were ranked as the behaviors and characteristics (16th, 17th, and 18th) that are least important to democratic citizenship was that they were completely different in Factors I, II, and III (Tables 5.3a, 5.3b, and 5.3c). Essentially, this means that where there was strong consensus regarding the most important behaviors and characteristics, there was no consensus at all concerning what is not important to democratic citizenship. In fact, the single point of consensus seemed to lay in their inability to find a common ground in ranking the least important behaviors and characteristics.
This lack of consensus was apparent in the few accompanying qualitative comments that were provided. Among the few comments that were recorded, participants were often unable to articulate why they ranked a given item as third least, second least, or even least important to democratic citizenship. In many cases, they offered no explanation at all. The qualitative comments for the items ranked least

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #17:</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to promote economic development</td>
<td>-1.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #14*:</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to help clean up the environment</td>
<td>-1.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #13*:</td>
<td>recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries</td>
<td>-1.932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #10*:</td>
<td>knows how government agencies work</td>
<td>-1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #3*:</td>
<td>critically assesses social structures to see beyond the surface causes of social stratification</td>
<td>-1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #16*:</td>
<td>knows how to effect systemic change</td>
<td>-1.856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #12*:</td>
<td>is an active member of community organizations</td>
<td>-0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #1*:</td>
<td>knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks</td>
<td>-1.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #15*:</td>
<td>actively participates in community improvement efforts</td>
<td>-2.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Least Important Behaviors and Characteristics by Z-score: A Factor I, B Factor II, C Factor III *Denotes distinguishing statements
important made it clear that study participants found this part of the rank ordering process to be overwhelming. Comments that were entered by study participants generally pertained to the item in question, but failed completely to encompass a precise explanation as to why the item had been ranked at a level of unimportance relative to democratic citizenship. The comments below are a representation of the remarks made about items that were considered unimportant as a whole. They were selected because they also reflect what I have described earlier as the inability to articulate clearly a particular aspect of the items that rendered them less important to democratic citizenship than other statements in the Q-sample.

**Q-sort #12 (concerning item #7 knows about democratic social movements):**

“Probably could have rated this higher – being well educated @ history etc. contributes to overall skill set.

**Q-sort #5 (concerning item #13 recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries):**

“These come as the outgrowth of the earlier learning. They build a ladder, rung upon rung, they move us along the desired path.”

**Q-sort #6 (concerning item #13 recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries):**

“these are nice things to do”

The vagueness of these explanations, along with the ranking of different behaviors and characteristics as least important to democratic citizenship may likely signal that while study participants were able to recognize what they believe constitutes democratic citizenship when prompted by the item list, they had not sufficiently pinpointed an idea of what it looked like beyond a personal or individual level. As a
result, they were unable to explain their reasons for ranking items certain items as they did.

Given that the behaviors and characteristics found in PRC are the most concrete, while those in JOC are the most abstract, perhaps what is suggested here is the underlying issue of cognitive complexity, which Reiman and Thies-Sprintall (1998) identified as a person’s tendency to think concretely or abstractly. In the case of democratic citizenship and the continuum constructed by Westheimer and Kahne (2004), the greater the progression that is made from left to right, the more abstract the behaviors and characteristics become. Furthermore, while progressing from left to right in the continuum and moving from PRC to PC to JOC, the behaviors and characteristics of citizenship also progressively de-emphasize individual behaviors and characteristics and replace them with actions and traits that are trained on society and the comprehensive greater good of all of its members. What is interesting here is that there is a clear pattern emanating from both the Z-scores of the highest ranked items in each factor as well as in the consensus statements. That pattern points unmistakably to study participants’ opinions that what matters most to democratic citizenship are behaviors and characteristics, such as obeying the law, working and paying taxes, acting responsibly in the community, and a willingness to contribute or serve when asked. Each of these exists on a plane of micro-level behaviors belonging to PRC. As a whole, these behaviors do not extend beyond the level of the individual, which is the smallest segment of society.
The nebulousness of the qualitative comments may also indicate that study participants simply do not conceptualize democratic citizenship on a societal level. Should that be the case, then perhaps when faced with ranking indicators that represent behaviors and characteristics focused on civic engagement and participation on a societal level or that are focused on improving society by using a critical lens to bring about social change, study participants simply did not see the items’ relevance to democratic citizenship. At the very least, some members of the P-set saw the goodness of the behaviors and characteristics focused on civic engagement and social change and even acknowledged them. However, they still did not consider them as essential aspects of democratic behaviors and attitudes, possibly for reasons that have been previously noted or possibly because they felt that citizenship is about the individual. All in all, what is likely the case here seems to be summed up in the qualitative comments from Q-sort #7 that were made in response to item #13 (recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries): “Even though #13 is important, I do not feel it makes someone a democratic citizen, but, then again, I am not sure what a democratic citizen is.”

Another among the lowest rated items that differentiated Factor III was item #12 (is an active member of community organizations). In Factor II and with a Z-score of 1.385, item #12 was ranked as the behavior or characteristic that is second most important to democratic citizenship. It was also ranked positively (Z-score 0.495) in Factor I, although not among the top three. In contrast, item #12 appeared in Factor III with a Z-score of -0.936, which is interesting in two respects. First, despite item #12’s clear tie to the theme of “community”, a common thread among items ranked as most
important to democratic citizenship, it was ranked as unimportant, but only in Factor III. Second is the composition of Factor III and its general strand of opinion. At first glance they appear to be the polar opposites of those in Factors I and II in terms of the opinions that emerged in the other two factors about how democratic citizenship seems to be conceptualized. However, upon further investigation, it rather seems that Factor III does not firmly conceptualize democratic citizenship much beyond that of the other two factors. What has occurred with item #12 in Factor III is that its negative rating is one of the few indications the strand of opinion for that factor does not always agree with the other two.

This irregularity then raises the question as to whether Factor III would have surfaced as similar to or distinct from Factors I and II in how it conceptualizes democratic citizenship had it not been for distinguishing statement in item #12. I contend that it would not have differed significantly from the other two factors had the confidence level not been lowered from $p<.01$ to $p<.05$, which allowed loadings that otherwise did not take place. Even then only two of the 20 participants loaded onto Factor III, which is the minimum number of loadings required for the factor to be considered viable. It is particularly important to see the larger picture here and understand that even with Factor III’s distinguishing statements, the majority of which were items ranked unimportant to democratic citizenship in this factor, (items #18, 12, 1, and 15\(^{20}\)), Factor III was still not greatly differentiated from Factors I and II. Its highest ranked item was item #8 (obeys

\(^{20}\) 18 = acts responsibly in his/her community; 12 = is an active member of community organizations; 1 = knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks; 15 = actively participates in community improvement efforts
laws). Among consensus statements, this item was ranked the highest [with a 3 in the scoring grid] and had the highest score (1.89). On that condition alone, it is reasonable to conclude that while the participants who loaded on Factor III may conceptualize democratic citizenship to some extent in terms of civic engagement and social change, they, too, feel strongly that it is rooted in obedience to the law along with a work ethic and the obligation to pay taxes. This is curious in itself as such a strong validation for obeying the law runs counter to valuing dissent. Historically, it has been those whose viewpoints are grounded in social justice who most value and most advocate dissent. It appears in this case that this view may have shifted.

