CIVIC EDUCATION POLICY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CIVIC EDUCATION POLICY AND CIVIC HEALTH IN GEORGIA AND NEW HAMPSHIRE

by

CORY ED PARROTT

(Under the Direction of John P. Dayton)

ABSTRACT

This study addresses three research questions: 1) what federal and state-level government policies influence civic education in Georgia and New Hampshire?, 2) what is the current state of civic health among citizens in Georgia and New Hampshire?, and 3) is there a relationship between state-level civic education policy and civic health in Georgia and New Hampshire? The scope of this study is confined to state-level civic education policy at the public, secondary level and civic health in Georgia and New Hampshire. Findings of this study reveal that although both Georgia and New Hampshire have public education systems that place very little emphasis on civic education, there are significant differences in the civic education policy of the two states in regard to the number and content of civic education standards; Georgia's standards being more numerous, lower-level, and less concerned with matters of citizenship than New Hampshire's. Relative to civic health, New Hampshire's is found to be relatively much stronger than Georgia and the rest of the nation.

INDEX WORDS: Citizenship education, Civic education, Civic education policy, Civic health, Civics, Secondary education policy, Social studies policy

CIVIC EDUCATION POLICY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CIVIC EDUCATION POLICY AND CIVIC HEALTH IN GEORGIA AND NEW HAMPSHIRE

by

CORY ED PARROTT

BS, Georgia Southern University, 2003

MS, Georgia State University, 2011

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2014

© 2014

Cory Ed Parrott

All Rights Reserved

CIVIC EDUCATION POLICY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CIVIC EDUCATION POLICY AND CIVIC HEALTH IN GEORGIA AND NEW HAMPSHIRE

by

CORY ED PARROTT

Major Professor:	John P. Dayton
Committee:	Sally J. Zepeda
	Sheneka M. Williams

Electronic Version Approved:

Julie A. Coffield
Interim Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2014

DEDICATION

This paper is dedicated to the promise of a brighter future guided by a society of individuals with compassionate hearts and critical minds.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the significance of the support I have received from my family and the faculty of the University of Georgia. I owe special gratitude to my wife, Beth Moyé-Parrott, my daughter, Madaleine Moyé-Lowery, my parents, Mercer and Sharlee Parrott, my dogs, Rooster and Sasha, my major professor, Dr. John Dayton, and my dissertation committee members, Dr. Sally Zepeda and Dr. Sheneka Williams. Due to the contributions and guidance of each of the above-named individuals, my efforts have been inspired and the completion of this dissertation was made possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

LIST OF TABLES viii

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 1

Research Questions 7

Research Design 7

Scope and Limitations 9

2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 12

Civic Education 12

Federal and National Civic Education Policy 35

State-level Civic Education Policy 45

Civic Health in Georgia and New Hampshire 66

3 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS 87

Data Sources 87

Demographic and Geographic Comparisons 89

Civic Health Comparison 92

Civic Education Policy Comparison 100

Conclusion 113

4 FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS 117

Findings 117

Conclusions and Implications 127

Suggestions 130

REFERENCES 134

APPENDICES

A Appendix A: American Government/Civics Georgia Performance Standards 141

B Appendix B: New Hampshire High School Civics and Government Standards 147

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1: Units Required per Area of Study for Georgia Graduation 52

Table 2: Social Studies Themes and Relationships to Civics 59

Table 3: New Hampshire Required Program Areas, Courses, and Credits 64

Table 4: Georgia Civic Health Indicator Rankings 71

Table 5: Civic Health Indicators by Area 72

Table 6: Georgia Social Connectedness Indicator Percentages 73

Table 7: Georgia Community Involvement Indicator Percentages 74

Table 8: Georgia Political Action Indicator Percentages 75

Table 9: Georgia Confidence in Institution Indicator Percentages 76

Table 10: New Hampshire Civic Health Indicator Rankings 79

Table 11: Civic Health Indicators by Area 80

Table 12: New Hampshire Volunteering and Giving Civic Health Indicators 81

Table 13: New Hampshire Political Activity Civic Health Indicators 82

Table 14: New Hampshire Community Engagement Civic Health Indicators 83

Table 15: New Hampshire Confidence in Public Institutions Civic Health Indicators 84

Table 16: Geographic and Population Comparison 89

Table 17: Demographic Comparison 91

Table 18: Common Civic Health Indicators by Area 93

Table 19: Social Connectedness Civic Health Indicator Comparison 94

Table 20: Community Involvement Civic Health Indicator Comparison....................................95

Table 21: Political Action Civic Health Indicator Comparison..97

Table 22: Confidence in Institutions Civic Health Indicator Comparison 98

Table 23: Civic Education Standard Comparison...102

Table 24: Foundation-building vs. High-level Comparison 104

Table 25: CCGPS and NH CCRS Topics by Standard...106

Table 26: High School Graduation Requirement Comparison...109

Table 27: High School Graduation Credit Requirements...111

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> When the human mind is not solidly grounded by a thorough education, relevant facts, and the learned power of rational thought, those who would profit from human ignorance can easily inflame the potent human emotions of fear, hate, and prejudice toward their own selfish ends, with disastrous results for the victims of their manipulation. (Dayton, 2012, p. 12)

Statement of the Problem

Benjamin Franklin, on leaving Independence Hall following the drafting of the *Constitution of the United States*, was asked what type of government had been decided on for the people, to which he is said to have replied, “a republic...if you can keep it” (Franklin in Feith, 2011, p. xvii). With that admonition, Franklin warned that in order for the American republic to survive, and for its democratic values and practices to be preserved, it is necessary for the citizens to be informed and actively engaged in the political process. Despite the necessity of an informed and engaged society, numerous studies reveal that a significant segment of the American citizenry lacks even a fundamental grasp of basic civic knowledge and that most Americans are far from being adequately informed or actively engaged in the political process (Cole, 2011; Feith, 2011; Hess, 2011; Junn & Niemi, 1998).

Civic knowledge and political involvement in society.

Civic education is grounded in an understanding and analysis of American history and political systems (Feith, 2011). However, a multitude of recent studies have revealed that Americans do not possess a clear understanding of the most significant historical events or political facts (American Revolution Center, 2009; Cole, 2011; Reynolds, 2011). A survey

conducted by the American Revolution Center in 2009 revealed that 83% of participants surveyed failed to answer correctly when asked questions about key documents, events, people, and ideas from American history, half lacked a basic grasp of American historical chronology, and over one-third were unable to even place the American Revolution in its correct century (American Revolution Center, 2009). Furthermore, Cole (2011) revealed that in that same survey one-third of those questioned did not know the right to a jury is found in the Bill of Rights, 40% thought the right to vote is expressed in the Bill of Rights, and over half attributed the quote "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" to either George Washington, Thomas Paine, or Barack Obama instead of to Karl Marx. Reynolds (2011) lamented the fact that "the simple outlines of our system – the three branches of the federal government, the relationship between them, how bills become law, and how the Constitution is amended – aren't well understood by Americans" (p. 204).

As a result of civic ignorance, many American voters are ill-equipped to evaluate political messages and lack a basic understanding of American political systems and offices (Bahmueller & Quigley, 2011; O'Connor, 2011; Reynolds, 2011). The lack of civic knowledge among the general public has led, as indicated by data gathered in numerous studies, to growth in negative perceptions and feelings toward America's political institutions and a decline in political efficacy (Cole, 2011; Graham, 2011; O'Connor, 2011). According to Graham (2011), "Americans often demonstrate not only limited civic knowledge, but also minimal understanding of how to flex their civic muscles and great feelings of cynicism about, and alienation from, democratic institutions" (p. 63). This cynicism is reflected in the findings of the 2012 National Civic Health Index in which it was shown that only 26% of Americans believe that government generally does what is right (National Conference on Citizenship, 2009). Further evidence of the

pervasive negative view of government among the American citizenry was indicated in the results of a 2010 Gallup poll in which only 11% of those polled professed having a high level of confidence in Congress (Saad, 2010). In addition to general cynicism regarding government, and perhaps as a result of that cynicism, voter turnout in national elections has declined significantly over the last half century (Graham, 2011). In fact, turnout among eligible voters has dropped from 63% in 1960 to 57% in 2008 (McDonald, 2010). The picture painted by recent data collected by the various organizations and studies cited in the preceding is one of a country whose citizens are largely ignorant of basic political and civic knowledge, distrustful of a government they do not understand, and disenfranchised as a result of their ignorance and cynicism.

Civic knowledge and citizenship education in schools.

The literature reveals a correlation between the decline of civic knowledge and political participation among the adult citizenry and the de-emphasis of civic education in schools (Hansen & Rosenstone, 2003; Jennings & Stoker, 2008; Rotherham, 2011). In a study conducted by Jennings and Stoker (2008), findings showed that pre-college civic education has a measurable effect on political interest and participation. As Rotherham (2011) indicated, "better educated citizens are more likely to participate in both electoral and governmental politics" (p. 89). However, the reality is that "today, students are more likely to encounter civic skills and issues as haphazard byproducts of their education than through intentional curricular effort" (Rotherham, 2011, p. 95). Graham (2011) illustrated this reality by revealing that over the last half century average civics requirements in high school have decreased from three years of classes to one semester, an effective 450 school day (83%) decline in civics instruction.

Oft repeated in the literature are the apparent detrimental effects of an overemphasis on college and career preparation, exclusive focus on math and reading instruction, standardized testing, and funding inequities on civic education (Graham, 2011; Hess, 2011; O'Connor, 2011) "As schooling has become more economically central," lamented Hess (2011), "the stuff of citizenship has become increasingly peripheral" (p. xii). Hess (2011) pointed out that schools are "devoting remarkably little intellectual energy to questions of citizenship or the formation of democratic citizens" (p. xii). As of 2008, forty states, including Georgia, require students to complete only one semester of civics to be eligible for graduation (Ross, 2011). In a study conducted by Stern and Stern (2011) for the Fordham Foundation, 28 states were given a grade of "D" or "F" for their U.S. history standards and the average grade among all 50 states was a "D" as a result of glaring omissions of important content and insufficient time dedicated to study. Ross (2011) found that only 11 states require mandatory civic examinations, a mere 6 states include civics questions on high school graduation tests, and only 13 states require that students learn about the Constitution and other founding documents in civics courses.

Hess (2011) asserted that "the civic education problem extends all the way from grade school through higher education and into the schools that train our teachers" (p. xiv). This assertion is supported by the findings of a study by the Center for Civic Education in which it was revealed that "more than 50 percent of high school government teachers could not adequately explain key concepts such as popular sovereignty, habeas corpus, judicial review, federalism, and checks and balances" (O'Connor, 2011, p. 6). So, the teachers who are charged with educating the youth are products of schools that failed to provide them with a proper civics education leading to a perpetuation of the problem.

A plethora of data reveal that students are largely uninformed regarding even the most basic and central aspects of civics knowledge (Feith, 2011; O'Connor, 2011; Paige, 2011; White, 2005). "U.S. history," pointed out Feith (2011), "is the only subject in which more than half of high-school seniors can't demonstrate even basic knowledge: not about our founding, not about the First Amendment, not about the civil rights movement" (p. xviii). O'Connor (2011) pointed out that:

> On the nationwide civics assessment administered by the federal government in 2006, more than two-thirds of students scored below proficiency, not even a third of eighth graders surveyed could identify the historical purpose of the Declaration of Independence, and less than a fifth of twelfth graders could explained how citizen participation benefits democracy. (p. 7)

Paige (2011) noted that on that same assessment, the National Assessment of Education Progress, it was revealed that 62% of high school seniors were not able to identify a sign reading "Colored Entrance" as being associated with segregation, 72% were not able to correctly answer basic questions regarding the Lincoln-Douglas debates, and 40% were unable to correctly identify the purpose of the "Black Codes" passed during Reconstruction in the south. Not only are students performing poorly on tests of civic knowledge, but their attitudes regarding the subject tend to be negative as well. Studies show that students view social studies courses negatively, describing them as boring, irrelevant, and ineffective at even accomplishing the minimum of causing them to memorize basic facts (White, 2005).

While American students as a whole lack basic civic knowledge and skills, as Andrew (2011) revealed, there is a large and disturbing gap in civic knowledge and participation among demographic lines. Andrew (2011) illustrated the disparity in civic knowledge by explaining that the results of the 2006 National Assessment of Educational Progress Civics Exam revealed "large gaps – in excess of 20 percentage points in most cases – exist along economic and racial

lines… [and] the gap is largest among twelfth graders, some of whom are already eligible to vote, as white students outperform black students by 25 percentage points" (p. 103). Those results are not surprising when considering the findings of a 2005 survey of California twelfth graders in which the data revealed that African-American students enrolled in fewer civics courses and discussed current events on a less frequent basis than did their Caucasian peers (Andrew, 2011). One possible result of inequitable access to civic education is that "Latinos and African Americans are far less likely to agree with the statement that 'I can make a difference in solving the problems of my community'" (Andrew, 2011, p. 103). Considering the evidence indicating a significant gap in civic knowledge, skills, and engagement along racial lines, the civic education problem exists as a facet of the larger problem in education concerning racial disparities in opportunity and outcomes.

Clearly, evidence shows that American citizens and students have, at best, very limited civic knowledge and skills and are not politically efficacious. Considering the fact that formal civic education has been found to lead to an increase in civic knowledge, skills, and engagement among adults (Jennings & Stoker, 2008; Rotherham, 2011), it is understandable that attempts to solve the problem of pervasive civic ignorance and inaction be addressed via education policy and practice reforms. Such reforms will not occur if people are not made aware of the problem, its causes, and its consequences. "Contributing to the weakness of civic education is," explained Hickok (2011), "a lack of public attention to the subject by political, educational, and cultural leaders" (p. 59). If the problem continues to be ignored, or paid lip service, then there is no chance of it being solved. As White (2005) explained, "a critical discussion regarding education and schooling must occur in order to develop an understanding of the issues and concerns with democracy and citizenship education in the world" (p. 77). This dissertation continues and

furthers the discussion with the intention of exploring the problem, examining correlations between civic education and civic health, and offering policy suggestions.

Research Questions

This dissertation addresses three questions:

1) What federal and state-level government policies influence civic education in Georgia and New Hampshire?

2) What is the current state of civic health among citizens in Georgia and New Hampshire?

3) Is there a relationship between state-level civic education policy and civic health in Georgia and New Hampshire?

The first question is concerned with the general level of civic health (*i.e.,* civic knowledge and engagement) among the populace of Georgia and New Hampshire. Research question number two is explored via analysis of administrative regulations affecting civic education that arise from the legislative and executive branches of the Georgia and New Hampshire state governments, most specifically the education standards, testing mandates, and graduation requirements imposed by the state legislatures and State Departments of Education. Lastly, the third research question examines the correlation between civic health and civic education policy through a comparative analysis of the available data.

Research Design

This dissertation applies the basic elements of legal research outlined by Dayton (2013). In this study, as is typical of much law-related research, "each element of legal research builds on and relies on the prior elements" (Dayton, 2013, p. 6). Chapter 1 presents an introduction to the study, including problem definition, research questions, design, and scope. Chapter 2 provides a comprehensive literature review, presenting relevant information from government documents and scholarly sources. Chapter 3 offers an analysis of the evidence from Chapter 2.

Chapter 4 relates findings based on the evidence, conclusions deduced from the findings, and resulting policy recommendations.

Data sources.

The legal information used in this study was acquired primarily from online government and legal research resources (*e.g.,* LexisNexis, ERIC, and state government-sponsored websites). Dayton (2013) pointed out that "federal and state constitutions, statues, regulations, and case decisions are all in the public domain and are generally available free online" (p. 10), a reality that was capitalized on in the process of gathering information for use in this study. While heavily reliant on primary sources of the law, secondary sources were used to assist in understanding and analyzing civic education and the effects of past and current policy on civic education.

Synthesis of the research findings was achieved using the IRAC method (Dayton, 2013). Dayton (2013) described the IRAC method as "a process that involves clearly identifying the legal issue; identifying governing rule(s) of law; applying the law to the issue/facts; and reaching a logical conclusion" (p. 12). The core legal issue, or question, in this study was; what state-level government regulations influence civic education in Georgia and New Hampshire? The legislative statutes and rules arising from administrative regulations affecting civic education in Georgia and New Hampshire are presented in Chapter 2. The application of the statutes and rules is accomplished through a comparative analysis of the policy in Chapter 3. Finally, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are offered in Chapter 4.

One significant source of information reviewed in Chapter 2 and analyzed in Chapter 3 are the Civic Health Indexes created by the National Conference on Citizenship. With the goal of gathering and providing data to policymakers, communities, and the media to promote discussion

concerning civic health, the National Conference on Citizenship (NCoC) has worked in partnership with various national, state, and local organizations to develop Civic Health Indexes for the nation, 22 of the 50 states, and various local communities. The NCoC works with their partners to "measure how much people trust their neighbors, are active in their communities, and interact with their government" (National Conference on Citizenship, 2014). To create the Civic Health Indexes, the NCoC analyzed a number of civic indicators based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2011 Current Population Survey (CPS) provided by the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE). Civic Health Indexes were produced by the NCoC for both Georgia and New Hampshire in 2012 using data from the 2011 CPS.

Ultimately, the findings of the study are intended to advance an understanding of the differences in civic health and state government policy guiding civic education curriculum, instruction, and assessment in Georgia and New Hampshire. The expectation is that the information presented in this dissertation be used to inform practices of practitioners (*e.g.,* school administrators and teachers) and policymakers at the local, state, and national level by helping them to understand the state of, and relationship between, civic health and civic education policy in Georgia and New Hampshire.

Scope and Limitations

This study is confined to an exploration of civic health and current state government policy related to civic education in Georgia and New Hampshire. Though the focus of the policy analysis is on state-level education policy, federal policy is referenced and taken into consideration as a means of providing a larger context and accounting for influences of federal policy on states. To limit the scope of this study and provide focused direction, the discussion of

current federal and state policy affecting civic education in Georgia and New Hampshire is confined to policy initiatives from 2000 to the present. The time period, 2000 to the present, was chosen because it effectively encompasses significant influences on civic education (*e.g.,* No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top) of the current and previous presidential administrations while at the same time avoiding dilution of the discussion by attempting to reach further into the past and potentially sacrificing quality for quantity.

Although public policy is comprised of the entire "system of laws, regulatory measures, courses of action, and funding priorities concerning a given topic promulgated by a governmental entity or its representatives" (Kilpatrick, 2000, p. 1), policy arising from state legislative and executive actions is exclusively considered in this study for two primary reasons: 1) an attempt to explore contributions from all branches of government to civic education policy would expand the scope of this study beyond what would be manageable or focused, and 2) the legislative statutes and administrative rules regarding curriculum standards, graduation requirements, and testing mandates have, arguably, the most significant impact on what students learn in the classroom (Goertz, 2009; Kaestle, 2007; Vinovskis, 2009, Wall, 2005). This is not done to imply that other contributions to policy are not significant, but that for the purposes of this study the administrative rules and legislative statutes specific to education standards, graduation requirements, and testing mandates are most relevant.

Additionally, the discussion of civic education is confined to the formal public education arena with primary emphasis on the secondary level. Though it is true that there are other sources of civic education outside of schools, this study pursues the issue from the perspective that schools are "the institutions best equipped to teach civic and political knowledge and skills such as critical thinking and deliberation" (Hess, 2011, p. xiv). The rationale for focusing on

secondary public education is based on the fact that high schools are the last stop for most citizens before reaching the legally defined age of adulthood and beginning civic involvement as voting, tax-paying individuals. In regard to education standards, graduation requirements, and testing mandates, the discussion is limited to general education diploma-based rules. Thus, special education and technical tracks are excluded.

The goal of the comparative analysis is to highlight differences in civic health and policy between Georgia and New Hampshire and to explore the possibility of correlation, not to assert a causal link. Georgia and New Hampshire were selected because both states participated in the Civic Health Index study published in 2012 by the National Conference on Citizenship, and the present study revealed distinct differences in the civic health and civic education policy of the two states. As a result of the differences in the civic health and civic education policy in Georgia and New Hampshire, as well as the availability of comparable data, it was possible to identify correlations and relationships between aspects of civic health and civic education policy in the two states.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of pertinent literature and is divided into four main sections, including: 1) civic education literature, 2) federal and national civic education policy, 3) state-level civic education policy, and 4) civic health in Georgia and New Hampshire. The section reviewing civic education literature provides historical context, defines and delineates distinctions between various conceptions of civic education, presents the case for civic education, explores aims and benefits of civic education, and discusses criticisms of civic education. Following which, the section reviewing civic education policy literature explores public policy affecting civic education at the federal/national level from 2000 to the present. Following the section on federal policy, state-level civic education policy in Georgia and New Hampshire is discussed providing detailed information regarding civic education standards, testing mandates, and high school graduation requirements in both states. Finally, data concerning the civic health of the citizens of Georgia and New Hampshire are presented. The goal of the literature review is to present pertinent data, provide context, and establish a framework via which to proceed with the comparative analysis of civic health and education in Georgia and New Hampshire in the following chapters.

Civic Education

Defining civic education.

The primary concern of civic education is, as revealed by Barr (2005), to explore the relationship between the citizen(s) and the state. Civic education involves the learning of civic

knowledge and skills via study of history, political systems, and political theory as a means of informing and engaging students (Andrew, 2011). Core questions that arise when attempting to define citizenship education include 1) what is involved in citizenship? and 2) what knowledge, skills, and dispositions do citizens need to be informed and actively engaged? Barr (2005) addresses the question of citizenship by explaining that it "has always involved more than just legal status" (p. 56). According to Barr (2005), many people view a citizen as an individual who is not only a legal resident but who also demonstrates certain attitudes and values. Traditionally, the attitudes and values associated with citizenship have embodied "ideals that represent what a citizen ought to be and how he or she ought to live" (Barr, 2005, p. 56). Those subscribing to this view of citizenship favor a knowledge-based curriculum for civic education according to Barr (2005). They believe, as Kyl (2011) asserted, "true citizenship is about understanding, believing in, and uniting around the country's first principles" (p. 35). Such a view of citizenship is challenged by those who favor a more critical approach to citizenship.

Walker (2005) illustrated the differing perspectives on citizenship by explaining that "there are two ways of looking at citizenship: conflict and consensus" (p. 302). Barr (2005) described the dichotomous relationship between opposing views of citizenship by asserting that:

> Those who see the state's primary duty as protecting individual rights, advocate the kind of citizenship that promotes freedom, independence, individualism and diversity. They support policies and programs that minimize government influence and maximize choice for individuals and minority groups. Those who see state unity as more important advocate the kind of citizenship education that promotes unity, conformity, and commonality. (p. 59)

Regardless of how one views citizenship, when discussing civic education it is necessary to consider how citizenship is defined because the answer to that question plays a large role in determining the goals and content of civic education. This study is approached with the understanding that there are multiple, and contradicting views of citizenship, but that, as Barr

(2005) asserted, many people “would opt for a state in which individual citizens have both recognized individual rights and a high degree of commitment to the state” (p. 60). Thus, the discussion of civic education presented in this study is pursued in consideration of both views of citizenship.

A review of the literature on civic education revealed that even though scholars agree in the general definition of civic education as being concerned with citizens’ relationship to their state, there are various conceptions and manifestations that can be grouped into two general categories; foundation-building civic education (FCE) and high-level civic education (HCE). Foundation-building education is concerned with the acquisition of knowledge while high-level education is defined by the application and interrogation of knowledge as a critical endeavor. Foundation-building education is associated with the two lowest learning domains in Bloom’s Taxonomy, involving remembering and understanding (Bloom et al., 1956). While high-level education is related to the upper domains and entails application, analysis, evaluation, and creation, foundation-building education relates to the lower domains concerning memorization and comprehension (Bloom et al., 1956). Because none of the terms used to characterize civic education found in the literature provide a means of delineating what clearly emerges as two distinct camps, the terms foundation-building and high-level civic education have been adapted from Bloom’s Taxonomy for the purposes of this study and are employed throughout.

Defining foundation-building civic education.

“One thing to look for in a civic education program,” according to Reynolds (2011), “is simple, straight-forward instruction about how the government is structured, and how it is supposed to work” (p. 205). Such is the basic function of foundation-building civic education. Hess (2011) explained that at the foundational level, the goals of civic education should include

teaching students about “their nation’s history, fundamental tenets, and democratic processes – including the Bill of Rights and esoteric topics such as judicial review and federalism” (p. xiv). Foundation-building civic education (FCE) is characterized by the type of content and objectives described by Hess (2011) and Reynolds (2011), involving inculcation of facts and values accomplished via study of American history and political systems.

Scholars concerned with what is herein characterized as foundation-building education characterize civic education using such terms as traditional, essentialist, and perennial (Barr, 2005; Diamond, 1997; Hess, 2011). Curricula emphasizing FCE “favor traditional disciplines, the liberal arts and great works, believing that these cultivate students’ intellect [and] they tend toward essentialism and perennialism” (Barr, 2005, p. 65). Though the terms essentialism and perennialism have earned negative connotation among scholars of education, the terms are not meant to serve here as an indictment of FCE but as a means of accurately defining this sort of civic education.

Many proponents of FCE argue that the primary goal of civic education is to teach students to understand and appreciate American history and political systems as a means of building a strong national community (Barr, 2005; Bridgeland, 2011; Diamond, 1997). Diamond (1997) asserted that the primary goals of civic education are to build knowledge of the constitution and the Rule of Law, impart certain core values, promote an appreciation for freedom, and encourage civic nationalism.

Civic nationalism,” according to Barr (2005), “uplifts and unifies the political community…by cherishing the democratic transitions, institutions, practices and symbols that make each democracy unique” (p. 63). In this view, teaching knowledge of American political systems and history is seen as a means of building unity and patriotism. However, civic

nationalism is not to be confused with blind patriotism, because, as Bridgeland (2011) asserted, "civic education is not meant to inspire blind patriotism, but to remind more Americans of our system's noble values and beliefs" (p. 49). According to Barr (2005), who depicts civic education as a socializing mechanism, it involves "learning about how the state functions, about citizens' rights and responsibilities within the state, and about attitudes and values that help develop positive relationships between individual citizens and the state" (p. 56).

