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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Deliberating in a Democracy in the Americas (DDA) Project was directed by the Constitutional Rights Foundation Chicago (CRFC), in collaboration with the Constitutional Rights Foundation in Los Angeles (CRF) and Street Law, Inc., with a grant from the U.S. Department of Education (#Q304A100003), October 2010 – September 2012. The DDA Project involved teachers and students in five countries, including Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and the United States.

The overall goal of the DDA Project was to increase the knowledge, ability, and dispositions of secondary teachers in both Latin America and the United States to conduct controversial public issues discussions on topics of mutual concern in secondary classrooms. Major activities associated with the project include: (1) teacher professional development workshops, (2) classroom deliberations, (3) online interactions between students at different sites, and (4) videoconferences between students at different sites.

The evaluation of the project is based on data collected from teacher and student questionnaires; individual interviews with site directors, teachers, and school administrators; classroom observations; and student focus groups. Key findings include the following:

- 134 secondary teachers from 11 sites were trained to facilitate classroom deliberations during the 2011-2012 school year.
- Ninety-one percent (91%) of the teachers who responded to the pre-deliberation questionnaire rated the training workshop as “Above Average” or “One of the Best” in comparison to other workshops they had attended.
- Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the teachers reported that their understanding of democracy deepened as a result of their participation in the DDA Project.¹
- One hundred percent (100%) of the teachers reported conducting three or more deliberations in their classrooms.
- Teachers reported that 9,443 students participated in at least one deliberation in their classes between August 2011 and June 2012.
- Over 90% of teachers Agreed to Strongly Agreed that deliberations helped their students to develop a deeper understanding of issues (96%), engage in critical thinking (94%), make decisions based on evidence and logic (93%), respect others’ points of view (91%), and identify multiple perspectives associated with the deliberation topics (94%).

¹ Teacher findings for this statement and the remainder of the Executive Summary are based on responses to the teacher post-deliberation questionnaire. One hundred and twenty-four (124) of the 134 teachers completed this questionnaire.
• Over 90% of teachers Agreed to Strongly Agree that deliberations helped their students respect others’ points of view (91%), and identify multiple perspectives associated with the deliberation topics (94%).

• Over 90% of teachers Agreed to Strongly Agree that deliberations helped their students to develop a deeper understanding of issues (96%), engage in critical thinking (94%), make decisions based on evidence and logic (93%), respect others’ points of view (91%), and identify multiple perspectives associated with the deliberation topics (94%).

• Over 90% of teachers Agreed to Strongly Agree that deliberations helped their students respect others’ points of view (91%), and identify multiple perspectives associated with the deliberation topics (94%).

• Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the teachers indicated that they had used videoconferencing (64%) or online activities (40%) to connect with students from other countries.

• The majority of students who completed a post-deliberation questionnaire (n=2,833) reported that they enjoyed the deliberations (89%), learned a great deal through their participation, (89%), and developed a better understanding of issues discussed (90%). In addition, 81% of students indicated that they were more confident when talking about controversial issues and 84% reported they increased their ability to state their opinions.
OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

The Deliberating in a Democracy in the Americas (DDA) Project was directed by the Constitutional Rights Foundation Chicago (CRFC), in collaboration with the Constitutional Rights Foundation in Los Angeles (CRF) and Street Law, Inc., with a grant from the U.S. Department of Education (#Q304A100003), October 2010 – September 2012. The University of Minnesota was contracted by the CRFC to conduct an external evaluation of the project. The DDA Project involved teachers and students in five countries, including Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and the United States.

The overall goal of the DDA Project was to increase the knowledge, ability, and dispositions of secondary teachers in both Latin America and the United States to conduct controversial public issues discussions on topics of mutual concern in secondary classrooms. Major activities associated with the project include: (1) teacher professional development workshops, (2) classroom deliberations, (3) online interactions between students at different sites, and (4) videoconferences between students at different sites.

Each of the Latin American sites was partnered with a site in the United States for the purpose of increasing all teachers’ and students’ intercultural awareness and understanding (Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin American Site</th>
<th>Site in United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador, Guayaquil</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador, Quito</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico, Mexico City</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico, Pachuca &amp; Cuernavaca</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru, Lima North</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru, Lima South</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description

Chronology of Events

This section provides a broad overview of the sequence of major events associated with the DDA Project in 2011-2012.

February 2011. The pre-project planning meeting for site directors participating in the 2011-2012 DDA Project took place in Los Angeles, California, from February 24–27. Site Directors from both Latin America and the United States met to learn the Structured Academic
Controversy (SAC)\(^2\) methodology; to review project expectations, including the evaluation design; to jointly identify 12 issues for lesson development and classroom deliberation; and to plan the initial professional development seminars. A complete list of the deliberation questions can be found in Appendix A. Each U.S. site was matched with a Latin American partner site during the planning meeting to coordinate activities and schedules for the 2011-2012 school year. Thirty-six (36) people attended the meeting.

