Civic Knowledge in a Representative Sample from Northeast Ohio

Andreas Johansson

Kent State University

Introduction

Within the social studies community, the idea of what civic education entails, and more importantly what it does not, has been debated[1]. Civic education, after all, is what prepares our students for a successful career as part of a democratic society[2], able to take part of and actively engage in all of its facets of participation.

What exactly counts as civic knowledge? What exact facts does one need to be able to regurgitate in order to pass for an effective citizen, a learned person, or an engaged individual? Does it matter if one knows who the current President of United States is, or who currently holds the post of Secretary of State? Or can one simply ignore the obvious, and focus on other, arguably more trivial questions like who said "Give me liberty, or give me death?" Civic knowledge and civic education fit along a very broad spectrum, and it would be very hard to pinpoint the exact information that is valued by everyone. In order to make this study more simplistic, the question set in the survey instrument will consist of an adaptation using questions from the current question bank hosted by the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, or USCIS[3], as well as other sources. In order to complete the naturalization process successfully, all legal immigrants must pass a citizenship test which consists of various questions regarding knowledge that has been classified as an indicator for acceptable citizenship in the United States. It is from this test bank, publicly available, that I drew most of my questions for the investigative instrument, and I discuss this more in detail in other sections of the paper.

---

[1] Evans, Ronald W. (2004) *The Social Studies Wars: What Should We Teach the Children?* Teachers College Press, New York, NY.
[2] United States Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free School, *Helping Your Child Become a Responsible Citizen.* Washington DC, 2006.
[3] http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis

Purpose

This study aims to determine what exactly the civic knowledge factual basis consists of, if any, and if indeed students of today, as well as some adults out of school, have what it takes to score well on a test consisting of civic knowledge type questions. As we shall discover through a brief literature review, we may be worse off than we think.

This study, although narrow in its investigation, will highlight some useful information about the state of our civic education (rooted in the social studies areas of the secondary school culture) and knowledge in a representative sample from the secondary, as well as collegiate, setting in the Northeast Ohio area. After all, students and adults alike should all have, arguably, the same level of civic education since the majority has gone through a similar educational process. This study aims to measure the level of knowledge in a sample representative group, with a focus on the secondary setting, using other populace more for control purposes and possible data comparison reasons. However, since the last major study was performed, our society has arguably changed, and so a new baseline needs to be established as a possible starting point for future research efforts.

Of course, National Assessment of Educational Progress[4] (NAEP), a government funded research project, performs civic education studies periodically, and while these help inform our understanding of student performance, they also limit themselves by excluding certain other test groups, and especially, by not setting the question types against a standard set of measures. This study will use a simple and effective instrument in assessing civic education and knowledge performance across the scales, all variables being equal. The same questions will be asked of

---

[4] National Assessment Governing Board, United States Department of Education. *Civics Framework for the 2006 National Assessment of Educational Progress.* Washington, DC., 2006. as well as the 1998 version.

high school students, college students, graduate students, and adults with varying degrees of

education and motivation, often with diverse backgrounds.

However, a concern remains that this study will not offer a complete picture of the state

of civic knowledge of today's students and adults. Perhaps the outcome will show an

improvement in knowledge over time as compared to other studies, or perhaps it will show the

opposite. However, what it will show is whether or not a sample of the general population know

basic information and factual information about their civic, domestic, and political environments.

Most people, in trial testing and polling for this study, were able to name the current

sitting United States President. However, few were able to do the same with the Secretary of

Defense[5], or the population size of the United States. This study aims to solidify those early and

premature findings, and report on the current state of civic education and civic knowledge among

a representative sample in the Northeast Ohio area.

Literature Review

The main case study used as a basis for this project was published in 1987 by Diane

Ravitch and Chester E. Finn, Jr., and titled "What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?" The work

describes a study aimed at charting the details of a highschooler's knowledge in history and

literature[6]. A partnership with NAEP was established, and in the end NAEP held all

responsibility for the instrument used as they had previous experience testing in the high school

setting. Ravitch and Finn hoped to discover just how limited was the knowledge possessed by

high school students. In the middle 1980's the American school system was undergoing some

major changes. The two areas under evaluation, history and literature, appeared neglected by

teachers, administrators, and most importantly, lawmakers. Ravitch and Finn argued that

---

[5] For a current and up to date listing, see http://www.whitehouse.gov/
[6] Ravitch, D. and Finn Jr., C. (1987) *What Do Our 17-Year Olds Know?* Harper & Row, New York, NY.

knowledge of history and literature among 17-year-olds was severely lacking, and saw their study as a wake-up call. It is interesting to note that the findings concluded that roughly 50% of the questions were answered incorrectly, and that the American students were mostly failing in the subjects tested.

The authors designed their test instrument to measure levels of knowledge of only those 17-year-olds who remained in high school, and did so in a series of questions designed to evoke the best result possible. Each question, all multiple choice, were designed to have only one correct answer, and leave no room for deception. In the end they, with the help of NAEP, had tested almost 8,000 students represented by all regions of the United States. By engaging in a matrix study where four sets of booklets were distributed, their results were classified as equally representative of the nation's students.

Ravitch and Finn offer a few suggestions on improvement of the educational system, especially in history and literature. They also provide helpful strategy in order to improve further and future assessment of knowledge, especially where a multiple choice type of instrument is used. Helpful hints are offered such as constructing an answer set including a choice for "I don't know" to eliminate random guessing, and making sure one test question does not give the answer to another.

As observed before, NAEP conducts ongoing reviews and assessments of civic knowledge and, by default, civic education in the American school system. They publish a practical guide to their thinking and reasoning behind their testing, namely the "Civics Framework for the 2006 National Assessment of Educational Progress." This booklet[7], last published in 1998, offers a view of civic knowledge and education that is very informative, and

---

[7] National Assessment Governing Board, United States Department of Education. *Civics Framework for the 2006 National Assessment of Educational Progress.* Washington, DC., 2006.

begins to further shape the foundation of appropriate civic knowledge. However, they remain

vague in their concepts, and do not solidify, nor codify, which facts or areas to focus on in their

research.

In addition to this research, the United States Department of Education's Office of

Educational Research and Improvement offers a guide to the meaning of democracy to students[8].