Beyond teaching students about historical facts, knowledge of American political systems, and engendering civic nationalism, FCE is also depicted in the literature as a means of imparting practical personal skills (Hess, 2011). Civic education, Hess (2011) explained, is in part concerned with helping young people develop "the basket of skills and attitudes (how to shake hands, speak properly, [and] be punctual) that will help students attend prestigious colleges and obtain desirable jobs" (p. xii). Hess categorized this type of education as being concerned with vocational citizenship.

Vocational citizenship is defined "by its focus on behavior that is typically considered part of good citizenship, but with primary emphasis on the practical benefits that they can provide to the individual student" (Hess, 2011, p. xiii). The aims of this type of education differ from the civic nationalism discussed by Barr (2005) in its focus on the individual rather than society as a group, but both are concerned with the dissemination of knowledge and can thus be categorized under the umbrella of FCE. In summary, foundation-building civic education, as depicted in the literature, is concerned with imparting knowledge of history, political systems, and shared values as a means of building a strong national community and providing students with practical knowledge and skills.

Defining high-level civic education.

"The goal of civic education," from a high-level civic education perspective, "is to foster in students the will and capacity to reflect deeply on the matter and spirit of public affairs – and, ultimately, to act accordingly as citizens" (Bahmueller & Quigley, 2011, p. 135). Scholars who are concerned with high-level civic education employ such terms as critical, experiential, constructivist, global, and critical to define civic education (Basile, 2005; Gibson & McKay, 2005; White, 2005). Proponents of HCE "argue that traditional ways of educating citizens are no longer appropriate" (Barr, 2005, p. 60). As O'Connor (2011) professed, because of the demands of our contemporary world "we cannot continue to teach civics as it was taught in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries" (p. 9). Civic education in this sense, as explained by Barr (2005), serves as a counterpart to the essentialist, perennialist FCE with its experientialist, constructivist theoretical foundation.

HCE is experientialist in its emphasis on reflective thinking, problem-solving, and democratic teaching methods. With high-level civic education there is an "explicit requirement for reflection before and after the action so that students begin to develop responsible actions and are not afraid to be responsible for those actions" (Basile, 2005, p. 352). HCE is constructivist in its recognition that "knowledge is created by people and influenced by their values and culture" (Barr, 2005, p. 66). A pervasive message in the literature is that civic education should be a highly critical endeavor (Bahmueller & Quigley, 2011; Hess, 2011; White, 2005).

According to White (2005), the goal of civic education should be to encourage students to further democratic principles and facilitate critical citizenship. In defining what is meant by critical citizenship, White (2005) explained that students should be led to "become historical and political actors" (p. 77) and that "critical democracy and citizenship requires in-depth analysis

and discourse of the issues facing the world today" (p. 78). Hess (2011) promotes civic education as a tool for teaching "habits [such] as questioning authority and searching for one's own truths" (p. xiii). The process of questioning and searching for truth includes, according to Bahmueller and Quigley (2011), analyses of political messages, policies, and candidates. HCE proponents assert that "civic education should foster in students the ability to evaluate alternative views of the common good and of self-interest and to decide which public policies and candidates for public office are best suited to serving them" (Bahmueller & Quigley, 2011, p. 128).

To effectively educate critical citizens, White (2005) maintained that civic education should introduce students to alternatives to democracy, provide examples of how democracies have failed as a result of a less than diligent citizenry, involve discussions of current events and controversial issues, and above all else provide opportunity for students to formulate, explore, and express their own ideas. Additionally, civic education "must provide students with the opportunity to participate in society" (White, 2005, p. 93). White (2005) suggested off campus excursions involving visits to legislatures in action, naturalization proceedings, and city council meetings followed by critical analysis and discussion in the classroom. As O'Connor (2011) explained, "civics is an active subject…it is about engaging in political action to accomplish results" (p. 9). This view is shared by Basile (2005), who argued that there is great benefit from providing opportunities for students to explore their communities and become involved in political processes.

White (2005) called for the inclusion of a pluralistic understanding of the world in civic education as a means of liberating students from essentialist views of what it means to be a citizen and affirming the ability of students to make their own meaning and effect change. While

knowledge of political structures, systems, and history are important, “it is not the knowledge of these academic areas that is the only goal, but the student’s ability to apply the knowledge to effect liberal democratic goals” (White, 2005, 84). In White’s (2005) view, civic education should facilitate critical thinking, emphasize problem-solving, open students’ eyes to global connectedness, develop tolerance of other cultures, cause students to analyze and evaluate information, and lead to social activism. Echoing White’s (2005) sentiment, Gibson and McKay (2005) wrote that “democracy necessitates a citizenry capable of identifying problems, collecting, evaluating, and analyzing information and making reasoned decisions (p. 171). They go on to argue that “citizenship is best promoted by problem solving and decision making” (Gibson & McKay, 2005, p. 170).

A central theme of HCE, according to many scholars, is that it intentionally ties civic content to issues of relevance to students (Barr, 2005; Dershowitz, 2011; O’Connor, 2011). O’Connor’s (2011) call for civics education programs “that are problem based, interactive, and tied to relevant issues” (p. 9) speaks to the core of HCE. Aims of high-level civic education, according to Barr (2005), include teaching students to make reasoned, evidence-based decisions, deal with social change, develop critical thinking skills, and it involves study of current issues and matters of significance to the students’ personal lives. According to Dershowitz (2011), “we need to develop sophisticated curricula that can educate children, of different ages and backgrounds, about how rights affect their lives” (p. 31). As O’Connor (2011) related, “if schools fail to inform students about issues that are interesting and relevant to them, they not only bore them but also weaken their capacity to participate in our democracy” (p. 9).

Along with an emphasis on critical citizenship, problem-solving, and application of knowledge to relevant current issues, proponents of HCE also call for the inclusion of oft ignored

voices in the civics curriculum (Barr, 2005; Gibson & McKay, 2005). Barr (2005) asserted that citizenship education should pay heed the voices of minorities and those who have historically been oppressed. Such a view of citizenship education broadens the scope of study from founding fathers and mainstream political figures to include other historical and contemporary figures of diverse backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives. As Gibson and McKay (2005) relate, “good citizens need to learn structures for accepting and appreciating diversity” (p. 176).

Another characteristic of HCE is that it expands one’s view of community to include global considerations (Barr, 2005; Basile, 2005; Gibson & McKay). A civic education that advocates global citizenship includes studies of global issues and world history effectively broadening the discussion of citizenship beyond the borders of one’s own country. Proponents of global inclusion argue that “in the new globalized world citizens need to be prepared through education programs that help them to view the world globally as well as nationally” (Barr, 2005, p. 64) and that there is a “need to develop a broad worldview about global issues, global systems, and common elements of human values and cultures” (Gibson & McKay, 2005, p. 178).

Basile (2005) offered three reasons why global education is important, including “the changing social structure of the world; the globalization of American society; and the relationship between social change and educational change” (p. 349). Advocates of HCE often agree with Basile (2005) that “we need to stop talking about how the world is becoming a global society and start teaching our children that the world is a global society” (p. 363). By incorporating oft dismissed or excluded voices and broadening the scope of civic education to include global perspectives, an emphasis is placed on “equity, sustainability, and universal human rights” (Barr, 2005, p. 64).

White (2005) provided a comprehensive overview of HCE with the assertion of four specific points, including:

> (1) Democracy and empowerment requires that citizens (students and teachers too) are active agents in decision making, questioning, and defining one's relationship in any societal endeavor; (2) there should be an understanding and acceptance of the discourse of pluralism in any societal endeavor; (3) empowerment of all should not only focus on critique, but also problem solving for constructing a variety of new societal possibilities; and (4) school should be places that facilitate this transformation. (p. 98)

Ultimately, the goal of HCE is to increase political sophistication among students. Political sophistication, as described by Bahmueller and Quigley (2011), is concerned with building political knowledge, awareness, and expertise. Highton (1998) explained that:

> Political sophistication facilitates the development and stability of public opinion; it enables people to connect their values and interests to their opinions and behaviors; awareness leads to the acquisition of new information from the political environment; and political knowledge promotes civic virtues like tolerance and political participation." (Highton, 1998, p. 156)

In essence, HCE requires a depth of understanding and application that goes beyond the basic learning of facts and details. The goal of this type of learning is to engender not only a sophisticated understanding of civics concepts, but to spur informed action and participation in civic life.

The case for civic education.

Benefits of educating members of society to be informed, active participants in political life can range from the broad and ambitious to the personal and practical. Speaking to the broad and ambitious aims of civic education, Dayton (2012) cautioned that:

> Democracy can be lost in a single generation…if educators are not prepared to teach the essential lessons of history, democracy, and the Rule of Law to the next generation of citizens… [and] our collective future depends on how well we teach these lessons of democracy and the rule of law to our children. (p. 2)

“The greatest threat to American democracy today,” according to Graham (2011), “doesn’t stem from any legislative measure, but from civic inaction and decay” (p. 67). A perspective shared by Dayton (2012), who warned that “among the greatest dangers to the continuation of freedom and democracy may be the complicity that can set in among those who have always enjoyed the fruits of freedom and democracy in their lives” (p. 4).

Dershowitz (2011) argued that, “no right is more fundamental to a democracy than the right to know your rights…no matter how powerful they may appear in print, rights are mere parchment pronouncements unless informed citizens are fully aware that they have them and are sufficiently knowledgeable to exercise them” (p. 27). Naturally, knowledge and understanding of one’s rights and duties as a citizen are not inherently known. The rights of the American people, according to Cole (2011), must be actively taught to the citizens if American liberties are to be preserved. As Cole (2011) professed, “citizens cannot defend what they cannot define” (p. 85).

In making the case for the importance of civic education, Feith (2011) explained that “it is negligent to assume that the American civic order will perpetuate itself, let alone grow stronger, without conscious effort from political and cultural figures, teachers, parents, and others” (p. xix). As Thomas Jefferson proclaimed, “those who expect to be both ignorant and free, expect what never was and never will be” (Jefferson in Dayton, 2012, p. 4). Kyl (2011) explained that “if people don’t understand the limits set forth in the Constitution, they may cede to government powers that challenge the very liberties that the Constitution is supposed to protect” (p. 34). At stake, according to Kyl (2011), is American exceptionalism itself. He maintained that “if Americans cease to understand who they are as citizens, our country risks losing the qualities that make it exceptional” (Kyl, 2011, p. 36).

As Junn and Niemi (1998) asserted, civic education leads to the development of individuals "who understand their own interests and are informed of their options" (p. 1). In a study by Galston (2003), it was found that there was a direct correlation between civic education and "political participation, expression of democratic values including toleration, stable political attitudes, and adoption of enlightened self-interest" (p. 33). People who received a proper civic education were, according to Junn and Niemi (1998), better able to hold government officials accountable to the people and in doing so contribute positively to society. The purpose, and result, of civic education, as explained by Junn and Niemi (1998), entailed an increase in political knowledge and awareness allowing individual citizens to engage in informed deliberation and consent as a means of furthering democratic aims and combating alienation of the people from the government. Bridgeland (2011) asserted, "without effective efforts, young Americans may grow up not knowing America's story, values, and ideals – or the role that an individual, inspired by those who came before, can play in shaping a civic nation" (p. 49).

Those who participate in effective civic education programs are more informed and feel greater political efficacy, and, as O'Connor (2011) revealed, evidence shows that those who do not received proper civic education tend to view government and political actors with misguided contempt. According to Feith (2011), "citizens lacking civic education are, in crucial respects, disenfranchised" (p. xix). O'Connor (2011), a former Justice of the United States Supreme Court, provided an example of the potential negative outcome of civic ignorance by explaining that "citizens who are less knowledgeable about the judiciary are more likely to believe that judges are biased and less likely to believe that courts act in the public interest" (p. 8). Her assertion is supported by results of a study by Hennessy and Jamieson (2007) in which it was found that 48% of Americans believe that judges should be removed from office for making

unpopular rulings. According to O'Connor (2011), civic education is the best means of combating the ill will felt by many Americans towards its government actors. She argued that "our independent judiciary will only survive if the public understands it and works to preserve it as a meaningful part of our constitutional framework" (O'Connor, 2011, p. 8).

White (2005) made a strong case for the importance of civic education, explaining that students should be educated in the various genres of what traditionally comprises social studies education because:

> History is what makes us who we are and has gotten us where we are; if understood, its lessons can take us where we need to go. Geography, of course, is the stage and the setting on which history is played. Government and economics show students how democracy and capitalism work and how the intricacies of our system evolved. If we can enhance our students' understanding of those principles as compared to other governments and economies, then they will be better informed, more productive citizens. (p. 91)

In essence, civic education proponents assert that an education in history, geography, government, and economics together constitute an effective civic education that has the potential to lead to an informed and actively engaged citizenry. Those subjects, together, help to build a foundation of what Cole (2011) terms "civic literacy". Cole (2011) exclaimed that "civic virtue is the chief concern of a republic…and civic virtue cannot be cultivated without civic literacy" (p. 84). The general case for civic education is founded on the assertion that the functioning and maintenance of the American republic depends on an informed citizenry equipped with civic knowledge and skills that they employ as active participants in the political process.

The case for foundation-building civic education.

The benefits of foundation-building civic education presented in the literature are wide-ranging. Many of the proponents of foundation-building civic education point to the importance of historical knowledge as a means of understanding the contemporary world and issues (Cole,

2011; Hess, 2011; Paige, 2011). As Rotherham (2011) explained, “students cannot understand or value the skills of participatory American citizenship without learning the proud , sometimes painful, complicated, and contentious history of the United States” (p. 95). For example, “if students are unfamiliar with the Fourteenth Amendment, the Civil War, and slavery, they will have difficulty making sense of contemporary debates – for example, regarding proposals to amend constitutional language in order to deny citizenship to children born of illegal immigrants” (Hess, 2011, p. xiv).

Paige (2011) pointed out that historical facts and knowledge are crucial aspects of civic education because “without a solid understanding of history, our next generation of leaders will lack the critical understanding of what brought our nation to where it is now” (p. 77). Dayton (2012) asserted that “understanding the history and purposes of the law not only helps you to better understand and apply the law in the present, but it also gives you a much broader understanding of the law and your essential role in advancing justice in your community” (p. xiv). Learning about our national past in general is, according to Cole (2011), “important because we are all direct heirs to it” (p. 84). After all, as George Santayana famously exclaimed, “those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it” (Santayana in Dayton, 2012, p. 4).

Another argument of those supporting FCE is that “the survival of democracy depends on our transmitting to each new generation the political vision of liberty and equality that unites us as Americans [effectively] forging historically knowledgeable citizens with a passion for democracy” (Finn, 1988, pp. 15-16). Proponents of FCE, according to Barr (2005), claim that democracy and community is best served by teaching students certain shared American values and long accepted truths. Cole (2011) professed that knowledge of founding documents and principles is crucial because “we are united not by blood, land, or common religion, but by our

founding principles" (p. 84). "Adolescents need to feel some positive attachment to their political community," claimed Ross (2011), "in order to complete their civic and character development" (p. 122).

Kyl (2011) asserted that "when young Americans learn the founding principles of our country, they are more likely to understand what is unique about it and what is, therefore, worth defending, preserving, and passing on to the next generation" (p. 35). A sentiment that is echoed by Gibson and McKay (2005) who stated that "in order to establish a common identity and a strong sense of community, all citizens of a nation must be exposed to [a] common body of knowledge" (p. 168). This perspective is also shared by Feith (2011) who maintained that "to remain America, our country has to give its kids a civic identity, an understanding of our constitutional system, and some appreciation of the amazing achievement of American self-government, including the work of Franklin and his founding brothers" (p. xviii). Not only is knowledge and understanding of our founding principles crucial to developing American community and identity, but Kyl (2011) argued that those principles must be actively taught to be preserved. Thus, an FCE that teaches founding principles is thought by many scholars to not only be conducive to preservation of American community, but is mandatory.

A primary benefit of FCE is that knowledge of history and political systems is a prerequisite of the type of critical engagement involved in HCE (Cole, 2011; Paige, 2011; Ross, 2011). Hess (2011) pointed out that "students must learn enough to be able to obtain and analyze the information that underlies our public debates" (p. xiv). "Without a solid grounding in the debates of the founding era," argued Ross (2011), "students are ill-prepared to understand the challenges of preserving individual liberty under the rule of law" (p. 122).

The case for high-level civic education.

Engaging students in the critical civics-based practices characteristic of high-level civic education is argued, and shown, in the literature to result in various and diverse meaningful benefits (Basile, 2005; Gibson & McKay, 2011; O'Connor, 2011). Benefits of HCE include development of skills related to critical thinking, problem solving, leadership, conflict resolution, negotiation, compromise, and community building (Gibson & Mckay, 2005). According to Basile's (2005) lofty claim, HCE has the potential to help develop a "more peaceful world civic culture that will ensure a better life on all parts of the planet" (p. 351). As Basile (2005) explained, in FCE curricula "students are taught about democracy, but have not been permitted to practice democracy" (p. 351). Proponents of HCE subscribe to the view that "knowledge alone does not lead to good citizenship" (Gibson & McKay, 2005, p. 169).

Levine (2011) pointed out that "students need to learn facts, but there is no reason to think that they will retain facts about politics or use their factual knowledge wisely and effectively in civic life unless they have experience with discussion and collaboration" (p. 213). Graham (2011) warned that "democracy is at risk as long as our political and educational systems tolerate a system that teaches fewer and fewer Americans to embrace their rights and responsibilities as citizens, that leaves Americans considering democracy a mere spectator sport" (p. 67). "The health of our democracy," asserted Graham (2011), "hinges on citizens knowing how to take an active role in shaping their communities" (p. 67). As Dayton (2012) explained, "rather than only teaching how things are, education must inspire students and give them the intellectual tools to make things better" (p. xiv).

Basile (2005), in her case study of Jefferson County Open School (JCOS), noted a number of benefits of the HCE aspects of its civics program. Perhaps the most meaningful

evidence of how the students at JCOS benefitted from the HCE program comes from the students themselves. One JCOS student, following a field excursion, explained "I was changed for the first time…I was challenging my social and personal issues more than ever before" (Basile, 2005, p. 358). The student went on to explain, wrote Basile (2005), that his experiences at JCOS caused him to become a better communicator, be more aware and accepting of other cultures, learn and analyze significant historical information, and broaden his vision of the world and community. Another graduate of JCOS admitted, in a letter mailed to the school following his graduation, that before attending JCOS "my world was relatively small and protected" (Basile, 2005, p. 361) and that after his experiences at JCOS "I could no longer see myself just as a responsible citizen residing in the USA" (p. 362).

The testimonials of JCOS graduates reveal that the HCE program at JCOS caused them to develop critical citizenship skills. Perhaps one of the most impressive benefits of participation in the HCE program at JCOS was how it brought personal relevance to the classroom content. This outcome is illustrated by a graduate of JCOS who wrote that after participation in the HCE program "economics could no longer be a sterile theoretical based discipline in my mind… issues of poverty, racism, multiculturalism, and philosophy bloomed with vibrancy" (Basile, 2005, p. 362). Out of the students own mouths came evidence that participation in an HCE program such as the one at JCOS could result in measurable and significant benefits successfully broadening students' minds in meaningful ways.

Evidence of benefits of engagement in civics programs incorporating aspects of HCE were found in other case studies as well. For example, in a study of students who participated in the *iCivics* online gaming experience, it was shown that "teens with the most (top 25%) civic gaming experiences are more likely to report interest and engagement in civic and political

activities than teens with the fewest (bottom 25%)" (O'Connor, 2011, pp. 10-11). Additionally, the civics students at Miami Carol City Senior High benefitted significantly from participation in a special, semester-long HCE-oriented program (Graham, 2011). As Graham (2011) related, in regard to the Miami Carol City Senior High civics course, "it was clear by the semester's end that students, having worked in the classroom to solve civic problems, felt empowered to do so in the real world, for themselves and their families" (p. 63). Because of its critical, experiential nature, high-level civics education allows students to apply civic knowledge to develop a deeper understanding of American history and political systems and empowers them to act to meaningfully impact their local and global communities.

Obstacles and arguments against civic education.

While the literature does reveal a number of obstacles and criticisms relating to general civic education, the majority of the opposition was leveled at either foundation-building civic education or high-level civic education specifically. According to Ross (2011), there are "three particular impediments to civic education: poorly conceived state requirements, a social studies discipline that sends the wrong messages about democracy and constitutional government, and civic educators' relative inability to seek crucial supplemental training" (p. 119). Kyl (2011) noted that civic education has failed to gain ground in the public arena in part because there is "the too-common view that civic education is just another subject, no different than algebra or biology [and] is not really necessary to one's daily life" (p. 37).

The fact that many students, especially in disadvantaged schools, are well below grade level in the core subjects of math and reading is a significant contributing factor to the devaluing of civic education in schools (Andrew, 2011). After all, "when students are three years behind grade level in reading and math, deciding that civic education is a luxury is not absurd" (Andrew,

2011, p. 107). These criticisms and those expressed in following sections, are significant matters of concern for proponents of civic education and are highly relevant to the type of discussion presented in this study.

Criticisms of foundation-building civic education.

As a result of the limitations and inherently fact-based scope of FCE, many scholars and critics warn of potential drawbacks. Those attacking FCE tend to focus their argument on the failure of FCE to involve critical application of knowledge and its potential to be used as a tool of indoctrination or homogenization (Barr, 2005; Gibson & McKay, 2005; Reynolds, 2011; White, 2005). Critics of FCE often ascribe to the belief espoused by John Stuart Mill, who lamented that "schools are better adapted to make disciples rather than make inquirers" (Mill in Walker, 2005, p. 303).

Barr (2005) asserted that FCE presents "knowledge as a body of core facts that need to be learned" (p. 65) effectively diminishing or stifling the interrogation of what is learned. This sentiment is echoed by Dershowitz (2011) who pointed out that "memorizing the words of the Bill of Rights is a far cry from knowing what your actual rights may be in practice" (p. 31). FCE courses, according to Ross (2011), "typically focus on the mechanics of the political process and of civic participation [and] fail to link those mechanics to the extended conversation among the founders regarding what institutions and practices are necessary to sustain self-government" (p. 121).

Critics of FCE argue that emphasizing shared values and essentialist views of knowledge has the danger of leading to indoctrination and stifling of independent, critical thought (Barr, 2005). Barr (2005) related that FCE promotes a non-critical view of active citizenship that is confined to participation in such mundane activities as voting but does not encourage students to

become actively involved in effecting meaningful change and thus promotes a passive view of citizenship. Such a view of citizenship is flawed, states Barr (2005), because “unless students feel their efforts will be effective, all the knowledge in the world is unlikely to lead them to be responsible citizens” (p. 71). As Gist and Jozwick (2009) explained, “when knowledge becomes unhitched from the flow of time and facts alone dictate action…it must be deemed as unwise” (p. 173).

Criticizing not only the content of FCE but also the method of its delivery, Gibson and McKay (2005) lamented that FCE is a “form of citizenship education that is dominated by lectures, worksheets, heavy reliance on one textbook, and structured question and answer sessions” (p. 169). White (2005) professed that “textbooks are the driving force in social education, and despite improvements, only serve to take the humanity and story out of history and social education” (p. 80). White (2005) also criticized FCE for its tendency to be shallow as a result of the overwhelming volume of knowledge attempting to be taught in short amounts of time in civics courses. In addition to being textbook-based and favoring quantity over quality, O’Connor (2011) pointed out that the content of civics courses fails to address controversial topics in American history and that such a “sugarcoated view of American history and government not only deprives students of the opportunity to understand and address the problems facing their society, but [has] also rendered civics textbooks and classes dull” (p. 9).

The picture of FCE painted by White (2005) and O’Connor (2011) is one in which there is an overemphasis on dissemination of objective facts driven by a curriculum devised by top-level bureaucrats and handed down to powerless teachers and bored students. This type of civic education, argued White (2005), has little or no “connection to kids’ lives and meaningful social

efficacy is missing" (p. 81). O'Connor (2011) agreed, and pointed out that the focus of civics classes is typically on reading textbooks and the memorization of disjointed facts.

Not only is FCE incomplete and stifling according to White (2005), but it is detrimental and harmful because it serves to perpetuate the status quo by presenting civic knowledge in a non-critical manner. In White's (2005) view, "training good citizens who can be productive workers seems the ultimate goal" (p. 87) of FCE. This falls far short of the emancipatory, empowering aims of HCE. Not only do Gibson and McKay (2005) see FCE as stifling and undemocratic, but they also assert that such curricula tend to be Eurocentric in nature. The critiques of FCE espoused by McKay and Gibson (2005) warn of the possibility of it being a tool of perpetuating oppressive structures and disempowering students. O'Connor (2011) criticized the fact that civics course have "often provided a one-sided view, failing to adequately address controversies and conflicts that citizens must confront" (p. 9).

Gibson and McKay (2005) admonish that FCE arises from "a passive vision of citizenship aimed at making homogeneous citizens who have the same body of knowledge" (p. 169). The homogenizing potential of FCE is highlighted by O'Connor (2011) who explained that:

> Critics assail the traditional approach to civic education for imposing a common culture rather than preserving elements of the diverse cultures that students brought with them to the classroom. These critics argue that the imposition of majority values made it harder for students from minority and immigrant backgrounds to perform well and that it therefore constituted an educational inequality. (p. 6)

This quote provided further warning of the potential for homogenization and assimilation as a result, or even aim, of FCE. In the view of its critics, efforts of FCE to bond people as a community actually rob individuals of their identity and efficacy. Indoctrination, memorization, and retention of prescribed facts are the defining aspects of FCE according to Gibson and

McKay (2005). In general, the attacks on FCE warn that if civics is taught as a non-critical, passive endeavor, it has the potential to disenfranchise students, perpetuate hegemony, and stifle independent thought.

Criticisms of high-level civic education.

