

James Madison Legacy Project Expansion

Pilot Study

Dr. Diana Owen
Professor
Director, Civic Education Research Lab
Georgetown University

M. Bradlee Sutherland
Research Associate
Civic Education Research Lab
Georgetown University



EVALUATION REPORT

JAMES MADISON LEGACY PROJECT EXPANSION

March 2023



Contact:

Dr. Diana Owen
Civic Education Research Lab
Georgetown University
3520 Prospect Street, NW
Room 320A
Washington, D.C. 20057
Email: owend@georgetown.edu
Website: <https://cerl.georgetown.edu/>

Independent program evaluation funded by the U.S. Department of Education

Disclosure of Potential Conflict of Interest

The research team for this study is based at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. Neither the author nor the staff have financial interests that could be affected by the findings of this study.

Table of Contents

- Executive Summary1**
- Key Findings.....2**
- Recommendations.....2**
- Study Description.....3**
 - Student Sample.....3
 - Teacher Data4
 - Student Characteristics5
 - Measures.....6
 - Civic Knowledge.....6
 - Civic Dispositions7
 - SEL Competencies8
 - Independent Variables9
 - Analysis.....10
- Civic Knowledge.....10**
 - Key Findings11
 - Civic Knowledge Index.....15
 - Learning about American Government, Historical Events, and Races and Cultures.....15
- Civic Dispositions16**
 - Key Findings16
 - Civic Disposition Index.....16
 - Interest in and Attention to Government, Politics, and Community Affairs.....20
- SEL Competencies23**
 - Key Findings23
 - Relationship Skills/Communication.....23
 - Relationship Skills/Collaboration26
 - Social Awareness28
- Student Takeaways31**
- References34**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The James Madison Legacy Project Expansion (JMLPE) is a three-year program of the Center for Civic Education (Center) that focuses on making the *We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution* (WTP) curriculum intervention accessible to students of color, English language learners (ELLs), and students with disabilities in middle and high school. The WTP curriculum bolsters students' knowledge acquisition with cooperative learning activities that also are designed to develop their civic dispositions and skills (Owen, Hartzell, and Sanchez, 2020). Social and emotional learning (SEL) competencies can be integrated into the WTP curriculum. The Civic Education Research Lab (CERL) at Georgetown University is responsible for the research component of the project.

During the first phase of the JMLPE, Center staff worked with teacher-experts, consultants, and stakeholders to adapt the WTP curriculum to meet the needs of the target student groups. CERL surveyed teacher-experts working with these student populations to identify priorities, educational objectives, challenges, needs, and best practices (Owen, 2022). Consistent with the goals of the JMLPE, teacher-experts cited providing civic content knowledge to teachers and students, making the curriculum accessible and relevant to the target populations, devising culturally appropriate and varied instructional approaches, and incorporating SEL competencies into the curriculum as priorities. These factors were considered when the WTP curriculum was adapted for use with the specified student groups. Lesson plans were developed for a pilot test of the curriculum to prepare for the next phase of the JMLPE where teachers will be provided with professional development to prepare them to teach using the adapted materials (Owen and Phillips, 2023).

This report provides the results of a pilot study conducted by CERL to assess the effectiveness of the adapted WTP curriculum and associated pedagogic practices in promoting student acquisition of civic content knowledge, civic dispositions, and SEL competencies. The pilot study was conducted in fall semester WTP classes of a select group of teachers with expertise in instructing the WTP curriculum with at least one of the three target student populations. The study was fielded during the fall and early spring of academic year 2022-23. The pilot study employed a quasi-experimental pretest/posttest design. Teachers administered the pretest prior to their students receiving the WTP intervention and gave the posttest at the conclusion of the class. CERL designed the student tests, prepared the data, and conducted the analysis.

The pilot study reconfirmed the consistent finding that the WTP curriculum intervention is highly successful in conveying civic knowledge to students, including those from high-need populations (Owen, 2015; Owen and Riddle, 2017; Owen, 2018; Owen, Hartzell, and Sanchez, 2020; Owen and Irion Groth, 2020). Modest, statistically significant improvements were found in students' civic dispositions related to their interest in and attention to politics, propensity to follow politics and learn about issues, political efficacy, and anticipatory voting intentions. Students made small gains in SEL competencies. Statistically significant increases were found in communication skills and social-awareness. Collaboration skills remained consistent with pre-program levels.

Key Findings

- Students showed large, statistically significant gains in civic content knowledge after taking the adapted WTP class. Overall, students gained an average of six points on the knowledge index, representing a 45% increase in knowledge from pretest to posttest. The pretest/posttest improvement in student knowledge was 54% for students of color, 65% for ELLs, and 69% for students with disabilities.
- Students made statistically significant gains in scores on a civic dispositions index that tapped into their understanding of issues, political efficacy, propensity to follow politics, and anticipation of voting in elections when eligible.
- Students' interest in and attention to government, politics, and community affairs increased modestly after the WTP curriculum intervention.
- Small, statistically significant increases were found in students' communication skills and social-awareness. The findings for collaboration skills were nonsignificant.

Recommendations

- 1) Raise the threshold for designating “high concentrations” of students with disabilities and ELLs to 50% or more in a class.** It is reasonable to expect that students with disabilities and ELLs will be assigned to classes with teachers who have the requisite certifications for instructing these student populations. Having a higher percentage of students with disabilities (Year 2) and ELLs (Year 3) in classes will improve the ability to generalize the findings to those populations.
- 2) Strongly emphasize pedagogies that will help students to develop relevant SEL competencies in the professional development program.** The pilot study teachers were given the considerable task of implementing an adapted WTP curriculum with new lesson plans and materials. Assuring that the lessons successfully conveyed content knowledge was of paramount importance. The PD program should provide teachers of the three target student populations with proven practices and concrete examples of how SEL competencies can be prioritized in their classrooms and effectively incorporated into the adapted lessons.
- 3) Integrate more civics content that is historically and culturally relevant to students in the target populations into the curriculum and lesson plans.** This recommendation addresses the finding that one-third of students reported that they did not learn about other races and cultures in their WTP class.
- 4) Review SEL test items with teacher-experts.** The SEL items used in the pilot study were derived from prior research using the CASEL framework and had known reliability and validity. These items can be refined with the input of teacher-experts to be more consistent with the goals of the JMLPE.

Study Description

The pilot research was conducted in Year One (2022-23) of the JMLPE to evaluate the effectiveness of the adapted WTP curriculum and associated pedagogies developed by the Center during the initial phase of the project on student learning and acquisition of civic dispositions and SEL competencies. The pilot study used a quasi-experimental, pretest-posttest design. Thirty teachers with experience teaching students of color, ELLs, and students with disabilities were recruited for the study. The teachers had prior experience with teaching the WTP curriculum and were identified by the Center's staff and state coordinators as expert instructors. More than half of the teachers in the pilot study had attended the Center's JMLPE workshop in June 2022 and had worked on adapting lesson plans and materials to be implemented in classrooms during the pilot. The initial goal was to recruit ten teachers who instructed students in each of the three target populations. However, several of the teachers instructed classes with high concentrations of students (30% or more) in more than one of the groups (see details in the Teacher Data section).

Teachers implemented the adapted WTP curriculum and lesson plans in their classes during the fall semester of the 2022-23 academic year. The pretest was fielded from August through September of 2022 and the posttest from December through early February of 2023 depending upon the school schedule. Teachers administered the pretest to their students at the start of their class prior to instructing the WTP curriculum intervention. The posttest was administered at the conclusion of the WTP class. Students took the tests using a secure SurveyMonkey Pro platform. The pretests and posttests were matched and subsequently all personally identifying information was removed from the data set.

Supplemental data were obtained from the teachers from a form submitted to the Center that provided information about teachers' backgrounds (education, years teaching), the composition of their classes (high concentrations of students of color, ELLs, and students with disabilities), and their schools (Title I status). Information also was obtained about the grade level teachers instructed, class size, the Level (2 or 3) of the WTP curriculum implemented, the WTP units and lessons taught, whether a simulated congressional hearing was held, and whether optional curricular materials were used. Relevant data, such as class composition, WTP level, whether a simulated congressional hearing was held in their class, and Title I school status were incorporated into the student data set.

IRB approval was granted for the study by the Georgetown University Human Subjects Review Board (IRB-C). The research involving both teachers (STUDY00005550) and students (STUDY00005562) was approved with "Exempt" status as the study involved minimal to no risks to subjects.