In "What Democracy Means to Ninth-Graders: United States Results from the International IEA

Civic Education Study" the authors offer a comparison of the United States' and foreign

students. Results here are more positive than in Ravitch and Finn's account. Furthermore, the

report gives great insight into the study habits of students, and when and where they are taking

various civic related classes in school. In addition, it provides knowledge of students' feelings

toward the civic education provided to them in school, and how they relate to government,

foreign nations, and various other curricula as taught in school.

There are other titles[9] that explore the subjects of civic education and civic knowledge,

but none that evaluate through proper and in-depth testing. Evans' "The Social Studies Wars"

describes the decades long quibble in the social studies arena regarding the study of history,

including what to teach, how to do it, and for what purposes[10]. Even though Evans offers no real

suggestions regarding content areas to focus on, he offers solutions based on historical contexts

in social studies. Furthermore, through a thorough explanation of all the various influences in the

civic education area, such as social studies, it is hard to imagine we will ever find the answer to

the question of what to teach the students in today's classroom when it comes to civic

---

[8] National Center for Education Statistics. *What Democracy Means to Ninth-Graders: U.S. Results From the International IEA Civic Education Study.* United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 2001.

[9] National Center for Education Statistics. *The Condition of Education 2003.* United States Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, 2003.

[10] Evans, Ronald W. (2004) *The Social Studies Wars: What Should We Teach the Children?* Teachers College Press, New York, NY.

knowledge. Another title that explores the various debates in social studies, how to teach, and to what degree, especially when it comes to various social theories, is Ross' "The Social Studies Curriculum – Purposes, Problems, and Possibilities." Ross, through an edited version[11] of compiled essays and chapters, displays the various arguments for what should be taught, which in turn impacts this study in the form of necessary background knowledge to properly analyze the outcome of the testing instrument.

This is certainly not an exhaustive literature review, since the limited size and scope of this study lends itself to limited review. The study is meant as an attempt, a first hand one at that, at primary research. It does not claim, nor wants to be, the ultimate authority on civic knowledge in the United States population, rather serves a small part in displaying simple facts for all to see and use as they may see fit.

Methodology

In order to generate research that would begin to explain some of the questions that I sought, certain methods needed to be in place, and a solid framework designed in order to produce the best data possible. At the outset lay a simple survey instrument by which to collect data in a short amount of time, and in as economical a way as possible due to limited funds available for this project. Furthermore, there was a need for this project to be possibly continued in the future, and for such reasons the entirety of the research undertaking needed to have the ability to be built upon, or expanded in the future. Working closely with advisors, I decided on a single point of data collection (see the section on *Instrument Creation)* in order to promote simplicity as well as statistic feasibility in the data collected.

---

[11] Ross, Wayne E. (2001) The Social Studies Curriculum: Purposes, Problems, and Possibilities. Revised Edition. State University of New York Press, Albany, NY.

Population

The study aimed at measuring civic knowledge at mainly the secondary level, or high school, with some input and complementary data from freshmen and sophomore level students in college, but some others as well. For these purposes, and since I had almost unlimited access to students in the secondary setting, it was decided that the study take place primarily at a suburban high school in Northeast Ohio. In addition, other data would come from a high school in a small-town setting, as well as from a major public university in the same geographical area. The school population in both of the secondary settings ranged between 1000-1500 students total divided among four grades, and the university holds an average of 20,000-25,000 students enrolled per school year at various campuses. The entire area where the subject schools are located is representative, on average, of the Northeast Ohio area, and shares various socioeconomic values across the board. Most of the university students live in the surrounding area of the university, and so partake of the local economy, henceforth representing the same area as those students in the secondary setting.

Additionally, the subject students from the secondary schools promote average numbers when it comes to college acceptance rates, diversity mix, and income levels. As previously discussed, most of the students in this study are very representative of the surrounding area, and create an accurate picture of that age group. The subject students in the university setting on the other hand were primarily enrolled in education type classes as these were the classes the author had access to. As such, and this will be described more in detail under other sections, the university data may have skewed the representative sample. However, the university sample was mainly used in order to gauge any potential offset of knowledge among the age levels, and turned out not to be substantial.

Instrument Creation

Keeping the above in mind when creating the instrument by which to gather and collect the data, I decided that a survey type instrument was needed. The instrument needed to be one with a very low level of difficulty both in administering and completing by the subject in order to benefit the researcher. In fact, after having consulted various other tests and survey material in order to better understand what works and what does not in data collection, a certain format was decided on.

In addition to the research efforts being tied to civic knowledge and its implications, I also wished to approach from the educational aspect of learning and teaching, and how these factors may impact, or have impacted, the outcomes of the survey. Additionally, I sought to gain validity by using questions that are generally accepted as those which most people should know, or at least attempt to answer, and those which the United States government uses in order to establish eligibility for United States citizenship. Questions were vetted from the United States Customs and Immigration's website[12] from a listing of more than 100 questions on citizenship, American history, government, and other areas as well. It has been decided by the government, and by the USCIS that these questions are representative of the knowledge an active citizen should possess, and so these questions were used as a base when constructing the instrument itself[13].

All of the first 16 questions on the survey instrument are somewhat rooted in the USCIS questions, but the format gas been changed in order to establish similarity and ease of

---

[12] From USCIS's website:
http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.eb1d4c2a3e5b9ac89243c6a7543f6d1a/?vgnextoid=bb93667706f7d 010VgnVCM10000048f3d6a1RCRD&vgnextchannel=bb93667706f7d010VgnVCM10000048f3d6a1RCRD, accessed 5/8/2007.

[13] It is interesting to note here that the USCIS has since decided to pilot a new test which uses a different format on the question types, but has not adopted the new version as of 5/10/2007.

administration and the taking of the survey. Most of the questions are generally regarded as common knowledge – that is knowledge such that most people ought to know the answer, even with no answer prompt. In order to promote a higher rate of correct answers, and to ease in scoring and data analysis, I decided to not use open ended questions such as are found in most qualitative efforts, rather provide answer choices for the respondents to choose from. Additionally, as found in several pieces on research using the survey method, an answer choice that indicated that the subject simply did not know the answer was added. This would hopefully limit guesses from the participants, and create a more accurate and duly representative collection of data.