The very defining aspects of HCE (*i.e.,* its leaning toward the critical and controversial) present potential criticisms of those supporting, promoting, and practicing HCE in schools. Criticisms of HCE address its tendency toward the contentious and controversial, its challenge of established American principles, and its devaluing of the importance of building a common American community (Basile, 2005; Hess, 2011; Rotherham, 2011). White (2005) cites the movement in education toward standardization and accountability as primary obstacles to HCE, explaining that "concepts of critical thinking, problem solving, and issues centered education are antithetical to this movement" (p. 89). Critics of HCE claim that "incorporating different cultural and gender perspectives into national curricula results in the dilution of the traditional Western canon of knowledge" (Barr, 2005, p. 61). Those supporting HCE, according to Rotherham (2011), ignore "the cultural and pedagogical value of shared knowledge" (p. 94).

As it relates to public schools, Hess (2011) admitted that it is understandable that they do not invite "critique of school organization, routine, or operations" (p. xiii) of the sort promoted in HCE because of the potential challenges and disruptions that may arise when students are encouraged to do so. In regard to barriers to HCE in the classroom, Gibson and McKay (2005) point out that because "many teachers are uncomfortable with and feel unprepared to deal with value-laden controversial issues, they tend to steer away from anything that could be perceived to be sensitive" (p. 176). Citing a real-world example of how an HCE program aroused negative criticism, Basile (2005) revealed, in his case study of Jefferson County Open School, that the

school received backlash from the community for its attempts to broaden its students' horizons with a trip to Cuba. When learning of the school's plans to take the students to Cuba, "local media critics cried communism and questioned the integrity of taking students to Cuba" (Basile, 2005, p. 360).

Hess (2011) suggests that programs that emphasize discussions of topics such as white privilege, hegemonic masculinity, systemic oppression, and anti-meritocratic aspects of American society "have deemphasized traditional sources of knowledge related to citizenship, including foundational documents" (p. xiv). As White (2005) noted, there is resistance to forms of HCE that call for challenging of the status quo because "social education as it exists is not supposed to provide empowering opportunities for children, or even provide opportunities for social efficacy, for these would threaten the powers that be" (p. 85).

Summary of civic education literature.

While the literature on civic education presents diverse, and often contradictory, views of how to define it and its aims, a careful review revealed that many of the conflicting perspectives can be reconciled in a productive manner. Rather than arguing for or against FCE or HCE, one can rationally subscribe to the view that "knowledge, when converted into wisdom, solves problems" (Gist & Jozwick, 2009, p. 174) and admit that both are advantageous and can work in harmony. After all, high-level civic education is not possible without the knowledge learned in foundation-building civic education because in HCE "students who possess basic information about history and about democracy use democratic values and principles to analyze history and current situations" (White, 2005, p. 92). As Graham (2011) argued, "for young Americans to feel empowered to operate within our political system, they need…knowledge of the system, competence to exercise their rights as citizens, and confidence in the system" (p. 63). What

emerges from a review of the literature on civic education is strong evidence supporting the argument that students should be instructed in foundation-building and high-level civic lessons as a means of providing a well-rounded, meaningful, and relevant civic education.

Federal and National Civic Education Policy

"Although public education is a state function," Dayton (2012) pointed out, "through civil rights legislation under the Fourteenth Amendment (*e.g.*,, Title VI, Title VII, Title IX, etc.), federal conditional funding grants (*e.g.*,, IDEA, NCLB, etc.), and federal court decisions concerning state public education, the federal government now exerts significant control over the daily operations of public schools" (p. 21). Accordingly, the following sections discuss how the policy decisions of the current and previous presidential administrations (*i.e.,* Presidents Barack Obama and George H. Bush) have affected civic education in the United States. Though court decisions and legislative action do have a significant impact on education policy, the scope of this study is confined to a discussion of executive policy and its effects. In addition to looking briefly at the effects of federal education policy on civic education over the previous two administrations, this study also provides an extensive overview of policy suggestions for bolstering civic education put forth by various scholars and policymakers.

Federal civic education policy from 2000 to 2008.

The majority of the federal programs promoting civic education over the past few decades have been spearheaded by the Center for Civic Education (Hickock 2011). The Center of Civic Education is a non-profit organization that has been receiving the majority of its funding from the U.S. Department of Education's Character and Civic Education division and various other federal agencies since 1987 (Hickok, 2011). The new millennium, and the election of George W. Bush, saw an apparent boost for civic education as a result of various federal policy

initiatives (Bridgeland, 2011; Hickok, 2011). The *We the People* program, which was initiated by the Center for Civic Education in September of 2002, was arguably the Bush administration's most significant project related to civic education (Bridgeland, 2011). The goal of *We the People*, according to Bridgeland (2011), was "to improve education in American history and civics and to link civic learning to the tradition of volunteer service" (p. 45). Supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities, *We the People* sponsored civics focused competitions, provided professional development for educators, and supported summer enrichment programs that provided opportunities for students to visit important historical sites via the *Landmarks of American History* program (Bridgeland, 2011).

In addition to initiating the *We the People* program, civic education was bolstered during the Bush administration as a result of the U.S. Department of Education renewing funding and support for grants provided to teachers of American history, which, according to Bridgeland (2011), was written into the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) bill by Senator Robert Byrd "partly out of concern that NCLB's focus on reading and math might narrow curricula and squeeze out other disciplines" (Hickok, 2011, p. 54). Data published by the U.S. Department of Education (2012) revealed that the *Teaching American History* grant program provided over $118 million to more than 120 recipients in 2010 alone.

Along with the *We the People* initiative and renewing of *Teaching American History* grants, the Bush administration also initiated *Our Documents*. The *Our Documents* program "provided teachers and students with facsimiles of one hundred important original documents held in the National Archives, from the Lee Resolution of 1776 to the Voting Rights Act of 1965" (Bridgeland, 2011, p. 46). In addition to providing access to primary source documents, *Our Documents* offered professional development for educators presenting workshops and

curriculum guides to help educators learn how to incorporate founding documents in their lessons (Bridgeland, 2011).

Many of the programs initiated during the Bush administration served to promote civic education in public schools, and Bridgeland (2011) stated that:

> Support for the *We the People* initiative exceeded $93 million, with $75 million from the federal government and an additional $18 million from nongovernmental sources. Funding for *Teaching American History* grants meanwhile grew to more than $118 million per year by 2010. And the *Our Documents* initiative continues to thrive. (p. 47)

Additionally, in 2003 the White House worked with the U.S. Department of Education to increase the frequency of assessment of civic knowledge by requiring that the National Assessment of Education Progress be administered every four years instead of every eight years (Bridgeland, 2011). Together, these federal programs effectively served to provide funding and support for civics education programs at the local and state levels.

Despite the various policy initiatives promoting civic education that were pioneered during the Bush administration, the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is depicted in the literature as leading to a significant de-emphasis of civic education (Graham, 2011; O'Connor, 2011). O'Connor (2011) noted that "the No Child Left Behind law and other recent educational initiatives have unintentionally contributed to the problem by assessing schools mainly according to students' performance in reading, math, and science" (p. 6). Graham (2011) asserted that in regard to civic education "the federal No Child Left Behind legislation was devastating" (p. 64). Thus, while a number of federal policy initiatives providing aid and support for civics education were put into place during the Bush administration, the passage of NCLB effectively narrowed funding and focus to reading and the STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) subjects while subsequently clouding out civics education.

Federal civic education policy from 2008 to the present.

Since 2008, and the election of President Barack Obama, civic education has been greatly devalued as a result of policy decisions and budget cuts (Cole, 2011; Levine, 2011). The Obama administration's primary educational program, Race to the Top (RTTT), provides discretionary competitive grant money to states based on reforms in four distinct areas involving 1) development of common standards with an emphasis on college and career readiness, 2) longitudinal data collection, 3) recruitment and retention of school personnel, and 4) improvement of low-performing schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). None of the four areas of foci identified in RTT place any direct emphasis on civic education. States, both those who have been awarded RTT grants and those who have not, have responded to the federal program by emphasizing college and career readiness, adopting the Common Core State Standards with a curriculum focused on math and reading, and increasing funding and assessment in core and STEM subjects (Onosko, 2011).

In 2011, Congress made significant cuts to all federal funding for civic education programs (Levine, 2011). The Obama administration has reduced funding to civic education programs championed by previous administrations, including cutting the budget of *We the People* by 27% (Cole, 2011). According to Levine (2011), the small portion of federal funding that was allocated for civics education went to programs that did not serve to promote or reward innovation. These moves indicate a decisive and intentional de-emphasis of civic education in favor of other subjects associated more directly with college and career readiness.

Not only have recent government actions in the form of law and policy diminished civic education, but inaction and avoidance has had a detrimental impact as well (Hickok, 2011). Graham (2011) claimed that the decline in civic education as a point of interest and action among

policymakers resulted from the conclusion of those on the extreme right and left that civics education was working to their disadvantage. “The two sides disagreed on the alleged bias,” explained Graham (2011), “but effectively concurred on a solution: cut civics from the curriculum” (p. 64). As Hickok (2011) explained that, “in their desire not to politicize education, politicians too often shy away from discussing anything that might link educational matters to seemingly political ones, including the teaching of history and civics” (p. 59).

Suggested national reforms promoting civic education.

A number of scholars have proposed policy, curriculum, and institutional innovations intended to bolster civic education in schools. As Junn and Niemi (1998) revealed, those addressing the problem of civic ignorance among the American citizenry “offer solutions that traverse the spectrum from anti-democratic elitist models that place power in the hands of experts and elites to participatory-democratic models that seek to transform the democratic capabilities of ordinary citizens” (p. 2). The former presupposing that those who lack civic knowledge are incapable of being educated sufficiently to participate productively in the political process, and the latter position is founded on the hope and understanding that members of society are capable of actively maintaining and furthering democratic principles and systems if they are properly educated.

As Dayton (2012) revealed, one of the primary means the federal government possesses of exerting influence over education is related to funding. Graham (2011) argued that to promote civic education the federal government must be concerned with “adequately funding elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education so that teachers and professors charged with instructing students on their rights and responsibilities as citizens have the resources needed to succeed” (p. 65). As Levine (2011) explained, “civics needs investment, especially funds for developing and

testing new tools and curricula" (p. 211). As a means of promoting civic education, Levine (2011) suggested that the Race to the Top grants should be awarded to schools, in part, based on the quality of their civic education programs. Levine (2011) called for more federal funding for pilot tests of innovative civics programs in schools. Ultimately, Levine (2011) argued that the federal government should "allocate funds on a highly competitive basis to school districts or organizations that propose to achieve substantial increases in students civic skills, knowledge, and values through innovative approaches that could be rigorously tested and then widely imitated if they worked" (p. 212). In effect, Levine suggests financial rewards for those schools demonstrating effective implementation of civics programs with measurable results.

Former Secretary Rod Paige (2011) offered two policy suggestions that he deems as beneficial to the cause of furthering civic education. First, Paige (2011) suggested that decisions regarding educational standards be safeguarded against politicization by excluding those who are not educators or scholars from the development process. His argument is that "we can and must reduce the extent to which politics distorts decisions about education in general and history education in particular" (Paige, 2011, p. 77). Politics can be prevented from having undue influence on education policy, according to Paige (2011), "by devising education governance structures that are protected from political extremism" (p. 77). Protecting the curriculum from self-serving political forces and entities, thus, is accomplished by devising systems in which decisions are made by those who are educated and qualified to do so, and who are most likely to act in the best interest of the students. The second policy suggestion made by Paige (2011) called for the adoption of national standards for civic education. Paige (2011) argued that "national standards would entail fewer decision points than currently exist in our system… [and] with the development of national standards, one could expect fewer opportunities for decisions to

be heavily swayed by political influence" (p. 78). If such standards were put in place, schools could be required to test students with mandatory federal assessments as suggested by Levine (2011).

Levine (2011) presented a number of additional policy proposals as means of advancing civic education in schools. First, Levine (2011) suggested that students should be required to anonymously report on the degree and extent to which their schools offer opportunities for civic education and involvement. He explained that student survey responses would be utilized to assess schools' civic education programs and that:

> Schools would be held accountable for offering civic learning opportunities equitably across their student bodies… schools districts, states, or the federal government could give recognition to schools that scored well… [and] the same government bodies could provide support to those that performed badly and could impose sanctions for failure to improve. (Levine, 2011, p. 214)

Such a system would serve to supplement data collected from formal assessments of students' civic knowledge.

Secondly, Levine (2011) proposed that assessment of students' civic knowledge and abilities should be performance-based rather than based on their ability to answer multiple-choice questioned correctly on standardized tests. Such an assessment would, according to Levine (2011), involve "knowledge of principles and facts, collaboration with others, and advanced skills" (p. 214). A third suggestion of Levine (2011) was that civic education should no longer be a suboffice within the Department of Education's Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools but should instead have a prominent new office of its own. The function of this new federal office of civic education would be to "address the complex issues involved with improving civics nationwide…[and] its work would be informed by an expanded National Assessment of Educational Progress in civics" (Levine, 2011, p. 215).

Hickok (2011) suggested that reform of teacher certification and education programs is needed to promote better quality civic education. He argued that:

> In far too many states history teachers are trained and certified in what is called social studies, which typically includes a mix of history, economics, sociology, geography, and political science… but a teacher certified to teach all of them is likely to lack real depth in any one of them. (Hickok, 2011, p. 56)

Additionally, Hickok (2011) called for major reform or abolishing of college and university schools of education as a way of bolstering civic education. Hickok (2011) claimed that as long as teacher preparation programs "emphasize pedagogical theory and classroom management over mastery of subject matter – the problems plaguing the teaching of history and civics will continue" (p. 57). Another possible means of better educating students in civics proposed by Hickok (2011) is the use of adjunct instructors and professionals from the community to help educate students in the classroom. The concluding argument of Hickok (2011) was that institutions outside of schools should be looked to as providers of civic knowledge and skills because "schools appear poorly suited for this task" (p. 58).

Other scholars look to school choice and privatization as a means of bolstering civic education. According to a study by Wolf (2007), students attending private schools and public schools of choice have more advanced civic knowledge and skills than their peers attending traditional public schools. Campbell (2010) found that private school students are more likely than traditional public schools students to participate in community service, display civic knowledge, possess and use civic skills, and have greater political efficacy. Citing those findings, Lefkowitz (2011) argued that policies furthering school choice and privatization have promise as a means of promoting civic education. He asserted that policymakers should support legislation that allows for such things as publicly funded education vouchers for private schools and funding for public schools of choice because "studies indicate that school choice and private

schooling generally have a significantly positive impact on the realization of civic values among students" (Lefkowitz, 2011, p. 193). According to Lefkowitz (2011), school choice demonstrated promise as a means of bolstering civic education.

The literature often highlights the significant effect that policy has on the curriculum decisions of those devising state and local curricula. Policymakers, suggested Bridgeland (2011), "should attempt to foster civic learning across the curriculum, enabling students to develop civic skills not only in history and government classes, but in science, social studies, English, foreign languages and other subjects" (pp. 47-48). Gibson and McKay (2005) offered a number of guiding principles for consideration in the creation of civic education curriculum, including placing an emphasis on preparing children for democratic citizenship, balancing importance of national and global citizenship, encouraging active student participation, engaging students in ethical decision making tasks, building efficacy, combating alienation, embracing diversity, and teaching compassion. White (2005) suggested that "a less is more approach to social studies would enable students to process content and ideas, and develop an in-depth understanding, rather than a surface understanding of facts that will soon be forgotten" (p. 95). Such an approach is supported by Hickok (2011) who proposed that civic education would be well served by separating subjects that are taught under the umbrella of social studies into distinct courses. Levine (2011) agreed that civics education would be better served by reducing the scope of the content, and he additionally suggested that civics be granted more instructional time.

Graham (2011) summarized the core argument of those proposing policy, curriculum, and institutional reforms to promote civic education by exclaiming that "lawmakers should restore civic education to its traditional role as a main component of the primary and secondary

curriculum, and include civics and the social sciences as subjects on which student progress is systematically evaluated" (p. 65). The policy suggestions offered by the scholars referenced herein will not gain ground until policymakers at the federal, state, and local levels embrace the importance of civic education as a coequal aim of schools that are now designed with a focus on college and career readiness (Graham, 2011). For the focus to be broadened beyond college and career readiness, the entire discussion and direction of education policy will have to be altered in a way that goes beyond an emphasis on preparing citizens for post-secondary education and entering the workforce to teaching them to be informed and engaged political actors.

Summary of literature on federal civic education policy.

A review of the literature on recent federal education policy and its effects on civic education shows that the ubiquitous focus on college and career readiness, emphasis on teaching math and reading content to the exclusion of other subjects, and the accountability movement founded in standardization and high-stakes testing has crowded out the importance of civic education (Bridgeland, 2011; Graham, 2011; Hess, 2011; Hickok, 2011). According to Hickok (2011), "the weakness of history and civic education is a symptom of the United States' larger education malaise" (p. 52). As Hess (2011) revealed, there is a lot of talk about education as a tool for promoting civil rights in American society but this discussion "has necessarily and usefully focused educators, advocates, and policymakers on test scores and on whether schools are preparing students for college and careers… [leading to] the devaluing of preparation for citizenship" (p. xi). "This approach," explained O'Connor (2011), "pressures teachers to focus on subjects that are tested at the expense of others, such as civics and history" (p. 7). Levine (2011) pointed to the fact that civics is often not formally tested as a contributor to the decline of civic education.

The literature reveals that policymakers have done a great deal to undermine the importance of civic education in schools (Graham, 2011; Levine, 2011; O'Connor, 2011). The STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) receive a highly disproportionate amount of funding at both the national and local levels (Ross, 2011). An overemphasis on those subjects, explained Bridgeland (2011), has led schools to abandon other subjects including civics. As Graham (2011) explained, "politicians have injured citizenship education not only through fierce partisanship, bickering, and horse trading, but by undermining – or by at least ignoring – the Jeffersonian standard of education" (p. 64). While there are numerous and varied policy reforms promoted by scholars and practitioners as having potential to promote civic education in the United States, the current political climate and education policy initiatives are decidedly focused on college preparation, career readiness, and accountability as measured by performance on high-stakes testing in subjects other than civics.

State-level Civic Education Policy

According to Tenth Amendment of the *Constitution of the United States* (1787), "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." Because public education is not an enumerated power of the federal government, it falls to the states to establish laws, rules, and policies regarding public education. State constitutions, legislative bodies, executive bodies, and the state judiciaries establish and oversee the regulations relating to public education. Both Georgia and New Hampshire have various governmental bodies (*e.g.,* state legislatures, state courts, and state departments of education) that act to establish educational laws, standards, and guidelines. This section presents information regarding the structure and function of Georgia and New Hampshire state governments relevant to the development of civic education policy.

Of specific interest to this study are the laws and guidelines established by the state concerning high school graduation requirements, mandated high school testing, and educational standards/curriculum.

Georgia civic education policy.

Article V of the *Constitution of the State of Georgia* (1982) provides for the executive branch, with Section I establishing the roles of Governor and Lieutenant Governor and Section II outlining the duties and powers of the Governor. Paragraph IX of Article V, Section II of the *Constitution of the State of Georgia* (1982), states that "the Governor shall make such appointments as are authorized by this Constitution by law" (p. 35). Included in such appointments are the members of the State Board of Education, which is established in Article VIII, Section II of the *Georgia Constitution* where it states that "there shall be a Board of Education which shall consist of one member from each congressional district in the state appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate" (*Constitution of the State of Georgia*, 1982, p. 59).

The Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) was established in 1870 and is headed by the state superintendant of schools who ultimately reports to the governor (Huff, 2013). The State School Superintendant works along with the Georgia Board of Education to create and adopt education policy. According to the GaDOE (2014), the purpose of the GaDOE is to oversee public education and ensure that education laws and regulations are followed.

Georgia civic education standards.

A primary duty of the state board of education is to develop and communicate educational standards, and through those standards, which mandate what is to be taught and tested, the state boards exert powerful influence on institutions of public education (Kirst & Wirt,

2009). According to Official Code of Georgia Annotated (OCGA) §20-2-140, the Georgia State Board of Education is mandated to adopt a uniform, sequenced curriculum for grades kindergarten through twelfth. The GaDOE Division of Standards Based Learning within the Office of Curriculum and Instruction works "to provide rigorous standards, quality instructional resources and online professional learning materials" (GaDOE Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment, 2014, para. 1). Currently, Georgia mandates that schools implement the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) that were adopted in 2010 by the State Board of Education (GaDOE, 2014). Prior to the CCGPS, Georgia schools were required to operate in accordance with the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) which were implemented beginning in 2005 (Grant, 2013). Before the GPS, Georgia education standards were based off of the Quality Core Curriculum (QCC), which came about as a result of enactment of the Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) of 1985 (Grant , 2013).

The development and implementation of education standards in Georgia, including those driving civics or social studies instruction, has been done so in accordance with, and influenced by, political and social pressures (Grant, 2013; Kingdon, 2011; Kirst & Wirt, 2009). For two decades, Georgia education standards were guided by the QCC. The QCC standards were Georgia's first prescribed curriculum and they were implemented to comply with the QBE (Greer, 2013). While the QCC provided greater guidance than previously afforded, the QCC has been depicted as vague, incomplete, and failing to encourage higher-order thinking (Barbour, Evans, & Ritter, 2007). Specifically concerning social studies or civics education, Barbour, Evans, and Ritter (2007) explained that the QCC standards were structured so that important historical events and political issues were presented in a way that encouraged a reduction that "could easily be drilled down into discrete facts that could appear on an end of course test" (p.

29) and were crafted with obvious influence by conservative actors who aimed to preserve the grand narrative of white America.

In 2003, a study conducted by Phi Delta Kappa International revealed that the QCC standards “did not meet national standards and could not be completed in twelve years” (Grant, 2013, p. 2). As a result, the Georgia State Board of Education created and adopted the GPS in 2005. The GPS provided a more rigorous guide to social studies educators, requiring a more nuanced and complete teaching of history and political systems which included alternative voices and historical perspectives challenging the grand conservative narrative (Barbour, Evans, & Ritter, 2007). In 2010, the State Board of Education adapted the GPS to conform to the Common Core Standards, resulting in the CCGPS (Greer, 2013). This move was made in accordance with the federally granted NCLB waiver and in efforts to comply with Race to the Top requirements.

The Common Core Standards provide specific standards for mathematics and language arts and address other subjects, including social studies, only in terms of literacy. According to the Common Core State Standards Initiative Frequently Asked Questions (2014), language arts and math standards were developed to the exclusion of others “because they are areas on which students build skill sets which are used in other subjects” (p. 2) and there are currently plans to develop standards in the areas of science, world languages, and arts but not civics or social studies. Thus, the adoption of the CCGPS has not caused a change in the social studies standards in Georgia, within which civics is categorized. So, the standards for social studies are still based on the GPS standards initiated in 2005 (GaDOE, 2014).

According to the Georgia Department of Education: Georgia Performance Standards for Social Studies (2014), “the Georgia Performance Standards for Social Studies,” within which

civics is encompassed, "were designed to develop informed Georgia citizens who understand the history of the United States and our place in an ever increasing interconnected world" (para. 1). Social Studies teachers, according to the GaDOE, should accomplish the goal of helping to develop informed citizens by making connections between past and present events, assist students in using and understanding the significance of primary and secondary sources, introduce multiple perspectives of events for consideration, lead students in speculation about motives of historical actions, and integrate the different Social Studies themes in the classroom (GaDOE, 2014). The specific standards for 9th through 12th grade American Government and Civics are included as a subcategory within the Social Studies GPS and consist of 22 distinct standards with varying numbers of specific guidelines for each standard. The American Government/Civics standards are designed to "provide students with a background in the philosophy, functions, and structure of the United States government [and] examine the structure and function of the United States government and its relationship to states and citizens" (GeorgiaStandards.org: American Government/Civics, 2014, p. 1).

Appendix A lists the 22 American Government/Civics GPS and accompanying guidelines as specified by the GaDOE (2014). Overall, considering the broad standards and guiding details, there are 79 civics GPS. Civics GPS, as displayed in Appendix A, range from broad and general to very detailed. Broad civics GPS include demands for students "to demonstrate knowledge of the political philosophies that shaped the development of the United States" and "to demonstrate knowledge of the *United States Constitution*" (GeorgiaStandards.org: American Government/Civics, 2014, p. 1). Examples of more detailed guidelines in the civics GPS include requirements for students to "compare and contrast the *Declaration of Independence* and the

Social Contract Theory" and "explain the function of lobbyists" (GeorgiaStandards.org: American Government/Civics, 2014, p. 1-2).

In addition to the 22 GPS listed in Appendix A, all social studies courses are required to incorporate the CCGPS Reading/Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies. The literacy standards are general guidelines for incorporating language arts standards and skills into social studies and science courses and do not specify civics content to be taught, so are not included in this study. The language and content of the civics GPS is analyzed in detail in Chapter 3.

Georgia high school graduation requirements.

This section presents the specific rules established by the GaDOE concerning graduation from a Georgia public school with a high school diploma. A high school diploma is "the document awarded to students certifying that they have satisfied attendance requirements, unit requirements and the state assessment requirements as reference in Rule 160-3-1-.007" (GaDOE State Education Rules, 2014, 160-4-2-.48(2)(f)(1)). High school diplomas are one of the three secondary school credentials awarded by Georgia high schools, the other two being high school certificates and special education diplomas. Because high school certificates and special education diplomas are based on partial or modified curriculum, and do not follow the general rules established by the GaDOE, this study is confined to a discussion of rules regarding qualifications for earning a high school diploma.