Student Sample

Teachers with expertise in instructing one or more of the target student populations were recruited for the pilot study to implement the adapted WTP curriculum in their classes. A total of 1,119 students took the pretest, of which 773 completed both the pretest and the posttest. These

students constitute the sample employed in this research. Thirty teachers administered the pretest to their students, and 24 teachers completed the study. Six teachers (20%) dropped out of the study as they did not administer the posttest to their students which accounts for 152 students leaving the research or 14% of the leavers. An additional 194 students took the pretest but not the posttest, accounting for 17% of the leavers. (See Table 1.) Joiners were not included in the study. However, it is worth noting that 204 students were categorized as joiners as they took the posttest only. One teacher joined the study, accounting for 50 student joiners, and 164 additional students took the posttest only.

Table 1
Student Sample

Total students who took pretest	1119
Students completed pretest and posttest	773
6 Teachers administered pretest only	152
Students left the study	194
Total Leavers	346
1 Teacher administered posttest only	50
Students joined the study	164
Total Joiners	204

Teacher Data

Teachers were asked to complete a form that provided information about their classes and their backgrounds. Thirty-two teachers submitted the form, including the 30 who began the study and the 24 who completed the research requirements. Only data from the teachers who participated in the study at the outset (30) or who remained in the study (24) are reported. Teachers who remained in the study were from the states of Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. 48% of teachers were situated in Title I schools.

The vast majority of teachers held Master’s degrees (20), three had Bachelor’s degrees, and one had a doctorate. They had been teaching for an average of 16 years, with a range of one to 26 years in the civics classroom. Thirteen of the 24 teachers in the study taught at Title I schools. Eleven teachers instructed at the middle school level and 13 taught high school. Twenty-one participants taught average size classes ranging from 16 to 32 students, and four teachers instructed small classes of 15 or fewer students.

Teachers indicated if their classes had high concentrations (30% or more) of students of color, ELLs, and students with disabilities. Students of color are defined as students who identify as Black or African American, Latine, Chicanx, Asian, South Asian, Pacific Islander (AAPI), Middle Eastern, Native American, and multiracial (Institute of Education Sciences, 2022a). English language learners are students whose native language is something other than English or who lack proficiency in English and are eligible to participate in language assistance programs (Office of English Language Acquisition, 2021). Students with disabilities, as defined under the

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, are students with “a disability that adversely affects academic performance and are in need of special education and related services” (IDEA, 2018). It was possible for teachers to have high concentrations of two or more of the target student populations. Of the teachers who completed the study by administering the pretest and posttest to their students, 18 taught students of color, 13 taught ELLs, and 9 taught students with disabilities. The attrition rate—teachers who administered the pretest but not the posttest—was highest for teachers of ELLs (23%), followed by students of color (14%). Only one teacher of students with disabilities left the study. (See Table 2.)

Table 2
Number of Teachers of Students in the Target Populations

	Pretest	Pretest and Posttest	% Attrition
Students of Color	21	18	14%
ELLs	16	13	23%
Students with Disabilities	10	9	10%

Teachers had the option of using Level 2 (middle school) or Level 3 (high school) of the WTP curriculum based on their assessment of the best fit for their students. Nineteen teachers used the Level 2 curriculum and five taught the Level 3 curriculum. While the teachers could choose from among the six WTP units and 50 lesson plans, all teachers made extensive use of the adapted curriculum. All but two of the teachers used the optional materials provided for each lesson.

Student Characteristics

The student sample was balanced in terms of female/male gender and racially diverse. The sample consisted of 48% female, 48% male, and 4% non-binary students. The racial composition of the sample was 20% Black/African American, 30% White/Caucasian, 31% Latine, 7% Asian American or Pacific Islander (AAPI), and 11% Mixed-Race. Students were aged twelve (6%), thirteen (32%), fourteen (19%), fifteen (11%), sixteen (16%), and seventeen/eighteen (16%). Seven percent of students were in the 6th and 7th grades, 34% were in 8th grade, 17% were in 9th grade, 9% were in 10th grade, 20% were in 11th grade, and 13% were in 12th grade. (See Table 3.)

Table 3
Students’ Gender, Race, and Grade

Gender	
Female	48%
Male	48%
Non-Binary	4%
Race	
Black/African American	20%
White/Caucasian	30%

Latine	31%
AAPI	7%
Mixed-Race	11%
Grade	
6 th and 7 th	7%
8 th	34%
9 th	17%
10 th	9%
11 th	20%
12 th	13%

Almost all students in the study had taken a prior class in social studies, civics, American government, or American History. An overwhelming percentage of students (81%) had taken a social studies class, while slightly more than half had taken American history. Fewer students had taken civics (10%) or American government (18%). Only 6% of students had no prior coursework in these areas. (See Table 4.)

Table 4
Percentage of Students with Prior Coursework

Social Studies	81%
Civics	10%
American Government	18%
American History	55%
No Prior Course	6%

Measures

The pilot study assessed the difference in students’ pretest and posttest scores on outcome measures of civic knowledge, civic dispositions, and SEL competencies. The independent variables in the analysis were target population (student was in a class with high concentrations of students of color, students with disabilities, and ELLs), Title I school status, grade, WTP curriculum Level 2 or 3, whether the simulated congressional hearings were held in class, gender, and race.

Civic Knowledge

Civic knowledge encompasses a vast amount of information pertinent to the foundations and institutions of government, political processes, public policies, and laws. Knowledgeable citizens understand their role in a democratic polity, know their rights and responsibilities in society, and are aware of America’s place in the world (Branson and Quigley, 1998; Van Camp and Baugh, 2016). The argument that knowledge forms the foundation for citizens’ engagement in political life (Niemi and Junn, 1998; Neimi, 2001; Galston, 2004; Milner, 2010; Campbell, 2006; Kleinberg and Lau, 2019) has been used to justify its prominence in civics instruction. Scholars have noted correlation between political knowledge and engagement that is predicated

upon the notion that knowledge is a building block, if not a necessary precondition, for action (Galston, 2004; DelliCarpini and Keeter, 1996). The connection between civic knowledge and dispositions also has been established. People possessing greater civic knowledge tend to be supportive of democratic values, such as liberty, equality, and political tolerance. They also are more politically efficacious. They have the confidence and ability to stake a position in the marketplace of political ideas as well as to actively engage in governmental and civic affairs (Finkel and Ernst, 2005; Galston, 2004; Brody, 1994; Youniss, 2011).

Civic knowledge in the present study was based on student's responses to 24 items related to the U.S. Constitution, founding principles, American governmental institution, and political processes. The topics represent standard content covered in civics, social studies, American government, and American history classes. The questions were not overly aligned with the WTP curriculum and were comprised of standard items used in testing in these subject areas that have known reliability and validity, including questions from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) civics assessment (Institute of Education Sciences, 2022b). The questions were developed after consulting prior research, civics inventories, civics tests, and state civic education rubrics. One point was assigned to each correct answer and zero points were awarded for an incorrect answer. Additive indexes were constructed that ranged from zero to 24. The index reliabilities were good; Cronbach's α was .861 for the pretest and .834 for the posttest.

Students also were asked to provide an assessment of how much they felt they had learned from the WTP class. They were asked if they strongly agreed, agreed, or disagree with the following statements: 1) I understand more about American government because of this class, 2) I understand more about the historical events that shape the United States because I took this class, and 3) I learned about other races and cultures in this class.

Civic Dispositions

Civic dispositions refer to traits, attitudes, and ingrained "habits of the heart" that are consistent with the common good and are central to the functioning of a healthy democracy (Tocqueville, 1838; Crittenden and Levine, 2018). Civic education, including the WTP curriculum, contributes to students' development of the capacities that support democratic citizenship (Owen, 2015; Owen, Hartzell, and Sanchez, 2020; Owen and Irion-Groth, 2020). Quality civic education provides young people with deep educational experiences that enable them to understand their rights and responsibilities and develop skills necessary to engage effectively in political and civic life. Civic education can provide opportunities for students to apply what they learn so that they can develop the dispositions and skills integral to responsible and effective citizenship (Branson, 1998; Branson and Quigley, 1998). Civics instruction in middle and high school can impart lasting democratic proclivities and prime citizenship orientations that develop over a lifetime. (Pasek et al., 2008, Kahne and Sporte, 2008).

Five items were used to create a civic dispositions index: 1) I understand important political issues facing the country, 2) I feel prepared participate in my community, 3) I have a say about what government does, 4) I follow government and politics in the media almost every day, and 5) I plan on voting in elections when I am eligible. Students responded that they agree, neither agree nor disagree, or disagree with the statement. The items were used to create additive

indexes that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 11 (strongly agree). The index reliabilities were adequate with a Cronbach's α for the pretest of .656 and for the posttest of .678.