In Table 5.4 an overall analysis of the distinguishing statements shows that items #12 and #13 both appear as distinguishing statements in all three factors. As a whole, the distinguishing statements do not tell much of a story. One item (#12: *acts responsibly in his/her community*) is ranked high in Factors I and II that appear to be fairly closely aligned with Personally Responsible Citizenship. Predictably, item #12 is ranked low in Factor III, which, though not effusive, has pretty evident leanings toward Justice-Oriented Citizenship.

Item #13 received a negative rank and score in Factor I, a neutral rank and the score of 0 in Factor II, and a positive rank and score in Factor III. All other distinguishing statements appeared in only one factor and combined to highlight the distinctive nature of their factor. The striking feature that can be seen when looking simultaneously at all of the distinguishing statements across all of the factors is a seeming evolution of the conceptualization of democratic citizenship from character and personal
responsibility to civic engagement and the social justice. For example, where the distinguishing statement #12 is ranked as important to democratic citizenship, distinguishing statement #17 in Factor II expands the conceptualization of democratic citizenship beyond character and personal responsibility to a level of civic responsibility, which benefits members of the entire community.

The only aspect of interest among the distinguishing statements is item #13 (recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries). In looking at its rankings across all three factors, item #13’s value relative to democratic citizenship rises as the factors evolve from those most closely aligned with Personally Responsible Citizenship (PRC) to a closer alignment with Justice-Oriented Citizenship. For example, in Factor I, which has shown thus far a strong alliance with PRC, item #13 has a Z-score of -1.93 out of -3.00. In Factor II, #13 has moved up in the rankings and is scored at 0.070 out of 3.00, which is a tepid endorsement at best, but does reflect some progression along the citizenship continuum. By Factor III, however, item #13’s Z-score in .94, showing that for those two members of the P-set who loaded on this factor, there was some understanding of democratic citizenship on a more global or societal plane. Further, item #13’s Z-score intimates that they have awareness that the actions of a democratic citizen impacts the present as well as the future.

Does this mean that those who loaded on Factor III are unquestionably situated in Justice-Oriented Citizenship? I would say probably not. What it does show to me is a realization that democratic citizenship transcends personal behavior and responsibility:
its needs encompass a commitment to civic responsibility, engagement, and concern for society as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #12</td>
<td>is an active member of community organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #14</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to clean up the environment</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #13</td>
<td>recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #12</td>
<td>is an active member of community organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #17</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to promote economic development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #13</td>
<td>recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #10</td>
<td>knows how government agencies work</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #3</td>
<td>critically assesses social structures to see beyond the surface causes of social stratification</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #16</td>
<td>knows how to effect systemic change</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-1.86*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #7</td>
<td>knows about democratic social movements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #13</td>
<td>recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #18</td>
<td>acts responsibly in the community</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #12</td>
<td>is an active member of community organizations</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-0.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #1</td>
<td>knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #15</td>
<td>actively participates in community improvement efforts</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C

Table 5.4 Distinguishing Statements, Item Rank, and Score: A Factor I, B Factor II, C Factor III (p < .05) *denotes p < .01
In contrast with the distinguishing statements that highlight each factor’s uniqueness, are consensus statements. The PQMethod Software 2.11 (2002) manual describes consensus statements as statements that do not distinguish between any factors. A better definition might be that they are statements that appear in each factor and are all ranked negatively or positively, showing agreement across all factors. They indicate where all factors agree in content and ranking, i.e. positive, negative, or neutral, but are not required to have identical scores and rankings in order to be considered a consensus statement (Table 5.5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>F-II Rank</th>
<th>F-I Rank</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>seeks out and addresses areas of injustice</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8*</td>
<td>obeys laws</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9*</td>
<td>critically assesses economic structures to see beyond surfaces causes of economic disparity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>works and pays taxes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5  Consensus Statements across Factors I, II, and III
All listed statements are non-significant at p > .01; *Denotes non-significant at p > .05

What is curious about the consensus statements that emerged in this study is that in certain respects, they bind together factors that appear to head in divergent directions. However, after reflecting on the consensus statements, it gives pause to consider a) the extent to which the conceptualizations of democratic citizenship actually differ across the three factors and b) how dissimilar or similar the study participants’ (P-set) perspectives were despite differences in gender, race/ethnicity, levels of education, policy body of
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21 denotes F as an abbreviation for Factor
22 reflects item rank after transfer of ranked items from the original continuum to the Q-sort scoring grid
service, and political affiliation. In looking at Table 5.5, we might be able to get a clearer picture of the P-set, how they loaded on the various factors, and how they view democratic citizenship. First, one issue that is fairly well-defined is that the P-set does not equate social justice and economic parity with democratic citizenship as is evident in items #4 and #9. Next, we can see that service and assistance do fit into the P-set’s collective idea of democratic citizenship, although the endorsement is rather lukewarm and the circumstances are qualified. Finally, what the study participants do see as unquestionably important to democratic citizenship are again behaviors of obedience and personal responsibility.

As we look at the scores, there can be little question that regardless of where participants may stand on civic and social justice issues relative to democratic citizenship. From their vantage point, obeying the law (item #8) and working, and paying taxes (item #11) are the key elements in democratic citizenship. Further, this opinion appears to supersede all other behaviors and characteristics regardless of how the distinguishing statements seem to typify their respective factors. And while this classification system reveals three factors and a progression of democratic citizenship that ranges from character and personal responsibility to civic responsibility and social justice, the consensus statements make clear that personal responsibility is the bedrock of democratic citizenship in the opinions of the members of these study participants. It is only after obeying the law that the remaining behaviors and characteristics may be considered.
**Item Means**

The mean scores of the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship appear in Tables 5.6 and 5.7 are as follows in descending order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Most important</td>
<td>acts responsibly in his/her community</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Second most important</td>
<td>obeys laws</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Third most important</td>
<td>works and pays taxes</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 Three highest ranked items and their means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Behavior or Characteristic of Democratic Citizenship</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Third least important</td>
<td>knows about democratic social movements</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Second least important</td>
<td>recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Least important</td>
<td>organizes community efforts to clean up the environment</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: Three lowest ranked items and their means

By themselves in a table, item means signify only the items with the highest and lowest total scores and averages and do not tell much else. However, when compared with other findings, the item means of the Q-sorts provide further insight into study participants’ conceptualizations of democratic citizenship while also serving to validate conclusions that have already been drawn: character and personal responsibility are key to democratic citizenship’s core elements.
As indicated in Tables 5.6 and 5.7, as has been the case across much of this study’s findings, the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship that pertain to character and personal responsibility had higher [mean] scores in general than did items with an emphasis on civic responsibility and social justice.

In terms of the intersection of the item means and distinguishing statements, no relationship was apparent between the two groups when looking solely at the Q-sample statements with the highest totals and highest mean scores. Items #18 (acts responsibly in his/her community), #8 (obeys laws), and #11 (works and pays taxes), which were the three items with the highest mean scores, had total scores ranging from 266 through 308 and mean scores ranging from 13.3 to 15.4. Still, none of these items was included among the distinguishing statements with positive scores in Factors I, II, or III.