Currently, as established by the Georgia State Board of Education Rule 160-4-2-.48, in order for Georgia public high school students to graduate with a high school diploma, they must complete a minimum of 23 units of credit in particular areas of study. The GaDOE State Education Rules (2014) specify that "one unit of credit [is] awarded for a minimum of 150 clock

hours of instruction or 135 hours of instruction in an approved block schedule" (160-4-2-.48(2)(h)). Table 1 outlines the specific units required for each area of study. The GaDOE State Education Rules (2014) mandate, in Rule 160-4-2-.48(3)(5)(IV), that of the three units of social studies credit mandated, it is required that one unit be United State History, one unit be World History, and that American Government/Civics and Economics each be one-half unit. In that one-half unit of Government/Civics and Economics, which equates to 75 clock hours of instructional time or 67.5 hours in a block schedule, teachers are mandated to teach all of the GPS listed in Appendix A as instructed by Rule 160-4-2-.48(3)(4)(i) which states that "unit credit shall be awarded only for courses that include concepts and skills based on the GPS or CCGPS" (GaDOE State Education Rules, 2014).

In addition to attaining the specified number and type of credits, students must meet attendance requirements. Student attendance guidelines, including those related to high school graduation, are defined by O.C.G.A. § 20-2-690.1 and Rule 160-5-1-.10 of the Georgia State Board of Education. O.C.G.A. § 20-2-690.1 establishes compulsory attendance in public, private, or home school for children between 6 and 16. According to Rule 160-5-1-.10(1)(e), any child who is subject to the compulsory attendance law established by O.C.G.A. § 20-2-690.1 is considered truant if accruing five unexcused absences during a school calendar year. A truant high school student, based on the laws and rules established by O.C.G.A. § 20-2-690.1, Rule 160-5-1-.10(1)(e), and Rule 160-3-1-.007, is subject to penalization by forfeiture of units of credits required for graduation.

Table 1: Units Required per Area of Study for Georgia Graduation

Area of Study	Units Required	Credit Requirements	
English/Language Arts	4	American Literature	1
		9th Grade Literature	1
		Electives	2
Mathematics	4	GPS Algebra	1
		GPS Geometry	1
		GPS Advanced Algebra	1
		Electives	1
Science	4	Biology	1
		Physical Science	1
		Chemistry, Earth Systems, Environmental Science, or AP/IB	1
		Elective	1
Social Studies	3	U. S. History	1
		World History	1
		American Government/Civics	0.5
		Economics	0.5
CTAE and/or Modern Language/Latin and/or Fine Arts	3	N/A	
Health and Physical Education	1	N/A	
Electives	4	N/A	

Data source: Georgia Department of Education State Education Rules (2014).

Georgia mandated high school testing.

In addition to meeting attendance and credit requirements, Rule 16-3-1-.07 mandates that to graduate with a high school diploma in Georgia students must satisfy requirements on specific end of course tests, the Georgia High School Writing Test, and the Georgia High School Graduation Test. End of course tests (EOCTs) are assessments that students are required to take at the completion of certain core courses (*i.e.,* English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies) in high school, according to O.C.G.A. § 20-2-281(f) and Rule 160-3-1-.07(h). O.C.G.A. § 20-2-281(f) requires that students in grades 9 through 12 complete end-of-course assessments for all core subjects and O.C.G.A. § 20-2-281(j)(2) states that the results of EOCT must "be included as a factor in a student's final grade in the core subject course for which the end-of-course assessment is given." The GaDOE End of Course Tests (2014) explains that "the EOCT align with Georgia's state mandated content standards and include assessment of specific content knowledge and skills" (para. 6). Currently, the GaDOE requires students to complete EOCT for four math courses, two social studies courses, two science courses, and two language arts courses mandating that the EOCT be counted as 20% of students' final grades in those courses according to Rule 160-4-2-.13. The two social studies courses that have EOCT are United States History and Economics/Business/Free Enterprise. There is currently no EOCT requirement for American Government/Civics courses.

The Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHSGT) is being phased out and only students who entered high school before July 2011 must meet GHSGT requirements. Rule 160-3-1-.07(j)(1) states that all students who entered high school before June 30, 2011 are required to post passing scores on the GHSGT as one requirement to be eligible to receive a high school diploma. A provision is made in Rule 160-3-1-.07(j)(2), where it indicates that:

> Students who entered ninth grade for the first time between July 1, 2008, and June 30, 2011, may satisfy the GHSGT requirement for graduation by achieving proficiency (meeting the standard) on one of the two End of Course Tests (EOCT) in each subject area (language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) or passing the corresponding subject-area GHSGT. (GaDOE State Education Rules, 2014, Rule 160-3-1-.07(j)(2))

According to Rule 160-3-1-.07(j)(3), any student who entered ninth grade on or after July 1, 2011 is not required to take or pass the GHSGT.

The current Social Studies GHSGT includes questions from five domains, including American Government/Civics, United States History to 1865, United States History since 1865, Geography, and World History (GeorgiaStandards.org: American Government/Civics, 2014). Comprising approximately 18% of the test, The American Government/Civics domain is based on the assertion that students "must understand the philosophy, functions, and structure of the United States government" (GaDOE Georgia High School Graduation Test Content Descriptors: Social Studies, 2010, p. 4). Ultimately, the Social Studies GHSGT is structured to cover the CCGPS presented in Appendix A and to provide a statewide common assessment for that subject area.

The Georgia High School Writing Test (GHSWT) is defined in Rule 160-3-1-.07 as "a perform-based writing assessment" (GaDOE State Education Rules, 2014) that students are required to pass to graduate with a high school diploma. Guidelines for the GHSWT are established by Rule 160-3-1-.07(j)(4) which states that "all students who entered ninth grade after July 1, 1991 must pass the Georgia High School Writing Test (GHSWT) as one requirement for receiving a high school diploma" (GaDOE State Education Rules, 2014, Rule 160-3-1-.07(j)(4)). Additionally, Rule 160-3-1-.07(j)(4) indicates that the GHSWT will first be administered to students in the fall of their junior year. A description of the GHSWT offered by the GaDOE Georgia High School Writing Test (2014) indicates that it requires students to

respond to a persuasive writing prompt by producing one on-demand composition of two pages or less. The GHSWT focuses on students' ability to effectively argue a position and has no clear tie to civics or any other particular content area other than language arts. Together, the prescribed CCGPS curriculum, high school graduation requirements, and testing mandates constitute what students are required to learn and be able to do before graduating from public, secondary school in Georgia.

New Hampshire civic education policy.

Article XLI of the *Constitution of New Hampshire* (1784) provides the guidelines for the administrative branch, establishing that "there shall be a supreme executive magistrate, who shall be styled the Governor of the State of New Hampshire" (New Hampshire State Constitution, 2007. art. 41). The powers of the Governor of New Hampshire relating the appointment of executive officers are outlined in Article XLVI, and among the governor's appointments are included the members of the State Board of Education. In accordance with the guidelines established in the state constitution, the New Hampshire State Board of Education was established in 1919 (Hall & Wallace, 1999). According to the New Hampshire Department of Education: About Us (2014), the mission of the New Hampshire Department of Education (NHDOE) is "to provide educational leadership and services which promote equal educational opportunities and quality practices and programs that enable New Hampshire residents to become fully productive members of society" (para. 1). The NHDOE works along with the state legislative and judiciary bodies to establish educational policy via the institution of statutes, rules, and court rulings.

New Hampshire civic education standards.

Within the NHDOE, the Bureau of Accountability and Assessment is responsible for developing and revising the content area standards (NHDOE, 2014). Pursuant to Ed 306.461 and Revised Statutes Annotated (RSA) 186:13 and 189:11, the NHDOE Bureau of Accountability and Assessment has developed specific educational standards for all core subjects including social studies and civics. RSA 186:13 outlines the 11 legal purposes for use of state education funds provided to public schools, one of which is:

> For the Americanization of immigrants, for the teaching of those 14 years of age and over to speak and read English and to appreciate and respect the civic and social institutions of the United States, and for instruction in the duties of citizenship. (State of New Hampshire Revised Statutes Online, 2014, RSA 186:13(II))

Local school boards are charged with the duty of providing an education that effectively instructs students in knowledge and skills needed to function as future adult citizens in RSA 189:1.

Ed 306.461 outlines four broad social studies program directives relating to specific instructional practices designed to “prepare students both civically and historically,” (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014, Ed 306.461) including instruction in certain knowledge, vocabulary, and experience relating to cross-cutting social studies concepts, integration of core disciplinary principles and social studies practices, and provision of learning progressions providing knowledge in specified core disciplinary areas. Of particular interest to civic education are the demands that public school social studies programs “support a foundation for citizenship by providing students with an understanding of the legacy of our republic and its enduring themes” (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014, Ed 306.461(b)(1)(a)), “prepare students for college or career, and citizenship” (Ed 306.461(b)(1)(f)), instruct students in “civic ideals, practices, and engagement” (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014, Ed 306.461(b)(3)(b)) and “patterns of social and political interaction” (NHDOE Administrative

Rules for Education, 2014, Ed 306.461(b)(3)(i)). Ed 306.461(b)(4)(a) defines the knowledge and experience required of civics and government courses; including instruction in the purpose and nature of government, structure and function of both the state and federal government, the United States' place in the world, and rights and responsibilities of citizens.

Education standards for each major subject area, including language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, art, health, technology, physical education, and world languages, are presented in what are termed "curriculum frameworks" by the NHDOE. The first social studies curriculum framework in New Hampshire was established in 1994, modified in 2004, and was then revised again most recently in 2006 (NHDOE, 2014). Revisions of the social studies standards result from the mandate by state law RSA 193-C1 that frameworks in all major subject areas be revised and updated regularly. Evolution of the initial social studies standards adopted in 1994, via revision, has been guided by conscious efforts to, according to the NHDOE, reduce the number of standards, establish clearer guidelines for learning, and promote higher-level thinking and understanding. The NHDOE claims that standard revisions have been informed by scholarly research, college and workforce surveys, assessment data, comparative analysis of other state and national standards, and the NAEP framework.

While the curriculum frameworks in all subject areas other than language arts and mathematics continue to be based on the New Hampshire Minimum Standards for Public School Approval set forth in Ed 306, the NHDOE adopted the New Hampshire College and Career Ready Standards (NH CCRS) in 2011 which include revised standards for mathematics and language arts. According to the New Hampshire College and Career Ready Standards (2014), the NH CCRS "were adopted after a state-led effort referred to as the Common Core State

Standards Initiative… [and] include the critical skills and dispositions, or competencies, necessary for skills in careers, college, and life" (para. 1).

The current New Hampshire K-12 Social Studies Curriculum Framework (NH SSCF) follows the guidelines established by RSA 186:13, RSA 189:1, and in Ed 306.461. According to the K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework (2006), the NH SSCF "serves as a guide to what New Hampshire students should know and be able to do within the Social Studies" (p. 4). The NH SSCF is categorized in three parts; 1) 10 social studies themes, 2) essential social studies skills, and 3) five subject areas or strands. Each of the 10 themes and a number of the skills outlined in the NH SSCF relate either directly or indirectly to civic education, but of primary relevance to civic education are the standards established under the Civics and Governments strand.

The 10 themes enumerated in the NH SSCF include 1) conflict and cooperation, 2) civic ideals, practices, and engagement, 3) people, places, and environment, 4) material wants and needs, 5) cultural development, interaction, and change, 6) global transformation, 7) science, technology, and society, 8) individualism, equality, and authority, 9) patterns of social and political interaction, and 10) human expression and communication. Table 2 provides examples of how each theme relates to civic education topics. As demonstrated in Table 2, the 10 social studies themes expressed in the NH SSCF are broad in nature and not necessarily tied directly to civics education but in practice do relate to certain civics-based content.

Table 2: Social Studies Themes and Relationships to Civics	
Theme	**Related Civics Topics**
Conflict and cooperation	Local attempts at conservation, and legitimate authority
Civic ideals, practices, and engagement	Suffrage, civic participation, and the role of the citizen in community, nation, and world
People, places, and environment	Public land use
Material wants and needs	Role of government in economy and services
Cultural development, interaction, and change	Nationalism, types of authority, safe-guards against abuse of authority, voting rights, rules preventing bullying, individual vs. group, core values, means of expansion of nations, and ways values are expressed
Global transformations	International organizations, and human rights balanced with cultural traditions
Science, technology, and society	Intellectual property rights issues
Individualism, equality, and authority	Types of authority, safe-guards against abuse of authority, voting rights, rules preventing bullying, individual vs. group, core values and means of expansion of nations and ways values are expressed
Patterns of social and political interaction	Human rights issues
Human expression and communication	Freedom of expression
Data source: K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework (2006)	

In addition to the 10 social studies themes, the K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework (2006) includes a number of "Essential Skills for Social Studies" that "are used throughout the Social Studies [and] cannot be separated from the teaching of content" (p. 6) in the NH SSCF. The essential social studies skills, specifying what student should be able to do on completing the social studies program, are categorized in three broad sections; 1) acquiring information, 2) organizing and communicating information, and 3) real-world application of social studies skills. While all of the essential social studies skills listed in the NH SSCF could be used in the teaching and learning of civics content, the civic participation skills under the "real-world application" umbrella are most directly related. New Hampshire social studies students are expected, according to the NH SSCF, to develop civic participation skills such as keeping informed on important societal issues, identifying the need for civic action, influencing individuals in leadership positions in the name of freedom and justice, and fulfilling the responsibilities of a United States citizen (NHDOE, 2014). These "real-world" skills require the type of application characteristic of HCE.

The actual content required to be taught in high school civics and government courses is expressed in the New Hampshire Social Studies Curriculum Framework by four general standards, each with three or four accompanying sub-standards offering curricular details. All four general standards, and the accompanying sub-standards, are intended to accomplish the explicit goal and purpose of educating "students to understand the purpose, structure, and functions of government; the political process; the rule of law; and world affairs [and] to teach students to become responsible, knowledgeable citizens, committed to participation in public affairs" (K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework, 2006, p. 77). Appendix B lists the general and specific standards expressed in the 9th through 12th grade Civics and

Government subsection of the NH SSCF, along with associated themes for each specific standard.

As depicted in Appendix B, the high school Civics and Government Standards included in the New Hampshire Social Studies Curriculum Framework provide both general and specific guidelines for what is to be taught in civics courses in New Hampshire secondary public schools. In total, there are 17 civics NH SSCF, with 4 general standards and 13 specific standards. The general civics NH SSCF standards provide broad guidance to what students are required to learn, including such demands as "students will demonstrate an understanding of the nature of government" and "student will demonstrate an understanding of the relationship of the United States to other countries" (K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework, 2006, p. 77 & 79). Examples of specific civics NH SSCF standards include requirements for students to "analyze the *United States Constitution* as a living document" and "describe the roles and responsibilities of the United States and New Hampshire judicial systems" (K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework, 2006, p. 78). The NH SSCG civics standards are analyzed in detail in Chapter 3.

New Hampshire high school graduation requirements.

High school graduation requirements for New Hampshire public schools are established by the NHDOE in Ed 306.27. Ed 306.27(q) outlines the three different types of diplomas that can be awarded by New Hampshire public high schools; regular diplomas, special diplomas, and equivalency diplomas. For the purposes of this study, guidelines for awarding regular diplomas are exclusively discussed because regular diplomas require completion of the standard curriculum and assessment requirements established by the NHDOE and New Hampshire General Court. "A school shall award a regular diploma," as set forth in Ed 306.27(q)(1), "for

achievement and demonstration of the graduation competencies" (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014, Ed 306.27(q)(1)). "Competencies," as defined by Ed 306.01(d), are learning targets for students that represent important content-based knowledge and skills and "graduation competencies [are] specific types of competencies that are common across the district and define learning expectations for each student for graduation from high school" (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014, Ed 306.01(d)). Graduation competencies are based on accumulation of a prescribed number and type of credits taught by certified educators (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014).

According to Ed 306.27(f), "credits shall be based on the demonstration of district and/or graduation competencies not on time spent achieving these competencies [and] shall equate to the level of rigor and achievement necessary to master competencies" (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014, Ed 306.27(f)). Student work collections and assessment data are used to determine whether or not a student has completed a specific graduation competency, and on completion of graduation competencies a student receives an "acknowledgement of achievement" which is awarded "when a student has demonstrated achievement of district competencies and or graduation competencies consistent with RSA 193-C:3" (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014, Ed 306.02(a)).

RSA 193-C:3 is a New Hampshire General Court statute that establishes and outlines the requirements for the Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment System. According to RSA 193-C:3, the Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program was created and acts to set learning objectives, development learning assessments, report assessments to the public, provide for accountability, and improve instruction and student learning (State of New Hampshire Revised Statutes Online, 2014). In addition to setting the program's general aims,

RSA 193-C:3 mandates that the Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program develop objective assessments based on established educational standards, establish consistent standards for all students, generate data that informs educational practices, and releases student achievement data to all stakeholders and government offices. Of primary importance to this study is that Ed 306.02(a) requires that student satisfaction of graduation competencies must meet the standards established by RSA 193-C:3.

The specific number credits required to earn a regular high school diploma is set at a minimum of 20 by Ed 306.27(k), which specifies that while the state minimum is 20 credits local school boards are able to set the minimum credit requirement above 20 at their discretion (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014). To achieve the mandatory 20 credits, the NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education (2014) indicate, in Ed 306.27(1)(4), that "local school boards shall ensure that courses necessary to meet the requirements for attaining graduation competencies are offered." The minimum course and credit requirements by program area are listed in Ed 306.27(1)(5) and Ed 306.27(t), and are outlined in Table 3. As depicted in Table 3, course requirements do not directly correspond to credit requirements and some required courses do not have associated credit requirements

New Hampshire mandated high school testing.

Although there are no statewide graduation testing requirements in New Hampshire, the NHDOE does mandate certain statewide testing pursuant to the New Hampshire Educational Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP), RSA 193-C, and RSA 193-E.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Table 3: Required Program Areas, Courses, and Credits</th></tr>
<tr><th>Required Program Area</th><th>Number of Courses</th><th colspan="2">Number of Credits</th></tr>
<tr><td>Arts education</td><td>3</td><td colspan="2">½</td></tr>
<tr><td>Business education</td><td>3</td><td colspan="2">N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Family and consumer science</td><td>3</td><td colspan="2">N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Information and communication technologies</td><td>½ or demonstrated proficiency</td><td colspan="2">½</td></tr>
<tr><td>World languages</td><td>5</td><td colspan="2">N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>Health education</td><td>½</td><td colspan="2">½</td></tr>
<tr><td>Physical education</td><td>2</td><td colspan="2">1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Technology education</td><td>4</td><td colspan="2">N/A</td></tr>
<tr><td>English</td><td>6</td><td colspan="2">4</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mathematics</td><td>6</td><td colspan="2">3</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Science</td><td rowspan="2">5</td><td>Physical</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>Biological</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Social Studies</td><td rowspan="4">5</td><td>US and NH History</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>US and NH government/civics</td><td>½</td></tr>
<tr><td>Economics</td><td>½</td></tr>
<tr><td>World history, global studies, or geography</td><td>½</td></tr>
<tr><td>Open electives</td><td>N/A</td><td colspan="2">6</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>43</td><td colspan="2">20</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Data source: NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education (2014)</td></tr>
</table>

Currently, the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) test is used to assess students in grades 3 through 8, and 11 in certain subject areas and "the results from the state tests are used to produce individual-student proficiency reports as well as diagnostic reports at the school, district, and state levels" (NH Educational Improvement and Assessment Program, 2014, para. 2). According to the NHDOE (2014), the NECAP test is designed to measure student learning of grade-level expectations developed as a common set of learning guidelines via collaborative efforts of the New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont Departments of Education.

Students in New Hampshire public schools take the Reading and Math NECAP in grades 3 through 8 and 11, the Writing NECAP in grades 5, 8, and 11, and the Science NECAP in grades 4, 8, and 11. According to the NHDOE Social Studies Assessment (2014), "Social Studies is no longer included in the NHEIAP, and is also not included in NECAP [and] at this time, there are no plans to restore Social Studies assessment at the state level" (para. 1). While the NECAP is used as a graduation requirement in Rhode Island, that is not the case in Vermont or New Hampshire. The NHDOE (2014) is moving schools away from the NECAP test, and has developed and piloted a new Smarter Balanced Assessment that will replace the NECAP beginning in the spring of 2015. The Smarter Balanced Assessment is intended to "provide a fair and reliable system of next-generation assessment for English language arts and mathematics for grades 3-8 and 11 aligned to Common Core State Standards" (NHDOE Smarter Balanced Assessment Transition Frequently Asked Questions, 2013, p. 2). As with Georgia, civic education policy in New Hampshire is shaped by the collection of laws and regulations concerning high school graduation, mandated testing, and education standards.

Summary of state-level civic education policy.

Both Georgia and New Hampshire have public education systems governed by laws established in their state constitutions, statutes issued by state legislative bodies, state court rulings, and rules developed by state departments of education. Multiple governmental departments and agencies contribute to the overarching civic education policy in each state, with the specific requirements for high school graduation, mandated testing, and curriculum/standards being derived from state law and department of education rules. While both Georgia and New Hampshire have specific laws and rules in place governing what is to be taught and tested in schools and what students must accomplish before graduating from secondary schooling, there are numerous significant differences in the specifics of their public education systems.

The details presented in this section provide a comprehensive overview of public, secondary education programs in both Georgia and New Hampshire. This information, along with the data concerning civic health presented in the following section, will be the primary subject of analysis in Chapter 3 of this dissertation.

Civic Health in Georgia and New Hampshire

Civic health can be defined as "the degree to which residents talk to neighbors, spend time with friends or family, participate in community groups, vote, talk about politics, and act to further a civic interest" (National Conference on Citizenship, 2014, para. 1). The National Conference on Citizenship (2014) lists a number of ways that strong civics health can benefit communities, including 1) contributing to the maintenance of democratic systems, 2) building consensus for policy via active citizenship, 3) developing social cohesion, 4) bettering public health, 5) improving child development and adolescent well-being, 6) lowering crime rates and youth delinquency, and 7) bolstering economic resilience. With the goal of gathering and

providing data to policymakers, communities, and the media to promote discussion concerning civic health, the National Conference on Citizenship (NCoC) has worked in partnership with various national, state, and local organizations to develop Civic Health Indexes for the nation, 22 of the 50 states, and various local communities.

The NCoC works with their partners to "measure how much people trust their neighbors, are active in their communities, and interact with their government" (National Conference on Citizenship, 2014). To create the Civic Health Indexes, the NCoC analyzed a number of civic indicators based on data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2011 Current Population Survey (CPS) provided by the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE). According to the U.S. Census Bureau Current Population Survey (2014):

> The CPS is administered by the Census Bureau using a probability selected sample of about 60,000 occupied households. The fieldwork is conducted during the calendar week that includes the 19th of the month. The questions refer to activities during the prior week; that is, the week that includes the 12th of the month. Households from all 50 states and the District of Columbia are in the survey for 4 consecutive months, out for 8, and then return for another 4 months before leaving the sample permanently. This design ensures a high degree of continuity from one month to the next (as well as over the year). The 4-8-4 sampling scheme has the added benefit of allowing the constant replenishment of the sample without excessive burden to respondents. (para. 1)

The CPS questionnaire is conducted by Census Bureau field representative via telephone and in-person interviews, and participants must meet the requirements of being 15 years or older, not in the Armed Forces, and not in a correctional institution. Civic Health Indexes were produced by the NCoC for both Georgia and New Hampshire in 2012 using data from the 2011 CPS. The data presented in the 2012 Civic Health Index reports for Georgia and New Hampshire, along with general demographic information of interest, are presented in the following sections.

Civic health in Georgia

Demographic and geographic data.

Demographic information provided in this section is based on the most recent data available from the U.S. Census Bureau: Georgia Quick Facts (2014). Georgia occupies 57,513.49 square miles of land, had approximately 168.4 persons per square mile in 2010, and had an average of 2.7 persons per household between 2008 and 2012. The 2010 population of Georgia was 9,687,653, and projections by the U.S. Census Bureau estimate a population of 9,915,646 in 2012 and 9,992,167 in 2013.

Age demographics show that 6.8% of Georgians were under 5 years old in 2012, 25.1% were under 18, and 11.5% were 65 years and over. In regard to gender; approximately 51.1% of Georgians were female and 48.9% were male. Racial demographics reveal that in 2012, 54.8% of Georgians identified as White alone, 31.2% identified as African American, 9.2% identified as Hispanic or Latino, 3.5% identified as Asian alone, 1.8% identified as having two or more races, 0.5% identified as American Indian or Alaskan Native, and 0.1% identified as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Of the Georgians surveyed between 2008 and 2012, 9.7% were foreign born and 13.1% spoke a language other than English at home in 2012.

In regard to education; 84.4% Georgians over the age of 25 surveyed between 2008 and 2012 were high school or higher graduates and 27.8% had earned a Bachelor's degree or higher. Economic data show that per capita income in Georgia between 2008 and 2012 was $25,309 and median household income was $49,604. Additionally, between 2008 and 2012 17.4% of persons in Georgia were below poverty level.

Civic health.

Georgia's first Civic Health Index was produced by the National Conference on Citizenship in 2012 in partnership with the Carl Vinson Institute of Government at the University of Georgia, the Georgia Family Connection Partnership, and GeorgiaForward. The purpose of the 2012 Georgia Civic Health Index (GCHI) report was to answer three questions; 1) how do Georgians engage civically with one another, their communities, institutions, and in politics? 2) how does civic participation vary based on different demographic variables? and 3) how does the rate of Georgians civic participation compare with other states? (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012). Four mains areas of civic health were the focus of the 2012 GCHI, including social connectedness, community involvement, political action and participation, and confidences in institutions.

In general, "according to current national data that inform [the GCHI] report, Georgia ranks among the bottom half of states on almost all measures of civic health" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 6). The 2012 GCHI indicates that Georgia maintains a low national ranking on 10 civic health indicators, an average ranking on seven indicators, and an above-average ranking on two indicators. Table 4 lists the indicators arranged by Georgia's state ranking. According to the data shown in Table 4, on the 19 civic health indicators measured in the 2012 GCHI report Georgia scored below average on approximately 53% of the indicators, average on approximately 37% of the indicators, and above average on approximately 11% of the indicators.