In addition, students' interest in and attention to government, politics, and community affairs were measured. Two items were combined to form an index: 1) How interested are you in American government and politics? (very, somewhat, not very interested) and 2) How much attention do you pay to issues that are affecting your community? (a lot, some, very little attention). The additive pretest/posttest indexes were scored 1 (not very interested/attentive) to 5 (very interested/attentive). The index reliabilities were adequate with a pretest Cronbach's α of .632 and a posttest value of .640.

SEL Competencies

A core objective of the JMLPE is to foster students' acquisition of SEL competencies related to the civics curriculum. Social and emotional learning is "the process through which all young people and adults acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to develop healthy identities, manage emotions, and achieve personal and collective goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible and caring decisions" (CASEL, 2020). JMLPE teacher-experts identified relationship and social-awareness skills as SEL competencies that should be prioritized with the three target student populations (Owen, 2022). Relationship skills reflect students' ability to establish and maintain healthy relationships in diverse setting through communication, self-advocacy, demonstrating gratitude and cultural humility, engaging in collaborative problem-solving, resisting negative social pressure, and standing up for the rights of others. Social-awareness is "the ability to accurately recognize one's own emotions, thoughts, and values, and how they influence behavior" (CASEL, 2020).

These SEL competencies can be developed using the WTP curriculum through class discussion, collaboration, and hands-on activities that emphasize responsible decision-making. The simulated congressional hearings provide opportunities for students to work as a unit to address questions through evidence-based collaboration, to consider different perspectives, and to express their ideas and viewpoints in a civil environment. The Center's strategy is to incorporate CASEL's SEL competencies into the JMLPE curriculum and instructional practices rather than treating them as stand-alone curricular components (Owen and Phillips, 2023).

The SEL measures employed in this study were derived from prior assessments using the CASEL framework and have known reliability and validity (see Denham, 2016; Taylor, et al., 2018). Relationships skills in two domains relevant to the JMLPE—communication and collaboration—were examined. Communication skills were measured by three items: 1) I am comfortable speaking in front of a group, 2) I enjoy sharing my views with others, and 3) I put a lot of effort into getting involved in class discussions. Students responded that they always, sometimes, or rarely felt this way. The three items were rescored and combined to form an additive communication skills index that ranged from 1 (never) to 7 (always). The reliability (Cronbach's α) of the index was good with a pretest value of .703 and a posttest value of .705. Collaboration was measured by two items: 1) I like to work with other students on projects and 2) I enjoy collaborating to achieve a common goal. The response options and scoring with the

same as for the communication items. An additive index measuring collaboration skills was created that ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The collaboration skills index had a good pretest reliability (Cronbach's α) of .724 and posttest reliability of .772. Social-awareness was measured by three items: 1) I care about other people's points of view, 2) When others disagree with me, I respect their views, and 3) It's important to arrive at an agreement or consensus when working with others. Students again responded that they always, sometimes, or never felt this way. An additive index of social-awareness was constructed that ranged from 1 (never) to 7 (always). The reliability of the social-awareness index was adequate (Cronbach's α pretest=.609 and posttest=.619).

Independent Variables

Students' civic knowledge, civic dispositions, and SEL competencies were analyzed by target population, Title I school status, middle or high school grade level, whether they were taught the WTP Level 2 or Level 3 curriculum, whether their class held simulated congressional hearings, gender, and race/ethnicity.

Target population in this context indicates that a student was a member of a class with a high concentration of students in one of the three groups. Teachers indicated if their classes included 30% or more students of color, ELLs, and students with disabilities. This information was collated with the student data. In some instances, teachers taught classes that had high concentrations of two or more of the target student populations. To account for the overlap, separate variables were created for students in classes with high concentrations of students of color, ELLs, and students with disabilities. A total of 413 student participants attended classes with high concentrations of students of color, 258 were in classes with high concentrations of ELLs, and 209 were in classes with high concentrations of students with disabilities.

A dichotomous variable indicating whether or not a teacher taught in a Title I school was included in the study. Title I schools serve high numbers or percentages of children from low-income families and receive financial assistance from the federal government through Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2018). Funds are allocated to schools at the district level based on a complex series of algorithms. Individual schools may not be receiving Title I funds although they may be located in Title I districts that serve large numbers of students living in poverty (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2019).

Students reported their grade level on the survey. For purposes of this analysis, 6th through 8th grade was considered middle school and 9th through 12th grade was designated as high school. A variable indicating whether a student was taught the WTP Level 2 or Level 3 curriculum was added to the data set. Level 2 was used most often with both middle school (83%) and high school (78%) students in the study. Level 3 was taught to 17% of middle school and 22% of high school students. (See Table 5.) Teachers' reports of whether or not they had held simulated congressional hearings in their classes were collated with the student data. It should be noted that this variable does not account for the varied ways that the hearings were implemented by the teachers and teachers' reports on this indicator may not be entirely accurate.

Table 5
Percentage/Number of Students by Grade and WTP Curriculum Level

	Middle School	High School
Level 2	83% (230)	(78%) (331)
Level 3	17% (48)	22% (93)
n	100% (278)	100% (424)

Gender differences were computed for female, male, and non-binary students. It should be noted that the number of non-binary students (28) who took the pretest and the posttest is small. The categories of race were Black/African American, White/Caucasian, Latine, Asian American Pacific Islander, and Mixed-Race.

Analysis

Analyses were conducted on the sample of 773 students who took the pretest and the posttest. The overall difference in pretest/posttest mean scores for the entire sample was computed for each of the outcome measures of civic knowledge, civic dispositions, and civic skills. In addition, pretest/posttest mean differences were recorded for students based on 1) target population (students of color, ELLs, students with disabilities), 2) Title I school, 3) grade, 4) WTP curriculum level, 5) simulated congressional hearing, 6) gender, and 7) race. The statistical significance of the difference in pretest/posttest means and the effect size (Hedge’s g) were computed.

Civic Knowledge

Key Findings

- Students made large, statistically significant gains in civic content knowledge after taking the adapted WTP class. Overall, students gained an average of six points on the knowledge index, representing a 45% increase in knowledge from pretest to posttest.
- The pretest/posttest improvement in student knowledge was 54% for students of color, 65% for ELLs, and 69% for students with disabilities.
- Students attending Title I schools gained more civic knowledge than their counterparts at non-Title I schools.
- Middle school students had a greater average pretest/posttest increase in knowledge than high school students.

- Students who were taught the WTP Level 3 curriculum gained slightly more knowledge than students who used the Level 2 version.
- Students in classes that held the WTP simulated congressional hearings gained more civic knowledge than students in classes that did not hold hearings.
- Small gender and race/ethnicity-based differences in knowledge gain were evident.
- 90% of students agreed that they have a better understanding of American government and historical events after taking the WTP class.
- One-third of students indicated that they had not learned about other races and cultures in their class.

Civic Knowledge Index

Students made significant gains in civic content knowledge after taking the adapted WTP class. All students in the study gained an average of six points from pretest ($\bar{x}=9.71$) to posttest ($\bar{x}=14.12$). The effect size based on Hedge's g is large. Overall, students had a 45% increase in knowledge after experiencing the WTP curriculum. Knowledge gains for students in classes with high percentages of students in all three of the target student populations were large and statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The average pretest/posttest increase in knowledge was five points for students of color (pretest $\bar{x}=9.42$; posttest $\bar{x}=14.46$), indicating a 54% gain. ELLs began with an average score on the pretest ($\bar{x}=8.41$) that was a full point lower than for students of color. They gained five and a half points on average on the posttest ($\bar{x}=13.89$), representing a 65% increase in knowledge. The growth in mean knowledge scores was greatest for students with disabilities, improving 5.81 points from $\bar{x}=8.38$ on the pretest to $\bar{x}=14.19$ on the posttest, or a 69% increase. (See Table 6.)¹

¹ A sensitivity analysis comparing the knowledge of stayers and leavers was conducted to determine if attrition had introduced bias into the study. The pretest \bar{x} for the stayers was 9.71 and the standard deviation was 5.44. The pretest \bar{x} for the leavers was 9.46 and the standard deviation was 5.40. The difference in the pretest mean scores for stayers and leavers was not statistically significant, with $p=.36$. The posttest \bar{x} for the stayers was 14.12 and the standard deviation was 5.94. The posttest \bar{x} for the leavers was 13.96 and the standard deviation was 5.02. The difference in the posttest mean scores for stayers and leavers was not statistically significant, with $p=.58$.