**Summer 2011.** Two separate teacher workshops occurred during summer 2011. The first workshop was held July 3-7 in Cuernavaca, Mexico and included teachers from California, Colombia, Illinois, Mexico, and Minnesota. The second workshop was held August 1-4 in Lima, Peru and included teachers from Colorado, Ecuador, Maryland, North Carolina, Peru, and Virginia. The central goal for the workshops was to prepare teachers and site directors to successfully implement the *DDA Project*. At the workshops, teachers were expected to: distinguish between discussion, debate, and deliberation; explain how deliberation is essential for democracy; examine the principles of democracy; access materials on the DDA website; network with teachers in partner sites; support the exchange of student work or experiences between partner sites; and support the needs of the evaluation. There were 76 individuals who attended the workshop in Mexico and 96 individuals who attended the workshop in Peru.\(^3\)

**August 2011- May 2012.** Timelines for specific sites varied, but during this time each teacher was to conduct three deliberations and participate in three teacher professional development sessions. Each professional development session was to be followed by teacher implementation of a deliberation (also called Structured Academic Controversy or SAC) in their classrooms. However, due to individual teacher and site needs, there was some variation in this sequence.

During this time, many of the site directors, teachers, and students communicated with their international partners through Skype video conferences and utilized multiple forms of electronic communication such as Facebook and email.

**June 2012.** From June 25–27, *DDA Project* staff convened a culminating three-day conference in Chicago, Illinois. *DDA Project* participants from all 11 sites and 5 countries attended the conference. There were 128 conference participants. The conference, entitled *Deliberation: An Authentic Learning Opportunity*, served as a final opportunity for participants from all 11 sites to meet and reflect upon the *DDA Project*. The central goal was to provide a forum for DDA participants to share and expand their professional knowledge and insights on the use of deliberation as an authentic learning opportunity. As a result of this conference, teachers were expected to:

- Enhance their use of deliberation as a method for teaching about citizenship and democracy;
- Promote and sustain deliberation as an instructional practice in their classrooms, schools, and in the broader educational community;
- Implement new and innovative civic education strategies in their classrooms;

---

\(^2\) Structured Academic Controversy (SAC) was originally developed by David and Roger Johnson at the University of Minnesota; the DDA staff adapted the model for the purposes of this project.

\(^3\) Number of individuals appearing on each workshop participant list.
• Analyze and explain cultural distinctions in democratic theory;
• Evaluate and assess teaching and learning of democracy and public policy through authentic civic education; and
• Encourage students to be active, thoughtful democratic citizens through participation in public life.

Featured keynote speakers at the conference included: Dr. Patricia G. Avery (University of Minnesota), Dr. Diana E. Hess (Spencer Foundation), Gabriel Murillo Castaño (University of Los Andes), Dr. Walter Parker (University of Washington), and Carolyn Pereira (Founder & Life Director, Constitutional Rights Foundation Chicago).
OVERVIEW OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation design consisted of two overlapping components. The first component, designed to generate data for use by key stakeholders for improving the project, was based on an adapted version of Thomas Guskey’s\(^4\) five-level model for evaluating professional development: (1) participants’ reactions, (2) participants’ learning, (3) organizational support and change, (4) participants’ use of new knowledge and skills, and (5) student learning outcomes. The second component of the evaluation design documents the degree to which the DDA Project achieved its stated outcomes. As such, the key evaluation questions were:

1. *Teachers’ Reactions to Training:* How satisfied are the teachers with the professional development experiences?
2. *Teachers’ Learning:* Did teachers deepen their content and pedagogical knowledge as a result of professional development activities?
3. *Organizational Support and Change:* What support was provided for project teachers?
4. *Teachers’ Use of New Knowledge and Skills:* Are the goals and objectives of the professional development experience reflected in teachers’ practices?
5. *Student Learning Outcomes:* Are the goals and objectives of the project reflected in student learning?
6. *Achievement of Outcomes:* To what degree did the DDA Project achieve its stated outcomes?

**Evaluation Methodology**

The University of Minnesota evaluation team worked collaboratively with *DDA Project* staff to develop and implement data collection processes designed to meet the information needs for the grant. The evaluators used a mixed-methods approach to collect and analyze information (see Table 2). The methods used in the evaluation of the project included teacher and student questionnaires; individual interviews with site directors, teachers, and school administrators; classroom observations; and student focus groups. The protocols used to collect information throughout the *DDA Project* can be found in Appendixes B–L. The Evaluation Methodology section of this report describes the methods used for the evaluation.

In collaboration with the *DDA Project* staff, the evaluation team selected Mexico and Minnesota for a more in-depth examination. Minnesota was selected for its physical proximity to the evaluation team. Mexico was selected because it was Minnesota’s partner site.

**Questionnaires**

*Teachers.* Two questionnaires were administered to teachers throughout the project. The first questionnaire (hereinafter pre-deliberation questionnaire) was administered to teachers who attended one of two DDA training workshops held during summer 2011 via an online survey software tool (Survey Monkey). The second questionnaire (post-deliberation questionnaire) was administered to all teachers in spring 2012. In each instance, the instruments were translated into Spanish by a Minnesota agency specializing in translation services, and were then reviewed by

---

one site director in Mexico and one in Peru for a final check of language and Latin American cultural sensitivities. Each teacher was able to select either an English or Spanish version of the questionnaires to complete.