Item #18 was included, however, as a negative distinguishing statement for Factor III. For the individuals who loaded on Factor III, item #18’s negative score highlighted their general opinion that, individual responsibility is of less importance to democratic citizenship than other concerns, such as civic responsibility, for example. This perspective that is reflected in the negative score of item #18 points to Factor III’s modest deviation from the views held by those who loaded on Factors I and II. The opinions concerning democratic citizenship parted ways primarily at the point where Factor III indicated that social and historical knowledge were more urgent characteristics of democratic citizenship than individual and/or socialized behaviors, such as acting responsibly or having a work ethic. While it would be an exaggeration to say that Factor III was all together more focused on civic engagement, civic responsibility, and social
justice, which are all behaviors and/or characteristics on a macro- or societal level, it was
the only factor that did conceptualize democratic citizenship on a multi-dimensional
basis.

The most intriguing aspect of the item means emanated from a comparison
between the items means and the consensus statements. As noted earlier, the top three
item means were, in order, items #18 (acting responsibly in his/her community), #8
(obey laws), and #11 (works and pays taxes). In looking at the consensus statements
from Factors I, II, and III, items #8 and #11 were two of the consensus statements that
were ranked high (in the scoring grid) and also had medium to high scores. Items #8 and
#11 were also included as two of the highest rated item means. The significance of this
comparison is that essentially, there was not only agreement across factors that the
behaviors and characteristics of items #8 and #11 are the most important to democratic
citizenship across factors, but that they were ranked the same way in the Q-sort process,
which led to the high total score and, ultimately, the high item means. In plain language,
items with high mean scores that intersect with consensus scores ranked 1-3 send a strong
message about the importance that study participants placed on items that fit this
description and fell into one or both of the categories. As a whole, the item means simply
confirmed the same conceptualization of democratic citizenship identified through the
ranking of Z-scores in each factor, the distinguishing statements of each factor, and the
consensus statements of common opinion running across all factors.

So, after looking at the Q-sort data from multiple angles, including factor
loadings, distinguishing and consensus statements, and item means, I am consistently
brought back to the same conclusion: responsible conduct, obeying the law, and working and paying taxes are the behaviors and characteristics that study participants believe to be the most important to democratic citizenship. In addition, the data show without variation that while the behaviors and characteristics related to civic engagement and responsibility and social justice may be recognized as good or appropriate behaviors in and of themselves, those policymakers who took part in this study do not believe them to be essential to democratic citizenship. The immediate question that arises at this juncture is why the view of democratic citizenship is so narrow or so grounded in a single dimension. It also prompts me to ask how this view manifests itself in state education policies that the policymakers bring to the General Assembly floor. Above all, it makes me wonder if Ohio state-level policymakers even recognize the possibilities that could emanate from the alignment of and/or inclusion of policy governing accountability, standards, and classroom practices with or in the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

**Research Question Four (Quantitative Investigation)**

The data for all three questions in Section Four: Quantitative Investigation, were negatively skewed. The negative skew indicated that there was a certain level of agreement among study participants that state-mandated accountability measures (Question 19) and the Ohio Academic Content (OAC) standards should be aligned with the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship (Question 20). Also indicated were high levels of agreement that state education policy should mandate the inclusion of
learning experiences that would provide opportunities for P-12 students to practice and develop those same behaviors (Question 21).

The most provocative result here revolves around the skewness of Question 19 and the seeming reticence on the part of various study participants to support the alignment of education accountability measures with the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. As I returned to Chapter Four to review the frequency of each possible response in the data that was displayed in the histogram for Question 19, it was clear that nearly half of the study participants had responded to this question with agree. I also saw that the next largest percentage of participants (20 percent) had responded with disagree to this same question. While 20 percent is not as striking as a 50 or 60 percent, in this case, it still underscored the policy area where a number of policymakers indicated that they did not necessarily see an intersection with democratic citizenship.

Interestingly, the reticence indicated in Question 19 is both subtle and relative. When compared with study participants’ collective views regarding the alignment of the OACs with the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship (Question 20) and then with their perspectives on mandating the inclusion of those same behaviors and characteristics in classroom practices (Question 21), the level of agreement in each well outstrips the equivalent affirmative response rate in Question 19. It begs the question as to what policymakers see as the link between democratic citizenship and accountability. The other question it raises is whether, based on the percentage of negative responses
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23 The questions in the quantitative section of the survey instrument were six point Likert-scale questions that featured response choices as follows: very strongly disagree, strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, and very strongly agree.
(disagree) relative to positive responses (agree) in Question 19, study participants view accountability in the same light as they view item #18 (*acts responsibly in the community*), item #8 (*obeys laws*), and item #11 (*works and pays taxes*). The behaviors and characteristics in items #18, #8, and #11 were ranked as the three most important to democratic citizenship in item means and also in at least one factor. These same items also feature behaviors and characteristics that are grounded in acting responsibly, obeying laws, and working and paying taxes. Perhaps students meeting test score minimums is viewed in the same light as working and paying taxes, which is the individual responsibility of every adult citizen in this democratic society. If it is, perhaps we shall see other items that were ranked high in at least one factor, such as item #7 (*knows about democratic social movements*).

The real concern here, however, is how education accountability measures and the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship can be seen to intersect only marginally. Even more at issue is how and why this disconnect impedes state-level policymakers’ ready willingness to ensure that state-mandated P-12 assessments be constructed in such a way that would reinforce learning across all disciplines. It is a comprehensive education along with interdisciplinary learning that engenders the reasoning, critical thinking, and analytical skills necessary to participate effectively in the democratic process.

**Implications of the Study**
After a thorough review of the findings from the first three research questions, including factor loadings, distinguishing and consensus statements, qualitative comments, and item means, it appeared as if study participants views of democratic citizenship were somewhat closely aligned with each of the three types of citizenship outlined by Westheimer and Kahne in *What Type of Citizen?: The Politics of Educating for Democracy* (2004). The alignment was particularly apparent when looking across all three factors, even though, in reality, the factors from this study truly showed only two distinct citizenship types across three factors.

Factors I and II were very similar and closely resemble Personally Responsible Citizenship (PRC), particularly among the items ranked as the three behaviors and/or characteristics that are most important to democratic citizenship. The top three items in both factors disproportionately emphasize issues of character and personal responsibility, which are typical of PRC. It is, however, when considering their distinguishing statements, that some differences between the two became more apparent and a slow progression from a vision of democratic citizenship predicated solely on individual behavior and personal responsibility toward civic responsibility and engagement was more easily visible.

The most ready example of the progression from PRC to PC across Factors I and II lays with item #13 (*recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries*) and was discussed earlier in terms of its Z-score that began as -1.94 in Factor I and ultimately ended up as 0.94 in Factor III. Although the behaviors listed in item #13 all show a level of good character and altruism, it is the far-reaching effects of recycling, giving blood,
and donating food that, when accompanied by a Z-score that steadily increases in value from negative to positive across factors, display a behavior that is collective and is grounded in community-based efforts and participation. Further, that behavior typically focuses on relationship building, common understandings, and collective commitments (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004) as the basis of “strong democracy”.