Table 6
Civic Knowledge by Target Student Population
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	All Students	Students of Color	ELL Students	Students with Disabilities
Pretest \bar{x}	9.71	9.42	8.41	8.38
Posttest \bar{x}	14.12	14.46	13.89	14.19
Pretest SD	5.44	5.27	5.37	5.42
Posttest SD	5.94	4.24	5.02	5.04
\bar{x} Difference	5.94	5.02	5.48	5.81
Significance	.00	.00	.00	.00
Hedge's g	.92	1.04	1.01	1.05
% Increase	45%	54%	65%	69%
n	733	413	258	196

Students attending Title I schools gained more civic knowledge through the WTP curriculum than their counterparts at non-Title I schools. Title I school students had a lower mean score (\bar{x} =9.29) on the pretest than students attending non-Title I schools (\bar{x} =10.43). Their average score rose by five and a half points on the posttest (\bar{x} =14.80), a 59% increase. In contrast, the knowledge level of students not attending Title I schools rose by 31%, with a mean pretest/posttest difference of 3.23 points. (See Table 6.) It is important to note that some of the schools without a Title I designation were in Title I districts with high concentrations of low-income students. These schools may not have received the federal funding that Title I schools are granted.

Table 6
Student Knowledge by Title I School Status
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Title I School	Not a Title I School
Pretest \bar{x}	9.29	10.43
Posttest \bar{x}	14.80	13.66
Pretest SD	5.15	5.35
Posttest SD	4.47	5.26
\bar{x} Difference	5.50	3.23
Significance	.00	.00
Hedge's g	1.16	.74
% Increase	59%	31%
n	344	322

The level of knowledge gained varied based on students' grade and the WTP curriculum level that was used in their class. (See Table 7.) The most striking finding was the middle school versus high school comparison. Middle school students exhibited a greater average increase in

knowledge from pretest to posttest than high school students. There was a sizable difference in the mean pretest knowledge scores of middle school (\bar{x} =7.23) compared to high school (\bar{x} =11.42) students which was expected. Middle school students' mean knowledge scores increased to 12.43 for a pretest/posttest mean difference of 5.20 that was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The effect size (Hedge's g =1.44) was large. High school students' posttest mean score improved to 15.33 representing an increase of 3.91 points over the pretest average. This increase was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$, and the effect size (Hedge's g =.94) was large.

Students whose teachers used the Level 3 curriculum gained slightly more knowledge than those who were taught the Level 2 curriculum. (See Table 7.) Level 2 students' average pretest score (\bar{x} =9.71) was close to that of the Level 3 students (\bar{x} =10.02). The pretest/posttest mean difference indicated an improvement of 4.12 points for Level 2 students and 4.95 points for Level 3 students. The mean difference was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The effect size for Level 2 (Hedge's g =.94) was large and for Level 3 (Hedge's g =.84) was moderately large. It should be noted that a substantially larger number of middle and high school students received the Level 2 curriculum than the Level 3 curriculum.

Table 7
Student Knowledge by Grade and WTP Level
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Middle School	High School	Level 2	Level 3
Pretest \bar{x}	7.23	11.42	9.71	10.02
Posttest \bar{x}	12.43	15.33	13.95	14.98
Pretest SD	4.52	5.39	5.42	5.72
Posttest SD	4.67	4.72	4.95	4.85
\bar{x} Difference	5.20	3.91	4.25	4.95
Significance	.00	.00	.00	.00
Hedge's g	1.44	.85	.94	.84
n	241	361	461	128

Students in classes that held the WTP simulated congressional hearings gained more civic knowledge than students in classes that did not hold hearings. (See Table 8.) For students who experienced the hearings, the difference between the pretest (\bar{x} =9.81) and posttest (\bar{x} =9.68) mean scores was 5.23 which was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The effect size (Hedge's g) of 1.01 was large. The difference between the pretest (\bar{x} =9.68) and posttest (\bar{x} =13.72) means for the students whose classes did not hold hearing was 4.04. The difference was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$ and the effect size of .88 was large.

Table 8
Student Knowledge by Simulated Congressional Hearings
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Hearing	No Hearing
Pretest \bar{x}	9.81	9.68
Posttest \bar{x}	15.05	13.72
Pretest SD	5.96	5.21
Posttest SD	4.84	4.93
\bar{x} Difference	5.23	4.04
Significance	.00	.00
Hedge's g	1.01	.88
n	203	424

The increase in civic knowledge post WTP was similar for female and male students as evidenced by the pretest scores (female \bar{x} =9.47; male \bar{x} =9.75) and posttest scores (female \bar{x} =14.04; male \bar{x} =14.06). The mean pretest/posttest difference was 4.57 for females and 4.30 for males. The effect size for females (Hedge's g =.98) was large and for males (Hedge's g =.86) was moderately large. Non-binary students' pretest score (\bar{x} =16.29) was higher than for male and female students as was their posttest score (\bar{x} =16.29). The pretest/posttest mean difference (3.44) was moderately large (Hedge's g =.82). (See Table 9.)

Table 9
Student Knowledge by Gender
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Female	Male	Non-Binary
Pretest \bar{x}	9.47	9.75	12.85
Posttest \bar{x}	14.04	14.06	16.29
Pretest SD	5.27	5.45	6.23
Posttest SD	4.86	4.93	5.22
\bar{x} Difference	4.57	4.30	3.44
Significance	.00	.00	.00
Hedge's g	.98	.86	.82
n	380	377	27

Race and ethnicity-based differences in civic knowledge were evident. (See Table 10.) Black students gained 4.14 points from pretest (\bar{x} =9.43) to posttest (\bar{x} =13.58). White students' knowledge increased significantly by 4.54 points (from \bar{x} =10.03 to \bar{x} =15.48). Latine students exhibited the largest average pretest/posttest improvement in knowledge, which increased from \bar{x} =8.69 to \bar{x} =13.39 for a mean difference of 4.70. AAPI students had the highest average pretest score (\bar{x} =13.31) and improved to \bar{x} =17.07, a mean difference of 3.74. Mixed-Race students' knowledge scores increased by 4.17 points from \bar{x} =9.72 to \bar{x} =13.90. The pretest/posttest mean differences for all of the groups were statistically significant at p ≤.01 and the effect sizes (Hedge's g) were large.

Table 10
Student Knowledge by Race/Ethnicity
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Black/African American	White/Caucasian	Latine	AAPI	Mixed-Race
Pretest \bar{x}	9.43	10.03	8.69	13.31	9.72
Posttest \bar{x}	13.58	15.48	13.39	17.06	13.90
Pretest SD	4.82	5.76	5.18	5.36	5.33
Posttest SD	4.97	4.82	5.05	3.84	4.70
\bar{x} Difference	4.14	4.54	4.70	3.74	4.17
Significance	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Hedge's g	.96	.97	.88	.87	.87
n	113	189	188	47	70

Learning about American Government, Historical Events, and Races and Cultures

Students were asked whether they understood more about American government and historical events that shape the United States because they took the WTP class. (See Table 11.) The vast majority (90%) strongly agreed or agreed with these statements. 49% of students strongly agreed that they understood more about American government and 46% strongly agreed that they understood more about historical events. 10% or less disagreed with these statements. Notably fewer students strongly agreed (28%) that they learned about other races and cultures in their WTP class. One third of the students (31%) disagreed with the statement that they had learned about other races and cultures. There were no meaningful differences based on whether a student was in a class with a high concentration of students of color, ELLs, or students with disabilities.

Table 11
Students' Perceptions of Learning about American Government,
Historical Events, and Races and Cultures
(Percentages)

	American Government	Historical Events	Races and Cultures
Strongly Agree	49%	46%	28%
Agree	42%	44%	41%
Disagree	9%	10%	31%

Civic Dispositions

Key Findings

- Students overall exhibited a small but statistically significant increase in scores on the civic dispositions index that tapped into their understanding of issues, political efficacy, propensity to follow politics, and anticipation of voting in elections when eligible.
- Students had small, statistically significant gains in interest in and attention to government, politics, and community affairs.
- Students of color had small, statistically significant increases in their scores on the indexes measuring civic dispositions and political interest/attention. Increases in interest in and attention also were apparent for ELLs.
- Students in Title I schools had a larger gain in civic dispositions and political interest/attention than those in non-Title I schools.
- High school students' scores on the civic dispositions index improved significantly while there was no change for middle school students. Middle school students' interest in and attention to politics increased more than that of high school students.
- Students taught the Level 3 WTP curriculum made moderate, statistically significant gains in civic dispositions while there was no change for Level 2 students.
- Students whose classes held simulated congressional hearings had a greater average increase in scores on the civic dispositions index than students who did not participate in hearings.
- Differences in civic dispositions based on gender and race/ethnicity were minimal. Small, statistically significant improvements in Black and Latine students' levels of political interest and attention were found.