Furthermore, the instrument was fitted with various demographic questions in order to glean an understanding of the basic makeup of subject participants, as well as their various interests and feelings about civic knowledge and their roles as active citizens. Questions aimed to establish a pattern among the participants in order to enhance the data analysis and to benefit the reader when it comes time to use the actual findings of this research.

Questions were submitted to and checked by the research advisor, and forwarded to the printer for final markup and actual printing of the survey instrument. The instrument was created in such a manner that it would be possible to scan the sheets later on, in order to aid in collection of data and for the ease of processing.

Administration

The administration of the survey was multi-part, multi-stage. Several different participants as well as administrators of the instrument were used in order to benefit time elements, as well as in order to deliver the instrument in an as non-intrusive way as possible. Most of the survey participants were, as previously stated, in the secondary setting, and valuable

time was taken away from those participants, with the approval of their teachers, in order to comply with the needs of the research effort.

Several of the faculty at all three locations, the two secondary schools and the university, had been allocated and recruited in order to administer the survey to participants. They were screened for compliance as well as trustworthiness, but almost no cases were vetted as non-desirable. The survey was given to a wide range of instructional areas in order to gain as much diversity as possible; in the secondary setting students from almost all areas of instruction were sampled. In the university setting, a limited area of study (all of the participants came from College of Education) was unfortunately created by my limited area of access. All instructors and teachers that were asked to participate gained no monetary compensation from their involvement, and were only promised a completed report of the aggregate findings if they wished. This in turn decreased the chances of skewing the data, as well as removed any bias that may have been present in their classrooms or instructional facilities.

The instrument was administered on a self paced, yet supervised, schedule I created. Several of the participating faculty were given, and used, up to two weeks in which to have their students complete the surveys, and returned them to me, sealed in their initial packets. Others were given more time in order to fit the survey in to their specific time slots, allowing for more flexibility on their part, and allowing them to administer the survey on their terms, further removing bias and skewed results. Survey packets were collected on a daily basis where needed, but sometimes remained on location until the author could pick them up. On a few occasions I had to administer to participants in lieu of the instructor, but this happened only on a few occasions, and only per prior approval and arrangement.

Collection and Scanning

All of the surveys were collected and vetted for wrongly marked entries (not incorrect, rather not a complete bubble, or entries which used pen instead of pencil, etc.) as well as some surveys that needed retouched in order to gain a valid scan once delivered to the data processor (in this case the Educational Research Bureau at Kent State University, located in White Hall). Once all samples had been collected and vetted, they were scanned and processed into data in the form of SPSS (a database program used for statistical analysis). The data were delivered to me on a CD, and were converted into Microsoft's Excel format using SPSS version 15.0. This made the data usable, as I had little to no experience using SPSS, nor the time to properly run full scale statistical analysis for this project. However, the data were successfully converted, and simple analysis performed. Please see the Analysis section for more on the results.

Validity

In any research it is important to establish and increase validity through solid research methods. For this project, there are a few items of concern. In discussing them here, and establishing the facts up front, will only strengthen the measure of validity.

First, dealing with the subject participants, and recognizing that some data is skewed simply because some samples are not valid due to efforts by some participants to willingly skew the data, or inadvertently mis-marking the survey as to disrupt the data collection, must be taken into account when considering the data and the analysis. Some participants sought to upset the collection by either marking all choices, or none of the choices where appropriate, or simply incorrectly marking for example both the male and the female gender category – hence upsetting the actual balance of data. This can be seen in the tables in Appendix A, and also in Appendix B where some of the data totals do not match up to the overall total surveys collected. However,

these kinds of data do not total a majority by any means, and as such can healthily be disregarded as an anomaly, and one which most readers should not concern themselves with. However, in order to establish validity, such items need to be discussed.

Second, the fact that most of the data as collected was not indeed collected by the primary researcher and author, it must be pointed out that every measure to protect the integrity of the data was taken. All blank surveys, along with specific instructions, pencils, and verbal consent forms were provided to the recruited teachers and instructors in sealed envelopes, and the collected data were returned in those same envelopes in order to minimize data manipulation after collection. All data were kept by the author as soon as it had been collected, and the chain of handling was never broken by infiltration by a third party (at least not to my knowledge). It is important to point out that some data corruption may have taken place due to the fact that some of the collectors, i.e. teachers and instructors, may have not understood all the directions given both verbally and in written form, but again, this corruption is very minimal at the most, and should not be of concern to most readers.

Third, the author worked closely with advisors from both the Political Science Department at Kent State University as well as from the College of Education, Health & Human Services in order to establish solid methodology, research efforts, ethics, and research etiquette. Proper approval was granted to the research efforts by Kent State University's Institutional Review Board in order to establish official approval and acceptance of the research project, and methods used, as well as approval of forms, survey instruments, and data collection and analysis. Throughout the research project I received input from other sources such as faculty and staff at both the secondary schools, as well as the university setting, and even input from some survey

participants – all in order to improve the project itself, including thoughts on analysis, usage, and dissemination of the final product.

All available methods as were reasonable were used in order to establish a high level and degree of validity in order to make this project sustainable in the future, and in order to prepare the findings for eventual possible publication. If any were left out, or other means influenced the efforts negatively, they were by no means overt actions, rather missteps that were not detected through the process itself.

Analysis

All of the data that will be discussed in the following sections of the analysis can be found in the first sections of the appendices. The specific data for the questions part of the survey instrument, where the participants were asked specific civic knowledge type questions as based on the USCIS citizenship test, can be found in Appendix A. Demographic data can be found in Appendix B. Calculations, and other tables and graphs may be found in Appendix C. All of the data have been handled through SPSS version 15.0, but this program was not used for analysis, rather those data were converted as previously discussed into a more usable form in Excel. All data were then handled through its database engine, and sorted mainly for a male versus female comparison, as well as an overall comparison of data for a representative view of answers to the civic knowledge questions, and for the average look at the survey participants in order to establish the representative sample. It is important to note here that most of the data came from the secondary setting. For a more detailed example, and actual data that confirms this, please view tables 13.0 – 13.2 in Appendix B.