Such behaviors belong to Participatory Citizenship (PC) and transcend Personally Responsible Citizenship (PRC) through actions that are deliberately intended to foster collective instead of individual behaviors and attend to community needs. In comparing Factors I and II, my final conclusion was that it was what they identified as least important as opposed to most important that set them apart from one another and illustrated the point of divergence where Factor II showed greater emphasis or maybe I should say less rejection of behaviors and characteristics that moved towards greater civic awareness and actualization.

Distinguishing statements for Factor III indicate that it is more closely aligned with Westheimer and Kahne’s (2004) Justice-Oriented Citizenship than Factors I and II. This is not to say that Factor III reflected a view of democratic citizenship that is rooted in social justice because it did not. What it does say about Factor III is that the two of its distinguishing statements with positive values (item #7: 1.14 and item #13: 0.94) were both centered around behaviors that benefit all segments of society both now and for future generations. Further, item #7 (*knows about democratic social movements*) tells us that there is an understanding of democracy, its history, and how it is supposed to work, especially in terms of civic engagement, which often means grassroots movements. As
noted in earlier discussions, Factor III was not distinctly situated in Justice-Oriented Citizenship (JOC) largely because it shared a consensus statement (item #8, obeys laws) with Factors I and II. However, Factor III still made a statement about social justice as a viable part of democratic citizenship that the other factors did not. It was its social justice aspect that differentiated it from Factors I and II and aligned it, to a degree, with Justice-Oriented Citizenship as described by Westheimer and Kahne (2004).

As a whole, what the findings and their alignments said about democratic citizenship was that it has been reduced to a set of individual behaviors with scant attention given to the nation or society as a whole. In addition, because democratic citizenship is being limited to a single dimension, certain aspects, that according to Thomas Jefferson (1781, 1781) were and still are critical to democracy, such as dissent, civic engagement, and a well-educated citizenry, become limited or stifled, and can have crippling effects on our unique form of government. By looking only on a micro-level of individual behaviors and then considering only the character issues at that level, it sends a message that a democratic citizen need only be concerned about himself or herself and that as long as he or she follows the law, works and pays taxes, and responds to a need when asked, democracy and the needs of a democratic society will have been fully addressed.

The view of Personally Responsible Citizenship does not address the need for participation, for input from citizens, for debate, deliberations, and dissent. And if a democratic society requires such skills and knowledge, then surely its citizens will require the ability to think critically, to reason, and to analyze. Democratic citizens will
also require historical knowledge of democracy, what it is based on, its many iterations, how it is supposed to function, and how citizens should function within it. All of this requires that all citizens have a sound educational foundation, including opportunities to learn about and develop the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.

Based on the findings from the quantitative investigation that addressed the policy aspect of this study, it seems that accountability measures still have priority over the needs of P-12 students to learn and to think and the needs of the state and nation for citizens who have both the knowledge and skills for democratic citizenship as well as the dispositions to participate freely and effectively. What does it say about our policymakers’ view of the intersection of education and democratic citizenship when on one hand they overwhelmingly agree that state education policy should include classroom and school learning experiences where students can practice and develop the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship, but on the other many of them fail to see how or why accountability measures should be aligned to the same behaviors and characteristics? It seems to say that when it comes to education, views are one dimensional and exist on the personal level alone. In addition, it appears that only a modicum of consideration has been given for the needs of this nation’s governance, especially if it is to function as it was intended, which was rooted in the people. The United States, which is a democratic society, requires adult citizens who can participate effectively in the political process by having the skills and knowledge to evaluate the issues, question policies, vote, and be actively, not passively involved in the community’s, state’s, and nation’s affairs. To achieve this end, P-12 education needs to
provide more than a curriculum designed around standardized evaluations to prepare school-age children for their roles as adult citizens in a democratic society. To offer anything less is to leave the nation disabled as those who would be involved in its governance would have too few skills and too little knowledge to carry out their duties (participate) effectively.

As I draw this study to a close, I remain uninspired from the results of studying our legislative leadership. As Neumann (2008) began his article *American Democracy at Risk,* “Conditions do not bode well for the health of democracy”. He went on to cite any number of areas where we as a nation and society are failing ourselves and our nation’s future. Among them he names how the hijacking of well-rounded, liberal arts education has severely impaired students’ ability to engage in civic behaviors because of a simple lack of understanding of American democracy and governmental processes. He attributes their civic shortcomings to a reduction in the teaching of social studies and also a full and well-balanced complement of courses across multiple subject areas. Why has there been a general reduction in the offerings of social studies classes like civics, American history, and government? The answer lays in accountability measures that are designed to prepare students for 21st century jobs. My question is where are the measures designed to teach students to think, to make connections, and, above all, to be ready to participate in the democratic process.

But knowledge and skills are not the only areas Neumann (2008) addressed. He also took issue with the fact that P-12 education does not address democratic dispositions
or those values, attitudes, and beliefs that make citizens value their opportunity to inform policy and influence government and that foster an appreciation for participatory forms of government. Democratic dispositions are learned by observing, by doing, and by interacting. However, if no value is placed on them and/or no time is set aside in the school day to address them, then it is likely that as with critical thinking, the dispositions will also remain unaddressed.

It is essential that we as a nation remain vigilant about a) including or, in some cases, restoring, the practice and development of democratic citizenship in P-12 education, and b) preparing our school-age children for their obligations as adult citizens in a democratic society. As I stated earlier on in this study, democracy is frequently equated with behaviors, characteristics, and ideas that it is not, such as patriotism, capitalism, or entrepreneurship. As a result, there is little clear understanding about what democracy really is and what citizens in such a society should be prepared to and are obliged to do. I fear that because the role of education in the health of any democracy is rarely covered by any newsgroup in any media form, this issue does not cross the minds of most Americans with or without children.

One of my strongest recommendations is that further research be done on how democratic citizenship is conceptualized. It is the only way we have to broach the subject and hash out this lack of thought and understanding of democracy and democratic practices, should a misunderstanding exist. However, the next time the focus should be on the American people and not on those who craft policy. By pursuing this research agenda with ordinary citizens, they would be a) reminded of an important aspect
(democratic citizenship) of their lives about which they probably give little thought, and
b) prompted to give democratic citizenship the consideration it deserves. They would
also have the opportunity to see the strong and important relationship between P-12
education and a healthy democracy and, hopefully, insist that their children be prepared
in knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for the roles that they will take on upon
reaching majority age and entering the adult world in the United States.

I would like to end this study with the following words from Thomas Jefferson
as it so aptly sums up the underlying ideas and concerns that fueled this study and
continue to give me pause for concern:

I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers
of the society but the people themselves; and if we
think them not enlightened enough to exercise their
control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is
not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion
by education (Jefferson, 1831).
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Pamela Greene, Doctoral Candidate
The Ohio State University
College of Education and Human Ecology
210 Arps Hall
1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1172
THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to:

- explore how Ohio state-level policymakers conceptualize democratic citizenship;
- understand the reasoning for their conceptualizations;
- investigate the extent to which policymakers believe that Ohio’s education policy regarding accountability, state curriculum standards, and student learning experiences should be aligned with and/or inclusive of the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship;
- inform state education policy; and
- develop a valid and reliable mechanism for additional studies regarding the conceptualization of democratic citizenship.