Civic Dispositions Index

Pilot study students exhibited a modest increase in their mean score on the civic dispositions index from pretest ($\bar{x} = 7.02$) to posttest ($\bar{x} = 7.26$). The pretest/posttest difference of .24 was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The effect size was small (Hedge's $g = .11$). The only statistically significant pretest/posttest mean difference was for students of color, which was small (.20). The findings for ELLs and students with disabilities were negligible. (See Table 12.)

Table 12
Civic Dispositions by Target Student Population
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	All Students	Students of Color	ELL Students	Students with Disabilities
Pretest \bar{x}	7.02	7.10	6.79	7.00
Posttest \bar{x}	7.26	7.32	6.88	7.15
Pretest SD	2.18	2.05	2.06	2.04
Posttest SD	2.17	2.09	2.16	2.09
\bar{x} Difference	.24	.20	.08	.15
Significance	.00	.03	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.11	.09	.04	.06
n	724	431	264	201

Students in Title I schools had a larger gain in civic dispositions than those in non-Title I schools. (See Table 13.) Title I school students had lower mean pretest scores on the civic dispositions index (\bar{x} =6.87) compared to non-Title I school students (\bar{x} =7.30). However, the increase in Title I students' mean score of .23 was statistically significant at $p \leq .05$, while the pretest/posttest change for non-Title I school students was negligible (.05) and nonsignificant.

Table 13
Civic Dispositions by Title I School Status
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Title I School	Not a Title I School
Pretest \bar{x}	6.87	7.30
Posttest \bar{x}	7.10	7.25
Pretest SD	2.07	2.15
Posttest SD	2.12	2.13
\bar{x} Difference	.23	.05
Significance	.04	NS
Hedge's g	.11	.02
n	399	321

Noteworthy differences were evident in the acquisition of civic dispositions based on grade and WTP curriculum level. (See Table 14.) High school students made statistically significant ($p \leq .01$) gains in civic dispositions after experiencing the WTP curriculum intervention. The average score on the civic dispositions index of high school students increased by .43 from pretest (\bar{x} =7.21) to posttest (\bar{x} =.764). The effect size (Hedge's g) of .20 was small. However, no discernible pretest/posttest mean difference was evident for middle school students.

The analysis of WTP curriculum level yielded stronger results. (See Table 14.) The average pretest civic dispositions scores for students who received the Level 2 and Level 3

curriculum interventions were almost identical. However, the Level 3 students' civic dispositions scores increased significantly, while there was little change in the pretest/posttest scores for the Level 2 students. The average Level 3 students' score on the pretest ($\bar{x} = 7.04$) increased by .87 points on the posttest ($\bar{x} = 7.91$). The difference in pretest/posttest scores was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The effect size for Level 3 (Hedge's $g = .41$) was moderate.

Table 14
Civic Dispositions by Grade and WTP Level
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Middle School	High School	Level 2	Level 3
Pretest \bar{x}	6.73	7.21	7.06	7.04
Posttest \bar{x}	6.71	7.64	7.14	7.91
Pretest SD	2.32	2.06	2.13	2.23
Posttest SD	2.15	2.11	2.12	2.19
\bar{x} Difference	.02	.43	.08	.87
Significance	NS	.00	NS	.00
Hedge's g	.01	.20	.03	.41
n	251	378	481	130

The mean scores on the civic dispositions index increased more for students whose class took part in the simulated congressional hearings. The difference in pretest ($\bar{x} = 6.99$) and posttest ($\bar{x} = 7.31$) mean scores was .32 for students who participated in hearings. The pretest ($\bar{x} = 7.03$)/posttest ($\bar{x} = 7.24$) mean difference was .21 for students whose classes did not include hearings. The increase in civic dispositions was statistically significant at $p \leq .05$ for both groups. The effect sizes (Hedge's g) while small, were larger for the students in classes with hearings. (See Table 15.)

Table 15
Civic Dispositions by Simulated Congressional Hearings
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Hearing	No Hearing
Pretest \bar{x}	6.99	7.03
Posttest \bar{x}	7.31	7.24
Pretest SD	1.31	2.37
Posttest SD	1.27	2.18
\bar{x} Difference	.32	.21
Significance	.02	.05
Hedge's g	.14	.09
n	203	468

Gender differences in civic dispositions for female and male students were modest. (See Table 16.) The pretest (female $\bar{x} = 7.04$ /male $\bar{x} = 6.97$) and posttest (female $\bar{x} = 7.29$ /male $\bar{x} = 7.17$) scores were similar. The pretest/posttest mean difference of .25 for females was small but

statistically significant at $p \leq .05$, while the mean difference of .20 for males was not significant. The effect sizes for both females and males were small. The increase in scores on the civic dispositions index was greater for non-binary students than for females and males. Non-binary students' mean pretest score ($\bar{x} = 7.48$) and posttest score ($\bar{x} = 8.11$) were higher than those of female and male students. The difference of means of .63 approached statistical significance (keeping in mind the small n), and the effect size (Hedge's g) of .30 was moderate.

Table 16
Civic Dispositions by Gender
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Female	Male	Non-Binary
Pretest \bar{x}	7.04	6.97	7.48
Posttest \bar{x}	7.29	7.17	8.11
Pretest SD	2.09	2.21	2.72
Posttest SD	2.10	2.25	2.11
\bar{x} Difference	.25	.20	.63
Significance	.02	NS	.06
Hedge's g	.12	.08	.30
n	303	299	27

AAPI students showed the largest gains on the civic dispositions index of all racial and ethnic groups. The increase from pretest ($\bar{x} = 6.91$) to posttest ($\bar{x} = 7.60$) was .69, which was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The effect size (Hedge's g) of .31 was moderate. The only other significant gains in civic dispositions were for White students (\bar{x} difference=.28) and Mixed-Race students (\bar{x} difference=.58). The effect sizes for these mean differences were small. (See Table 17.)

Table 17
Civic Dispositions by Race/Ethnicity
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Black/African American	White/Caucasian	Latine	AAPI	Mixed-Race
Pretest \bar{x}	7.01	7.10	6.98	6.91	6.91
Posttest \bar{x}	7.22	7.38	7.01	7.60	7.49
Pretest SD	2.06	2.32	2.19	2.13	2.39
Posttest SD	2.02	2.33	2.06	1.76	2.14
\bar{x} Difference	.21	.28	.03	.69	.58
Significance	NS	.04	NS	.01	.03
Hedge's g	.09	.13	.01	.31	.23
n	159	234	249	63	79

Interest in and Attention to Government, Politics, and Community Affairs

Students' interest in and attention to government, politics, and community affairs increased modestly after the WTP curriculum intervention. (See Table 18.) Overall, students' mean scores increased by .13 on the interest and attention index, a small but statistically significant ($p \leq .01$) difference. The pretest/posttest mean difference scores of students of color (.19) and ELLs (.20) were small and statistically significant ($p \leq .01$). There was no significant change in pretest/posttest scores for students with disabilities.

Table 18
Interest and Attention by Target Student Population
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	All Students	Students of Color	ELLs	Students with Disabilities
Pretest \bar{x}	3.05	3.00	3.18	3.11
Posttest \bar{x}	3.18	3.19	3.38	3.23
Pretest SD	1.08	1.03	1.06	1.11
Posttest SD	1.02	.99	.97	.96
\bar{x} Difference	.13	.19	.20	.12
Significance	.00	.00	.00	.06
Hedge's g	.11	.18	.18	.11
n	761	467	295	229

Students attending Title I schools had a small but statistically significant increase in their levels of interest and attention. Their scores on the index improved by .21 from $\bar{x} = 3.02$ on the pretest to $\bar{x} = 3.23$ on the posttest. The effect size (Hedge's $g = .19$) was small. The nominal change in interest and attention for students attending non-Title I schools was nonsignificant. (See Table 19.)

Table 19
Interest and Attention by Title I School Status
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Title I School	Not a Title I School
Pretest \bar{x}	3.02	3.09
Posttest \bar{x}	3.23	3.19
Pretest SD	1.05	1.08
Posttest SD	.99	1.02
\bar{x} Difference	.21	.10
Significance	.00	.08
Hedge's g	.19	.09
n	337	273

Middle school students had a greater increase in interest and attention (.19) than high school students (.09). The middle school pretest/posttest mean difference was small and statistically significant ($p \leq .01$). Students who were taught WTP Level 2 had a small (.17) and significant ($p \leq .01$) rise in interest and attention. There was no pretest/posttest difference for Level 3 students. (See Table 20.)