Invitations to complete the pre-deliberation questionnaires were e-mailed to 135 teachers immediately following the workshop they attended in July (Cuernavaca, Mexico) or August 2011 (Lima, Peru). Teachers were invited to complete the post-deliberation questionnaire in late spring 2012. Follow-up reminders were e-mailed to teachers one week after each initial invitation to complete a questionnaire, followed by a final reminder one week later. The pre- and post-deliberation questionnaires can be found in Appendixes B and C, respectively.

Qualitative and quantitative responses for both questionnaires were entered into a data file for statistical analysis. Quantitative data are reported as one or more of the following: the percentage of respondents or number of responses for each question, the number count of respondents selecting the answer, and the mean scores for Likert-type (e.g., Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) items. Teachers’ qualitative responses to open-ended questions are reported throughout by themes that emerged from data analysis.

**Students.** Pre- and post-deliberation questionnaires were administered to students using an online survey software tool (Survey Monkey). The students who participated in the questionnaires were identified by teachers as those in attendance in their “target” class (the class chosen by teachers for evaluation purposes). The pre-deliberation questionnaire was administered to students from summer through fall 2011 across all 11 project sites, depending on when the teachers and students started the deliberations. Most of the pre-deliberation questionnaires were completed 7 - 10 days prior to the first deliberation. A post-deliberation questionnaire was administered to students after completion of the deliberations. The questionnaires were translated into Spanish and reviewed by site directors in Mexico and Peru for clarification of Spanish and cultural sensitivities. Each student was able to select either an English or Spanish version of the questionnaires to complete.

Both qualitative and quantitative responses were entered into two data files for statistical analysis. One database includes responses from all students who completed a post-deliberation questionnaire (n=2,833). The second database includes matched pairs of students who completed both the pre- and post-deliberation questionnaires (n=1,938).

Quantitative data are reported as one or more of the following: the percentage of respondents for each question, the number count of respondents selecting the answer, and the mean scores for Likert-type (e.g., Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) items, and Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test used to compare the difference between students’ pre- and post-deliberation questionnaire responses. Students’ qualitative responses to open-ended questions are reported throughout by themes that emerged from data analysis. Student questionnaire protocols can be found in Appendixes D and E.

---

5 One teacher dropped out following the conference for reasons unrelated to the project. Thus, throughout the remainder of the report we refer to 134 teachers total.
Individual Interviews

Teachers. Teachers from Mexico (n=4) and Minnesota (n=5) participated in a phone or in-person interview regarding their experiences implementing the deliberation process in their classes. The evaluators took notes and also made an audio recording. Each interview lasted approximately 30-45 minutes and was transcribed into a database and used for the qualitative analyses. The teacher interview protocol can be found in Appendix F.

School administrators. A total of five school administrators (Mexico n=3; Minnesota n=2) completed interviews. The purpose of the interviews was to learn about the perceptions of school leadership in relation to the DDA Project and to understand what supports were provided for teachers to implement the deliberations in their classes. The evaluators took notes and also made an audio recording. Each interview lasted approximately 15-45 minutes and was transcribed into a database and used for the qualitative analyses. The school administrator interview protocol can be found in Appendix G.

Site directors. The DDA Project site directors from all 11 sites participated in phone interviews every four to six weeks between September and December 2011. Follow up interviews were also conducted with the coordinators in 2012 at the conclusion of project activities (see Appendixes H and I). The purpose of the interviews was to get a general sense of how the project was progressing at each site over the course of project implementation. The site directors were asked to share information about the site-based teacher professional development sessions and to reflect on the overall progress of the project, both at their specific site and more generally. Information was also gathered by members of the evaluation team who attended teacher professional development sessions in Mexico and Minnesota. Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes and was scheduled approximately one week after each teacher professional development session at their sites. The evaluators took notes and also made an audio recording. Interview notes were typed, entered into a database, and used for the qualitative analyses.

Classroom Observations

The evaluators observed three classroom deliberations each for teachers from Mexico (n=4) and Minnesota (n=5). A total of 27 class sessions were observed; class periods ranged from 50-120 minutes. The evaluators took notes and made an audio recording of the observation sessions. Each observation recording was transcribed into a database and used for qualitative analyses. The classroom observation protocol can be found in Appendix J.

Focus Groups

Students. A total of nine student focus groups were conducted (Mexico n=4, Minnesota n=5) after the completion of three deliberations in DDA Project classrooms. Parents were notified by each school where appropriate about their child’s participation in a focus group. Each group interview was scheduled at a time decided by teachers. Focus groups lasted approximately one hour. Students completed a short survey prior to the focus group. Evaluators made an audio
recording of each session and transcribed the information into a database for qualitative analyses. The student focus group protocols can be found in Appendixes K and L.
Table 2

Methods Used to Address Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Teachers’ Reactions to Training</th>
<th>Teacher Learning</th>
<th>Organizational Support</th>
<th>Teachers’ Use of New Knowledge and Skills</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Implementation Fidelity and Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Questionnaires (pre/post)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Questionnaires (pre/post)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coordinator Interviews (mid-project, post)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Interviews</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Teacher and administrator interviews, classroom observations, and student focus groups were conducted only in Mexico and Minnesota.
TEACHER AND STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

One hundred and thirty four (134) teachers from five countries (Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, United States) in 11 sites participated in the DDA Project. Table 3 provides relevant demographic data about the teachers.