Each part of the data will be discussed in the below sections, and will begin with an analysis of some of the civic knowledge questions. Some will establish the general level of

knowledge among participants, where as others will be used to showcase ignorance (simply

missing knowledge, or knowledge that perhaps the participants do not value) among the

participants. Brief discussions will be offered where deemed appropriate, as well as commentary

by the author on why the data may suggest certain values, issues, or efforts.

In order to establish understanding of the data used, and the way it is presented mainly in

the appendices, here follows a brief description, together with a sample, of the layout of the

presented data, and its labels, values, and meanings.

ALL	Q7	95.61%
0	0	0.00%
1	1	0.18%
2	2	0.37%
3	506	92.84%
4	36	6.61%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	545	100.00%

Sample Table – not used for analysis.
Used for explanation and description only.

In the above table (an actual table, but used here for demonstrative purposes only, as it

will not be referred to other than for this explanation), shows sample data as used for the

analysis. All of the data came in raw form, and was moved into separate tables to ease in analysis

and showcasing. The 'ALL' designator describes that this table shows data for the entire set

combined. Other denominations include M for males, and F for females, and those tables

showcase data that is specific to those two gender groups. The 'Q7' designator displays what

question (from the actual scannable survey sheet) the data has been culled from. The percentage

next to the question designator displays the amount of total participants who answered that question. Overall, 570 surveys were collected and scanned. In this example however, only 545 participants answered the question, so the calculation [545/570 = 0.9561 = 95.61%] aids in understating how many actually answered the question, or in some cases, the survey was able to be scanned.

The shaded gray area denotes the correct answer on the civic knowledge questions (questions 1 – 16) in order to ease interpretation by the reader. The numbered rows are the database fields in which the data were sorted. Some rows were not used for the first part of the survey, but are used later on in the demographic section. However, for ease of use and data manipulation, all values are represented here, and during analysis. Furthermore, each row displays the amount of participants in real numbers who answered with which answer choice, as well as what the percentage of those answers were. An additional explanatory note accompanies each table in the appendices displaying the correct answers as well as all answer choices available to the participant.

Of note here as well is that the data for males and females have been further vetted for records that indicated either malicious data or simply blank records. As such, some numbers when viewed in the appendices, especially the totals, may not add up correctly, however, as a representative sample the data are correct.

Data

In order to establish a sense of ground and common knowledge among the participants, the first two questions will be analyzed briefly (see Appendix A, Tables 1.0-1.2 and 2.0-2.2). They both deal with identifying the President of the United States and the Vice President. Overall, most survey takers knew the right answer, which is comforting, but a few outliers

emerged as well. Together, 99.64% recognized and selected George W. Bush as the President, and the numbers dropped slightly where 96.89% chose Dick Cheney as the Vice President. It is a little shocking that 15 people think Ronald Reagan is the current Vice President, but those numbers may be skewed by destructive participants as previously discussed in the section on validity. So, it seems that the first two questions were relatively easy, and that almost all got it right. The data certainly indicates that the participants in the survey pay some sort of attention to who is currently heading the Executive Branch of the government as well as who is not.

The next few questions were a bit more specific, and asked for specific numbers in government, namely the number of amendments to the United States Constitution, and how many members there are in the House of Representatives (see Tables 3.0-3.2 and 4.0-4.2). Judging by the above scores on the presidential questions, one would assume these two to have equal scores as well, or at least follow some type of predictive behavior. In fact, only a little more than a third of respondents answered correctly on the members question, and about half got the amendment question right. Does this mean that government is not that important after all? One would assume these questions to be easy, since they haven't changed for a long time, and also due to the importance of both (since government is so involved in people's lives, one would expect all to know the answers). However, this data certainly suggests otherwise.

In all fairness, the answer choices for most of the questions were constructed with some entrapment in mind, where the participant would actually have to know the answer, even though they were to choose from a list. As such, on the members one (the right answer being 435) the other answer choices were 237 and 100, as well as the IDK (I don't know) answer choice present on all questions. One third of the participants confused the House of Representatives with the Senate, and chose 100, where as 20% chose 237 which was an arbitrary number not connected to

any legislature known to me. This shows great guesswork on the part of the survey takers, and an unsurety as to what the right answer is. The rest picked the IDK answer, which is also an honest way to answer the question, and one that will be discussed in greater detail later. Here, specifically, females tended to pick that choice more often than males.

The amendments questions, Tables 4.0-4.2, show similar results as well. More people got the question correct (27), 52.79% overall, and the rest were stuck on the other choices or the IDK answer. All three choices to pick from included an odd number, and this was again by design. But, apparently, even though most people will say that knowing this type of information is useful to them, 83.18% agree to this, most do not know it. There seems to be a great divide between what participants felt was important to know, and what they actually knew. Is this a trend? And are there other implications to that notion as well?

A question on the test that was directly, word for word, copied from the USCIS citizenship exam was "Who said: Give me liberty or give me death?" The answer, Patrick Henry, only came to about half of the respondents (52.12%), where the other equal parts answered George Washington or John Hancock. 45 people agreed that they did not know the answer. This question is of particular interest because it is one deeply rooted in most school textbooks, and one that most students will have come in contact with at one point or another in their studies if they followed a standard curriculum (as based on national standards for teaching American history and social studies). However, one could easily argue that this kind of information is useless, especially since it no longer matters to most students, and hence when they learned it had very little interest in retaining the knowledge, or even attempting to make meaning from it. As such, the answers reflect perhaps blissful ignorance, or simply forgetfulness on the part of the participant. It is, however, a true question of spiral curriculum and a question of what should be

taught in the schools, and who decides what to teach. If only about 50% know the answer, and it plays little to no role in everyday use, even in the respondent group (who are mostly still in school), should we even bother to teach it? Are there not other areas we can spend more time on?

One of the more interesting sections of the entire survey, and the area of knowledge that actually began the quest for more information in regards to civic knowledge type questions, is that of the knowledge of the world around an individual. As such, the survey sought to measure whether or not the average school educated person had general knowledge about their own environment, such as population, and size of their country, as well as general setup of governance. The two questions that addressed these concepts asked the participant to identify the correct approximate population of the United States and the amount of states in the federal system. The data is displayed in full detail in Tables 7.0-7.2 and 8.0-8.2 in Appendix A.