INSTRUCTIONS

Please take 20-25 minutes to complete the following questionnaire on democratic citizenship. There are four sections in the questionnaire:

**Section I:**
Ranking the Behaviors & Characteristics of Democratic Citizenship

**Section II:**
The Reasons Behind Your Rankings

**Section III:**
Democratic Citizenship & Ohio P-12 Education

**Section IV:**
Demographic Information

ALL RESPONSES WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL!
SECTION I:
Ranking the Behaviors & Characteristics of Democratic Citizenship

There are 18 statements in this section. Each statement describes a behavior or characteristic of democratic citizenship.

After reading the statements on page four, please rank them according to the importance you place on the behaviors and characteristics in each. Please remember to rank all 18 statements relative to democratic citizenship.

The researcher understands that, as a respondent of this survey questionnaire, you may consider some items to be related. As a result of the potential similarities, the researcher acknowledges that the task of ranking the 18 items on page 4 may be difficult. However, ...

ALL STATEMENTS MUST BE RANKED INDIVIDUALLY
PLACE ONLY ONE NUMBER IN EACH BOX
EACH STATEMENT MAY BE RANKED ONLY ONCE

Example:

A Democratic Citizen:
1. takes care of his/her property.
2. attends religious services regularly.
3. is able to read at or above an 8th grade level.
4. appreciates free enterprise

MOST IMPORTANT BEHAVIOR OR CHARACTERISTIC

 LEAST IMPORTANT BEHAVIOR OR CHARACTERISTIC
STEP I:

Read the following 18 statements about Democratic Citizenship.

A Democratic Citizen:

1. knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks.
2. organizes community efforts to care for those in need.
3. critically assesses social structures to see beyond the surface causes of social stratification.
4. seeks out and addresses areas of injustice.
5. volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis.
6. critically assesses political structures to see beyond the surface causes of political inequality.
7. knows about democratic social movements.
8. obeys laws.
9. critically assesses economic structures to see beyond the surface causes of economic disparity.
10. knows how government agencies work.
11. works and pays taxes.
12. is an active member of community organizations.
13. recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries.
14. organizes community efforts to clean up the environment.
15. actively participates in community improvement efforts.
16. knows how to effect systemic change.
17. organizes community efforts to promote economic development.
18. acts responsibly in his / her community.

Record your responses by ranking the above statements in descending order in the column on page 5.
STEP II

Place in rank order the 18 statements that you have just read.

Write the number of statement with the most important behavior or characteristic in the top box.

Write the number of statement with the least important behavior or characteristic in the bottom box.


**SECTION II:**

**The Reasons Behind Your Rankings**

Use the spaces below to explain why, in your opinion, the behaviors and characteristics in the statements that you ranked *highest* in the column on page 5 are the most important to democratic citizenship.

These are the behaviors and characteristics found in the statements whose numbers you recorded in the top three boxes of the column on page 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important Behavior or Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Most Important Behavior or Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Most Important Behavior or Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Reasons Behind Your Rankings  
(continued)

Now use the spaces below to explain why, in your opinion, the behaviors and characteristics in the statements that you ranked *lowest* in the column on page 5 are the *least important* to democratic citizenship.

These are the behaviors and characteristics found in the statements whose numbers you recorded in the **bottom three boxes** of the column on page 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Least Important Behavior or Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Least Important Behavior or Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Important Behavior or Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION III:

Democratic Citizenship & Ohio P-12 Education

Please circle the number that corresponds most closely with your reaction to each of the following statements.

Example: 1 2 3 4 5 6

1 = very strongly disagree 4 = agree
2 = strongly disagree 5 = strongly agree
3 = disagree 6 = very strongly agree

1. Ohio education policy governing accountability measures should seek to foster an alignment between assessments of student achievement and the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship that are found on page 4 of this booklet.

1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Ohio education policy should ensure that the state-mandated P-12 Academic Content Standards are aligned with the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship that are found on page 4 of this booklet.

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Ohio education policy should mandate the inclusion of classroom and school learning experiences where students have the opportunity to practice and develop the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship that are listed on page 4 of this booklet.

1 2 3 4 5 6
SECTION IV:

Demographic Information

Please provide the following information that is requested below by placing a check mark (√) in the blank before the most appropriate response.

1. What is your gender?

   ________ 1 = Male   ________ 2 = Female   ________ 3 = Other

2. What is your race/ethnicity?

   ________ 1 = American Indian/Alaskan Native   ________ 5 = White/non-Hispanic
   ________ 2 = Asian/Pacific Islander              ________ 6 = Multi-racial:
   ________ 3 = Black, non-Hispanic               Please identify:
   ________ 7 = Other: Please identify:   ________ 4 = Hispanic

3. What is your highest level of education?

   ________ 1 = Secondary school, Grades 7-12   ________ 4 = JD/MD/DDS/DVM
   ________ 2 = Associate degree                  ________ 5 = MA degree
   ________ 3 = Bachelor's degree                 ________ 6 = PhD/EdD

4. In which Ohio legislative body do you currently serve?

   ________ 1 = Ohio Senate
   ________ 2 = Ohio House of Representatives
   ________ 3 = State Board of Education
5. Please indicate the description that best fits your current political affiliation.  

*Please indicate only one affiliation!*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Conservative</th>
<th>2 = Moderate conservative</th>
<th>3 = Independent</th>
<th>4 = Moderate liberal</th>
<th>5 = Liberal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS, REACTIONS, AND REFLECTIONS**  
Please write any additional comments in the space below.

**ATTENTION:**  
*Please do not leave any identifying information, such as name, address, telephone number, or place of employment at any place in this questionnaire.*
PLEASE PLACE THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE AND RETURN TO:

Pamela Greene  
School of Education Policy and Leadership  
The Ohio State University  
122 Ramseyer Hall  
29 West Woodruff Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43210-1172

Thank you for your participation in this study.
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Letter of Invitation
Face Validity Evaluation Form
List of Reviewer Names
February 25, 2009

Dr. Jack Smith
Program Manager
Department of German
110 Melvin Hall
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Dr. Smith:

I am currently engaged in a research study for my dissertation at The Ohio State University. The focus of my study is policymakers’ conceptualizations of democratic citizenship and the extent to which their conceptualizations intersect with both public education practices and scholarly and popular literature on the needs of democracy and democratic governance.

I have constructed a survey questionnaire of twenty-two total items that I intend to administer to state-level policymakers in Ohio. I would like to know if you, as a professional educator, would review the enclosed survey questionnaire for face validity and return it to me with your comments.

For this type of validity check, I require feedback on appearance, user friendliness, and ease of reading. Above all, I would like to know if, in your opinion, the survey questionnaire seems to measure what it intends to measure according to the information in the opening paragraph above and the title on the cover of the questionnaire booklet.