Table 3

*Teacher Demographics by Site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Teachers n (%)</th>
<th>Mean Years of Teaching Experience (Range)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12 (1 – 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>7.4 (1 – 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>14.9 (3 – 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>15.5 (7 – 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10.5 (1 – 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11.8 (7 – 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10.1 (1 – 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14.2 (6 – 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17.6 (7 – 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.6 (1 – 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11.5 (4 – 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>12.1 (1 – 35)</td>
<td>75 (56%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source.* DDA Program database.

*Figure 1.* Teachers’ years of teaching experience.
Figure 1 shows that the majority of the project teachers (84%) had more than five years of teaching experience. Teachers with less than five years of experience made up the smallest percentage of teachers (16%) in the DDA Project.

A total of 2,833 students who took part in the DDA Project by participating in deliberations in a target class completed a post-deliberation questionnaire during the school year. Of these students, 1,938 (68%) also completed a pre-deliberation questionnaire. Table 4 shows the number of students who completed a post-deliberation questionnaire in a target class by site. Overall, students’ ages ranged from 13-20 with a mean age of 16.5. There were slightly more female than male participants (52% to 48%).

Table 4

Student Demographics by Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Mean Age of Students (Range)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>17.3 (14-19)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>16.7 (14-20)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>17.8 (15-20)</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>17.1 (13-18)</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>16.7 (14-19)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>16.6 (14-19)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>15.9 (14-19)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>16.1 (14-19)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>16.9 (14-19)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>16.5 (14-19)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>15.7 (13-19)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,833</td>
<td>16.1 (13-20)</td>
<td>1,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The number of females and males does not equal the total number of students because some students chose not to identify their gender.

Many students who were not enrolled in a DDA Project target class also participated in deliberations because teachers frequently chose to implement the deliberations in multiple classes. According to teachers, approximately 9,443 students participated in at least one deliberation. Table 5 shows that Minnesota (1,413), Peru (1,160), and Colorado (1,160) teachers reported the greatest number of students who participated in deliberations across all classes.
Table 5

*Teachers’ Report of the Number of Students Participating in at Least One Deliberation Across All Classes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DDA Site</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Who Completed Post-Deliberation Questionnaire</th>
<th>Teacher Estimate of Number of Students Who Participated in Deliberations Per Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,443</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHER EXPERIENCES

This section addresses the evaluation questions related to teachers’ experiences:

*Teachers’ Reactions to Training:* How satisfied are the teachers with the professional development experiences?

*Teachers’ Learning:* Did teachers deepen their content and pedagogical knowledge as a result of professional development activities?

*Organizational Support and Change:* What support was provided for project teachers?

*Teachers’ Use of New Knowledge and Skills:* Are the goals and objectives of the professional development experience reflected in teachers’ practices?

**Teachers’ Reactions to Training**

The DDA Project provided one major professional development opportunity for teachers in the summer prior to project implementation before the school year began: the summer 2011 workshop was conducted in two sites. These regional professional development workshops were convened in Cuernavaca, Mexico and Lima, Peru.

**Teacher Assessment of Quality of Regional Professional Development Workshops**

The evaluators asked teachers how these workshops compared to other professional development experiences. Table 6 shows that 91% of the teachers rated the workshop as *Above Average or One of the Best*. The teachers responded positively to both the quality and the content of the workshops, in comparison to other workshops they had attended.

Table 6

Comparison of Summer 2011 Workshop to Other Professional Development Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One of the Best</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More specific indicators of professional development quality as identified by scholars,\(^6\) show high levels of teacher satisfaction (see Table 7). For instance, on five of the seven indicators

---

Workshop organization, Clarity of goals, Quality of materials, Quality of collaborative learning, and Knowledge and skills of workshop facilitators) more than three-quarters of the teachers rated the workshop Very Good to Excellent. Seventy-three percent (73%) of the teachers rated the workshop coordinators’ Demonstration of good teaching practices as Very Good to Excellent. The seventh workshop measure, Adequate time for reflection, had the lowest rating, however a majority of teachers (78%) ranked it Good to Excellent (48% ranked it Very Good to Excellent).

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Organization of DDA Workshop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Clarity of DDA Project Goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Workshop Materials</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Demonstration of Good Teaching Practices</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Adequate Time for Reflection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Collaborative Learning Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Knowledge and Skills of Workshop Facilitators</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Commitment to Student Deliberation

Shortly after the conclusion of the regional workshops, teachers were asked to share their level of agreement with the statement, “It is important that students learn how to deliberate about significant issues.” Over 90% of the teachers indicated they Strongly Agreed with the statement. This high level of agreement suggests a correspondingly high level of teacher “buy-in” and commitment to deliberation as an instructional strategy.