Table 20
Interest and Attention by Grade and WTP Level
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Middle School	High School	Level 2	Level 3
Pretest \bar{x}	3.21	2.95	3.05	2.98
Posttest \bar{x}	3.40	3.04	3.22	3.01
Pretest SD	1.15	1.01	1.05	1.13
Posttest SD	1.05	.98	1.01	1.06
\bar{x} Difference	.19	.09	.17	.03
Significance	.00	.05	.00	NS
Hedge's g	.15	.08	.15	.02
n	289	396	513	167

Modest increases in political interest and attention were found for students whose classes held hearings and those who did not experience hearings. (See Table 21.) The difference of pretest/posttest means was similar for students in classes that held hearings (.16) and those that did not (.13). The mean differences were small and statistically significant for both conditions.

Table 21
Interest and Attention by Simulated Congressional Hearings
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Hearing	No Hearing
Pretest \bar{x}	3.02	3.06
Posttest \bar{x}	3.18	3.19
Pretest SD	1.09	1.07
Posttest SD	.95	1.06
\bar{x} Difference	.16	.13
Significance	.02	.01
Hedge's g	.14	.10
n	203	468

Female students' interest in and attention to politics increased slightly over the course of their WTP class. There was a small (.15) increase in female students' mean score on the interest and attention index that was statistically significant ($p \leq .01$). No significant change in pretest/posttest scores was evident for male students. Non-binary students had the largest pretest ($\bar{x} = 2.46$)/posttest ($\bar{x} = 2.82$) mean difference (.36), which was statistically significant with a moderate effect size (Hedge's $g = .42$). (See Table 22.)

Table 22
Interest and Attention by Gender
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Female	Male	Non-Binary
Pretest \bar{x}	3.08	3.07	2.46
Posttest \bar{x}	3.24	3.15	2.82
Pretest SD	1.01	1.11	1.20
Posttest SD	.98	1.06	1.06
\bar{x} Difference	.15	.08	.36
Significance	.00	NS	.02
Hedge's g	.15	.06	.42
n	319	322	28

Statistically significant increases in interest and attention were found for Black and Latine students. The pretest/posttest mean difference for Black students was .16 and for Latine students was .22. These differences were small as evidenced by the effect sizes (Hedge's g) of .15 and .18 respectively. The findings for White, AAPI, and Mixed-Race students were not statistically significant. (See Table 23.)

Table 23
Interest and Attention by Race/Ethnicity
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Black/African American	White/Caucasian	Latine	AAPI	Mixed-Race
Pretest \bar{x}	3.04	3.14	3.07	2.92	2.88
Posttest \bar{x}	3.20	3.16	3.29	3.02	3.07
Pretest SD	.99	1.18	1.02	1.05	1.13
Posttest SD	.98	1.17	.99	.86	.86
\bar{x} Difference	.16	.02	.22	.10	.19
Significance	.04	NS	.01	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.15	.01	.18	.11	.14
n	149	202	223	69	89

Social and Emotional Learning Competencies

Key Findings

- Pre/post program improvements in social and emotional learning competencies were modest for communication and self-awareness. There were no statistically significant increases in collaboration skills.
- A small increase in communication skills was evident for students in classes with high concentrations of students of color, but not for ELLs and students with disabilities.
- High school students' communication skills increased significantly after taking the WTP class. There was no change for middle school students.
- Black and White students had small, significant increases in communication skills.
- High school students and students who were taught the WTP Level 3 curriculum made small gains in social-awareness.
- Social-awareness increased slightly among White students.

Relationship Skills/Communication

Pilot study students achieved small, statistically significant improvements in their communication skills after their WTP class. (See Table 24.) For all students, scores on the communication index increased by .22 from pretest (\bar{x} =4.07) to posttest (\bar{x} =4.30). The effect size (Hedge's g =.14) was small. There was a small, statistically significant rise in communication skills for students of color (\bar{x} difference=.21). However, there was no change in communication skills for ELLs or students with disabilities.

Table 24
Relationship Skill/Communication
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	All Students	Students of Color	ELL Students	Students with Disabilities
Pretest \bar{x}	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.14
Posttest \bar{x}	4.30	4.27	4.06	4.2
Pretest SD	1.61	1.56	1.57	1.63
Posttest SD	1.66	1.64	1.62	1.65
\bar{x} Difference	.22	.21	.08	.06
Significance	.00	.00	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.14	.13	.05	.03
n	646	439	271	212

Students attending Title I schools scored slightly higher on the communications index posttest (\bar{x} =4.22) than on the pretest (\bar{x} =4.04) for a mean difference of .18. The improvement was weak but statistically significant. The findings for students not attending a Title I school were not significant. (See Table 25.)

Table 25
SEL Relationship Skills/Communication by Title I School Status
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Title I School	Not a Title I School
Pretest \bar{x}	4.04	4.19
Posttest \bar{x}	4.22	4.33
Pretest SD	1.54	1.6
Posttest SD	1.68	1.6
\bar{x} Difference	.18	.15
Significance	.03	NS
Hedge's g	.11	.09
n	302	230

High school students' communication skills increased significantly after taking the WTP class. (See Table 26.) Their score on the communication index rose from \bar{x} =4.07 on the pretest to \bar{x} =4.40 on the posttest for a gain of .34. The effect size (Hedge's g =.20) was small. There was no change in communication skills for middle school students. The increase in interest and attention of students who were taught the WTP Level 3 curriculum was greater than for Level 2 students. The mean differences between pretest (\bar{x} =4.15) and posttest (\bar{x} =4.54) scores on the index was .39 and was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The effect size (Hedge's g =.22) was small. The average interest and attention index score of Level 2 students increased by .17, a small, statistically significant effect.

Table 26
SEL Relationship Skills/Communication by Grade and WTP Level
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Middle School	High School	Level 2	Level 3
Pretest \bar{x}	4.10	4.07	4.01	4.15
Posttest \bar{x}	4.10	4.40	4.25	4.54
Pretest SD	1.58	1.63	1.57	1.79
Posttest SD	1.58	1.69	1.65	1.69
\bar{x} Difference	.00	.34	.17	.39
Significance	NS	.00	.01	.01
Hedge's g	.00	.20	.11	.22
n	257	384	489	135

Students in classes that held simulated hearings began with higher scores on the communication index than those in classes without hearings. The change in pretest/posttest scores for students who experienced hearings was small and nonsignificant. The average pretest/posttest difference in communication skills for the students without hearings was small (.28) and statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. (See Table 27.)

Table 27
SEL Relationship Skills/Communication by Simulated Congressional Hearings
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Hearing	No Hearing
Pretest \bar{x}	4.24	4.00
Posttest \bar{x}	4.34	4.28
Pretest SD	1.58	1.61
Posttest SD	1.67	1.65
\bar{x} Difference	.10	.28
Significance	NS	.00
Hedge's g	.06	.17
n	203	447

Male students' average pretest score ($\bar{x} = 4.32$) on the communication measure was substantially higher than the mean score for females ($\bar{x} = 3.82$). The improvements in mean scores were similar (.26 female; .23 male) and statistically significant. The effect sizes were small. The findings for non-binary students were nonsignificant. (See Table 28.)

Table 28
SEL Relationship Skills/Communication by Gender
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Female	Male	Non-Binary
Pretest \bar{x}	3.82	4.32	4.25
Posttest \bar{x}	4.08	4.55	4.15
Pretest SD	1.53	1.61	1.93
Posttest SD	1.62	1.62	1.83
\bar{x} Difference	.26	.23	-.10
Significance	.00	.00	NS
Hedge's g	.16	.14	.07
n	367	356	28

Racial differences were found for Black and White students on the communication skills index. Black students' mean score increased by .24 from $\bar{x} = 3.92$ on the pretest to $\bar{x} = 4.17$ on the posttest. White students' scores improved by .25 from $\bar{x} = 4.29$ on the pretest to $\bar{x} = 4.54$ on the posttest. The mean differences were statistically significant ($p \leq .05$) for both groups of students and the effect sizes were small. (See Table 29.)

Table 29
SEL Relationship Skills/Communication by Race
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Black/African American	White/Caucasian	Latine	AAPI	Mixed-Race
Pretest \bar{x}	3.92	4.29	3.89	4.17	4.23
Posttest \bar{x}	4.17	4.54	4.06	4.47	4.37
Pretest SD	1.50	1.63	1.60	1.58	1.65
Posttest SD	1.59	1.57	1.71	1.78	1.62
\bar{x} Difference	.24	.25	.16	.29	.14
Significance	.05	.02	NS	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.15	.15	.09	.19	.08
n	133	203	223	61	73

SEL Relationship Skills/Collaboration

There was no improvement in students' SEL relationship skills associated with collaboration for the entire sample. The pretest/posttest difference in mean scores on the collaboration index was near zero and nonsignificant for all students. There were no statistically significant changes based on target student population (see Table 30), Title I school status (see Table 31), grade, WTL level (see Table 32), simulated congressional hearings (see Table 33), and gender (see Table 34). The only statistically significant difference for race/ethnicity was an inverse relationship for Black students whose scores on the collaboration index declined on the posttest (see Table 35).