Included in the packet of materials is a comment form that you may use to guide your evaluation of the questionnaire. Please feel free to write comments on the form and/or the survey questionnaire as you prefer.

For your convenience, I have enclosed a pre-addressed, stamped envelope in which you may return the survey questionnaire and/or the comment form with your
responses. If you have any questions about the materials that I have enclosed, I can be reached at either greene.3@osu.edu or 614.292.2575.

Your feedback is greatly appreciated. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Pamela Greene
Doctoral Candidate
Ohio State University
College of Education and Human Ecology
greene.3@osu.edu
614.292.2575
A Survey of How Ohio’s State-level Policymakers Conceptualize Democratic Citizenship

Face Validity Check Comment Form

#____

Please look over the enclosed survey questionnaire and answer the following six questions with your thoughts about and reactions to its appearance, appropriateness, and suitability.

Use as much space as you require for your comments, including extra pages as needed. You may also wish to write comments directly on the survey questionnaire.

For the sake of timeliness, comments returned via e-mail are greatly appreciated!

1. In your opinion, would the general appearance of the instrument (survey questionnaire) appeal to respondents?

   Y    N

   Comments:

2. In your opinion, would the instrument look valid to respondents?

   Yes    No

   Comments:

3. In your opinion, does this seem like a reasonable way to acquire the information that the researcher seeks?

   Yes    No

   Comments:
4. In your opinion, does the instrument seem to measure what is intended?
   
   Yes       No

   Comments:

5. In your opinion, do the instrument’s items seem relevant to the construct of democratic citizenship?
   
   Yes       No

   Comments:

6. In your opinion, does the instrument seem to measure what is important about the construct of democratic citizenship?
   
   Yes       No

   Comments:

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, REACTIONS, & REFLECTIONS**

Please use the space below to write any additional comments that you have about the instrument.
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Dr. Moreen Carvan
Marian University
Fond du Lac, WI

Linda Hengst
Executive Director, Ohioana Library
Columbus, OH

Dr. Alan Hirvela
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Dr. Donna Long
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Dr. Betty Rider
Vocational Educator/
Education Consultant
Columbus, OH

Jeff Wright
Social Studies Teacher
Delaware City Schools
Delaware, OH
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- Letter of Invitation
- Evaluation Form
- List of Reviewer Names
March 14, 2009

Rev. Tim Ahrens
First Congregational Church
444 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Rev. Ahrens:

I am currently engaged in a research study for my dissertation at The Ohio State University. The focus of my study is policymakers’ conceptualizations of democratic citizenship and the extent to which their conceptualizations intersect with policy governing state-level education accountability measures, state-mandated P-12 Academic Content Standards, and classroom practices specifically designed to foster the development of the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship in P-12 students.

I have constructed a survey questionnaire of twenty-two total items that I intend to administer to state-level policymakers in Ohio. I would like to know if you, as a critical and analytical reader, would review the enclosed survey questionnaire as part of my field test and then return it to me with your comments.

For the field test, I require feedback on the instrument’s clarity, accuracy, suitability, and its overall structure. Above all, I would like to know if, in your opinion, the survey questionnaire seems to measure what it intends to measure according to a) the information in the opening paragraph above, and b) the title on the cover of the questionnaire booklet.

Included in the packet of materials is a comment form that you may use to guide your evaluation of the questionnaire. Please feel free to write comments on the form and/or the survey questionnaire as you prefer.
For your convenience, I have enclosed a pre-addressed, stamped envelope in which you may return the survey questionnaire and/or the comment form with your responses. If you have any questions about the materials that I have enclosed, I can be reached at either plgp2@yahoo.com or 614.292.2575.

Your feedback is greatly appreciated. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Pamela Greene
Doctoral Candidate
Ohio State University
College of Education and Human Ecology
greene.3@osu.edu
614.292.2575
Appendix C: Evaluation Form

How Ohio’s State-level Policymakers Conceptualize Democratic Citizenship: A Survey

Field Test Comment Form

Please look over the enclosed survey questionnaire and answer the following eight questions with your thoughts about and reactions to its clarity, accuracy, suitability, and overall structure.

Use as much space as you require for your comments, including extra pages as needed. You may also wish to write comments directly on the survey questionnaire.

For the sake of timeliness, comments returned via e-mail are greatly appreciated!

1. In your opinion, are all sections of the survey questionnaire clear? If not, please identify the sections that are unclear as well as the causes of confusion in each.

   Yes   No

   Comments:

2. In your opinion, can the structure of the survey questionnaire be improved? If so, please describe how.

   Yes   No

   Comments:

3. In your opinion, does the instrument (survey questionnaire) seem suitable for use with state-level policymakers? How might its suitability for the intended audience be improved?

   Yes   No

   Comments:

4. In your opinion, does the instrument seem inclusive of the knowledge, skills, and dimensions comprising democratic citizenship?

   Yes   No

   Comments:
5. Do you believe that the instrument is constructed in a way that will allow the researcher to identify clearly how policymakers’ conceptualize democratic citizenship? If not, how can the instrument’s structure be improved?

Yes          No

Comments:

6. Do you believe that the instrument is constructed in a way that will allow the researcher to learn what compels policymakers to rank the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship as they do?

Yes          No

Comments:

7. Do you think that the instrument is constructed in a way that will allow the researcher to discover if and to what extent state-level policymakers believe that the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship [as described in this booklet] should be aligned with or reflected in state accountability measures, state standards, and classroom practices?

Yes          No

Comments:

8. Do you believe that the survey questionnaire is biased in any way? If so, please identify how it is biased and where the biased statements appear.

Yes          No

Comments:

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, REACTIONS, & REFLECTIONS**

Please use the space below to write any additional comments that you have about the instrument.
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Terry Davis
Personal Life Coach
West Chester, OH

Dr. Shirley DeLucia
Department of Education
Capital University
Columbus, OH

Dr. Charles Hancock
College of Education and Human Ecology
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Dr. Kathleen Kastner
Ohio Department of Education
Columbus, OH

Dr. Merry Merryfield
College of Education and Human Ecology
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

John Nichelson
Ashland University
Columbus, OH

Dr. Dean Pond
Division of Education
Urbana University
Urbana, OH

Dr. Robert Ransom
College of Education and Human Ecology
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH
Dr. Kathleen Romstedt
College of Education and Human Ecology
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Dr. Debbie Robinson
Ohio Department of Education
Columbus, OH

Dr. Rob Robison
College of Humanities
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Dr. Marguerite Vanden Wyngaard
Assistant Superintendent
Eden Prairie Unified School District
Eden Prairie, MN

Mark White
Assistant Superintendent
Gahanna Jefferson City Schools
Gahanna, OH
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How Ohio’s State-level Policymakers Conceptualize Democratic Citizenship: A Pilot Survey

Democratic Citizenship & Ohio P-12 Education

Please circle the number that corresponds most closely with your reaction to each of the following statements.

Example: 1 2 3 4 5 6

1 = very strongly disagree 4 = agree
2 = strongly disagree 5 = strongly agree
3 = disagree 6 = very strongly agree

1. Ohio education policy governing accountability measures should seek to foster alignment between assessments of student achievement and the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship that are found on the reverse side of this page.