Most people seem to know how many states there are in the United States (50), with a 92.84% correct response rate. However, several people believe that there are 52 states. Apparently, Alaska and Hawaii make the additional two[14], which would make sense since they are the last two to be added to the union. But to have almost 7% of respondents incorrectly identify the number of states as 52, and all of those respondents being either in high school, or in college, demands clarification. In order to further the discussion, and to attempt to explain the lack of knowledge regarding the immediate surroundings, let us take a closer look at the population question.

34.57% of all respondents to the survey identify the approximate population of the United States to be 1.2 billion. According to the Central Intelligence Agency's World Factbook[15], China has now surpassed the 1.2 billion mark, and currently reigns as population leader with 1.3 billion

---

[14] I found this out after having spoken to several students in order to clarify the question.
[15] Available at: https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/, accessed 5/8/2007.

inhabitants. But why do so many identify the United States' population to be near that of China's? Is it because there is a notion that the United States is the 'biggest' country in the world, and therefore clearly has the largest population? Or are other variables included when picking that choice? Only a sad 41.04% could correctly identify the approximate population of the United States as 300 million. It is interesting to note that at the time of the survey, recent news coverage of the 300 millionth baby born had just about died out in the headlines. Still, most participants did not know the right answer, and hence do not know their immediate geographical area very well. Geography is not one of the focus areas in the secondary setting, where world and American history come first, with studies of government and other social studies electives having priority over the separate areas of study, like geography, which most students have to wait until college in order to enjoy. But a simple figure like 300 million does not require a separate course, does it? What does this tell us about the average student in the secondary setting, and even worse as adults, as we may certainly expect the numbers who answer these types of questions correctly to be even worse the further away from school one gets?

On the bright side, the majority of participants knew the capital of Iraq (92.86%), as seen in Tables 9.0-9.2. It is interesting to see that the media does play a role in disseminating information, and that the schools take time to study current events. Perhaps students themselves take charge of keeping up on such information, but it is hardly probable as other data suggests otherwise, especially in the domestic areas. However, to contradict, or perhaps show ignorance on the part of knowing our own area again, only about half (48.99%) of the survey takers knew how many justices there are on the United States Supreme Court. Now, to be fair, some survey participants may not have been fortunate to have studied the Judicial Branch in depth, and as such may never have encountered the specific data by which to gauge their answer on the survey

itself. Although, it is telling, especially since there have been recent media reports in regards to Supreme Court replacements, debates on Capitol Hill and other upsets, but perhaps the domestic area bores the average survey respondent, or they find such information unnecessary.

One last question to ponder is that of United States' opponents in World War II. This is an area of knowledge that all of the respondents had encountered for sure in their education, and yet failed to answer 100% on. Only 88.81% could correctly identify that Germany, Japan, and Italy were among the enemies in World War II, rather than England, France, and Belgium with 4.95%, and 4.40% simply not knowing. It attests to the question, again, whether or not what we are teaching sticks, and whether or not it matters.

Demographics

As a separate part of the survey instrument, I asked for basic demographic data in order to begin to understand the target survey participant, as well as glean some insight in to the daily, or perhaps weekly, behavior of the respondents. As such several questions were fashioned in order to ask solid, yet simple questions that would meet the project's need. A selected portion of the demographic data can be viewed in Appendix B, and the following section will discuss some of the items in more detail.

One basic measure was to find out the difference between males and females, and to perhaps measure some of their answers against each other. Males represented 50.74% of the survey takers to female's 49.26%, in a statistically accurate sample, as compared to the makeup of the United States population, and the world's[16]. As previously discussed, most of the subjects were in the age group of 12-25, with most still in secondary school. The decision to use age 12 as the lower designator stemmed simply from the IRB requirement to not include such participants without further approval needed from both subjects, parents, and the review board itself. One

---

[16] See the CIA World Factbook's numbers on world and United States population, and its breakown.

anomaly can be found in the female group where substantially more are in the 19-25 age group as compared to males, and this can be explained by the high frequency of females, as observed by myself during administration of the surveys in the university setting, in the specific subject classes.

The majority of the respondents have only high school education, as they are still in some sort of secondary school. Additionally, most of the parents of the survey participants have high school and college educations, with 15.73% having a Master's degree of some kind. This establishes the basic makeup of the population sampled as well, as most will probably follow in their parents' footsteps when it comes to education, and one could expect to see the same rate if the same sample group were to be measured again in some time (if the level of education were not even higher for that matter). Race was not part of this study, and has for those purposes not been identified in any way, on the surveys or through observation.

Next, I was eager to find out how often the subjects used various media outlets, or if they even valued or enjoyed education or knowing information of the kind featured on the survey instrument itself. Through a set of questions at the end of the survey I attempted to gauge usage, as well as willingness to learn and keep information[17].

Overall, 56.85% of respondents never use or read a newspaper. 43.15% read a newspaper one time per week, and no one reads it more than that. These data support a decline in the newspaper business that has been observed in the last few years, where more and more news outlets move online, or shut down altogether. When asked the same question about the Internet: "How often do you use the Internet?", 73.16% agreed that they use it every day, with only 4 people overall that never use it. The Internet usage is quite high, and more and more people have

---

[17] For a deeper understanding of a sample group in northeast Ohio, mainly in the secondary setting, and their Internet usage, please see *Student Technology Inventory: A Report*, by Andreas Johansson (2007).

access to the Internet, and use it frequently. According to the CIA World Factbook again, more than one billion users of the Internet exist across the world, with the majority focused in the Western areas such as Europe, United States, and parts of Asia. As a comparison, there are approximately 2.1 billion cell phone users in the world.

When asked whether or not the participants ever enjoyed the study of either history or government as subjects, many people agreed that they did indeed enjoy them, however, males tended to appreciate history much more than females, and government was overall the least favorite of the two subjects between both groups. Only 36.40% of all respondents enjoy government as a subject, and perhaps this is reflective of some of the answer results with especially low scores. It is well known that a student has to, on some level, enjoy the subject studied in order to take something away from it, and hence keep it and use it in the future. If the study of government did not provide that (the feeling of importance) to the majority of the survey takers, then that would certainly explain some of the answers.