Table 30
SEL Relationship Skills/Collaboration by Target Student Population
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	All Students	Students of Color	ELL Students	Students with Disabilities
Pretest \bar{x}	3.68	3.71	3.64	3.77
Posttest \bar{x}	3.63	3.63	3.60	3.68
Pretest SD	1.18	1.16	1.14	1.12
Posttest SD	1.97	1.17	1.16	1.13
\bar{x} Difference	-.05	-.09	-.04	-.09
Significance	NS	NS	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.04	.07	.04	.09
n	710	444	276	209

Table 31
SEL Relationship Skills/Collaboration by Title I School Status
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Title I School	Not a Title I School
Pretest \bar{x}	3.65	3.76
Posttest \bar{x}	3.60	3.71
Pretest SD	1.15	1.21
Posttest SD	1.18	1.20
\bar{x} Difference	-.05	.05
Significance	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.05	.04
n	410	332

Table 32
SEL Relationship Skills/Collaboration by Grade and WTP Level
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Middle School	High School	Level 2	Level 3
Pretest \bar{x}	3.77	3.62	3.68	3.65
Posttest \bar{x}	3.76	3.54	3.6	3.72
Pretest SD	1.17	1.2	1.18	1.22
Posttest SD	1.2	1.19	1.19	1.2
\bar{x} Difference	.01	.08	.09	.07
Significance	NS	NS	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.01	.06	.07	.06
n	265	385	498	136

Table 33
SEL Relationship Skills/Collaboration by Simulated Congressional Hearings
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Hearing	No Hearing
Pretest \bar{x}	3.92	3.57
Posttest \bar{x}	3.79	3.56
Pretest SD	1.10	1.20
Posttest SD	1.13	1.21
\bar{x} Difference	-.13	.01
Significance	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.12	.00
n	196	458

Table 34
SEL Relationship Skills/Collaboration by Gender
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Female	Male	Non-Binary
Pretest \bar{x}	3.58	3.73	3.42
Posttest \bar{x}	3.59	3.69	3.32
Pretest SD	1.18	1.18	1.23
Posttest SD	1.21	1.21	1.12
\bar{x} Difference	.01	.10	-.10
Significance	NS	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.00	.08	.06
n	319	326	28

The only significant pretest/posttest difference on the collaboration index was for Black students, whose average mean score decreased by .26 from pretest (\bar{x} =3.57) to posttest (\bar{x} =3.32). The mean difference was statistically significant and the effect size was small. (See Table 35.)

Table 35
SEL Relationship Skills/Collaboration by Race/Ethnicity
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Black/African American	White/Caucasian	Latine	AAPI	Mixed-Race
Pretest \bar{x}	3.57	3.89	3.59	3.62	3.50
Posttest \bar{x}	3.32	3.91	3.57	3.86	3.54
Pretest SD	1.15	1.12	1.13	1.32	1.37
Posttest SD	1.14	1.11	1.22	1.21	1.28
\bar{x} Difference	-.26	.03	-.02	.24	.04
Significance	.00	NS	NS	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.22	.02	.01	.20	.03
n	135	208	237	70	87

Social-Awareness

The social-awareness index measured how much students cared about other people's points of view, respected the views of people with whom they disagree, and the importance of arriving at consensus. The difference in pretest (\bar{x} =5.62) and posttest (\bar{x} =5.74) mean scores for all students was .12, a small, statistically significant increase. There were no significant pretest/posttest mean differences for students of color, ELLs, and students with disabilities. (See Table 36.)

Table 36
Social-Awareness by Target Population
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	All Students	Students of Color	ELL Students	Students with Disabilities
Pretest \bar{x}	5.62	5.69	5.39	5.63
Posttest \bar{x}	5.74	5.72	5.42	5.65
Pretest SD	1.32	1.29	1.4	1.33
Posttest SD	1.27	1.28	1.35	1.31
\bar{x} Difference	.12	.03	.03	.02
Significance	.02	NS	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.09	.02	.02	.01
n	648	439	272	208

No statistically significant differences in social-awareness were found based on Title I school status. (See Table 37.)

Table 37
Social-Awareness by Title I School Status
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Title I School	Not a Title I School
Pretest \bar{x}	5.48	5.83
Posttest \bar{x}	5.55	5.87
Pretest SD	1.35	1.29
Posttest SD	1.29	1.23
\bar{x} Difference	.08	.03
Significance	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.05	.02
n	304	232

Small, statistically significant increases in pretest/posttest social-awareness were found for high school students. The findings for middle school students were not significant. The social-awareness of students who were taught the Level 3 curriculum increased a small to moderate amount (\bar{x} difference=.29) from pretest (\bar{x} =5.55) to posttest (\bar{x} =8.84). The relationship was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The findings for Level 2 were nonsignificant. (See Table 38.)

Table 38
Social-Awareness by Grade and WTP Level
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Middle School	High School	Level 2	Level 3
Pretest \bar{x}	5.4	5.76	5.65	5.55
Posttest \bar{x}	5.53	5.87	5.69	5.84
Pretest SD	1.45	1.20	1.33	1.28
Posttest SD	1.38	1.16	1.28	1.2
\bar{x} Difference	.13	.11	.05	.29
Significance	NS	.05	NS	.00
Hedge's g	.09	.09	.03	.25
n	260	382	494	132

A small increase in social-awareness was detected for female students. The mean difference between the pretest (\bar{x} =5.67) and posttest (\bar{x} =5.84) scores was .16 which was statistically significant at $p \leq .01$. The effect size (Hedge's g) of .13 was small. The findings for male and non-binary students were nonsignificant. (See Table 39.)

Table 39
Social-Awareness by Gender
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Female	Male	Non-Binary
Pretest \bar{x}	5.67	5.53	5.92
Posttest \bar{x}	5.84	5.62	6.07
Pretest SD	1.27	1.39	1.07
Posttest SD	1.23	1.30	1.03
\bar{x} Difference	.16	.08	.14
Significance	.01	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.13	.05	.12
n	310	307	27

A statistically significant increase in social-awareness was detected for White students. Mean scores on the social-awareness index increased by .33 from \bar{x} =5.59 on the pretest to \bar{x} =5.92 on the posttest. The effect size (Hedge's g) of .25 was moderately small. No other significant differences were found based on race/ethnicity. (See Table 40.)

Table 40
Social-Awareness by Race/Ethnicity
Pre/Post Difference of Means

	Black/African American	White/Caucasian	Latine	AAPI	Mixed-Race
Pretest \bar{x}	5.50	5.59	5.50	6.07	5.86
Posttest \bar{x}	5.56	5.92	5.57	6.16	5.65
Pretest SD	1.24	1.33	1.41	1.11	1.20
Posttest SD	1.33	1.18	1.34	1.06	1.20
\bar{x} Difference	.05	.33	.07	.08	.21
Significance	NS	.00	NS	NS	NS
Hedge's g	.03	.25	.04	.06	.14
n	136	210	226	61	74

Student Takeaways

Students generally looked forward to taking the WTP class and expressed interest in the subject area, sentiments that remained following the course. Most students indicated that they participated actively in the class. Students were asked if they agreed with the following statements about their interest and participation in the WTP class. The pretest items were: 1) I am looking forward to this class, and 2) I am eager to participate in this class. The posttest items were: 1) I was interested in the class, and 2) I participated in this class. The percentage of students who looked forward to the class and reported that the class interested them on the posttest was similar. 29% of students strongly agreed that they were looking forward to the class, and 24% on the posttest strongly agreed that the class interested them. One-quarter of students on the pretest strongly agreed that they were eager to participate in the class, and 45% strongly agreed that they had participated in the class. While 23% of students were not eager to participate, only 2% reported that they did not participate in the class. (See Table 41.)

Table 41
Student Pretest/Posttest Interest and Participation in the WTP Class
(Percentage)

	Looked Forward to Class (Pretest)	Interested in Class (Posttest)	Eager to Participate (Pretest)	Participated in Class (Posttest)
Strongly Agree	29%	24%	25%	45%
Agree	57%	59%	52%	43%
Disagree	14%	17%	23%	2%

Students had the opportunity to provide comments about their experience in their WTP classes on the posttest. General comments expressed satisfaction with their JMLPE experience, with some expressing that it was their favorite class. They indicated that the class was interesting, fun, and helped them to gain a greater understanding of American government. Students had great appreciation for their teachers who they described as knowledgeable, supportive, and kind.