1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Ohio education policy should ensure that the state-mandated P-12 academic content standards are aligned with the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship that are found on the reverse side of this page.

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Ohio education policy should mandate the inclusion of classroom and school learning experiences where students have the opportunity to practice and develop the 18 behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship that are found on the reverse side of this page.

1 2 3 4 5 6
The 18 Behaviors and Characteristics of Democratic Citizenship

A democratic citizen:

1. knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks.
2. organizes community efforts to care for those in need.
3. critically assesses social structures to see beyond the surface causes of social stratification.
4. seeks out and addresses areas of injustice.
5. volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis.
6. critically assesses political structures to see beyond the surface causes of political inequality.
7. knows about democratic social movements.
8. obeys laws.
9. critically assesses economic structures to see beyond the surface causes of economic disparity.
10. knows how government agencies work.
11. works and pays taxes.
12. is an active member of community organizations.
13. recycles, gives blood, and donates to food pantries.
14. organizes community efforts to clean up the environment.
15. actively participates in community improvement efforts.
16. knows how to effect systemic change.
17. organizes community efforts to promote economic development.
18. acts responsibly in his / her community.
Dear Dr. Hite,

The Office of Responsible Research Practices has determined the above referenced protocol exempt from IRB review.

Date of Exempt Determination: 05/14/2009
Qualifying Exemption Category: 2

Please note the following:
• Only OSU employees and students who have completed CITI training and are named on the signature page of the application are approved as OSU Investigators in conducting this study.
• No procedural changes may be made in exempt research (e.g., recruitment procedures, advertisements, instruments, enrollment numbers, etc.).
• Per university requirements, all research-related records (including signed consent forms) must be retained and available for audit for a period of at least three years after the research has ended.
• It is the responsibility of the Investigator to promptly report events that may represent unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.
This determination is issued under The Ohio State University’s OHRP Federalwide Assurance #00006378.

All forms and procedures can be found on the ORRP website – www.orrp.osu.edu. Please feel free to contact the ORRP staff contact listed above with any questions or concerns.

Cheri Pettey, MA, Certified IRB Professional
Senior Protocol Analyst—Exempt Research
Office of Responsible Research Practices
300 Research Foundation
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1063
Phone (614) 688-8457
Fax (614) 688-0366
www.orrp.osu.edu
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Letter of Notification
Confirmation Postcard
IRB Letter of Approval
June 2, 2009

The Honorable Mary Smith
Senate Building
Room #100, First Floor
Columbus, OH  43215

Dear Senator Smith:

Like you, our nation’s democracy is frequently on my mind! As Americans we are aware of how special our form of government is and how important it is to maintain those freedoms we value so highly.

As a nation, we have become increasingly aware of democracy’s fragile and delicate nature. We have learned that democracy requires our attention and that it must be monitored and nurtured on an on-going basis in order for it to be sustained and, ultimately, to thrive. To that end, democracy also requires citizens whose educational experiences have taught them critical thinking, reasoning, and analytical skills along with the importance of participating in this unique form of government.

I am currently conducting a doctoral study to explore and describe how Ohio’s state-level policymakers* conceptualize democratic citizenship. As part of that study, I also seek to understand the ideas behind their conceptualizations and to explore and describe the extent to which they believe that education policies that govern accountability measures, academic content standards, and educational experiences for school-age children should be aligned with the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.
As one of Ohio’s state-level policymakers, your input in this important research is vital, and I am asking you to assist me by completing the enclosed survey questionnaire on the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. Even though participation in this project is completely optional, I hope you will be willing to take a few moments to be involved. By returning your completed survey questionnaire to me, it is understood that you are giving your consent as a willing participant in my research study.

Please be assured that your responses on this non-partisan survey questionnaire will remain confidential and anonymous and that only I and my co-investigator and advisor, Dr. Robert Hite, will see or have access to any information that you submit. Further, and in order to preserve all participants’ anonymity, I ask that you refrain from leaving any identifying information, such as your name, address, telephone or district number and/or any identifying marks on your survey.

If you are willing to help me with this important study, please find the survey questionnaire, a pre-addressed, stamped envelope to use when returning the survey to me, and a pre-addressed, stamped postcard enclosed in the packet containing this letter. I have included the postcard so you can let me know that you have completed and returned your survey without compromising your anonymity. Please make sure you mail the postcard separately from and after you have completed the survey questionnaire. To ensure receipt of your responses in a timely manner, I ask that the survey be postmarked no later than June 17, 2009.

In closing, I would like to thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in my research on democratic citizenship and education. Your input will ensure that future generations of Americans understand the importance of their participation in this nation’s democratic process and that they are well-prepared to have a voice in our unique form of government.

I look forward to your participation in my study!

Sincerely,

Pamela Greene
PhD Candidate
School of Educational Policy and Leadership
College of Education and Human Ecology
The Ohio State University

* The Ohio Senate, The Ohio House of Representatives, and The State Board of Education for the purposes of this study only
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To:
Pamela Greene
Ohio State University
College of Education and Human Ecology
210 Arps Hall
1945 North High Street
Columbus, OH 43210

The survey has been completed and returned.

Senator Mary Smith
Appendix E: Actual Study Letter of Approval from the IRB

June 16, 2009

Protocol Number: 2009E0486
Protocol Title: HOW OHIO STATE LEVEL POLICYMAKERS CONCEPTUALIZE DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP, ROBERT HITE, PAMELA GREENE, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN ECOLOGY

Type of Review: Request for Exempt Determination

ORRP Staff Contact:
Cheri M. Pettey
Phone: 614-688-0389
Email: pettey.6@osu.edu

Dear Dr. Hite,

The Office of Responsible Research Practices has determined the above referenced protocol exempt from IRB review.

Date of Exempt Determination: 06/03/09
Qualifying Exemption Category: 2, 3

Please note the following:

• Only OSU employees and students who have completed CITI training and are named on the signature page of the application are approved as OSU Investigators in conducting this study.

• No procedural changes may be made in exempt research (e.g., recruitment procedures, advertisements, instruments, enrollment numbers, etc.).

• Per university requirements, all research-related records (including signed consent forms) must be retained and available for audit for a period of at least three years after the research has ended.

• It is the responsibility of the Investigator to promptly report events that may represent unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

This determination is issued under The Ohio State University’s OHRP Federalwide Assurance #00006378.
All forms and procedures can be found on the ORRP website – www.orrp.osu.edu. Please feel free to contact the ORRP staff contact listed above with any questions or concerns.

Cheri Pettey, MA, Certified IRB Professional
Senior Protocol Analyst—Exempt Research
Appendix F: Follow-up Postcard
On June 11, you received a packet from me asking you to participate in my doctoral research study on DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP. As of today, July 6, I have not yet heard from you. I have sent this reminder to let you know that there is still time to participate in my study & to share your ideas on DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP. Please don’t miss out on your chance to contribute to this important research study. Your input is critical!