Each of the specific indicators contribute to an overall understanding of where Georgians fall in relation to the four general areas of civic health; social connectedness, community involvement, political action, and confidence in institutions. Table 5 depicts where the specific

civic health indicators are categorized in relation to the four general areas. In the following sections, a discussion of the civic health of Georgians in each of the general civic health categories is considered in relation to how the state ranks in each of the specific civic health indicators that comprise the four broad categories.

Social connectedness in Georgia.

Social connectedness "refers to how often people interact with friends, family, and neighbors" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 6). Within the category of social connectedness, as depicted in Table 5, such civic health indicators as talking to neighbors, spending time with family and friends, and trusting neighbors are included. Of the five civic health indicators that comprise the social connectedness group, Georgians scored close to the national average in four and below average in one. The four social connectedness indicators that Georgia received average rankings were talking to neighbors, eating dinner with friends or family, seeing to and hearing from friends or family, and exchanging favors with neighbors. Georgia scored far below the national average in trust of neighbors, ranking 44th.

Results of the 2011 Current Population Survey (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012), which was used to determine the state social connectedness indicator rankings, are shown in Table 6. Table 6 reveals that low percentages of Georgians exchange favors with neighbors, talk to neighbors, and trust neighbors. High percentages see, hear from, and interact with family and friends. Of the four general civic health indicators, Georgia ranked the highest in social connectedness with the indicators relating to interaction with family and friends being stronger than those related to interaction with neighbors.

Table 4: Georgia Civic Health Indicator Rankings		
National Rank	**Civic Health Indicator**	**Georgia's Rank**
Above average	Expressing opinions about community or political issues online	6th
	Talking about politics with friends or family	17th
Average	Talking to Neighbors	25th
	Eating dinner with friends or family	26th
	Seeing or hearing from friends or family	26th
	Buying or boycotting goods to express political opinions	27th
	Exchanging favors with neighbors	28th
	Group membership	28th
	Voting in local elections	29th
Below average	Volunteering	34th
	Contacted elected officials	34th
	Attending public meetings	36th
	Voter turnout (2010)	38th
	Confidence in corporations	38th
	Charitable giving	40th
	Confidence in public schools	40th
	Voter registration (2010)	41st
	Trust all or most of people in their neighborhood	44th
	Confidence in the media	46th
Data source: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012)		

Table 5: Civic Health Indicators by Area	
General Category	**Civic Health Indicator**
Social connectedness	Talking to Neighbors
	Eating dinner with friends or family
	Seeing or hearing from friends or family
	Exchanging favors with neighbors
	Trust all or most of people in their neighborhood
Community involvement	Charitable giving
	Attending public meetings
	Group membership
	Volunteering
Political action	Expressing opinions about community or political issues online
	Talking about politics with friends or family
	Voting in local elections
	Contacted elected officials
	Voter turnout (2010)
	Voter registration (2010)
Confidence in institutions	Confidence in corporations
	Confidence in public schools
	Confidence in the media
Data source: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012)	

Table 6: Georgia Social Connectedness Indicator Percentages			
Indicator	**Description**	**Percentage**	**National Rank**
Exchanging favors with neighbors	Percent indicating that they exchanged favors with neighbors	14%	28th
Talking to neighbors	Percent indicating that they frequently talk with neighbors	44.5%	25th
Trust neighbors	Percent who trust all or most of their neighbors	53%	44th
Seeing or hearing from friends or family	Percent indicating seeing or hearing from family or friends at least a few times per week	80.4%	26th
Eating dinner with family or friends	Percent indicating that they frequently eat dinner with family and friends	90.1%	26th
Data source: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012)			

Community involvement in Georgia.

Community involvement "refers to the ways people interact with fellow residents beyond their friends, family, and immediate neighbors" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 6). Table 7 reveals that there are four indicators that comprise the community involvement category, including charitable giving, attending public meetings, group membership, and volunteering. Of the four community involvement indicators, Georgia ranks close to the national average on one and below average on three. The indicator for which Georgia ranked average was group membership, and the indicators for which Georgia ranked below average were volunteering, charitable giving, and attending public meetings. Table 7 presents the results of the 2011 Current Population Survey (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012) for the community involvement indicators.

Table 7: Georgia Community Involvement Indicator Percentages			
Indicator	**Description**	**Percent**	**National Rank**
Attending public meetings	Percent who attended a public meeting in 2011	8.3%	36th
Volunteering	Percent who indicated volunteering in 2011	26%	34th
Group membership	Percent who belong to an established community group	36.2%	28th
Charitable giving	Percent who donated to a charity in 2011	49.7%	40th
Data source: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012)			

According to the available data presented in Table 7, small percentages of Georgians attend public meetings, volunteer, or belong to community groups while relatively higher percentages donate to charity (though still to a much lesser degree than citizens of other states). Overall, Georgians rank well below the national average in community involvement.

Political action in Georgia.

According to the Georgia Civic Health Index (2012), political action relates to "the ways people influence local government and public institutions" (p. 6). Table 8 lists the six indicators under the political action umbrella, including expressing opinions about community or political issues online, talking about politics with friends or family, voting in local elections, contacting elected officials, voter turnout, and voter registration. Of the six political action indicators, Georgia ranked above the national average in two, average in one, and below average in three. The two indicators for which Georgia ranked above average were expressing opinions about community or political issues online and talking about politics with friends or family. Georgia ranked near the national average for voting in local elections. For contacting elected officials,

voter turnout, and voter registration Georgia ranked below the national average. Table 8 presents the results of the 2011 Current Population Survey (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012) for the political action indicators.

Table 8: Georgia Political Action Indicator Percentages			
Indicator	**Description**	**Percentage**	**National Rank**
Expressing opinions about community or political issues online	Percent who regularly express political opinions on the internet	10.5%	6th
Contacting elected officials	Percent who contacted elected officials in 2011	12%	34th
Talking about politics with friends or family	Percent who regularly discuss politics with friends or family	32.5%	17th
Voter turnout (2010)	Percent who reported voting in general elections	43.6%	38th
Voting in local elections	Percent reporting voting in local elections in 2011	59.3%	29th
Voter registration (2010)	Percent who reported being registered to vote	62%	41st
Data source: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012)			

When it comes to political action, the data show that Georgians are more involved in discussing politics than in taking political action such as voting and contacting elected officials.

Confidence in institutions in Georgia.

The 2012 Georgia Civic Health Index defines confidence in institutions as "the degree to which residents believe that various local institutions, including public schools, media and corporations will do what is right" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 6). There are three

civic health indicators that comprise the confidence in institutions category, including confidence in corporations, confidence in public schools, and confidence in the media.

Georgia ranks below the national average in all three indicators for confidence in institutions. The percentage results from the 2011 Current Population Survey (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012) regarding the three indicators within the confidence in institutions category are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Georgia Confidence in Institutions Indicator Percentages			
Indicator	**Description**	**Percentage**	**National Rank**
Confidence in the media	Percent who indicated having some or a great deal of confidence in the media	57.1%	46th
Confidence in corporations	Percent who indicated having some or a great deal of confidence in corporations	59%	38th
Confidence in public schools	Percent who indicated having some or a great deal of confidence in public schools	86.8%	40th
Data source: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012)			

Of all four civic health categories, Georgia scored the lowest in confidence in institutions. Georgians indicated a general lack of confidence in the media and corporations, while relatively higher numbers have confidence in public schools (though in relation to the national average there is low confidence in public schools as well).

Summary of Georgia's civic health.

Overall, "Georgia has much room to improve its civic health" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 23). Of all the civic health indicators measured by the National Conference on Citizenship in the development of the Georgia Civic Health Index, Georgia ranked relatively well in those concerning discussion of political issues and connection with family and friends.

So, Georgia is relatively strong on social connectedness. However "with the exception of how often Georgians discuss politics with friends or family and express opinions online, Georgia is ranked among the bottom half of states for all major civic health indicators, and often in the bottom third" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 6). The most extreme deficiencies shown in the data relate to voting, confidence in media, charitable giving, and trusting neighbors. In general, Georgia's civic health is much poorer than that of other states.

Civic health in New Hampshire

Demographic and geographic data.

Demographic information provided in this section is based on the most recent data available from the U.S. Census Bureau: New Hampshire Quick Facts (2014). New Hampshire has a land area of 8,952.65 square miles, with 147 persons per square mile in 2010, and 2.47 persons per household. The population of New Hampshire was approximately 1,316,470 in 2010, and U.S. Census Bureau projections estimate a population of 1,321,617 in 2012 and 1,323,459 in 2013.

Age demographics indicate that in 2012, 5% of New Hampshire's population was under 5 years old, 20.8% was under 18 years old, and 14.7% were 65 years and over. In regard to gender, approximately 50.6% of New Hampshire's population was female and 49.4% was male in 2012. Racial demographic data for 2012 reveal that 91.6% of New Hampshire's population identified as White alone, 3% identified as Hispanic or Latino, 2.4% identified as Asian alone, 1.5% identified as belonging to two or more races, 1.4% identified as Black or African American alone, and 0.3% identified as American Indian or Alaskan Native. Approximately 5.3% of New Hampshire's population was foreign born between 2008 and 2012.

Concerning education, between 2008 and 2012, 91.4% of the New Hampshire population had graduated from high school or higher and 33.4% had earned a Bachelor's or higher degree. Approximately 7.9% of New Hampshire residents reported speaking a language other than English at home. Economic data show that the per capita income between 2008 and 2012 was $32,758 and the median household income was $64,925. Additionally, 8.4% of the New Hampshire population was below poverty level from 2008 to 2012.

Civic health.

The 2012 New Hampshire Civic Health Index (NH CHI) which is the third New Hampshire Health Index (the previous two conducted in 2006 and 2009), was created in partnership between the National Conference on Citizenship and the Carsey Institute of the University of New Hampshire using data from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2011 Current Population Survey. In general, "New Hampshire citizens rank relatively high on several key indicators of civic health" (New Hampshire Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 5). Table 10 presents comparisons between New Hampshire civic health indicators and national results according to the 2012 New Hampshire Civic Health Index. As depicted in Table 10, New Hampshire ranked above average in 14 of the 17 indicators (82.4%), average in 2 indicators (11.8%), and below average in one indicator (5.8%).

Each of the specific indicators are grouped in one of four general categories; volunteering and giving, political activity, community engagement and neighborliness, and confidence in public institutions. Table 11 outlines how each of the indicators are grouped according to the four general categories.

Table 10: New Hampshire Civic Health Indicator Rankings			
National Rank	**Civic Health Indicator**	**NH %**	**National %**
Above average	Generally trust neighbors	72.3%	56.7%
	Discuss politics regularly	36.8%	29.3%
	Attend public meetings	16.3%	9.1%
	Vote in local elections	63.6%	57.8%
	Gave to charity in 2011	57.5%	51.8%
	Contact public officials	16.9%	12.3%
	Have confidence in public schools	92.1%	88%
	Boycott or buy products to express political positions	15.6%	12.1%
	Have confidence in corporations	65%	62%
	Volunteered in 2011	29.4%	26.8%
	Eat dinner with family or friends regularly	91.8%	89.5%
	Registered to vote	66.5%	65.1%
	See or hear from family and friends regularly	79.9%	79%
	Have confidence in media	62.5%	62%
Average	Talk with neighbors regularly	42.7%	42.7%
	Voter turnout in general elections	48.8%	48.8%
Below Average	Belong to a community group	39%	39.2%
Data source: New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)			

Table 11: Civic Health Indicators by Area	
General Category	**Civic Health Indicator**
Volunteering and giving	Charitable giving
	Volunteering
Political activity	Discuss politics regularly
	Attend public meetings
	Contact public officials
	Boycott or buy products to express political positions
	Vote in local elections
	Registered to Vote
	Voter turnout in general elections
Community engagement and neighborliness	Eat dinner with family or friends regularly
	See or hear from family and friends regularly
	Generally trust neighbors
	Talk with neighbors regularly
	Belong to a community group
Confidence in public institutions	Confidence in corporations
	Confidence in public schools
	Confidence in the media
Data source: New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)	

In the following sections, a discussion of the civic health of New Hampshire residents in relation to each of the general civic health categories is considered in relation to how the state ranks in each of the specific civic health indicators that comprise the four broad categories.

Volunteering and giving.

The two indicators that comprise the volunteering and giving category are charitable giving and volunteering. Table 12 depicts New Hampshire's ranking in the two volunteering and giving indicators in relation to national results.

Table 12: New Hampshire Volunteering and Giving Civic Health Indicators				
General Category	**Civic Health Indicator**	**NH %**	**National %**	**Difference**
Volunteering and giving	Charitable giving	57.5%	51.8%	+5.7
	Volunteering	29.4%	26.8%	+2.6
Data source: New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)				

As shown in Table 12, New Hampshire ranked above the national average in both charitable giving and volunteering. Approximately 57.5% of New Hampshire residents surveyed indicated that they gave to charities in 2011, which is 5.7% above the national average. In regard to volunteering, 29.4% of those surveyed reported volunteering their time in 2011 which is 2.6% higher than the national average. Based on the data presented in the NH CHI (2012) concerning volunteering and giving, New Hampshire ranks slightly above average in relation to the rest of the nation.

Political activity.

There are seven indicators that comprise the political activity category, including discussing politics regularly, attending public meetings, contacting public officials, boycotting or buying products to express political positions, voting in local elections, registering to vote, and

voter turnout in general elections. Table 13 displays New Hampshire's data regarding the seven political activity indicators, including a comparison between New Hampshire and national averages.

Table 13: New Hampshire Political Activity Civic Health Indicators				
General Category	**Civic Health Indicator**	**NH %**	**National %**	**Difference**
Political activity	Discussing politics	36.8%	29.3%	+7.5
	Attending public meetings	16.3%	9.1%	+7.2
	Voting in local elections	63.6%	57.8%	+5.8
	Contacting public officials	16.9%	12.3%	+4.6
	Boycotting or buying products to express political positions	15.6%	12.1%	+3.5
	Registering to vote	66.5%	65.1%	+1.4
	Voter turnout in general elections	48.8%	48.8%	±0
Data source: New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)				

As shown in Table 13, New Hampshire ranked above the national average in six of the seven political activity indicators and equal to the national average on one. The NH CHI (2012) reveals that New Hampshire is 7.5% above the national average in discussing politics, 7.2% above average in attending public meetings, 5.8% above average in voting at local elections, 4.6% above average in contacting public officials, 3.5% above average in boycotting or buying products to express political positions, 1.4% above average in registering to vote, and equal to the national average in voter turnout in general elections. Based on the individual civic health indicators, New Hampshire ranks well above the national average in engagement in political activity.

Community engagement and neighborliness.

Within the category of community engagement and neighborliness, there are five specific indicators; eating dinner with family or friends, seeing or hearing from family and friends, generally trusting neighbors, talking with neighbors, and belonging to a community group. The NH CHI (2012) data regarding community engagement and neighborliness is presented in Table 14, including comparison to national averages.

Table 14: New Hampshire Community Engagement and Neighborliness Civic Health Indicators				
General Category	**Civic Health Indicator**	**NH %**	**National %**	**Difference**
Community engagement and neighborliness	Generally trust neighbors	72.3%	56.7%	+15.6
	Eat dinner with family or friends regularly	91.8%	89.5%	+2.3
	See or hear from family and friends regularly	79.9%	79%	+0.9
	Talk with neighbors regularly	42.7%	42.7%	±0
	Belong to a community group	39%	39.2%	-0.2
Data source: New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)				

Of the five community engagement and neighborliness indicators, New Hampshire ranked above the national average in three, equal to the national average in one, and below the national average in one. For generally trusting neighbors New Hampshire was 15.6% above the national average, 2.3% above average in eating dinner with family or friends regularly, and 0.9% above average in seeing or hearing from family and friends regularly. They were equal to the national average in talking with neighbors and 0.2% below average in belonging to a community group. Overall, with the exception of generally trusting neighbors for which New Hampshire scored very high

above the rest of the nation, the state is slightly above average in regard to community engagement and neighborliness.

Confidence in public institutions.

Confidence in corporations, confidence in public schools, and confidence in the media are the three indicators that comprise the confidence in public institutions category. Table 15 provides a comparison between New Hampshire indicators regarding confidence in public institutions and national results.

Table 15: New Hampshire Confidence in Public Institutions Civic Health Indicators				
General Category	**Civic Health Indicator**	**NH %**	**National %**	**Difference**
Confidence in public institutions	Confidence in public schools	92.1%	88%	+4.1
	Confidence in corporations	65%	62%	+3
	Confidence in the media	62.5%	62%	+0.5
Data source: New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)				

According to the data in the 2012 New Hampshire Civic Health Index, New Hampshire ranks above the national average in all three indicators in the confidence in public institutions category. Those surveyed were 4.1% above the national average in confidence in public schools, 3% above average in confidence in corporations, and 0.5% above average in confidence in the media. In general, New Hampshire residents were shown to be moderately above the national average in indicators relating to confidence in public institutions.

Summary of New Hampshire civic health.

The results of the 2012 New Hampshire Civic Health Index "are indicative of a state that is in good civic health" (p. 18). New Hampshire ranked extremely high in trusting neighbors,

discussing politics, and attending public meetings. Other indicators for which New Hampshire ranked relatively high included charitable giving, voting in local elections, contacting public officials, and boycotting or buying goods to express political positions. The only indicators for which New Hampshire was not found to be above the national average were talking with neighbors, voter turnout in general elections, and belonging to community groups (the sole indicator for which New Hampshire was below the national average). The data show that:

> New Hampshire residents by and large are active participants in civic life, [they] volunteer time and expertise at relatively high rates, [they] help [their] neighbors, [they] spend time with friends and family, [they] are more likely to vote and engage in political conversations and activities than [their] national peers, and [they] generally trust [their] public and private institutions. (New Hampshire Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 18)

With few exceptions, New Hampshire's civic health is strong and the citizens of New Hampshire rank higher than those of most other states.

Summary of civic health literature.

The literature reveals that civic health involves multiple aspects of community life, both personal and private, and "is distinct from, yet interconnected with, other forms of well-being, including physical and mental health and access to basic needs" (New Hampshire Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 4). By presenting demographic data and the results of civic health indexes generated from information gathered and analyzed by the U.S. Census Bureau and the National Conference on Citizenship, the literature in this section serves to paint a picture of the civic health of Georgia and New Hampshire and how they relate to the larger nation. Information provided in this section revealed that Georgia is much less healthy (in a civic sense) than other states, and that New Hampshire is better-off than most others in the nation in all broad and specific indicators of civic health. The data exhibited in this section is analyzed in the following chapters as a means of exploring similarities and differences between civic health in Georgia and

New Hampshire, and will be discussed in relation to the state-level civic education policy research presented in the previous section as a means of exploring possible correlations.

CHAPTER 3

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Data Sources

Civic education policy and civic health data for Georgia and New Hampshire presented in Chapter 2 are examined in this chapter as a means of providing a comparative analysis of the two states. In the following sections, data related to the states' geography, demographics, civic education policy, and civic health are presented. The U.S. Census Bureau: Georgia Quick Facts (2014) and U.S. Census Bureau: New Hampshire Quick Facts (2014) are the data sources used in the analysis of geographic and demographic details in the following section. The information in the Quick Facts for both states is compiled by the U.S. Census Bureau based on data gathered via the Current Population Survey (CPS). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2014):

> The CPS is administered by the Census Bureau using a probability selected sample of about 60,000 occupied households. The fieldwork is conducted during the calendar week that includes the 19th of the month. The questions refer to activities during the prior week; that is, the week that includes the 12th of the month. Households from all 50 states and the District of Columbia are in the survey for 4 consecutive months, out for 8, and then return for another 4 months before leaving the sample permanently. (para. 1)

Data for the CPS are gathered by U.S. Census Bureau field representatives and via computer assisted telephone interviewers. The questions on the CPS include both demographic and labor force items. The responses to the CPS are compiled to reveal details about the U.S. population, many of which have high relevance to this study. Those details are presented in the *Demographic Data* sections for each state in Chapter 2 and are applied in analysis in this chapter.

Data sources used to investigate civic education policy in Georgia and New Hampshire are taken from official government documents and include state constitutions, legislative statutes, department of education rules regarding graduation requirements, state education standards, and testing mandates. Official state government websites were accessed as a means of locating these government documents. All references to state constitutions, statutes, and rules are cited in text and can be reviewed using the references provided at the end of this paper. All data presented in Chapter 2, and analyzed in this chapter, represent the most current information available at the time of this study.

The Civic Health Index reports published by the National Conference on Citizenship (2014) are the data sources for information pertaining to state civic health. The Georgia Civic Health Index (2012) and New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012) were both created using data from the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey. The National Conference on Citizenship used the data from the CPS to determine the civic health of the United States as a whole and 22 individual states (including Georgia and New Hampshire). The CPS information used in the drafting of the Georgia and New Hampshire Civic Health Indices was based on data gathered in the 2010 CPS. That data was used by the authors of the Civic Health Index reports to determine the overall, and relative, strength of the two states in relation to various measures of civic health (*e.g.,* voter turnout, trust in public institutions, *etc.*). The findings of the National Conference on Citizenship, as presented in the Civic Health Indices, are presented individually for each state in Chapter 2 and are considered in relation to one another and the larger nation in this chapter.

Demographic and Geographic Comparison

Georgia and New Hampshire, though both members of the 13 original U.S. colonies, lie in stark contrast to each other regarding many of their geographic and demographic characteristics. The most obvious difference is the location of the two states; Georgia lying in the southeastern region of the United States and New Hampshire being a New England state located in the northeast region. U.S. Census Bureau statistics reveal that the two states also vary in regard to geographic and population features relating to land area, population density and size, and persons per household. Table 16 provides a comparison of geographic and population data gathered by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2010, representing the most current information available.

	Table 16: Geographic and Population Comparison	
	Georgia	New Hampshire
Land Area (square miles)	57,513.49	8,952.65
Total population	9,687,653	1,316,470
Population Density (persons per square mile)	168.4	147
Persons Per Household	2.7	2.47
Data sources: United States Census Bureau: Georgia Quick Facts (2014); United States Census Bureau: New Hampshire Quick Facts (2014)		

The starkest difference between the two states is in land area and total population. Georgia spans 48,560.84 more square miles of land than New Hampshire. So, the land area of Georgia is 6.42 times larger than New Hampshire. In regard to population size, Georgia's population was 8,371,183 larger than New Hampshire's in 2010 which indicates that New Hampshire's population is only 13.59% of Georgia's. The population density differences between Georgia

and New Hampshire are not as large, with Georgia having 21.4 more people per square mile. The average household size in New Hampshire is slightly smaller than that of Georgia with a difference of 0.23 persons per household.

Demographic features of the states' populations are presented in Table 17. The demographic data reveals differences in age, gender, race, education, and socio-economic status of the citizens of the Georgia and New Hampshire. While the demographic characteristics relating to age and gender are comparable, there are acute differences in the statistics relating to racial demographics, education, and income. Demographically, the largest difference is between the percentage of the population identifying as black and those identifying as white. While 54.8% of Georgians identify as white, 91.6% of the New Hampshire population is white; a difference of 36.8%. Additionally, 29.7% more of Georgia's population identifies as black. Another large difference is in the percentage of citizens reporting Latino heritage. Three times the percentage of Georgians are Hispanic or Latino in comparison to New Hampshire. Demographic percentages of those reporting to be Asian, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and multi-racial are comparable between the two states.

Educational attainment and economic statistics reveal additional significant differences between the populations of Georgia and New Hampshire. Approximately 7% more New Hampshireans have graduated high school and 5.6% more have Bachelor's degrees. The average per capita income in New Hampshire is $9,449 more than in Georgia and the average median household income is $15,321 greater. Georgia's population has more than twice the percentage of individuals below the poverty level than does New Hampshire's. In general, New Hampshire is smaller, less populated, less racially diverse, more educated, and wealthier than Georgia.

		Table 17: Demographic Comparison	
		Georgia	New Hampshire
Under 5 Years Old		6.8%	5%
Under 18 Years Old		25.1%	20.8%
Over 65 Years Old		11.5%	14.7%
Male		48.9%	49.4%
Female		51.1%	50.6%
Racial Demographics	American Indian/Alaskan	0.5%	0.3%
	Asian	3.5%	2.4%
	Black	31.2%	1.5%
	Latino	9.2%	3.2%
	Multi-racial	1.8%	1.6%
	White	54.8%	91.6%
Foreign Born		9.7%	5.3%
Speak Non-English at Home		13.1%	7.9%
High School Graduates		84.4%	91.4%
Bachelor's Degree		27.8%	33.4%
Average Per Capita Income		$25,309	$32,758
Average Median Household Income		$49,604	$64,925
Below Poverty Level		17.4%	8.4%
Data sources: United States Census Bureau: Georgia Quick Facts (2014); United States Census Bureau: New Hampshire Quick Facts (2014)			

Civic Health Comparison

Both Georgia and New Hampshire participated in the 2012 Civic Health Index studies conducted by the National Conference on Citizenship (NCoC). The Georgia Civic Health Index (2012) was created in partnership between the NCoC, the Carl Vinson Institute of Government at the University of Georgia, the Georgia Family Connection Partnership, and GeorgiaForward. The NCoC partnered with the Carsey Institute at the University of New Hampshire to create the 2012 New Hampshire Civic Health Index. As explained in the *Introduction* of this chapter, both studies were conducting using data from the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey conducted in 2011. In this section, data from the 2012 Civic Health Indices (CHI) of each state are subjected to a comparative analysis.

Civic health is determined based on "the degree to which residents talk to neighbors, spend time with friends or family, participate in community groups, vote, talk about politics, and act to further civic interests" (National Conference on Citizenship, 2014, para. 1). The civic health studies used CPS data to measure how 22 states, and the nation as a whole, measured in regard to various indicators of civic health. Georgia and New Hampshire were evaluated in a number of the same areas, which provides data that is used in this study to conduct a comparative analysis. Table 18 outlines the specific categories and civic health indicators that were measured for both states. As depicted in the table, both Georgia and New Hampshire were assessed in four general civic health categories and a total of 17 civic health indicators. A comparative analysis of how the states performed in relation to the nation and one another is provided in the following sections.