This is a pretty interesting class about the best democratic government in the world. The teacher of this class is fantastic as well, and probably the best teacher I have ever had.

I think this class is good. The teacher has a unique way of teaching which makes the class easier to understand compared to my last year's Social Studies teacher. I have never really been interested in government or history, but this teacher makes it so that it is somewhat interesting compared to normal.

To be honest this class is amazing and very interesting and it's important for me and others to learn about government because I wanna know about the law and how it started.

Prior to the pilot study, teacher-experts identified making the WTP curriculum relatable to the target student populations as a key objective of the JMLPE. Students' comments following their classes reflect teachers' success in achieving this objective.

This class has further taught me about American history, and how we had the ideas to have a democratic government. It also taught me how the government affects a regular person's life.

It is a very good class. I learned the most about politics and U.S politics in this class. This class helped me not only just understand the topics, but also how those topics work in today's life and how we as people interact with it.

This is class is great opportunity for me to learn how the government system works and for adolescents like me to learn how to vote, learn about our rights' and knowing what to do during a trial in court or what benefits or consequences it will have. Overall, I found this class was very interesting to me.

This class is very educative and interactive. The assignments and lessons are very well taught. The "We The People" book used in class is a very helpful book to use with our assignments. I like being in this class to learn about government and just being in a well-rounded, upbeat, and positive environment. Our teacher is always striving for us to do our best in this class, always in a positive and upbeat mood.

It was an excellent class for me. I just came here from another country, and I did not know about American government a lot. I learned many things about the American government and laws in this class and I am happy for that.

The class is very cool. It taught me more about this country and how the court works. I wish it taught me more about the people and their backgrounds but overall it's good.

Students commented that they were able to express themselves in a safe environment and gained communication skills.

This class is a good class and I feel I can express my opinions and stances without being put down.

This class was really interesting and fun I learned a lot of things about the government and our history. I definitely enjoyed learning about this and becoming more aware of our government. This class also helped me with speaking in front of people and it really made me gain more knowledge.

While the aggregate statistics did not reflect gains in SEL collaboration skills, student comments indicated that they were emphasized by some teachers. Students who mentioned collaboration in the comments tended to have high scores on the collaboration index. This evidence, while anecdotal, suggests that emphasizing collaboration while using the adapted WTP curriculum can produce positive results.

There is a very high collaboration level in this class, everyone works with one another to achieve a common goal/answer. The notes we take help us succeed on future tests and assignments.

The benefits and ways I can relate the things I learn in class to real life make me feel successful. Collaboration expectation in this class is high and I love that.

At first I thought I wouldn't be interested in this class due to the fact that I wasn't very interested in politics and government. But after some convincing I joined the class and I definitely don't regret it because I've learned so much from this class and I've gotten so many amazing chances to partake in activities with my classmates and my peers.

References

- Branson, Margaret Stimmann. 1998. *The Role of Civic Education: An Education Policy Task Force Position Paper with Policy Recommendations*. Research Report. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.
- Branson, Margaret Stimmann, and Charles N. Quigley. 1998. "The Role of Civic Education." Washington, D.C.: The Communitarian Network. http://www.gwu.edu/~ccps/pop_civ.html
- Brody, Richard. 1994. "Secondary Education and Political Attitudes: Examining the Effects on Political Tolerance of the We the People . . . Curriculum," Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.
- Campbell, David E. 2006. *Why We Vote: How Schools and Communities Shape Our Civic Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- CASEL. 2020. "CASEL's SEL Framework: What Are the Core Competence Areas and Where Are They Promoted," October 1. [CASEL'S SEL Framework - CASEL](#)
- Crittenden, Jack, and Peter Levine. 2018. "Civic Education," in Edward N. Zalta, ed. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2018 Edition). <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/civic-education>
- Delli Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. 1996. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Denham, Suzanne. 2016. "Tools to Assess Social and Emotional Learning in Schools," *Edutopia*, June 17. [Tools to Assess Social and Emotional Learning in Schools | Edutopia](#)
- Finkel, Stephen E., and Howard R. Ernst. 2005. "Civic Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Alternative Paths to the Development of Political Knowledge and Democratic Values," *Political Psychology*, vol 26: 333-364.
- Galston, William. 2004. "Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education," *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 4: 217-234.
- Haggerty, Kevin, Jenna Elgin, and Andrew Woolley. 2011. "Social-Emotional Learning Assessment Measures for Middle School Youth," January 5. Social Development Research Group, University of Washington and the Raikes Foundation. [Raikes-SEL-Assesment.pdf \(casel.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com\)](#)
- IDEA. 2018. "Sec. 300.8 Child with a Disability." United States Government, Individual with Disabilities Education Act. [Sec. 300.8 Child with a disability - Individuals with Disabilities Education Act](#)

Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. 2022a. “Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Public Schools, May. U.S. Government. [COE - Racial/Ethnic Enrollment in Public Schools \(ed.gov\)](#)

Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. 2022b. “Civics,” September 7. U.S. Government. [Assessments - Civics | NAEP \(ed.gov\)](#)

Kleinberg, Mona S., and Richard R. Lau. 2019. “The Importance of Political Knowledge for Effective Citizenship: Differences Between the Broadcast and Internet Generations,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 83, no. 2: 338-362.

Niemi, Richard G. 2001. “The Effects of High School Civics and Government Instruction on Political Knowledge and Attitudes: A Report to the Center for Civic Education.” Research Report. University of Rochester.

Niemi, Richard G., and Jane Junn. 1998. *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Office of English Language Acquisition. 2021. *English Learner Toolkit*. U.S. Department of Education. [English Learner Tool Kit \(OELA\) \(ed.gov\)](#)

Owen, Diana. 2015. *High School Students’ Acquisition of Political Dispositions: The Impact of We the People*. Report for the Center for Civic Education, July. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University. <http://jmlpresearch.org/research/>

Owen, Diana. 2018. *Evaluation of the We the People Program: Student Knowledge*. Research Report. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, May. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331939336_Evaluation_of_the_We_the_People_Program_Student_Knowledge/stats

Owen, Diana. 2022. *Teacher Expert Report: James Madison Legacy Project Expansion*, June. Civic Education Research Lab, Georgetown University. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.21136.89600

Owen, Diana, and G. Isaac W. Riddle. 2017. “Active Learning and the Acquisition of Political Knowledge in High School,” in Alison McCartney, Elizabeth Bennion, Elizabeth Matto, and Richard Simpson, eds. *Teaching Civic Engagement*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.

Owen, Diana, Kathryn Hartzell, and Chelsea Sanchez. 2020. The James Madison Legacy Project: Evaluation Report. Washington, D.C.: Civic Education Research Lab, Georgetown University. <https://cerl.georgetown.edu/james-madison-legacy-project-evaluation-report/>

Owen, Diana, and Alissa Irion-Groth. 2020. “Civic Education for Youth Empowerment: The Impact of We the People and Project Citizen,” *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, vol. 24: no. 4.

Owen, Diana, and Donna P. Phillips. 2023. "Toward and Accessible Civics Curriculum: Adapting *We the People* for High-Need Students." Paper prepared for Presentation at the American Political Science Association Teaching and Learning Conference on the panel on Inclusive Curriculum and Institutional Change, February 11, Baltimore, MD.

Pasek, Josh, Lauren Feldman, Daniel Romer, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. 2008. "Schools as Incubators of Democratic Participation: Building Long-Term Political Efficacy with Civic Education." *Applied Developmental Science*, 12 (1): 26–37.

Taylor, Jeremy, Katie Buckley, Laura S. Hamilton, Brian M. Stecher, Lindsay Read, and Jonathan Schweig. 2018. *Choosing and Using SEL Competency Assessments: What Schools and Districts Need to Know*. Research Report. Assessment Work Group, Rand Corporation. [practitioner-guidance.pdf \(casel.org\)](#)

Tocqueville, Alexis de. 1838. *Democracy in America*. New York: G. Dearborn & Co.
U.S. Department of Education. 2018. "Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)," Office of State Support, U.S. Department of Education. [Title I, Part A Program \(ed.gov\)](#)

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. 2019. *Study of the Title I, Part A Grant Program Mathematical Formulas* (NCES 2019-016), [Executive Summary](#), [Introduction](#), and [Chapter 1](#).

Van Camp, Debbie, and Stacey-Ann Baugh. 2016. "Encouraging Civic Knowledge and Engagement: Exploring Current Events through a Psychological Lens," *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, vol. 16, no. 2: 14-28. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1100860.pdf>

Youniss, James. 2011. "Civic Education: What Schools Can Do to Encourage Civic Identity and Action." *Applied Developmental Science*, vol.15, no 2: 98-103.