Related Findings

As is often true with any research, other data than that the researchers are looking for tend to show up, and create new areas of interest, and new questions to be answered in other, perhaps future endeavors. This project, as it set out to measure knowledge of civic knowledge type questions, also asked a final question on the survey where the respondents were asked to gauge whether or not they thought they knew most of the questions on the test they had just taken. The raw data can be seen in Table 20.0-20.2 in Appendix B.

I became interested to measure whether or not, and how, males or females estimate their knowledge on a test, and how accurate they were in estimating that knowledge. As such, I ran a comparison between the estimated levels of knowledge (where if the respondent indicated that,

yes, they felt they knew most of the questions that would be an indicator to as what their expected score would be on the test). Overall, 85.69% felt they knew most of the questions on the test, but it became even more interesting when I looked at the separate genders and their numbers. I will discuss briefly how this information may impact not only the school environment, but also how it may impact society at large.

In table 21.0 in Appendix C, I have charted the scores for all questions on the test, and broken the data up male versus female for easy comparison. I then averaged the overall correct answers for each gender, compared them with their estimated score, or the answer to the question described above. I then calculated the difference between the two scores, which can be seen in the DIFF row in the table. A positive score indicates an overestimation of ability or knowledge, and a negative score the opposite.

Both sexes overestimated their knowledge level some, but males overestimated by almost 10%, which would indicate, in at least the secondary, and perhaps even the university setting, that males perceive themselves to perform a whole letter grade better than they actually are. Females only overestimate by a modest 3%. This in turn may prove why a large amount of females tend to, at least as suggested from the secondary setting results, to underperform *according to their abilities* (due to perhaps a societal stifling of gender roles). Males on the other hand, often need help improving their work as they tend to underperform *based on false pretences*. This information is very interesting to take into consideration, especially in the secondary setting, as the two genders often operate differently within the classroom, but also on outside assignments. Knowing more about their behavior can only improve teachers, and perhaps allow them to design more effective curriculum based solely, or at least more accurately, on each gender's specific need and ability.

It would be very interesting to continue these studies, and to focus the efforts on more specific questions and interviews, as well as prolonged quantitative and qualitative data collection. In order to gain a better picture of perceived performance levels and attitudes toward learning as tied to performance, understanding student views on performing, abilities, and their outlook on learning, much more research is needed.

Conclusion

In general, the level of civic knowledge is low overall, and questions most people would assume they could get right, people are failing at, or at least not performing as well as they ought to. The questions remain: What is civic knowledge and how does the average person define it, and what parts of civic knowledge are really important? How do the average populace define success (*and is knowing civic knowledge type questions part of that definition*) and are they doing what it takes to reach that success? Can we as educators, based on the above information really change the way we teach, or are we facing the sad outcomes of education as we know it?

Survey participants were able to identify our current President and Vice President with a high rate of success, as well as some information in regards to the international scene, such as the capital of Iraq. Where they failed were areas of domestic knowledge, with more than half not being able to identify the population of the country they live in. Furthermore, the research shows, or certainly suggests, that males tend to overestimate their own knowledge abilities, and perhaps this influences educational outcomes as well as impacts society as a whole, where males tend to operate on false pretenses at times.

Further Efforts

I hope to one day continue this study, and perhaps make it much more involved, and certainly collect more data than was done this time around. Using a matrix sampling as was done

in the Ravitch and Finn study would certainly provide more solid data in terms of actual representation nationwide, and it would be interesting to see if there were differences in the level of civic knowledge across the nation, and whether or not such differences could be traced back to the state level of education, students attitudes toward studying and keeping up on the news, or none of the above. In addition, I wish to gather more data on the differences between males and females, especially how they see themselves in education, and what part they believe they play in both the current educational model, as well as in their own lives as learners. It would be interesting to continue the quantitative data, and couple it with solid qualitative analyses regarding students, teachers, and others as connected to the development of civic knowledge, as well as societal attitudes at large in regards to such knowledge. It is interesting to note that most of society, while heavily reporting on issues of civic knowledge, in reality does not do much to raise the level of awareness in certain areas as proven by the research in this project. What impact does that phenomena have on the overall performance of society, and what can be done to change that in the long run? How do we get more people excited about civic knowledge, or do we chose to abandon all hope and teach what is really needed instead? And, if so, *what knowledge is really needed to be taught in our schools in order for most people to include civic knowledge (as measured in this research effort) in their definition of success*?

Appendix A – Selected Data Tables, Civic Knowledge Questions

ALL	Q1	96.32%
0	0	0.00%
1	0	0.00%
2	2	0.36%
3	0	0.00%
4	547	99.64%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	549	100.00%

M	Q1	97.77%
0	0	0.00%
1	0	0.00%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	263	100.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	263	100.00%

F	Q1	98.13%
0	0	0.00%
1	0	0.00%
2	2	0.76%
3	0	0.00%
4	261	99.24%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	263	100.00%

Table 1.0 – 1.2 – Who is the current President of the United States?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – Bill Clinton, 3 – Dick Cheney, 4 – George Bush, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

ALL	Q2	95.96%
0	0	0.00%
1	2	0.37%
2	15	2.74%
3	530	96.89%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	547	100.00%

M	Q2	98.88%
0	0	0.00%
1	1	0.38%
2	6	2.26%
3	259	97.37%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	266	100.00%

F	Q2	97.76%
0	0	0.00%
1	1	0.38%
2	7	2.67%
3	254	96.95%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	262	100.00%

Table 2.0 – 2.2 – Who is the current Vice President?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – Ronald Reagan, 3 – Dick Cheney, 4 – George Bush, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

Appendix A – Selected Data Tables, Civic Knowledge Questions

ALL	Q3	95.26%
0	0	0.00%
1	62	11.42%
2	194	35.73%
3	112	20.63%
4	175	32.23%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	543	100.00%

M	Q3	98.14%
0	0	0.00%
1	28	10.61%
2	106	40.15%
3	53	20.08%
4	77	29.17%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	264	100.00%