Table 18: Common Civic Health Indicators by Area	
General Category	**Civic Health Indicator**
Social connectedness	Talking to Neighbors
	Eating dinner with friends or family
	Seeing and hearing from friends or family
	Trusting all or most of people in their neighborhood
Community involvement	Charitable giving
	Attending public meetings
	Group membership
	Volunteering
Political action	Talking about politics with friends or family
	Voting in local elections
	Contacting elected officials
	Voter turnout (2010)
	Voter registration (2010)
Confidence in institutions	Confidence in corporations
	Confidence in public schools
	Confidence in the media
Data sources: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012); New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)	

Social connectedness.

According to the Georgia Civic Health Index (2012), social connectedness "refers to how often people interact with friends, family, and neighbors" (p. 6). The four indicators in the social connectedness category that Georgia and New Hampshire were both measured in include talking to neighbors, eating dinner with friends or family, seeing and hearing from friends or family, and trusting neighbors. Table 19 displays a comparison of the social connectedness data for Georgia, New Hampshire, and the nation.

Table 19: Social Connectedness Civic Health Indicator Comparison				
General Category	**Civic Health Indicator**	**NH**	**GA**	**National**
Social Connectedness	Generally trust neighbors	72.3%	53%	56.7%
	Eat dinner with family or friends regularly	91.8%	90.1%	89.5%
	See or hear from family and friends regularly	79.9%	80.4%	79%
	Talk with neighbors regularly	42.7%	44.5%	42.7%
Data sources: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012); New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)				

The data show that New Hampshire is above the national average in trusting neighbors (+15.6), eating dinner with family and friends regularly (+2.3), and seeing or hearing from family and friends regularly (+0.9) and equal to the national average in talking with neighbors regularly. Georgia is above the national average in eating dinner with family and friends (+2.3), seeing or hearing from family and friends (+1.4), and talking with neighbors regularly (+1.7), but below the rest of the nation in generally trusting neighbors (-3.7%). Overall, New Hampshire is an average of 4.7% higher than the national average in social connectedness indicators and Georgia is 0.4% higher on average.

Comparing the two states shows that New Hampshire is 19.3% higher than Georgia in generally trusting neighbors and 1.7% higher than Georgia in eating dinner with family and friends regularly. The Georgia survey results reveal that Georgia is higher than New Hampshire by 0.5% in seeing or hearing from family and friends regularly and 1.8% higher in talking with neighbors regularly. So, besides Georgians trusting neighbors much less than New Hampshireans, the two states are comparable to each other, and generally above national averages, in indicators of civic health related to social connectedness.

Community involvement.

Community involvement "refers to the ways people interact with fellow residents beyond their friends, family, and immediate neighbors" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 6). Charitable giving, attending public meetings, group membership, and volunteering are the four civic health indicators in which both Georgia and New Hampshire were evaluated within the community involvement category. Table 20 presents a comparison of the community involvement data for Georgia, New Hampshire, and the nation.

Table 20: Community Involvement Civic Health Indicator Comparison

General Category	Civic Health Indicator	NH	GA	National
Community Involvement	Charitable giving	57.5%	49.7%	51.8%
	Attending public meetings	16.3%	8.3%	9.1%
	Group membership	39%	36.2%	39.2%
	Volunteering	29.4%	26%	26.8%

Data sources: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012); New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)

Georgia ranked below the national average in all four indicators within the community involvement category, while New Hampshire ranked above the national average in charitable

giving, attending public meetings, and volunteering. On average, Georgia placed 1.7% below the national average, ranking 2.1% lower in charitable giving, 0.8% lower in attending public meetings, 3% lower in group membership, and 0.8% lower in volunteering. The only civic health indicator in the community involvement category for which New Hampshire did not rank above the national average was group membership, and in that area New Hampshire ranked only 0.2% below the rest of the nation.

State-to-state comparison reveals that New Hampshireans rank well above Georgians in attending public meetings (+8%) and charitable giving (+7.8%), and slightly above Georgia in group membership (+2.8%) and volunteering (+3.4%) with an average advantage over Georgia of 5.5%. Ranking above the national average in three of the four community involvement indicators and above Georgia in all indicators, New Hampshire is revealed to be relatively healthy in community involvement. Conversely, Georgia, which is positioned below both the nation and New Hampshire in all indicators relating to community involvement, is revealed to have poor civic health in this category.

Political action.

Political action concerns "the ways people influence local governments and public institutions" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 7). The six indicators comprising the political action category include talking about politics with family and friends, voting in local elections, contacting elected officials, voter registration, and voter turnout. Table 21 displays a comparison of civic health data for Georgia, New Hampshire, and the nation relating to political action.

Table 21: Political Action Civic Health Indicator Comparison				
General Category	Civic Health Indicator	NH	GA	National
Political Action	Talking about politics with friends or family	36.8%	32.5%	29.3%
	Voting in local elections	63.6%	59.3%	57.8%
	Contacted elected officials	16.9%	12%	12.3%
	Voter turnout (2010)	48.8%	43.6%	48.8%
	Voter registration (2010)	66.5%	62%	65.1%
Data sources: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012); New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)				

While New Hampshire was positioned above the nation in four of the political action indicators and equal to the rest of the nation in one, Georgia was higher than the nation in two indicators and lower in one. New Hampshire ranked 7.5% higher than the rest of the United States in discussing politics, 5.8% higher in voting in local elections, 4.6% higher in contacting elected officials, 1.4% higher in voter registration, and equal to the national average in voter turnout. Georgia placed 3.2% higher than other states in discussing politics and 1.5% higher in voting in local elections, but fell short of the nation by 0.3% in contacting elected officials, 5.2% in voter turnout, and 3.1% in voter registration. Overall, New Hampshire ranked an average of 3.9% higher than the nation in political action indicators while Georgia fell short of the national averages by 0.8%.

A comparative analysis of the two states reveals that New Hampshire ranks above Georgia in all five political action indicators. New Hampshireans bested Georgians by 4.3% in discussing politics, 4.3% in voting in local elections, 4.9% in contacting elected officials, 5.2% in voter turnout, and 4.5% in voter registration. So, New Hampshire is relatively strong in the

area of civic health concerning political action considering the fact that it ranked an average of 3.9% higher than the nation and 4.6% higher than Georgia. As is the case with community involvement, Georgia ranked well below New Hampshire in the political action category but only slightly below the other states that participated in the study.

Confidence in institutions.

"The degree to which residents believe that various local institutions, including public schools, media, and corporations will do what is right" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 6) is measured by the confidence in institutions indicators. Data concerning the three civic health indicators concerning confidence in institutions (confidence in public schools, confidence in corporations, and confidence in media) for Georgia, New Hampshire, and the United States are compared in Table 22.

Table 22: Confidence in Institutions Civic Health Indicator Comparison

General Category	Civic Health Indicator	NH %	GA %	National %
Confidence in Institutions	Confidence in public schools	92.1%	86.8%	88%
	Confidence in corporations	65%	59%	62%
	Confidence in media	62.5%	57.1%	62%

Data sources: Georgia Civic Health Index (2012); New Hampshire Civic Health Index (2012)

In all three indicators comprising the confidence in institutions category, New Hampshire scored above the national average and Georgia scored below. In comparison to the rest of the country, New Hampshire placed 4.1% higher in confidence in public schools, 3% higher in confidence in corporations, and 0.5% higher in confidence in media. Georgia, on the other hand, ranked lower than the national average by 1.2% in confidence in public schools, 3% in confidence in

corporations, and 4.9% in confidence in media. On average, New Hampshire ranked 2.5% higher than the nation and Georgia ranked 3.1% lower.

Comparing the two state reveals that New Hampshire is positioned higher than Georgia in all three confidence in institutions indicators; ranking above Georgia by 5.3% in confidence in public schools, 6% in confidence in corporations, and 5.4% in confidence in media. New Hampshire placed an average of 5.6% above Georgia in the three indicators within the confidence in institutions category. As with the political action and community involvement categories, the Georgia survey results place the state well below New Hampshire. Of all the categories, Georgia is the lowest relative to New Hampshire and the nation in the confidence in institutions indicators. Not only does New Hampshire have relatively high levels of confidence in institutions as compared to Georgia, but is also comparatively healthier than the rest on the nation.

Summary of civic health comparison.

Results of the comparative analysis of the two states reveal that New Hampshire is generally much stronger in regard to civic health than is Georgia. While "Georgia has much room to improve its civic health" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 23), the data for New Hampshire are "indicative of a state that is in good civic health" (New Hampshire Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 18). Georgia ranked low in most categories and indicators, excluding those relating to discussing politics and relationships with family and friends. According to the 2012 Georgia Civic Health Index, "with the exception of how often Georgians discuss politics with friends or family and express opinions online, Georgia is ranked among the bottom half of states for all major civic health indicators, and often in the bottom third" (p. 6).

Whereas Georgia has extreme deficiencies in areas related to voting, confidence in public institutions, charitable giving, and trusting neighbors, New Hampshire is strong in those areas in addition to others. "New Hampshire residents," explains the 2012 New Hampshire Civic Health Index, "are active participants in civic life [and] are more likely to vote and engage in political conversations than [their] national peers" (p. 18). Of the 16 common civic health indicators that were measured, New Hampshire ranked above Georgia in all but two. Besides the social connectedness category, New Hampshire outranked Georgia in all categories. On average, New Hampshire scored 55.1% on the 16 indicators, which is 5.1% higher than Georgia's 50% and 3.8% higher than the national average of 51.3%. The only areas in which Georgia surpassed New Hampshire were in two of the social connectedness indicators; eating dinner with family or friends and seeing or hearing from family and friends regularly.

Civic Education Policy Comparison

The State Constitutions of Georgia and New Hampshire both provide for the establishment of legislative, executive, and judicial bodies; each contributing to the development of education policy in those states. Of primary interest to this study are the statutes of the state legislative bodies and the rules established by the state departments of education that relate to civic education. Of specific concern are the educational standards, graduation requirements, and testing mandates that have been put into place according to the legislative statutes and executive rules in each state. Analysis of the statutes and rules shows that there are distinct differences between the civic education standards, graduation requirements, and testing mandates in Georgia and New Hampshire and the following sections provide a comparative examination of those aspects.

Education standards.

Both Georgia and New Hampshire have established public education standards mandating the specific content that must be taught in public schools in particular courses by grade-level. According to OCGA §20-2-140 and RSA 186:13, for public schools in those states to be eligible for public funding they must teach the state mandated curriculum standards. The body responsible for developing state standards in Georgia is the Georgia Department of Education's Division of Standards Based Learning within the Office of Curriculum and Instruction. In New Hampshire, the New Hampshire Department of Education's Bureau of Accountability and Assessment creates the state standards.

Currently, Georgia public schools are required to teach the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) adopted by the Georgia State Board of Education in 2010. The New Hampshire College and Career Ready Standards (NH CCRS), established in 2011, are the current standards being implemented in New Hampshire. A complete list of the CCGPS and NH CCRS civics standards is displayed in the *Appendices* section at the end of this paper, with Appendix A depicting the civics CC GPS and Appendix B presenting the civics NH CCRS.

Civics standards for Georgia's public schools are presented in the American Government/Civics GPS and the civics standards for New Hampshire are contained within the New Hampshire Social Studies Curriculum Framework. Table 23 displays a comparison between the number, structure, type, and content of the CCGPS and the NH CCRS. Analysis reveals that significant differences exist in the number, type, and content of the standards in Georgia and New Hampshire. Perhaps the most obvious difference is between the numbers of standards; Georgia having 61 more civic education standards than New Hampshire.

		Table 23: Civic Education Standard Comparison	
		Georgia	New Hampshire
Number of Standards		79	18
Structure		22 broad standards with 57 total accompanying guidelines	4 broad standards with 14 total accompanying substandards
Type	Foundation-Building	50; 63.3%	13; 76.5%
	High-Level	29; 36.7%	5; 23.5%
Topics	Government Structure	16; 20.3%	2; 11.1%
	Purpose/Function of Government	27; 34.2%	5; 27.8%
	Foundations of Government	15; 19%	3; 16.7%
	International Affairs	1; 1.3%	4; 22.2%
	Citizenship	3; 3.8%	4; 22.2%
	Federal, State, and Local Relationship	5; 6.3%	0
	Election Process	7; 8.9%	0
	Influences on Government	5; 6.3%	0
Data sources: K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework (2006); Georgia Department of Education: Georgia Performance Standards for Social Studies (2014)			

Of the 79 civics standards in Georgia, approximately 63.3% include foundation-building language as compared to 76.5% in New Hampshire. Conversely, 23.5% of New Hampshire's standards are written with high-level language in comparison to 36.7% of Georgia's. Table 24 provides an overview of which civics standards in the two states are categorized as foundation-building civics education (FCE) standards and which are high-level civics education (HCE) standards based on the language used in the standards.

As explained in Chapter 2, foundation-building civic education (FCE) is concerned more with the learning and memorization of facts while high-level civic education (HCE) requires application of in-depth analysis and application of knowledge (Bahmueller & Quigley, 2011; Hess, 2011; White, 2005). The CCGPS and the NH CCRS have been categorized as foundation-building or high-level based on the language used in the standards. Those standards calling for analysis, evaluation, comparison, and application of knowledge have been categorized as high-level and those involving describing, explaining, and identifying are labeled as foundation-building. An example of an HCE standard, based on wording, is CCGPS SSCG2-A which calls for students to "compare and contrast the Declaration of Independence and the Social Contract Theory" (GaDOE: Georgia Performance Standards for Social Studies, 2014, p. 1). NH CCRS SS:CV:12:1.1 asks students to "identify the structures and functions of government at various levels" (K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework, 2006, p. 78) and is an example of an FCE standard. Approximately 13.2% more of Georgia's standards are HCE standards (in regard to language) than are New Hampshire's. When considering the wording of the standards, Georgia, which has over four times the number of civics standards than does New Hampshire, has 24 more HCE standards and 37 more FCE standards.

	Table 24: Foundation-building vs. High-level Comparison	
	CCGPS (Georgia)	NH CCRS (New Hampshire)
Foundation-building	SSCG1; SSCG3; SSCG3-A; SSCG3-C; SSCG4; SSCG4-A; SSCG5; SSCG5-A; SSCG5-B; SSCG5-C; SSCG5-D; SSCG5-G; SSCG6; SSCG6-C; SSCG6-D; SSCG6-E; SSCG7; SSCG8; SSCG8-A; SSCG8-B; SSCG8-E; SSCG9; SSCG10; SSCG10-A; SSCG10-B; SSCG11; SSCG11-A; SSCG11-B; SSCG11-C; SSCG13; SSCG13-A; SSCG13-B; SSCG14; SSCG14-A; SSCG14-B; SSCG15; SSCG15-B; SSCG16; SSCG16-A; SSCG16-C; SSCG17; SSCG17-C; SSCG18; SSCG20; SSCG21; SSCG21-B; SSCG21-D; SSCG22; SSCG22-B; SSCG22-C	SS:CV:1 SS:CV:12:1.1 SS:CV:12:1.4 SS:CV:2 SS:CV:12:2.1 SS:CV:12:2.3 SS:CV:3 SS:CV:12:3.1 SS:CV:12:3.2 SS:CV:12:3.3 SS:CV:4 SS:CV:12:4.1 SS:CV:12:4.3
High-level	SSCG1-A; SSCG1-B; SSCG2; SSCG1-A; SSCG1-B; SSCG3-B; SSCG4-B; SSCG5-E; SSCG5-F; SSCG6-A; SSCG6-B; SSCG8-C; SSCG8-D; SSCG12; SSCG15-A; SSCG16-B; SSCG16-D; SSCG17-A; SSCG17-B; SSCG17-D; SSCG17-E; SSCG18-A; SSCG18-B; SSCG18-C; SSCG19; SSCG21-A; SSCG21-C; SSCG22-A; SSCG22-D	SS:CV:12:1.2 SS:CV:12:1.3 SS:CV:12:2.2 SS:CV:12:2.4 SS:CV:12:4.2
Data sources: K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework (2006); Georgia Department of Education: Georgia Performance Standards for Social Studies (2014)		

So, the civics-based CCGPS are more numerous and the language of the standards calls for more high-level learning than do the NH CCRS.

In addition to varying in number and level, the CCGPS and NH CCRS Civics Standards vary in regard to the topics covered with differences in the number and percentage of standards dedicated to each topic. For the purposes of this study, the standards are categorized by topic according to the content of each standard in Table 20. Those concerning government structure include information about how the government is organized including issues relating to the three branches of government, checks and balances, and the bicameral legislature.

Standards relating to the purpose and function of government deal with matters relating to government duties, powers, and actions. Foundations of government standards are concerned with founding documents, philosophies, and actors. Relationships between the United States and other nations are explored in the standards within the international affairs group. Citizenship standards relate to the duties, responsibilities, and rights of citizens. The relationship between the different levels of government is the concern of the standards categorized in the federal, state, and local relationship group. Details of the election process such as voting requirements, the Electoral College, and women's suffrage are covered in the standards in the election process category. Finally, the ways in which lobbyists and special interest groups interact with the government are explored in the standards relating to the topic of influences on government.

Table 25 displays which of the state standards relate to each topic within the eight categories. As depicted in the table, the CCGPS cover eight general areas of civics and the NH CCRS cover five. Among the eight broad topics, the Georgia and New Hampshire standards vary in the numbers and percentages of standards relating to each. The civics CCGPS have higher percentages of standards relating to government structure, purpose, and foundation.

	Table 25: CCGPS and NH CCRS Topics by Standard	
	CCGPS (Georgia)	NH CCRS (New Hampshire)
Government Structure	SSCG4; SSCG4-A; SSCG4-B; SSCG5; SSCG5-B; SSCG5-C; SSCG9; SSCG13; SSCG13-A; SSCG13-B; SSCG17-A; SSCG17-B; SSCG17-C; SSCG19; SSCG22-A; SSCG22-C	SS:CV:12:1.1; SS:CV:2
Purpose/Function of Government	SSCG3-B; SSCG6-D; SSCG10; SSCG10-A; SSCG10-B; SSCG12; SSCG14; SSCG14-A; SSCG14-B; SSCG15; SSCG15-A; SSCG15-B; SSCG16; SSCG16-A; SSCG16-C; SSCG16-D; SSCG-17; SSCG18; SSCG18-A; SSCG18-C; SSCG21; SSCG21-A; SSCG21-B; SSCG21-C; SSCG21-D; SSCG22; SSCG22-D	SS:CV:1; SS:CV:12:1.2; SS:CV:12:1.3; SS:CV:12:2.3; SS:CV:12:2.4;
Foundations of Government	SSCG1; SSCG1-A; SSCG1-B; SSCG2; SSCG2-A; SSCG2-B; SSCG3; SSCG3-A; SSCG3-C; SSCG6; SSCG6-A; SSCG6-B; SSCG6-C; SSCG6-E; SSCG16-B	SS:CV:12:1.4; SS:CV:12:2.1; SS:CV:12:2.2; SS:CV:
International Affairs	SSCG20	SS:CV:3; SS:CV:12:3.1; SS:CV:12:3.2; SS:CV:12:3.3
Citizenship	SSCG5-G; SSCG7; SSCG22-B	SS:CV:4; SS:CV:12:4.1; SS:CV:12:4.2; SS:CV:12:4.3
Federal, State, and Local Relationship	SSCG5-A; SSCG5-D; SSCG5-E; SSCG5-F; SSCG17-D	N/A
Election Process	SSCG8; SSCG8-A; SSCG8-B; SSCG8-C; SSCG8-D; SSCG8-E; SSCG17-E	N/A
Influences on Government	SSCG11; SSCG11-A; SSCG11-B; SSCG11-C; SSCG18-B	N/A
Data sources: K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework (2006); Georgia Department of Education: Georgia Performance Standards for Social Studies (2014)		

Additionally, there are three areas that are addressed in Georgia's civic standards that are not covered in the NH CCRS; 1) federal, state, local relationship, 2) election process, and 3) influences on government. Conversely, the New Hampshire civics standards have greater numbers and percentages involving international affairs and citizenship.

Although, as previously discussed, the CCGPS have a higher percentage of HCE standards than do the NH CCRS (according to language), the majority of the CCGPS are concerned with concrete facts regarding government structure, the function of government, foundational documents and principles, and the election process. Georgia standards relating to those four categories comprise 82.4% of the civics CCGPS as compared to 55.6% of the NH CCRS; a difference of 26.8%. So, while the language of the CCGPS standards calls for analysis, evaluation, and comparison, which are high-level adjectives, the content of the standards is more concerned with civics knowledge than its application. For example, although CCGPS SSCG3-B asks students to "analyze the purpose of government state in the Preamble of the Unite States Constitution" (GaDOE, 2014) the topic is concerned with a founding document and does not necessitate high-level application despite the use of the term "analyze."

On the other hand, the New Hampshire civics standards dedicate greater focus to topics requiring broader understanding and application with 44.4% of their standards relating to concerns of citizenship and international affairs in comparison to only 5.1% of the CCGPS relating to those topics. One such NH CCRS is SS:CV:3.3 which calls for students to "investigate how knowledgeable and engaged citizens have acted to preserve and extend their liberties" (NHDOE, 2014). Of additional pertinence is the fact that the civics CCGPS dedicate 12.6% of their standards to topics concerning relationships between the different levels of government and influences on government within the United States whereas there are no NH

CCRS concerning those matters. In fact, there are 10 Georgia civics standards relating to internal government influences and relationships and only one standard concerned with international affairs as opposed to the NH CCRS which have no standards dealing with internal government relationships and influences and four (22.2%) that relate to international affairs.

In summary, a comparative analysis of the civics standards in the CCGPS and the NH CCRS reveals that 1) there are many more civics standards in Georgia than there are in New Hampshire, 2) the language of the CCGPS calls for higher-level learning to a larger degree than do the NH CCRS, 3) the Georgia standards dedicate a greater percentage of standards to civics knowledge concerning government structure, function, and foundations than do the New Hampshire standards, 4) the New Hampshire standards have a higher percentage of standards dedicated to matters of citizenship and international affairs, 5) 21.5% of the CCGPS are concerned with relationships between federal, state, and local governments, the election process, and internal influences on government while the NH CCRS exclude those topics from the curriculum, 6) topics covered in the New Hampshire standards are more conducive to HCE, and 7) the NH CCRS place a greater emphasis on the relationship of the United States to the rest of the world and its people while CCGPS are more concerned with relationships between government departments and individuals within the United States. So, while the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards are more numerous and are written in a way that demands evaluation and application, the New Hampshire College and Career Readiness Standards have content that requires more application and in-depth understanding and place a greater emphasis on matters of citizenship.

High school graduation and testing requirement comparison.

The NHDOE and the GaDOE have each established detailed guidelines for earning a high school diploma. Graduation requirements for New Hampshire are outlined by Ed 306.27 and the Georgia high school graduation requirements are established by rule 160-4-2-.48(2)(f)(1) which mandates that a high school diploma only be awarded to students who "have satisfied attendance requirements, unit requirements and state assessment requirements" (GaDOE State Education Rules, 2014, Rule 160-4-2-.48(2)(f)(1)). New Hampshire's Ed 306.27(q)(1) explains that "a school shall award a regular diploma for achievement and demonstration of graduation competencies" (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014, Ed 306.27(q)(1)). Table 26 displays general information and basic graduation requirements for each state.

Table 26: High School Graduation Requirement Comparison

	Georgia	New Hampshire
Name	High School Diploma	Regular Diploma
Rule	160-4-2-.48(2)(f)(1)	Ed 306.27(q)(1)
Academic Requirement	23 Units of Credit	20 Credits
Credit Satisfaction	150 clock hours of instruction per credit (135 in block schedule)	Demonstration of competency mastery
Graduation Testing	Georgia High School Graduation Test (students entering prior to July 1, 2011); Georgia High School Writing Test; 10 end-of-course assessments	None

Data sources: Georgia Department of Education State Education Rules (2014); New Hampshire Department of Education Administrative Rules for Education (2014).

Concerning the general graduation requirements outlined in Table 21, perhaps the most significant differences are in regard to credit satisfaction requirements and graduation testing mandates.

While New Hampshire and Georgia have a comparable number of unit requirements, the guidelines governing completion of credits are significantly different. In Georgia, a high school credit is strictly defined based on a specific number of hours of instruction; 150 or 135 hours depending on the structure of the school schedule. However, in order for students to earn the 20 required credits for graduation in New Hampshire they must demonstrate mastery of specified graduation competencies. So, in New Hampshire credits are "based on the demonstration of district and/or graduation competencies not on time spend achieving these competencies" (NHDOE Administrative Rules for Education, 2014, Ed 306.27(f)). The New Hampshire graduation competencies are specific learning targets for high school students that are common across districts that define the expectations for learning, and the mastery of those competencies, according to the NHDOE (2014), is based on accumulation of a prescribed number and type of credits earned. So, while the focus on credit completion in Georgia is on instructional hours, in New Hampshire credit completion is based on demonstration of learning.

Both states mandate that high school students earn credit for a prescribed number and type of courses to graduate. Table 27 displays a comparison of the credit requirements for graduation in Georgia and New Hampshire and reveals that both New Hampshire and Georgia require credits in seven distinct program areas. In the core areas (language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) Georgia requires 17 credits while New Hampshire requires 11.5 credits. So, 65.2% of the credit requirements for Georgia are in the four core areas as compared to 57.5% of New Hampshire's.

Program Area	Georgia	New Hampshire
	Table 27: High School Graduation Credit Requirements	
Language Arts	4 (17.4%)	4 (20%)
Mathematics	4 (17.4%)	3 (15%)
Science	4 (17.4%)	2 (10%)
Social Studies	3 (13%)	2.5 (12.5%)
CTAE and/or Modern Language/Latin and/or Fine Arts	3 (13%)	1 (5%)
Health and Physical Education	1 (4.3%)	1.5 (7.5%)
Open Electives	4 (17.4%)	6 (30%)
Total	23	20
Data sources: Georgia Department of Education State Education Rules (2014); New Hampshire Department of Education Administrative Rules for Education (2014).		