Teacher Knowledge of Program Expectations

After the regional workshops, evaluators asked teachers to respond to the statement, “I know what is expected of me as a DDA project participant.” Ninety-five percent (95%) of the teachers Agreed to Strongly Agreed with the statement. When asked to respond to the same item on the post-deliberation questionnaire, a slightly higher percentage of teachers (98%) responded Agreed.
to Strongly Agreed, suggesting that clarity around expectations only increased as the project progressed.

**Teachers’ Learning**

The second question in Guskey’s framework focuses on the extent to which teachers’ content and pedagogical knowledge deepened as a result of professional development activities. The evaluators asked teachers to self-assess their skills in conducting deliberations, their understanding of the eight steps of deliberation, and whether participation in the project deepened their understanding of democracy. Teachers were also asked to describe their understanding of the purpose of deliberation.

**Conducting Effective Deliberations**

Both at the conclusion of the teacher professional development workshops and at the conclusion of the project year, evaluators wanted teachers to self-assess whether they possessed the skills needed to conduct effective deliberations in their classes. Nearly all of the teachers Agreed to Strongly Agreed that they had learned the skills to conduct effective classroom deliberations (pre: 95%; post 98%).

**Understanding the Deliberation Steps**

Teachers were also asked to rate their understanding of the steps involved in the SAC deliberation process. Specifically, teachers were asked: “How would you rate your current understanding of the deliberation steps?” Teachers used a 5-point scale to rate their understanding of the steps (Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent). Table 8 shows that on the post-deliberation questionnaire, teachers’ understanding of the deliberation steps increased by 11% over responses to the pre-deliberation questionnaire item (no teacher rated his or her understanding as Poor or Fair on either of the questionnaires). A paired samples $t$-test showed a statistically reliable difference between teachers’ understanding of the deliberation steps before and after deliberations. The analysis suggests that practicing the deliberations in their classrooms and participating in site-based professional development workshops, improved teachers’ understanding of the SAC steps.

**Table 8**

*Teachers’ Assessment of Their Understanding of the Deliberation Steps*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Very Good or Excellent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Deliberation Questionnaire</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Deliberation Questionnaire</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^7$ There was a significant difference in the understanding rating for pre-deliberations ($M = 4.11$, $S.D. = .662$) and post-deliberation mean ($M = 4.25$, $S.D. = .545$); $t(113) = 2.465$, $p = .015$, $\alpha = .05$.  
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Deepened Understanding of Democracy

Regardless of country or site, teachers reported that their understanding of democracy had deepened as a result of their participation in the DDA Project. Table 9 shows that 105 of the 120 respondents (88%) Agreed to Strongly Agreed with the statement, “My participation in this project has deepened my understanding of democracy” – a mean score of 5.35 on the 6-point scale.

Table 9

Teachers’ Belief That DDA Project Participation Deepened Their Understanding of Democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of Deliberation

On the post-deliberation questionnaire, we asked teachers to share their personal views on the purpose of the deliberations. All of the teachers (n=124) responded to the question. Nearly all of the responses clustered into four areas, with most respondents selecting more than one area. The four areas listed by rank were: Higher order thinking skills and analysis (89), Listening skills and perspective taking (75), Citizenship skills in a democracy (26), and Consensus building (22). The responses below are typical of the responses provided to this item.

To help students learn the importance of discussing controversial issues. To provide students with the experience of seeing the other side so that they learn why people believe what they do. Deliberation also encourages students to have more informed opinions of their own. (California, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)

To educate and train citizens to be critical thinkers, capable of taking a political position in the daily aspects of life with full knowledge of the facts. To train citizens who are fully informed of the various implications of assuming a certain position, but also know how to listen with tolerance to another’s position and take part in collective decisions. (Colombia, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)

To strengthen the processes of formation of democratic states based on the development of activities such as analysis of sensitive or controversial issues by reflecting different points of view. (Ecuador, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)
To help students discuss difficult topics coherently and maturely by understanding the different opinions about the topic. Students learn to weigh evidence, understand both sides--for and against--the issue, and then come to their own conclusion. Listening skills are of necessity to this process, and thus students improve this skill while participating. (Illinois, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)

Getting my students to be critical, reflective, empathetic collaborators and seek solutions through dialogue, to behave as democratic citizens, to deepen democratic issues to look for a common good. (Peru, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)

Organizational Support and Change

An important element of Guskey’s framework is the amount of support teachers received to implement changes in instructional practice. Five items on the post-deliberation questionnaire asked teachers whether they had been observed by specific people as they conducted deliberations, had observed other teachers conducting deliberations, or had collaborated with a colleague to conduct the deliberations (see Table 10).