F	Q3	97.76%
0	0	0.00%
1	33	12.60%
2	77	29.39%
3	56	21.37%
4	96	36.64%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	262	100.00%

Table 3.0 – 3.2 – How many members are there in the House of Representatives?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – 435, 3 – 237, 4 – 100, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

ALL	Q4	94.39%
0	0	0.00%
1	46	8.55%
2	68	12.64%
3	140	26.02%
4	284	52.79%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	538	100.00%

M	Q4	96.28%
0	0	0.00%
1	19	7.34%
2	22	8.49%
3	67	25.87%
4	151	58.30%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	259	100.00%

F	Q4	97.01%
0	0	0.00%
1	26	10.00%
2	43	16.54%
3	67	25.77%
4	124	47.69%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	260	100.00%

Table 4.0 – 4.2 – How many amendments are there to the United States Constitution?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – 25, 3 – 29, 4 – 27, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

Appendix A – Selected Data Tables, Civic Knowledge Questions

ALL	Q5	95.26%
0	0	0.00%
1	45	8.29%
2	101	18.60%
3	114	20.99%
4	283	52.12%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	543	100.00%

M	Q5	96.65%
0	0	0.00%
1	17	6.54%
2	53	20.38%
3	50	19.23%
4	140	53.85%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	260	100.00%

F	Q5	98.51%
0	0	0.00%
1	27	10.23%
2	45	17.05%
3	62	23.48%
4	130	49.24%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	264	100.00%

Table 5.0 – 5.2 – Who said "Give me liberty, or give me death!"?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – George Washington, 3 – John Hancock, 4 – Patrick Henry, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

ALL	Q6	95.61%
0	0	0.00%
1	30	5.50%
2	470	86.24%
3	26	4.77%
4	19	3.49%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	545	100.00%

M	Q6	97.40%
0	0	0.00%
1	15	5.73%
2	231	88.17%
3	8	3.05%
4	8	3.05%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	262	100.00%

F	Q6	98.88%
0	0	0.00%
1	13	4.91%
2	223	84.15%
3	18	6.79%
4	11	4.15%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	265	100.00%

Table 6.0 – 6.2 – How many Senators represent each state in the United States Senate?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – 2, 3 – 50, 4 – 100, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

Appendix A – Selected Data Tables, Civic Knowledge Questions

ALL	Q7	95.61%
0	0	0.00%
1	1	0.18%
2	2	0.37%
3	506	92.84%
4	36	6.61%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	545	100.00%

M	Q7	97.03%
0	0	0.00%
1	0	0.00%
2	1	0.38%
3	244	93.49%
4	16	6.13%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	261	100.00%

F	Q7	98.51%
0	0	0.00%
1	0	0.00%
2	1	0.38%
3	245	92.80%
4	18	6.82%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	264	100.00%

Table 7.0 – 7.2 – How many states are there in the United States?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – 48, 3 – 50, 4 – 52, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

ALL	Q8	94.91%
0	0	0.00%
1	80	14.79%
2	52	9.61%
3	222	41.04%
4	187	34.57%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	541	100.00%

M	Q8	96.65%
0	0	0.00%
1	18	6.92%
2	29	11.15%
3	117	45.00%
4	96	36.92%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	260	100.00%

F	Q8	97.76%
0	0	0.00%
1	60	22.90%
2	22	8.40%
3	97	37.02%
4	83	31.68%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	262	100.00%

Table 8.0 – 8.2 – What is the approximate population of the United States?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – 29 million, 3 – 300 million, 4 – 1.2 billion, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

Appendix A – Selected Data Tables, Civic Knowledge Questions

ALL	Q9	95.79%
0	0	0.00%
1	26	4.76%
2	507	92.86%
3	4	0.73%
4	9	1.65%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	546	100.00%

M	Q9	98.14%
0	0	0.00%
1	7	2.65%
2	253	95.83%
3	2	0.76%
4	2	0.76%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	264	100.00%

F	Q9	98.51%
0	0	0.00%
1	17	6.44%
2	238	90.15%
3	2	0.76%
4	7	2.65%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	264	100.00%

Table 9.0 – 9.2 – What is the capital of Iraq?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – Baghdad, 3 – Islamabad, 4 – Tikrit, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

ALL	Q13	95.26%
0	0	0.00%
1	107	19.71%
2	266	48.99%
3	73	13.44%
4	97	17.86%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	543	100.00%

M	Q13	97.77%
0	0	0.00%
1	38	14.45%
2	135	51.33%
3	33	12.55%
4	57	21.67%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	263	100.00%

F	Q13	98.88%
0	0	0.00%
1	67	25.28%
2	123	46.42%
3	39	14.72%
4	36	13.58%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	265	100.00%

Table 10.0 – 10.2 – How many Supreme Court Justices are there?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – 9, 3 – 8, 4 – 7, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

Civic Knowledge   32

Appendix A – Selected Data Tables, Civic Knowledge Questions

ALL	Q14	95.61%
0	0	0.00%
1	24	4.40%
2	10	1.83%
3	27	4.95%
4	484	88.81%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	545	100.00%

M	Q14	98.51%
0	0	0.00%
1	5	1.89%
2	5	1.89%
3	8	3.02%
4	247	93.21%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	265	100.00%

F	Q14	97.76%
0	0	0.00%
1	19	7.25%
2	4	1.53%
3	18	6.87%
4	221	84.35%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	262	100.00%

Table 11.0 – 11.2 – Who were United States' main opponents in World War II?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – I don't know, 2 – Iraq, Afghanistan, 3 – England, France, Belgium, 4 – Germany, Japan, Italy, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

Appendix B - Selected Data Tables, Demographic Data

ALL	Q17	95.44%
0	276	50.74%
1	268	49.26%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	544	100.00%

Table 12.0 – Male / Female dispersion
Answer Value Key: 0 – Male, 1 – Female, 2 – Not Used, 3 – Not Used, 4 – Not Used, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

ALL	Q18	95.26%
0	0	0.00%
1	464	85.45%
2	72	13.26%
3	1	0.18%
4	6	1.10%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	543	100.00%

M	Q18	99.26%
0	0	0.00%
1	257	96.25%
2	7	2.62%
3	0	0.00%
4	3	1.12%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	267	100.00%