The most significant differences in the credit requirements between the two states are 1) New Hampshire requires half the number of science credits, 2) Georgia requires three credits in career, technical, and agricultural education (CTAE), modern language, Latin, and fine arts compared to one credit requirement in that area for New Hampshire, and 3) 30% of New Hampshire's credit requirements are satisfied by open electives in comparison to only 17.4% of Georgia's.

Of primary interest to his study are the social studies and civics credit requirements. Georgia and New Hampshire have a comparable number of social studies credit requirements, with Georgia requiring three credits and New Hampshire requiring 2.5 credits. Both states require one-half credit of civics. So, in Georgia one-half credit of the 23 mandated credits (2.2%) is civics-based and in New Hampshire the requirement is one-half credit of civics out of

the 20 necessary (2.5%). In that one-half credit of civics, which equates to 75 or 67.5 hours of instructional time (depending on the structure of the school day) in Georgia and demonstration of academic competency in New Hampshire, the public schools are mandated by law to teach all of the state standards.

So, Georgia public high schools are charged with teaching all 79 civics standards in, at most, 75 hours of instruction time. That means that Georgia civics teachers are permitted an average of approximately 57 minutes to fully teach each civics standard. Reviewing Appendix A, which lists all 79 civics CCGPS, reveals that in the 57 minute average amount of instructional time allowed for each standard students are expected to complete such tasks as 1) analyzing the writings of Hobbes, Locke, and Montesquieu as they affect our concept of government (SSCG1-B), 2) explaining the fundamental principles upon which the *United States Constitution* is based (SSCG3-C), and 3) examining the legislative, executive, and judicial branches (SSCG17-A). While New Hampshire credits are not based on a specified number of hours, all 18 civics NH CCRS must be covered in the one-half unit of civics mandated for graduation. So, the average amount of instructional time that is dedicated to teaching each of the 18 civics standards is approximately 4.2 hours in New Hampshire, which is 3.25 more hours than is allowed in Georgia.

In addition to the graduation credit requirements, Georgia requires that students pass 10 specific end-of-course tests (EOCTs), the Georgia High School Writing Test (GHSWT), and the Georgia High School Graduation Test (GHSGT) for students who entered high school before July 1, 2011. Conversely, New Hampshire students are only required to complete the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) test which is mandated in grades five, eight, and eleven but is not a graduation requirement. In regard to the Georgia EOCTs, while there are

two social studies EOCTs (United States History and Economics/Business/Free Enterprise), there is not an EOCT for civics. The GHSWT is a writing skills test that is tied most directly to language arts standards without clear or intended connections to civics or any other content area. The GHSGT, which is being phased out for students who entered Georgia high school on or after July 1, 2011 according to Rule 160-3-1-.07(j)(3), includes a social studies test 18% of which is based on the civics domain. The 11th grade NECAP test, which is used to "produce individual-student proficiency reports as well as diagnostic reports at the school, district, and state levels" (NHDOE, 2014) for New Hampshire students, is confined to the subjects reading, writing, math, and science with no current or planned test in social studies or civics.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis presented in this chapter highlighted numerous differences between Georgia and New Hampshire in areas concerning geographic characteristics, demographics, civic education policy, and civic health. In regard to geographic and demographic features, Georgia is larger, more populated, more racially diverse, less educated, and less wealthy than New Hampshire. Though not directly related to the topic of this study, the geographic, population, and demographic characteristics of the two states are important factors to consider in relation to how they affect the governance and civic health of the two states. While the influences of these characteristics on civic health and education policy will not be explored in detail in this study, an understanding of the geographic and demographic differences between the two states help to provide context for the discussion.

Civic education standards, high school graduation requirements, and testing mandates that comprise the civic education policy of the two states present a number of noteworthy differences. Standards communicated via the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards

and the New Hampshire College and Career Readiness Standards differ in regard to quantity, depth, content, and areas of focus. Generally, the NH CCRS are much less numerous than the CCGPS, focus on content that requires high-level application of civics knowledge to a greater degree, place greater emphasis on matters of citizenship, and are more concerned with international affairs. Conversely, the CCGPS are relatively numerous, have language that calls for high-level learning but content that is more concerned with foundational knowledge than application, place greater focus on relationships between local, state, and national government entities than do the NH CCRS, and are nearly silent on topics of international relations. These differences are perhaps the most significant aspects of the variables impacting civic education policy discussed in this study.

Graduation and testing requirements in the two states, established via legislative statutes and administrative rules put into place by the state departments of education are comparable in some ways while presenting stark contrasts in others. Perhaps the most significant similarity between the graduation requirements of the two states is that each state requires only one-half credit of civics to graduate with a high school diploma. So, the civics requirement in Georgia is only one-half credit out of the 23 mandated credits (2.2%) and in New Hampshire it is one-half credit of the 20 required credits (2.5%). Though both states dedicate an extremely small percentage of the required credits to civics requirements, there is a significant difference in the expectations for how much material must be covered while earning that one-half credit. One-half credit, which translated to approximately 75 hours of instructional time, is dedicated to the mastery of 79 standards in Georgia and 18 standards in New Hampshire. Thus, Georgia high school students are required to master each of the 79 standards in less than one hour while New Hampshire students are afforded over four hours of instructional time to learn each standard.

Georgia has multiple graduation testing mandates while New Hampshire has no such requirements. Although Georgia requires students to pass the Georgia High School Graduation Test, 10 end-of-course tests in specific subjects, and the Georgia High School Writing Test, the only test that assesses students in civics is the GHSGT. The social studies portion of the GHSGT includes a civics domain that comprises 18% of the test, but the GHSGT is being phased out and students who entered high school on or after July 1, 2011 are not longer required to take the test. So, once the GHSGT is completely phased out then Georgia will have no civics assessments required for high school graduation. On the same note, the New England Common Assessment Program test, which is not required for graduation but is mandatory for 11th grade students, has no civics component.

While geographic characteristics, demographic details, and civic education policy in the two states do present various significant differences, the most drastic difference revealed in this study is between the civic healths of the two states. In general, New Hampshire has a much higher level of civic health than does Georgia. Georgia, which is relatively strong in indicators of civic health concerning social connectedness, ranked low in most categories of civic health including: voter registration, voter turnout, voting in local elections, contacting elected officials, and confidence in public institutions. Conversely, New Hampshire was rated above Georgia and the rest of the nation in nearly every category of civic health especially those concerning political action and community involvement.

Data presented in this chapter revealed that Georgia and New Hampshire exhibit a number of stark contrasts, and certain similarities, in the areas of civic education policy and civic health. The purpose of this examination is to provide the necessary information needed to answer the research questions concerning civic education policy, civic health, and their

relationship. Conclusive findings based on the comparative analysis performed in this chapter, including proposed answers to the research questions and policy suggestions, are provided in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS

> The death of democracy is not likely to be an assassination from ambush… it will be a slow extinction from apathy, indifference and undernourishment. (Hutchins, 1956, p. 32)

Findings

Numerous significant findings resulted from the analysis of civic education policy and civic health conducted in this study. This section highlights the most significant findings in relation to the current problems associated with civic health and civic education, various forms and interpretations of civic education, federal civic education policy, state-level civic education policy in Georgia and New Hampshire, and the state of civic health in Georgia and New Hampshire. The presentation of the findings in this section leads into a discussion of conclusions, implications, and policy proposals in the following sections.

Problem findings.

An exploration of the problem in Chapter 1 found that a majority of United States citizens do not possess a clear understanding of the most significant historical events or political facts (American Revolution Center, 2009; Cole, 2011; Reynolds, 2011). Compiling and synthesizing data from multiple studies revealed that as a result of civic ignorance, many American voters are ill-equipped to evaluate political messages and lack a basic understanding of American political systems and offices (Bahmueller & Quigley, 2011; O'Connor, 2011; Reynolds, 2011). In study after study, Americans demonstrated a ubiquitously high level of civic ignorance.

Viewing the problem through the scope of public education revealed a correlation between civic ignorance in the larger population and devaluing of civic education in schools (Hansen & Rosenstone, 2003; Jennings & Stoker, 2008; Rotherham, 2011). Studies showed that schools have diminished civics requirements in schools and that existing civics programs are of poor quality (Stern & Stern, 2011). Numerous scholars point out the detrimental effects of an overemphasis on college and career preparation, exclusive focus on math and reading instruction, standardized testing, and funding inequities on civic education (Graham, 2011; Hess, 2011; O'Connor, 2011). Hess (2011) explained that "as schooling has become more economically central the stuff of citizenship has become increasingly peripheral" (p. xii). The effects of the de-emphasis of civic education in schools are apparent when considering the results of assessments of student civic knowledge. One such assessment administered by the federal government in 2006 revealed that:

> More than two-thirds of students scored below proficiency, not even a third of eight graders surveyed could identify the historical purpose of the Declaration of Independence, and less than a fifth of twelfth graders could explained how citizen participation benefits democracy. (O'Conner, 2011, p. 7)

An exhaustive review of available research exposes American students as having a poor understanding of civics knowledge and general lack of civics skills (Feith, 2011; O'Connor, 2011; Paige, 2011; White, 2005). It is no surprise that students in the United States, who are educated in a public education system that places civics in the peripheral, demonstrate a large level of civic ignorance; a phenomenon that is also found among American adults, many of whom are products of the very same public educational system.

Civic education findings.

Findings resulting from a review of research concerning civic education reveal that scholars differ in regard to definitions of civic education, understandings of the aims of civic

education, and perspectives of the place of civic education in schools. Even though scholars present various arguments for how civics should be defined, the general understanding is that it is primarily concerned with the relationship between the citizen(s) and the state (Barr, 2005). Conceptions of citizenship affect how various individuals view civic education, and Barr (2005) effectively explained two differing views of citizenship by pointing out that:

> Those who see the state's primary duty as protecting individual rights, advocate the kind of citizenship that promotes freedom, independence, individualism and diversity. They support policies and programs that minimize government influence and maximize choice for individuals and minority groups. Those who see state unity as more important advocate the kind of citizenship education that promotes unity, conformity, and commonality. (p. 59)

When citizenship is defined by shared values and knowledge, a much different view of civics education arises than when a more critical view is adopted. These often conflicting views result in significant differences regarding the aims and goals of civics education.

Proponents of a view of citizenship that emphasizes community and establishment of shared identity advocate for a type of civics education grounded in acquisition of knowledge and basic skills while those subscribing to a more critical view argue for a civics education defined by application and interrogation of knowledge. In this study, the former is defined as foundation-building civic education (FCE) and the latter as high-level civic education (HCE). These terms were adapted from Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, Engelhart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956); FCE relating to the lower domains (involving memorization and comprehension) and HCE being characterized by its delving into the upper domains (concerning application, analysis, evaluation, and creation). The argument of those who support FCE is that civics education should focus on "simple, straight-forward instruction about how the government is structured, and how it is supposed to work" (Reynolds, 2011, p. 205). FCE involves instruction in the popular version of American history, foundational principles, political systems,

and basic civic duties. On the other hand, proponents of HCE argue that "the goal of civic education is to foster in students the will and capacity to reflect deeply on the matter and spirit of public affairs – and, ultimately, to act accordingly as citizens" (Bahmueller & Quigley, 2011, p. 135).

Aspects of FCE and HCE are found in most civics education programs, and scholars make strong arguments for the importance of both. In general, proponents of civics education echo Cole's (2011) position that the rights of citizens must be actively taught in order for them to be preserved. This is echoed by the famous Jeffersonian quote in which the founding father asserted that "those who expect to be both ignorant and free, expect what never was and never will be" (Jefferson in Dayton, 2012, p. 4). Arguments for the importance of FCE in particular are often centered on the necessity of learning the basic knowledge characteristic of FCE to perform the higher level tasks in HCE. As Dayton (2012) asserted, "understanding the history and purposes of the law not only helps you to better understand and apply the law in the present, but it also gives you a much broader understanding of the law and your essential role in advancing justice in your community" (p. xiv). Those who call for a civic education characterized by the application and interrogation characteristic of HCE claim that "knowledge alone does not lead to good citizenship" (Gibson & McKay, 2005, p. 169). Proponents of HCE demand that students be guided in how to analyze and examine civics knowledge in order to glean a deeper understanding and to become actors who actively shape their worlds. Ultimately, findings show that most scholars agree that civics programs should include aspects of both FCE and HCE (though they tend to argue about the proportions) and that in a balanced system "students who possess basic information about history and about democracy use democratic values and principles to analyze history and current situations" (White, 2005, p. 92).

In contrast to those calling for a more robust civic education in American schools are those who argue against the importance of civic education for various reasons. The voices of civics opponents and the various obstacles to civic education are found to lie in opposition to those who wish to further promote it. Ross (2011) pointed out three impediments to civic education in public schools, including "poorly conceived state requirements, a social studies discipline that sends the wrong messages about democracy and constitutional government, and civic educators' relative inability to seek crucial supplemental training" (p. 119). Additionally, civics is intentionally deemphasized by those who assert that the stuff of math and reading are more central to the future of students in their preparation for college and careers. Some argue against the importance of civic education based on practical grounds, such as Andrews (2011) who explained that "when students are three years behind grade level in reading and math deciding that civic education is a luxury is not absurd" (p. 107).

Typically, attacks against civics education are leveled either at foundation-building civic education or high-level civic education specifically. Those attacking FCE tend to focus their argument on the failure of FCE to involve critical application of knowledge and its potential to be used as a tool of indoctrination or homogenization (Barr, 2005; Gibson & McKay, 2005; Reynolds, 2011; White, 2005). Criticisms of HCE address its tendency toward the contentious and controversial, its challenge of established American principles, and its devaluing of the importance of building a common American community (Basile, 2005; Hess, 2011; Rotherham, 2011). Critics who argue against a civics education heavily focused upon FCE or HCE are correct to point out that subjecting students to extremely unbalanced forms of education has the potential to cause detriment. Hence, the position of most scholars is that civics education

programs should include a balance of FCE and HCE and be guided by skilled and informed educators.

Federal and national civic education policy findings.

Findings from an analysis of federal civic education policy from 2000 to the present reveal that the near-exclusive focus on college and career readiness, emphasis on teaching math and reading content to the exclusion of other subjects, and the accountability movement founded in standardization and high-stakes testing has crowded out the importance of civic education (Bridgeland, 2011; Graham, 2011; Hess, 2011; Hickok, 2011). Though a number of federal programs aimed at bolstering civic education were established and promoted during the administration of George W. Bush (2000 to 2008), the passage of No Child Left Behind significantly undermined the importance of civics education. Graham (2011) asserted that in regard to civic education "the federal No Child Left Behind legislation was devastating" (p. 64). As O'Connor (2011) explained, "the No Child Left Behind law and other recent educational initiatives have unintentionally contributed to the problem [of devaluing civic education] by assessing schools mainly according to students' performance in reading, math, and science" (p. 6).

The problem became more pronounced with the election and subsequent actions of President Barack Obama and his administration. The Obama administration's primary educational program, Race to the Top, provides discretionary competitive grant money to states based on action in four distinct areas (none of which relate to civic education). From 2008 to the present, not only has the focus on teaching and testing STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) subjects continued, but funding of federal programs promoting civics

education have been drastically cut. Findings show that the Obama administration has reduced funding to civic education programs championed by previous administrations (Cole, 2011).

In addition to taking detrimental action to devalue civics education, inaction has led to further damage. Graham (2011) claimed that the decline in civic education as a point of interest and action among policymakers resulted from the conclusion of those on the extreme right and left that civics education was working to their disadvantage. Ultimately, findings reveal that federal civic education policy from 2000 to the present has served to move civics further and further to the periphery in favor of funding and focus on STEM subjects.

In an effort to address the obvious devaluing of civic education at the national level, scholars promoting civics education have proposed numerous reforms that have promise of bolstering civic education. Many suggest an increase in funding for civics programs and teacher training as a means of improving civic education (Graham, 2011; Levine 2011). Others call for the institution of a national civics curriculum and mandatory national testing for civics (Levine, 2011; Paige, 2011). Additional suggested reforms include the institution of student civics surveys, performance-based civics assessments, a dedicated federal department for civics education, reform of teacher certification and education programs, separation of civics from the broader social studies category, and school choice.

Graham (2011) summarized the core argument of those proposing policy, curriculum, and institutional reforms to promote civic education by exclaiming that “lawmakers should restore civic education to its traditional role as a main component of the primary and secondary curriculum, and include civics and the social sciences as subjects on which student progress is systematically evaluated” (p. 65). Despite the impassioned calls for stronger federal support for civics education in public schools, findings reveal that federal education policy is focused

intently on promoting STEM subjects and preparing students for college and career readiness rather than active and informed citizenship.

Findings of the comparative analysis of Georgia and New Hampshire.

Demographics.

The two states that are the subject of this study, Georgia and New Hampshire, are revealed to have various significant differences and similarities in regard to geography, demographics, civic health, and civic education policy. Besides the obvious difference between the geographic location of the two states, Georgia located in the Southeastern United States and New Hampshire in the Northeast, there are stark differences in regard to land area, total population, and population density. In fact, Georgia is over six times larger than New Hampshire and the population is over seven times greater. Demographically, the citizens of the two states are similar in regard to age and gender but differ in most other measures. One of the most significant demographic differences is that Georgia has a much greater minority and immigrant population than does New Hampshire. New Hampshire's population was 91.6% Caucasian in 2010 while Georgia's was 54.8% Caucasian; the two states having an African American population of 1.5% and 31.2% respectively (U.S. Census Bureau: Georgia Quick Facts, 2014; U.S. Census Bureau: New Hampshire Quick Facts, 2014).

Similarly, acute differences are found in analysis of the educational attainment and economic data for the two states. New Hampshire is found to be generally more educated and more economical strong relative to Georgia. Georgia's population has 7% less high school graduates and 5.6% less citizens with Bachelor's degrees (U.S. Census Bureau: Georgia Quick Facts, 2014; U.S. Census Bureau: New Hampshire Quick Facts, 2014). The average per capita income of Georgia is $7,449 lower than New Hampshire, the average median household income

is $15,321 less, and 9% more of Georgia's population is below poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau: Georgia Quick Facts, 2014; U.S. Census Bureau: New Hampshire Quick Facts, 2014). So, as a whole, Georgia is larger, more densely populated, more diverse, less educated, and economically weaker than New Hampshire.

Civic health.

Georgia and New Hampshire both participated in civic health studies conducted by the National Conference on Citizenship (NCoC) in 2011, and the results of the studies found that New Hampshire is much stronger in civic health relative to Georgia and the rest of the nation. . According to the NCoC, civic health is determined based on "the degree to which residents talk to neighbors, spend time with friends or family, participate in community groups, vote, talk about politics, and act to further civic interests" (2014, para. 1). The two states were measured in 16 common civic health indicators, and Georgia ranked below New Hampshire in all but two (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012; New Hampshire Civic Health Index, 2012). New Hampshire was found to be strong in civic health indicators relating to political action, community involvement, and confidence in public institutions; areas in which Georgia proved to be weak. Georgia's strongest area of civic health was social connectedness, which concerns interaction with family and friends. In general, New Hampshire's findings are "indicative of a state that is in good civic health" (New Hampshire Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 18) while "Georgia has much room to improve its civic health" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 23).

Civic education policy.

In-depth analysis of civic education policy in Georgia and New Hampshire finds that while there are meaningful differences between the two states, both states place very little emphasis on civic education in their public secondary schools. Findings reveal that the states

differ in regard to the number and content of civics standards, while sharing comparable requirements concerning testing and graduation requirements relative to civics. While neither state mandates civics testing in order to meet the requirements for high school graduation, both states require only one-half credit of civics instruction. In that one-half credit of civics, which translates to between 67.5 and 75 hours of instructional time, Georgia students are expected to master 79 standards and New Hampshire students are responsible for learning 18. The lower number of New Hampshire civics standards allows New Hampshire students 3.25 hours more instruction time per standard to accomplish mastery. In addition to having a greater number of civics standards, Georgia's standards have 1) higher-level language with lower-level content, 2) a greater percentage of standards dedicated to topics concerning government structure, function, and foundations, 3) lower percentages of standards dedicated to matters of citizenship and international affairs, and 4) include standards related to relationships between local, state, and federal governments that are excluded from the New Hampshire standards.

Summary.

Findings show that although neither Georgia nor New Hampshire place an emphasis on civic education at the public secondary level, the states differ in regard to level of civic health and the aspects of their civic education policy concerning educational standards. New Hampshire, which is found to be less diverse, less populated, stronger economically, and of greater civic health than Georgia, differs from Georgia in regard to civic education policy primarily in that it has fewer standards overall and the content of its standards demands higher-level application. Application of the findings presented in this section to this study's research questions, and conclusions that can be drawn in the consideration of these findings, are explored in detail in the following section.

Conclusions and Implications

This section applies the findings presented previously to address the three research questions and explore implications. The overarching purpose of this study was to explore the possible relationship between civic education policy and civic health and implications arising from those relationships. Each research question is discussed independently in the following section. Finally, implications of the data are discussed as a means of extrapolating possible correlations.

Research question number one.

Question 1: What federal and state-level government policies influence civic education in Georgia and New Hampshire?

Findings reveal that since 2000 the federal government has cut funding to civic education programs and shifted focus to support for teaching and testing of STEM subjects. Race-to-the-Top funding is tied to measures that exclude civics, and the Common Core State Standards Initiative is focused on reforms in math and reading. In an effort to adapt to federal funding requirements, both Georgia and New Hampshire have adapted their state standards to conform to the Common Core Standards. These curriculum reforms have pushed civics to the periphery resulting in a focus on subjects tied more directly to college and career readiness to the exclusion of civics which is associated with the overlooked effort to prepare students for citizenship.

State-level government policies in the form of legislative statutes and rules arising from the state departments of education have the most direct influence on civic education in Georgia and New Hampshire. Of greatest influence, and the primary subject of analysis in this study, are the statutes and rules concerning secondary civics curriculum and high school graduation requirements. Both states have established, via legislative statutes and executive rules,

requirements for what must be taught in schools, credit requirements for graduation, and testing mandates that have significant bearing on their civic education policy.

Research question number two.

Question 2: What is the current state of civic health among citizens in Georgia and New Hampshire?

Based on a comparative analysis of the data gathered by the U.S. Census Bureau (2014) in the Current Population Survey (CPS) in 2010, which was compiled by the National Conference on Citizenship and used to produce civic health indexes for Georgia and New Hampshire in 2012, Georgia has relatively poor civic health in comparison to New Hampshire and the rest of the country while the converse is true for New Hampshire. Four general areas of civic health, and 16 specific indicators, were measured for both Georgia and New Hampshire using 2010 CPS data. New Hampshire was stronger than Georgia and the rest of the country in the areas of political action, community involvement, and confidence in public institutions and ranked better than Georgia in 14 of the 16 indicators. Georgia only ranked well in one category, social connectedness. In general, New Hampshire's findings are "indicative of a state that is in good civic health" (New Hampshire Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 18) while "Georgia has much room to improve its civic health" (Georgia Civic Health Index, 2012, p. 23).

Research question number three.

Questions 3: Is there a relationship between state-level civic education policy and civic health in Georgia and New Hampshire?

Although both Georgia and New Hampshire place very little emphasis on civic education in their public secondary education system, as evidenced by the extremely small amount of instructional time dedicated to civics in comparison to other courses and the lack of civics testing

mandates which are required for other subjects, New Hampshire citizens are much stronger in measures of civic health. The possibility of a relationship between the stronger civic health in New Hampshire and its state-level civic education policy hinges on the one distinct difference between civic education in the two states; educational standards. While Georgia has 61 more civics standards than New Hampshire, the New Hampshire civics standards require higher-level application and are more concerned with matters of citizenship. So, both the quantity and quality of the standards differ. So, students in New Hampshire, who are found to develop into adults with strong civic health, are given more instructional time to master civics standards, are guided in the higher-level application of those standards, and are exposed to topics concerning roles and duties of citizenship to a higher degree than are Georgian students.

Implications.

The most logical, and broad, implication that can be drawn from the findings of this study is that New Hampshire's public education system is doing a better job of producing citizens who take political action and are actively involved in their communities than is Georgia. This cannot be attributed to differences in civic education policy related to instructional time or testing mandates, because the two states are comparable in regard to those components (*i.e.,* both require 75 hours or less of civics instruction and neither mandate civics testing for high school graduation). However, it can be argued that New Hampshire's students are being better-educated in civics because of the greater emphasis on depth over breadth and more direct instruction in matters of citizenship.

As Schwartz, Sadler, Sonnert, and Tai (2009) admitted, "despite the long history and high profile of the breadth versus depth debate, the education research literature provides precious little empirical evidence that supports either approach or one over the other" (p. 800). In

recognition of the fact that there is a lack of empirical evidence supporting either depth or breadth, and that there are numerous other factors affecting civic health in Georgia and New Hampshire, this study does not claim a causal link between the greater emphasis on depth in the New Hampshire standards and the relative strength of its civic health. However, numerous studies, including this one, have shown that students who are exposed to educational programs favoring depth over breadth exhibit positive outcomes (Cavanagh, 2009; Schwartz, Sadler, Sonnert, & Tai, 2009). So, while this study does not assert the existence of a causal link, it is arguable that the correlative association between the greater the focus on depth over breadth in New Hampshire's civic education standards and its stronger civic health is meaningful.

Suggestions

There are various possible reforms at the federal and state levels have potential promise as a means of advancing civic education. The primary contribution that can be made at the federal level is to increase funding for civics programs. As Graham (2011) and Levine (2011) asserted, civics programs in public school would benefit significantly from a larger share of the funds that are now allocated to programs directly tied to college and career readiness. An additional suggestion for federal reform, which is also tied to funding, is a revision of the Race-to-the-Top (RTT) grant to include qualifying measures based on student performance in the area of civics. Incorporating civics requirements in RTT would require states that are competing for RTT funds to place greater importance on their civic education programs.