Teachers’ responses suggest that observations were conducted primarily by DDA site directors and other teachers. Seventy percent (70%) of teachers had at least one classroom observation conducted by a site coordinator and about the same percentage was observed by another teacher. About half of the teachers (48%) indicated that their classroom deliberations were observed by a school administrator (principal or other school leader). The majority of the teachers (62%) reported that they did not observe another teacher conducting classroom deliberations. All teachers in California, Colombia, and Colorado who responded to the post-deliberation questionnaire were visited at least once by their site coordinator(s), and all but one teacher from Peru reported at least one visit from a site coordinator. Ten teachers (8%) were not observed by a site coordinator, teacher, or school administrator.
Table 10

Teachers’ Report of Number of Classroom Observations and Collaborations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number of Observations/Collaborations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A DDA site coordinator observed you conduct a deliberation. (n=123)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another teacher observed you conduct a deliberation. (n=122)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A school administrator observed you conduct a deliberation. (n=123)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOU observed another teacher conduct a classroom deliberation. (n=122)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOU co-facilitated a classroom deliberation with another teacher. (n=123)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The first number in each cell indicates the number of teachers; the second number is the percentage of teachers.

Support from Site directors and School Administrators

Site directors provided regular support to teachers throughout the program year by organizing and convening three professional development sessions and visiting teachers in their classrooms.

Professional development sessions focused primarily on sharing best practices, coordinating teacher peer support efforts, and assisting with logistical support for activities between partner sites. These sessions provided opportunities for the teachers to review the deliberation steps, learn strategies for aligning deliberations to required curricula, and discuss how to use the DDA website. Teachers also discussed the advantages and challenges associated with conducting the deliberation. In a few instances, coordinators or teachers invited guest speakers to present information on topics such as public health and technology. One coordinator also mentioned that the teachers received valuable feedback from visiting partners.

Some school administrators, like site directors, provided significant support to the teacher participants. A few details of the kind of support a teacher could receive are illustrated in the excerpt of one school administrator interviewed in October 2012.

At the beginning, my intention was that students would learn a little about the art of deliberation— in the deepest sense of the word, not just arguing for fun. This was the first objective that interested me.

[Regarding the administrator’s connection to the program] we had been in close contact. I heard about the programs schedule, I heard about the two deliberations that were introduced, and I heard about the technological efforts to contact Minnesota using
Teachers were given a list of possible sources of support and asked to identify those which were helpful to them during the project (see Table 11). Teachers indicated that the greatest source of support came from the DDA Readings and Support Materials. Other sources of support frequently mentioned included DDA Project Team Members (57%), Teacher Colleagues (57%), and Site directors (50%).

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Support</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DDA Readings and Support Materials</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDA Project Team Members</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Colleagues</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site directors</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrators</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages do not add up to 100 because teachers could check multiple responses.

In response to this item, teachers were also given the opportunity to specify other sources of support. Fourteen teachers (11%) provided specific sources from which they received support. Of these teachers, eight indicated that they received support from a network of experts or online sources. Five teachers said that their students’ class contributions provided support for their teaching, while one teacher mentioned the support received through the professional development workshops. These comments highlight that teachers received support from many different sources.

**Teachers’ Practices**

The fourth evaluation question is: Are the goals and objectives of the professional development experience reflected in teachers’ practices? The goals and objectives of the DDA Project stipulate that teachers should:

- conduct a minimum of three deliberations in their classrooms,
- engage their students in discussions on controversial public issues with students in other classrooms and countries, and
• teach their students about the political and governmental systems, cultures, and history of partner countries.

This section addresses these specific goals and objectives, as well as other aspects of teachers’ practices (e.g., use of formal grades, perception of greatest challenges).

Deliberations

Frequency of deliberations. Of the 124 teachers who responded to the post-deliberation questionnaire, 123 teachers indicated that they had conducted three or more deliberations in their classrooms (one teacher did not respond to the item) (see Figure 2). Given that the teachers were only required to conduct three deliberations, the number of deliberations exceeded project expectations.

![Figure 2](image_url)

**Figure 2.** Number of deliberations teachers conducted in target class.

Deliberation topics. The teachers who responded to the post-deliberation questionnaire reported that they conducted 564 deliberations in their classrooms by the end of the project year. The deliberations conducted for each topic are listed in Figure 3. The figure shows that teachers deliberated the topic of Voting most often (Should voting be compulsory in our democracy?), with 111 teachers reporting that they had conducted deliberations in their classes about the topic. Project coordinators encouraged participating teachers to make Compulsory Voting the first topic of the required three deliberations, in part because this deliberation had been modeled during the first professional development workshop. After Compulsory Voting, the teachers were most likely to deliberate the topics of Juvenile Justice (99 teachers) and Cyberbullying (54 teachers); of all the topics, these two topics were most directly connected to students’ lives. The specific questions for these topics were: In our democracy, should violent juvenile offenders be punished as adults? Should our democracy allow schools to punish students for off-campus cyberbullying?
Figure 3. **Number of teachers who reported deliberating each topic.**

For this item, respondents were also given the opportunity to list additional deliberation topics that they used in their classrooms. Twenty-six (26) of the 38 teachers who specifically named other deliberation topics indicated they used other deliberation topics available through the DDA Project. Three of the remaining 12 topics were selected from preceding projects (*Deliberating in a Democracy* [DID] and *Expanding Deliberating in a Democracy* [ExDID]). The Bush Doctrine (preemptive war), Hate Speech, and Marriage and the State are examples of deliberation topics from previous years that DDA teachers used in their classrooms. The remaining nine topics most likely corresponded to classroom subjects (e.g., topics on world religions, historical events, or country specific national issues).