F	Q18	98.88%
0	0	0.00%
1	204	76.98%
2	58	21.89%
3	0	0.00%
4	3	1.13%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	265	100.00%

Table 13.0 – 13.2 – Age Group designator
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – 12-18, 2 – 19-25, 3 – 26-40, 4 – 41+, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

Appendix B - Selected Data Tables, Demographic Data

ALL	Q19	93.16%
0	0	0.00%
1	290	54.61%
2	167	31.45%
3	61	11.49%
4	5	0.94%
5	3	0.56%
6	1	0.19%
7	4	0.75%
TOTAL	531	100.00%

M	Q19	96.28%
0	0	0.00%
1	163	62.93%
2	84	32.43%
3	6	2.32%
4	2	0.77%
5	2	0.77%
6	0	0.00%
7	2	0.77%
TOTAL	259	100.00%

F	Q19	97.39%
0	0	0.00%
1	125	47.89%
2	80	30.65%
3	50	19.16%
4	2	0.77%
5	1	0.38%
6	1	0.38%
7	2	0.77%
TOTAL	261	100.00%

Table 14.0 – 14.2 – What is your highest level of education?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – Some High School, 2 – High School, 3 – College, 4 – Master's Degree, 5 – Professional, 6 – GED, 7 – None.

ALL	Q20	90.35%
0	0	0.00%
1	8	1.55%
2	160	31.07%
3	213	41.36%
4	81	15.73%
5	37	7.18%
6	8	1.55%
7	8	1.55%
TOTAL	515	100.00%

M	Q20	94.05%
0	0	0.00%
1	4	1.58%
2	72	28.46%
3	113	44.66%
4	37	14.62%
5	16	6.32%
6	4	1.58%
7	7	2.77%
TOTAL	253	100.00%

F	Q20	93.28%
0	0	0.00%
1	4	1.60%
2	84	33.60%
3	95	38.00%
4	42	16.80%
5	20	8.00%
6	4	1.60%
7	1	0.40%
TOTAL	250	100.00%

Table 15.0 – 15.2 – What is your parents' level of education?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Not Used, 1 – Some High School, 2 – High School, 3 – College, 4 – Master's Degree, 5 – Professional, 6 – GED, 7 – None.

Appendix B - Selected Data Tables, Demographic Data

ALL	Q21	94.74%
0	307	56.85%
1	233	43.15%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	540	100.00%

M	Q21	98.14%
0	156	59.09%
1	108	40.91%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	264	100.00%

F	Q21	98.88%
0	146	55.09%
1	119	44.91%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	265	100.00%

Table 16.0 – 16.2 – How often do you read a newspaper?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Never, 1 – 1 time / week, 2 – 2-3 times / week, 3 – Every day, 4 – Not Used, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

ALL	Q22	95.44%
0	4	0.74%
1	24	4.41%
2	118	21.69%
3	398	73.16%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	544	100.00%

M	Q22	98.51%
0	0	0.00%
1	14	5.28%
2	54	20.38%
3	197	74.34%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	265	100.00%

F	Q22	98.51%
0	3	1.14%
1	10	3.79%
2	61	23.11%
3	190	71.97%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	264	100.00%

Table 17.0 – 17.2 – How often do you use the Internet?
Answer Value Key: 0 – Never, 1 – 1 time / week, 2 – 2-3 times / week, 3 – Every day, 4 – Not Used, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

Appendix B - Selected Data Tables, Demographic Data

ALL	Q27	95.26%
0	202	37.20%
1	341	62.80%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	543	100.00%

M	Q27	98.14%
0	74	28.03%
1	190	71.97%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	264	100.00%

F	Q27	99.63%
0	126	47.19%
1	141	52.81%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	267	100.00%

Table 18.0 – 18.2 – Do you now, or did you ever, enjoy studying history as a subject?
Answer Value Key: 0 – No, 1 – Yes, 2 – Not Used, 3 – Not Used, 4 – Not Used, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

ALL	Q28	95.44%
0	346	63.60%
1	198	36.40%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	544	100.00%

M	Q28	99.26%
0	153	57.30%
1	114	42.70%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	267	100.00%

F	Q28	99.63%
0	190	71.16%
1	77	28.84%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	267	100.00%

Table 19.0 – 19.2 – Do you now, or did you ever, enjoy studying government as a subject?
Answer Value Key: 0 – No, 1 – Yes, 2 – Not Used, 3 – Not Used, 4 – Not Used, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

Appendix B - Selected Data Tables, Demographic Data

ALL	Q29	95.61%
0	78	14.31%
1	467	85.69%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	545	100.00%

M	Q29	99.26%
0	25	9.36%
1	242	90.64%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	267	100.00%

F	Q29	98.88%
0	52	19.62%
1	213	80.38%
2	0	0.00%
3	0	0.00%
4	0	0.00%
5	0	0.00%
6	0	0.00%
7	0	0.00%
TOTAL	265	100.00%

Table 20.0 – 20.2 – Do you feel you knew most of the information asked of you on the test?
Answer Value Key: 0 – No, 1 – Yes, 2 – Not Used, 3 – Not Used, 4 – Not Used, 5 – Not Used, 6 – Not Used, 7 – Not Used.

Appendix C – Various Tables, Calculations & Comparisons

Estimation of Knowledge, Males vs. Females

M - Actual AV % Correct Answers		F - Actual AV % Correct Answers	
1	100	1	99.24
2	97.37	2	96.95
3	40.15	3	29.39
4	58.3	4	47.69
5	53.85	5	49.24
6	88.17	6	84.15
7	93.49	7	92.8
8	45	8	37.02
9	95.83	9	90.15
10	97.74	10	95.86
11	96.21	11	96.96
12	99.24	12	98.85
13	51.33	13	46.42
14	93.21	14	84.35
15	98.87	15	99.62
16	90.49	16	86.31
AVERAGE	81.20313	AVERAGE	77.1875
ESTIMATED	90.64	ESTIMATED	80.38
DIFF	9.436875	DIFF	3.1925

Table 21.0 – Estimated knowledge among males and females, as compared to actual average correct responses on knowledge related test questions.