Pamela Greene
greene.3@osu.edu
Appendix G: Final Follow-up Letter
August 20, 2009

The Honorable A. B. Melvin
Room 100
Senate Office Building
60 East State Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Senator Melvin:

Like you, our nation’s democracy is frequently on my mind! As Americans we are aware of how special our form of government is and how important it is to maintain those freedoms we value so highly.

As a nation, we have become increasingly aware of democracy’s fragile and delicate nature. We have learned that democracy requires our attention and that it must be monitored and nurtured on an on-going basis in order for it to be sustained and, ultimately, to thrive. To that end, democracy also requires citizens whose educational experiences have taught them critical thinking, reasoning, and analytical skills along with the importance of participating in this unique form of government.

I am currently conducting a doctoral study to explore and describe how Ohio’s state-level policymakers* conceptualize democratic citizenship. As part of that study, I also seek to understand the ideas behind their conceptualizations and to explore and describe the extent to which they believe education policies that govern accountability measures, academic content standards, and educational experiences for school-age children should be aligned with the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship.
As one of Ohio’s state-level policymakers, your input in this important research is vital! I am asking you to assist me with this important study by completing the enclosed survey questionnaire on the behaviors and characteristics of democratic citizenship. Even though participation in this project is completely voluntary, I hope you will be willing to take a few moments to be involved. By returning your completed survey questionnaire to me, it is understood that you are giving your consent as a willing participant in my research study.

Please be assured that your responses on this non-partisan survey questionnaire will remain confidential and anonymous and that only I and my co-investigator and advisor, Dr. Robert Hite, will see or have access to any information that you submit. Further, and in order to preserve all participants’ anonymity, I ask that you refrain from leaving any identifying information, such as your name, address, telephone or district number and/or any other identifying marks on your survey.

If you are willing to help me with this important study, please find the survey questionnaire, a pre-addressed, stamped envelope to use when returning the survey to me, and a pre-addressed, stamped postcard enclosed in the packet containing this letter. I have included the postcard so you can let me know that you have completed and returned your survey without compromising your anonymity. Please make sure you mail the postcard separately from and after you have completed the survey questionnaire. To ensure receipt of your responses in a timely manner, I ask that the survey be postmarked no later than August 31, 2009.

In closing, I would like to thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in my research on democratic citizenship. Your input will ensure that future generations of Americans understand the importance of their participation in this nation’s democratic process and that they are well-prepared to have a voice in our unique form of government.

I look forward to your input and participation in my study!

Sincerely,

Pamela Greene
PhD Candidate
School of Education Policy and Leadership
College of Education and Human Ecology
The Ohio State University

*The Ohio Senate, The Ohio House of Representatives, and The State Board of Education for the purposes of this study only*
Appendix H: Timeline of Tasks and Procedures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2009</td>
<td>The frame of the members of the 128th Ohio General Assembly was obtained from websites of the Ohio Senate and the Ohio House of Representatives. The frame of the members of Ohio’s State Board of Education for 2009 was obtained from the Board Relations link on the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12-15, 2009</td>
<td>Materials, including the data collection instrument, were prepared and distributed to the face validity checkers. A copy of the letter of invitation and the evaluation form has been included in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20-25, 2009</td>
<td>The researcher revised the data collection instrument as per the feedback that was received from reviewers in the first round of the face validity check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, March 2009</td>
<td>The data collection instrument was revised and distributed for a second face validity check of specific components in the data collection instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20-31, 2009</td>
<td>The data collection instrument and the accompanying evaluation materials were distributed for field testing. Specific aspects that were to be addressed in the field test were face and construct validity and the utility of the data collection instrument. The letter of invitation and the accompanying evaluation form are attached in Appendix C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2009</td>
<td>The frame of the members of the 128th Ohio General Assembly was obtained from websites of the Ohio Senate and the Ohio House of Representatives. The frame of the members of Ohio’s State Board of Education for 2009 was obtained from the Board Relations link on the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12-15, 2009</td>
<td>Materials, including the data collection instrument, were prepared and distributed to the face validity checkers. A copy of the letter of invitation and the evaluation form has been included in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20-25, 2009</td>
<td>The researcher revised the data collection instrument as per the feedback that was received from reviewers in the first round of the face validity check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, March 2009</td>
<td>The data collection instrument was revised and distributed for a second face validity check of specific components in the data collection instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20-31, 2009</td>
<td>The data collection instrument and the accompanying evaluation materials were distributed for field testing. Specific aspects that were to be addressed in the field test were face and construct validity and the utility of the data collection instrument. The letter of invitation and the accompanying evaluation form are attached in Appendix C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2009</td>
<td>The data collection instrument was revised and prepared for the pilot study after receiving feedback from field test reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2009</td>
<td>The researcher submitted an application to the Office of Responsible Research Practices (ORRP) at The Ohio State University for approval to conduct the pilot study using Section III (Quantitative Investigation) of three Likert-scale questions in the data collection instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2009</td>
<td>The researcher received the required approval from the ORRP to conduct the pilot study using Section III (Quantitative Investigation) of the data collection instrument. A copy of the approval letter is included in Appendix D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16-18, 23-24, &amp; 26</td>
<td>The pilot study was conducted with Ohio citizens who met the necessary conditions: 18 years of age or older, US citizens (native born or naturalized), eligible to vote (registration notwithstanding), and eligible to run for public office. A copy of the data collection instrument used in the pilot study is included in Appendix D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29, 2009</td>
<td>The researcher submitted an application to the Office of Responsible Research Practices (ORRP) at The Ohio State University for approval to conduct the actual study using the entire data collection instrument to study the Ohio General Assembly and the State Board of Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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June 3, 2009  The researcher received IRB approval required to begin formal
data collection for the actual study.

A copy of the approval letter is included in Appendix E

June 4 & 8, 2009  Research packets containing the data collection instrument, the
letter of notification, a confirmation postcard, and a pre-
addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to members of the
State Board of Education and hand-delivered to members of
the Ohio Senate and the Ohio House of Representatives.

A copy of the data collection instrument is included in
Appendix A. A copy of the letter of notification and the
confirmation postcards are included in Appendix E.

June 5 – July 10, 2009  Data were collected from members of the Ohio Senate, the
Ohio House of Representatives, and the State Board of
Education.

July 14, 2009  Follow-up postcards were mailed to non-respondents from the
State Board of Education. Follow-up postcards were hand-
delivered to the administrative offices of the Ohio House of
Representatives and to the Office of the Secretary of the
Senate to be placed in the mailboxes of the non-respondents
from the Ohio General Assembly.

July 16, 2009  Data from the pilot study were entered and analyzed using
SPSS.

July 16 – August 10, 2009  Data collection continued from members of the Ohio General
Assembly and the State Board of Education

August 20, 2009  A second follow-up research packet was hand delivered to
select members of the Ohio Senate. Research packets included
a reminder postcard, the data collection instrument, a copy of
the original letter of notification, and a pre-addressed, stamped
envelope.

August 2009  Demographic data from Section IV (Demographic
Information) of the data collection instrument were entered
into SPSS and analyzed.

August 31, 2009  Data collection was concluded.

September 2009  Data were organized and cleaned.

September – October 2009  Data from Sections I, II, and III of the data collection
instrument were analyzed.
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