**Formal grades for deliberations.** When asked if student participation was graded (see Table 12), almost two-thirds of the teachers (63%) said “yes.” All of the teachers in Colorado gave formal grades for student participation; teachers in Mexico were least likely to grade students on their participation in deliberations. Approximately three-fourths (76%) of the teachers in the United States graded their students’ participation in the deliberations, while a little less than half (47%) of the Latin American teachers did the same.
Table 12

Teachers’ Use of Formal Grades for Deliberations, by Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>% of Teachers Using Formal Grades by Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colombia (n=10)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador (n=11)</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (n=14)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru (n=18)</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (n=12)</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado (n=12)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois (n=10)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland (n=9)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota (n=8)</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina (n=10)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia (n=9)</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenges in implementing the deliberations. On the post-deliberation questionnaire, the teachers responded to the following open-ended prompt: “Please share any challenges that made it more difficult to conduct deliberations in your classroom.” About 85% of the teachers responded to the item. The most frequent response, as shown in Table 13, was time. Over half of the teachers in Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and Virginia reported that lack of time was a challenge in conducting the deliberations. A teacher from Maryland wrote: “Deliberations take a long time and it is sometimes difficult to fit them in with a demanding schedule.”

Concerns about meeting curricular requirements were echoed by a teacher from Virginia: “... the time demands caused by covering extensive state standards, finding time to fully develop these deliberations in my classroom was a bit challenging.” And a teacher from California wrote:

I am on a very strict pacing plan that is mandated by my district and must cover all of the CA [California] state standards, which limited the amount of time I could spend on deliberations as well as the frequency with which I could conduct them. Nevertheless, I allocated 3-4.5 hours to each deliberation.

Some teachers mentioned that coordinating the SAC process was difficult. A teacher from Ecuador wrote: “The problems occurred at the time of deliberation practice. Time, logistics, and remaining respectful while taking turns speaking (in mild sense), were the main problems” (translated from Spanish). Similarly, a teacher from Minnesota commented: “I was quite strict with the process, but some of the students wanted to move faster than my structure allowed. Also, they tended to read facts from the notes taken, but once those were read, they did not engage in further discussion of those facts.”

A teacher from Illinois cited student issues:
Students would rather just share what they wrote instead of discussing. At times they were immature and off-task as well. (Unless I was there to keep them on task.) Even when I assigned the groups, students were reluctant to talk to each other.”

Table 13

*Teachers’ Greatest Challenges in Implementing Deliberations (n=124)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Giving Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers Giving Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Time</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC Process</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Lack of Interest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Issues (e.g., lack of knowledge, maturity)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings (difficulty, interest level)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size (large number of students)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics Inadequate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Fit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages do not add up to 100 because teachers could cite multiple reasons. Challenges identified by less than 5% of the teachers are not included.

The evaluation team’s classroom observations and interviews with teachers also suggest some factors that tended to present challenges to teachers:

- A large class size (35+)
- Lack of curricular flexibility associated with required courses
- Reading level associated with deliberation materials
- Topics students don’t feel are relevant to their lives

In one instance, the difficulties associated with a large class size were mitigated by the presence of two adults (teacher and student teacher). But in another class of 42 students, the teacher said that “…it was just hard to monitor conversations when you’ve got so many kids in the class to keep them on task.”

Required courses seemed to present challenges for two reasons. First, the two teachers of required courses reported having more difficulty connecting the deliberation topics to their curriculum. In one such class, the teacher told the students: “*Tomorrow we will be doing an actual deliberation [on compulsory voting]. Then back to Chinese history and then Thursday some of you will be going to the zoo on a field trip.*” In an interview, the teacher said: “*The [deliberation] process is great. The topics aren’t for this class.*” Teachers of required classes seemed to perceive less curricular flexibility. Second, in contrast to elective courses, students didn’t necessarily want to be in the required classes. This was particularly evident in one required class where the observer noted frequent off-task behavior.
In Minnesota, the readability of the deliberation materials was cited as a challenge. The teacher of a ninth grade civics class said: “[The students are] not good readers, so working through the reading and trying to draw out the important points and focusing on the text was difficult. I mean, it was very hard for them.” Another teacher rewrote parts of the readings for his English as a Second Language (ESL) students. This teacher explained that the problem with the readings went beyond vocabulary:

The way that they mix kind of anecdotal evidence with like real evidence can be confusing for a struggling reader. . . . So if you consider that a lot of our kids read at let’s say fourth, fifth, sixth grade level, to be reading something, a text that goes – that starts talking about this one situation that happened, and then goes to another one, and then all of a sudden it’s these statistics, and it’s comparing these countries, all in three pages, that’s confusing.

This teacher suggests that the structure of the text presented difficulties for students.