Additionally, the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which are not federally directed but are nationally impactful, could expand on the reading and mathematics standards to include social studies and civics standards. Since many of the states seeking NCLB waivers and applying for RTT funds have adopted the CCSS in order to meet federal compliance, if civics

standards were included in the CCSS then civics education may be bolstering at the state level. Those three reforms alone (increasing federal funding for civics programs, including civics requirements in RTT, and incorporating civics standards in the CCSS) have the potential to bring about a greater focus on civics education at the national level.

State-level policy suggestions are tied to funding, curriculum, assessment, and graduation requirements. As is the case at the federal level, educational funds at the state level are disproportionately allocated to STEM subjects and those associated with college and career readiness (Levine, 2011). An increase in civics funding at the state level would allow for teacher training, research, curriculum development, and resources that are not presently available. Based on the relative strength of civic health in New Hampshire and the findings of this study, curriculum reform should focus on revising the civics standards in favor of depth over breadth and with greater focus on matters of citizenship. As White (2005) explained, "a less is more approach to social studies would enable students to process content and ideas, and develop an in-depth understanding, rather than a surface understanding of facts that will soon be forgotten" (p. 95). Specifically, Georgia's standards could be cut down from 79 to a more manageable number and the content of the standards could be altered to include more emphasis on citizenship and higher-level application.

Additionally, state-level civics credits needed for graduation could be increased to provide greater instructional time to students which would allow for more breadth and depth of study. This reform would require the revision of existing administrative rules established by state departments of education which, in Georgia, would expand the civics requirement from one-half credit (75 instructional hours) to a greater number; bringing civics in line with other subjects such as mathematics and language arts. Additional administrative rule revisions would

be required to alter high school graduation testing requirements at the state level to mandate civics testing. Not only do numerous studies show that greater time is afforded to subjects that are tested (Berliner, 2011; Blazer, 2011), but Berliner (2011) pointed out that studies of schools whose students are subjected to high-stakes testing have found that time is cut from non-tested subjects and "social studies (civics, history, law and related studies) is the curriculum area from which most time is taken" (p. 290). Adding civics to the list of subjects with mandatory testing for high school graduation may catalyze changes at the state and local school levels resulting in greater emphasis being placed on civics education.

Call to action.

Ultimately, the ubiquitous emphasis on college and career readiness at the national, state, and local levels must be altered to include consideration of citizenship if civics education has any hope of being strengthened. In order to escape the mandates of NCLB, many states, including Georgia, have applied for and been granted NCLB waivers. To comply with NCLB waiver requirements and to qualify for RTT funds, Georgia has adopted the CCSS (as have many other states) and transitioned from measuring schools by Adequate Yearly Progress guidelines to the College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI). The CCSS are focused on mathematics and reading and the CCRPI, as its name clearly states, is concerned primarily with college and career readiness and those areas of education that are most closely tied to preparing students to succeed in the workplace and at the secondary level.

What is largely absent in the discussion of educational reform is any talk of preparing students to be informed, active, and responsible citizens. A clear message regarding the lack of perceived importance of civics by state-level education policy-makers in Georgia has been sent by the funding, curriculum, and assessment decisions that have been made in recent years.

However, as White (2005) explained, “schooling isn’t just to train good little workers for McDonald’s or General Motors” (p. 85) and neither is it meant be exclusively focused on preparation of students for additional schooling.

The findings of the Georgia Civic Health Index (2011), which rank Georgia extremely low in comparison to the rest of the country in nearly every indicator of civic health, are not surprising considering the condition of civics education in the state. Policymakers in Georgia, and across the country, have intentionally pushed civics to the periphery in favor of STEM subjects and those that are perceived to be more closely tied to college and career readiness. Those policymakers should heed the words of George Washington, who demanded that “the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican government, are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally stacked, on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people” (Washington in Cole, 2011, p. 84). As representatives of the people, and those with the greatest power to shape the course of society, policymakers must take to heart the fact that the fate of our democracy depends on the people of the nation and their ability to understand and engage in the political processes that shape society. Ultimately, the goal should be to “create institutions, in government and in our communities, that will continuously improve civic education into the future” (Levine, 2011, p. 215) thus ensuring that citizens have the necessary knowledge, skills, and disposition to preserve and further American democracy and liberty.

REFERENCES

Andrew, S. (2011). Fighting civic malpractice: How a Harlem charter school closes the civic achievement gap. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 99-109). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

American Revolution Center. (2009*). The American Revolution: Who cares? Americans are yearning to learn, failing to know*. Dautrich, K. Retrieved from http://www.americanrevolutioncenter.org/sites/default/files/attachment/ARCv27_web.pdf

Bahmueller, C. F., & Quigley, C. N. (2011). Teaching political sophistication: On self-interest and the common good. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 127-137). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Barbour, M. K., Evans, M., & Ritter, J. (2007). Situating the Georgia Performance Standard in the social studies debate: An improvement for social studies classrooms or continuing the whitewash. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 31*(1), 27-33.

Barr, H. (2005). Toward a model of citizenship education: Coping with differences in definition. In R. Openshaw & C. White (Eds.), *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education* (pp. 55-76). Oxford, UK: Lexington Books.

Basile, C. (2005). Jefferson County open school: Voices of global citizenship. In R. Openshaw & C. White (Eds.), *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education* (pp. 55-76). Oxford, UK: Lexington Books.

Berliner, D. (2011). Rational response to high stakes testing: The case of curriculum narrowing and the harm that follows. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 41*(3), 287-302.

Blazer, C. (2011). Unintended consequences of high-stakes testing. Information Capsule. Volume 1008. *Research Services, Miami-Dade County Public Schools.*

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of education objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook 1: Cognitive domain.* Longman, NY: Longman.

Bridgeland, J. M. (2011). Civic nation: My White House mission after September 11. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 41-49). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Campbell, D. E. (2010). The civic side of school choice: An empirical analysis of civic education in public and private schools. *Brigham Young University Law Review, 2*(2010): 487-524. Retrieved from http://ehis.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=17&hid=6&sid=46b35fc1-61b8-4004-82e5-cac20a622da4%40sessionmgr112.

Cavanagh, S. (2009). "Depth" matters in high school science studies. *Education Week, 28*(24), 1.

Cole, B. (2011). Revolutionary ignorance: What do Americans know of the original tea party? In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 81-88). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Common Core State Standards Initiative Frequently Asked Questions. (2014). Common Core State Standards Initiative. Retrieved from www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/FAQs.pdf

Constitution of the State of Georgia. (1982). State of Georgia. Retrieved from http://sos.georgia.gov/elections/GAConstitution.pdf.

Constitution of New Hampshire (1784). Retrieved from https://www.nh.gov/constitution/constitution.html

Constitution of the United States. (1787). United States of America. Retrieved from http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution.html.

Dayton, J. (2012). Education *law: Principles, policies, and practice.* Bangor, ME: Wisdom Builders Press.

Dayton, J. (2013). *Georgia education law: A state law companion to John Dayton's education law: principals, policies, and practice.* Bangor, ME: Wisdom Builders Press.

Dershowitz, A. M. (2011). The right to know your rights: Civic literacy, the Miranda warnings, and me. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 27-32). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Diamond, L. (1997). Cultivating democratic citizenship. *The Social Studies, 88*(6): 244-251.

Feith, D. (2011). Keeping the republic. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. xvii-xx). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Finn, C. E. (1988). The social studies debacle among the educationaloids. *The American Spectator (May):* 15-16.

Galston, W. A. (2003). Civic education and political participation. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(1): 29–33.

Georgia Civic Health Index. (2012). National *Conference on Citizenship*. Retrieved from http://www.cviog.uga.edu/free-downloads/georgia-civic-health-index.pdf

Georgia Department of Education (2014). Retrieved from http://www.gadoe.org/Pages/Home.aspx

Georgia Department of Education Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Pages/default.aspx

Georgia Department of Education End of Course Tests. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.gadoe.org/curriculum-instruction-and-assessment/assessment/pages/eoct.aspx

Georgia Department of Education: Georgia Performance Standards for Social Studies. (2014). Retrieved from https://www.georgiastandards.org/Standards/Pages/BrowseStandards/SocialStudiesStandards.aspx

Georgia Department of Education Georgia High School Graduation Test Content Descriptors: Social Studies. (2010). Retrieved from http://archives.gadoe.org/DMGetDocument.aspx/GHSGT%20Social%20Studies%20Content%20Descriptions%20GPS%20Version%20Update%20Oct%202010.pdf?p=6CC6799F8C1371F6A344D9C15C23A9D859A861593B934AB75F446073BD12714C&Type=D

Georgia Department of Education Georgia High School Writing Test. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Assessment/Pages/Georgia-High-School-Writing-Test.aspx

Georgia Department of Education State Education Rules. (2014). Retrieved from http://archives.gadoe.org/pea_board.aspx?PageReq=PEABoardRules

GeorgiaStandards.org: American Government/Civics. (2014). Retrieved from https://www.georgiastandards.org/standards/Georgia%20Performance%20Standards/American-Government.pdf

Gibson, S., & McKay, R. (2005). Reexamining competing views of citizenship education and their influence on social studies. In R. Openshaw & C. White (Eds.), *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education* (pp. 55-76). Oxford, UK: Lexington Books.

Gist, J. M., & Jozwick, F. X. (2009). *Angst and evolution: The struggle for human potential.* Casper, WY: Abzar Pub USA.

Goertz, M. (2009). Standards-based reform: Lessons from the past, directions for the future. In K. K. Wong & R. Rothman (Eds.), *Clio at the table: Using history to inform and improve education policy* (pp. 201-219). New York: Peter Lang.

Graham, B. (2011). A failure of leadership: The duty of politicians and universities to salvage citizenship. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 61-68). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Grant, C. (2013). *New Georgia encyclopedia: Education reform.* Retrieved from http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/education/education-reform

Greer, L. (2013). At issue: Common Core Standards. *Georgia Senate Research Office.* Retrieved from http://www.senate.ga.gov/sro/Documents/AtIssue/atissue_June13.pdf

Hall, D. E., &Wallace, R. S. (1999) A New Hampshire education timeline. New Hampshire Historical Society. Retrieved from http://www.nhhistory.org/edu/support/nhlearnmore/nhedtimeline.pdf

Hansen, J. M., & Rosenstone. (2003). *Mobilization, participation, and democracy in America.* New York, NY: Longman.

Hennessy, M., & Jamieson, K. H. (2007). Public understanding of and support for the courts: Survey results. *Georgetown Law Journal, 95*(4): 899-901.

Hess, F. M. (2011). Civic education, devalued. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. xi-xv). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Hickok, E. (2011). Civic literacy and no child left behind: A lesson in the limits of government power. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 51-60). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Highton, B. (1998). Revisiting the relationship between education attainment and political sophistication. *Journal of Politics, 71*(4), 1564-1576. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Huff, C. A. (2013). *New Georgia encyclopedia: Georgia Department of Education.* Retrieved from http://www.georgiaencyclopedia.org/articles/government-politics/georgia-department-education

Hutchins, R. M. (1956). *Freedom, education and the fund: Essays and addresses.* New York: Meridian Books.

Jennings, M. K., & Stoker, L. (2008). Another and longer look at the impact of higher education on political involvement and attitudes. *Midwest Political l Science Association Convention: April 3-6, 2008.* Retrieved from http://ehis.ebscohost.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=46b35fc1-61b8-4004-82e5-cac20a622da4%40sessionmgr112&vid=9&hid=115

Junn, J., & Niemi, R. G. (1998). *Civic education: What made students learn*. Durham, NC: Running Feet Books.

K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework. (2006). Retrieved from http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/social_studies/documents/frameworks.pdf

Kaestle, C. (2007). Federal education policy and the changing national polity for education. In C. Kaestle & A. Lodewick, (Eds.), *To educate a nation: Federal strategies and national strategies of school reform.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Kilpatrick, D. G. (2000). Definitions of public policy and the law. National Violence Against Women Research Center. Retrieved from https://mainweb-v.musc.edu/vawprevention/policy/definition.shtml

Kingdon, J. W. (2011). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2nd ed.). Glenview, IL: Pearson.

Kirst, M. W., &Wirt, F. M. (2009). *The political dynamics of American education* (4th ed.). Richmond, CA: McCutchman Publishing Corporation.

Kyl, J. (2011). Safeguarding American exceptionalism: An uninformed citizenry risks ceding excessive power to government. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 33-38). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Lefkowitz, J. P. (2011). How school choice enhances civic health: Vouchers and informed politics. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 193- 202). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Levine, P. (2011). Letter to President Obama: A policy approach for the federal government. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 209-217). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

McDonald, M. (2010). 2008 General Election turnout rates. United States Election Project, October 10, 2010. Retrieved from http://elections.gmu.edu/Turnout_2008G.html

National Conference on Citizenship. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.ncoc.net

New Hampshire Civic Health Index. (2012). *National Conference on Citizenship*. Retrieved from http://www.ncoc.net/index.php?download=114jbcfl954

New Hampshire College and Career Ready Standards. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/

New Hampshire Department of Education. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.education.nh.gov

New Hampshire Department of Education: About Us. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.education.nh.gov/aboutus/index.htm

New Hampshire Department of Education Administrative Rules for Education. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.education.nh.gov/legislation/admin_rules_toc.htm

New Hampshire Department of Education Smarter Balanced Assessment Transition Frequently Asked Questions. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.education.nh.gov/spotlight/ccss/documents/faq_sbac.pdf

New Hampshire Department of Education Social Studies Assessment. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.education.nh.gov/instruction/curriculum/social_studies/assessment.htm

New Hampshire State Constitution. (2007). Retrieved from http://www.nh.gov/constitution/constitution.html

New Hampshire General Court. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/XV/193-C/193-C-3.htm

O'Connor, S. D. (2011). The democratic purpose of education: From the founders to Horace Mann to today. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 3-14). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Onosko, J. (2011). Race to the Top leaves children and future citizens behind: The devastating effects of centralization, standardization, and high stakes accountability. *Democracy & Education, 19*(2). Retrieved from http://democracyeducationjournal.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1017&context=home

Paige, R. (2011). Forgetting Martin Luther King's dream: How politics threatens America's civil rights memory. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 69-79). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Reynolds, G. H. (2011). Education versus indoctrination: What separates sound policy from state overreach? In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 203-208). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Ross, J. (2011). The wisdom of twenty thousand teachers: Strengthen state requirements, stop marginalizing the founders. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 119-126). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Rotherham, A. J. (2011). Core curriculum: How to tackle general illiteracy and civic illiteracy at the same time. In D. Feith (Ed.), *Teaching America: The case for civic education* (pp. 89-96). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Saad, L. (2010). Congress ranks last in confidence in institutions. Gallup, July 22, 2010. Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/141512/congress-ranks-last-confidence-institutions.aspx.

Schwartz, M. S., Sadler, P. M., Sonnert, G., & Tai, R. H. (2009). Depth versus breadth: How content coverage in high school science courses relates to later success in college science coursework. *Science Education, 93*(5), 798-826.

State of New Hampshire Revised Statutes Online. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/indexes/

Stern, J. A., & Stern, S. M. (2011). The state of state us history standards 2011. Thomas B. Fordham Institute, February 2011. Retrieved from http://www.edexcellence.net/publications/the-state-of-state-us.html.

United States Census Bureau Current Population Survey. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/cps/methodology/

United States Census Bureau: Georgia Quick Facts. (2014). Retrieved from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/13000.html

United States Census Bureau: New Hampshire Quick Facts. (2014). Retrieved from http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/33000.html

Vinovskis, M. (2008). *From a Nation at Risk to No Child Left Behind: National education goals and the creation of federal education policy.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Walker, T. (2005). Whose civics, whose citizen: Reconceptualizing U. S. democracy in the Postindustrial Era. In R. Openshaw & C. White (Eds.), *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education* (pp. 55-76). Oxford, UK: Lexington Books.

Wall, D. (2005). *The impact of high-stakes examinations on classroom teaching: A case study using insights from testing and innovation theory.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

White, C. (2005). Critical democratic education for social efficacy. In R. Openshaw & C. White (Eds.), *Democracy at the crossroads: International perspectives on critical global citizenship education* (pp. 77-104). Oxford, UK: Lexington Books.

Wolf, P. J. (2007). Civics exam. *Education Next, 7*(3): 66-72. Retrieved from http://educationnext.org/files/ednext_20073_66.pdf.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: American Government/Civics Georgia Performance Standards		
GPS Code	**Standard**	**Guidelines**
SSCG1	The student will demonstrate knowledge of the political philosophies that shaped the development of United States constitutional government.	A. Analyze key ideas of limited government and the rule of law as seen in the *Magna Carta*, the *Petition of Rights*, and the *English Bill of Rights*.
		B. Analyze the writings of Hobbes (*Leviathan*), Locke (*Second Treatise on Government*), and Montesquieu (*The Spirit of Laws*) as they affect our concept of government.
SSCG2	The student will analyze the natural rights philosophy and the nature of government expressed in the *Declaration of Independence*.	A. Compare and contrast the *Declaration of Independence* and the *Social Contract Theory*.
		B. Evaluate the *Declaration of Independence* as a persuasive argument.
SSCG3	The student will demonstrate knowledge of the *United States Constitution*.	A. Explain the main ideas in debate over ratification; include those in *The Federalist*.
		B. Analyze the purpose of government stated in the *Preamble of the United States Constitution*.
		C. Explain the fundamental principles upon which the *United States Constitution* is based; include the rule of law, popular sovereignty, separation of powers, checks and balances, and federalism.
SSCG4	The student will demonstrate knowledge of the organization and powers of the national government.	A. Describe the structure and powers of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.
		B. Analyze the relationship between the three branches in a system of checks and balances and separation of powers.

Appendix A: American Government/Civics Georgia Performance Standards		
GPS Code	**Standard**	**Guidelines**
SSCG5	The student will demonstrate knowledge of the federal system of government described in the *United States Constitution*.	A. Explain the relationship of state governments to the national government.
		B. Define the difference between enumerated and implied powers.
		C. Describe the extent to which power is shared.
		D. Identify powers denied to state and national governments.
		E. Analyze the ongoing debate that focuses on the balance of power between state and national governments.
		F. Analyze the supremacy clause found in Article VI and the role of the *U.S. Constitution* as the "supreme law of the land."
		G. Explain the meaning of the *Pledge of Allegiance* to the flag of the United States.
SSCG6	The student will demonstrate knowledge of civil liberties and civil rights.	A. Examine the *Bill of Rights* with emphasis on First Amendment freedoms.
		B. Analyze due process law expressed in the 5th and 14th Amendments.
		C. Explain selective incorporation of the *Bill of Rights*.
		D. Explain how government seeks to maintain the balance between individual liberties and the public interest.
		E. Explain every citizen's right to be treated equally under the law.

Appendix A: American Government/Civics Georgia Performance Standards		
GPS Code	**Standard**	**Guidelines**
SSCG7	The student will describe how thoughtful and effective participation in civic life is characterized by obeying the law, paying taxes, serving on a jury, participating in the political process, performing public service, registering for military duty, being informed about current issues, and respecting differing opinions.	N/A
SSCG8	The student will demonstrate knowledge of local, state, and national elections.	A. Describe the organization, role, and constituencies of political parties.
		B. Describe the nomination and election process.
		C. Examine campaign funding and spending.
		D. Analyze the influence of media coverage, campaign advertising, and public opinion polls.
		E. Identify how amendments extend the right to vote.
SSCG9	The student will explain the differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate, with emphasis on terms of office, powers, organization, leadership, and representation of each house.	N/A
SSCG10	The student will describe the legislative process including the roles played by committees and leadership.	A. Explain the steps in the legislative process.
		B. Explain the function of various leadership positions within the legislature.

Appendix A: American Government/Civics Georgia Performance Standards		
GPS Code	**Standard**	**Guidelines**
SSCG11	The student will describe the influence of lobbyists (business, labor, professional organizations) and special interest groups on the legislative process.	A. Explain the function of lobbyists.
		B. Describe the laws and rules that govern lobbyists.
		C. Explain the function of special interest groups.
SSCG12	The student will analyze the various roles played by the President of the United States; including Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, chief executive, and chief agenda setter, representative of the nation, chief of state, foreign policy leader, and party leader.	N/A
SSCG13	The student will describe the qualifications for becoming President of the United States.	A. Explain the written qualifications for President of the United States.
		B. Describe unwritten qualifications common to past presidents.
SSCG14	The student will explain the impeachment process and its usage for elected officials.	A. Explain the impeachment process as defined in the *U.S. Constitution*.
		B. Describe the impeachment proceedings of Andrew Johnson and Bill Clinton.
SSCG15	The student will explain the functions of the departments and agencies of the federal bureaucracy.	A. Compare and contrast the organization and responsibilities of independent regulatory agencies, government corporations, and executive agencies.
		B. Explain the functions of the Cabinet.
SSCG16	The student will demonstrate knowledge of the operation of the federal judiciary.	A. Explain the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, federal courts and the state courts.
		B. Examine how John Marshall established the Supreme Court as an independent, coequal branch of government through his opinions in *Marbury v. Madison*.

Appendix A: American Government/Civics Georgia Performance Standards		
GPS Code	**Standard**	**Guidelines**
		C. Describe how the Supreme Court decides cases.
		D. Compare the philosophies of judicial activism and judicial restraint.
SSCG17	The student will demonstrate knowledge of the organization and powers of state and local government described in the Georgia Constitution.	A. Examine the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.
		B. Examine the structure of local governments with emphasis on county, city, and town.
		C. Identify current state and local officials.
		D. Analyze the relationship among state and local governments.
		E. Evaluate direct democracy by the initiative, referendum, and recall processes.
SSCG18	The student will demonstrate knowledge of the powers of Georgia's state and local governments.	A. Examine the powers of state and local government.
		B. Examine sources of revenue received by each level of government.
		C. Analyze the services provided by state and local government.
SSCG19	The student will compare and contrast governments that are unitary, confederal, and federal; autocratic, oligarchic and democratic; and presidential and parliamentary.	N/A

Appendix A: American Government/Civics Georgia Performance Standards		
GPS Code	**Standard**	**Guidelines**
SSCG20	The student will describe the tools used to carry out United States foreign policy (diplomacy; economic, military, and humanitarian aid; treaties; sanctions and military intervention).	N/A
SSCG21	The student will describe the causes and effects of criminal activity.	A. Examine the nature and causes of crimes.
		B. Explain the effects criminal acts have on their intended victims.
		C. Categorize different types of crimes.
		D. Explain the different types of defenses used by perpetrators of crime.
SSCG22	The student will demonstrate knowledge of the criminal justice process.	A. Analyze the steps in the criminal justice process.
		B. Explain an individual's due process rights.
		C. Describe the steps in a criminal trial or civil suit.
		D. Examine the different types of sentences a convicted person can receive.
Data source: Georgia Department of Education: Georgia Performance Standards for Social Studies (2014)		

Appendix B: New Hampshire High School Civics and Government Standards	
General Standard	**Specific Standards**
SS:CV:1: The Nature and Purpose of Government Students will demonstrate an understanding of the nature of governments, and the fundamental ideals of government of the United States.	SS:CV:12:1.1: Identify the structures and functions of government at various levels, *e.g.,*, county—role of the sheriff's office, or nation—role of providing the defense of the country. SS:CV:12:1.2: Examine how institutions and individuals make, apply, and enforce rules and laws, *e.g.,*, the Federal Communications Commission regulations on television broadcast standards or local public hearings on zoning regulations. SS:CV:12:1.3: Evaluate how the purposes of government have been interpreted, *e.g.,*, promoting the general welfare or protection of private property. SS:CV:12:1.4: Explain how in the United States legitimate authority derives from custom, law and consent of the governed, *e.g.,*, the *Mayflower Compact* or local curfews.
SS:CV:2: Structure and Function of United States and New Hampshire Government Students will demonstrate an understanding of major provisions of the *United States* and *New Hampshire Constitutions*, and the organization and operation of government at all levels including the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.	SS:CV:12:2.1: Describe how the fundamental ideals and principles of American government are incorporated in the *United States Constitution* and the *New Hampshire Constitution*, *e.g.,*, the rule of law or individual rights and responsibilities. SS:CV:12:2.2: Analyze the evolution of the *United States Constitution* as a living document, *e.g.,*, the *Bill of Rights* or *Plessy v. Ferguson*. SS:CV:12:2.3: Describe the roles and responsibilities of the United States and New Hampshire judicial systems, *e.g.,*, resolution of conflict between states or New Hampshire Legislature's use of advisory opinions from the New Hampshire Supreme Court.

Appendix B: New Hampshire High School Civics and Government Standards	
General Standard	**Specific Standards**
	SS:CV:12:2.4: Evaluate how individual rights have been extended in the United States, *e.g.,*, Truman's integration of the Armed Services or the Miranda decision.
SS:CV:3: The World and the United States' Place In It Students will demonstrate an understanding of the relationship of the United States to other countries, and the role of the United States in world affairs.	SS:CV:12:3.1: Discuss the impact on world affairs and the United States' response to environmental, economic, and technological issues, *e.g.,*, intellectual property rights or global warming. SS:CV:12:3.2: Discuss the relationship between domestic and foreign policy, *e.g.,*, farm subsidies or the impact of the 2003 Iraq war on the United Kingdom, the United States, and Spain. SS:CV:12:3.3: Discuss the impact of United States' contributions to the ideals of democracy and representative government on world affairs., *e.g.,*, the *United States Constitution* or free elections.
SS:CV:4: Rights and Responsibilities Students will demonstrate an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and the ability to apply their knowledge of local, state, and national government through the political process and citizen involvement.	SS:CV:12:4.1: Demonstrate responsible practices within the political process, *e.g.,*, registering to vote or taking civic action. SS:CV:12:4.2: Investigate how knowledgeable and engaged citizens have acted to preserve and extend their liberties, *e.g.,*, writing letters to the editor or participating in town meetings. SS:CV:12:4.3: Explain why the preservation of liberty requires the participation of knowledgeable and engaged citizens, *e.g.,*, writing letters to the editor or participating in town meetings.
Data source: K-12 Social Studies New Hampshire Curriculum Framework (2006)	