Teachers also indicated that when students could not see the relevance of a topic to their lives, the students had more difficulty with the deliberations. In an interview, one teacher noted that the topic of Compulsory Voting didn’t capture his students’ interest: “[Compulsory voting] was not – just not a topic that’s going to grab kids. They don’t get it. Especially for our kids who most of them aren’t even citizens, even more so. Who cares?” Another teacher echoed this concern: “You know, why are we talking about voting? Which to them was really, you know, ninth grade student – that was a tough one to get going with. Compulsory voting was tough for ninth grade students, especially [as a first topic to deliberate].”

**Teachers’ continued use of deliberation.** Teachers were asked to respond to two items indicating their intention to continue using aspects of the DDA Project: “I will continue using deliberations in my classroom next year” and “I plan to continue using DDA materials in my classes next year.” Ninety-one percent (91%) of the teachers who responded to this item Agreed to Strongly Agreed that they would continue to conduct deliberations in their classrooms in 2012-2013. Eighty-nine percent (89%) Agreed to Strongly Agreed that they intended to use DDA deliberation materials in their classes the following year.

Interviews with the Minnesota teachers also suggested that they will continue to use deliberation. Several of the teachers indicated that they will use the process, though not necessarily the DDA Project topics. For example, one teacher said:

I’ve been sort of playing with the idea of using [deliberation] for my Advanced Placement US History class to talk about an historic debate, whether it would be – right now we’re doing Civil War, so I was thinking maybe we could do it up “What’s the South’s argument? What’s the North’s argument?” to see if they could put it in that way. . . I’m kind of thinking that there might be some opportunities like that, where there’s a

---

8 The original DID Project materials were at a 12th grade reading level. Between the DID and the DDA Projects, the Project Partners intentionally rewrote the materials such that readability was gauged at the 9th grade level.
historical debate where they’ll need to articulate the positions in that and then come to their own conclusions.

The same teacher later said: “I will probably be least likely to continue using the specific topics. I’ll either develop my own or get them more in line with the curriculum.”

Connections to Other Classrooms and Countries

Each site was partnered with one other site for the purpose of establishing an international connection; teachers from partner sites met together at the initial workshop. There were two primary ways teachers could develop this connection: classes could engage in online activities with classes in their partner country, and classes could participate in videoconferences. Thirty percent (30%) of the teachers indicated that they did not participate in either online or videoconference activities (several indicated that they would do so later in the year). A very small percentage of teachers (13%) visited a classroom outside their country, but these were rare opportunities not intended to be part of the regular program structure.

Online activities. There were various ways teachers could engage their students in public issues discussions with students from other classrooms and countries. Forty percent (40%) of the teachers reported that their students engaged in online activities (see Figure 4). There was considerable variation by site in this area with almost all of the teachers in Colorado and Peru reporting that their students participated in online activities with students from other sites. None of the teachers in either Chicago or Virginia indicated that their students were involved in such activities. Those teachers reporting “not sure” may have been unsure of whether all of their students had participated or of whether students had engaged in online activities outside of school.

![Figure 4. Use of online activities, teacher report (n=124).](image-url)
Of the 50 teachers who responded affirmatively, about two-thirds reported that the activities were *Effective* to *Very Effective* (see Figure 5).

![Bar chart showing teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of online activities.](image)

**Figure 5. Teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness of online activities.**

In an open-ended item on the teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, teachers who indicated that their students did *not* participate in online activities were asked to explain their responses. The most frequent responses are shown in Table 14.
Table 14

Reasons Teachers Did NOT Engage Their Students in Online Activities with Other Schools (n=65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Giving Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers Giving Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Computer Access</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Issues (general, as well as lack of communication with partner site)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Difficulties</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Teacher and/or Student Interest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages do not add up to 100 because teachers could cite multiple reasons. Reasons identified by less than 5\% of the teachers are not included.

Limited computer access was the most frequent response, with most teachers indicating that they had difficulty accessing the computer lab at their school. A teacher in Chicago wrote: “Most of my kids have no access to a computer or internet in the school or at home.” A teacher from California indicated that both time and lack of computer access were challenges. Following are some additional representative responses from the teachers.

*Unfortunately, a lack of logistical coordination did not allow the exchange of views with other schools* (Colombia, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

*They [referring to the U.S. partner site] are not accustomed to using the Internet and lack the resources to make those connections.* (Ecuador, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

*I ran out of time and I had participated in the online forum with a different project without much success. I also found it a bit cumbersome to get my students’ emails and send them for passwords. I would either have to have had them type in their own emails, which I think would have been distracting, or I would have had to retype them. It would have been easier if I could have just set it up on the spot.* (Maryland, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)

*I tried to communicate with my partner in Chicago, however, the means for making those connections within their school were weak, so we didn’t have much success with it.* (Mexico, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

*Because my corresponding teacher and I were completing different deliberations on different days, it made it challenging to provide a way for our students to discuss one topic together.* (North Carolina, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)
Videoconference activities. Teachers were also asked: “Did your students engage in videoconference activities with students from other schools?” Figure 6 shows that 64% of the teachers responded that they had used videoconferencing, a higher percentage than those who reported engaging in online activities (40%). Given that most of the videoconferences involved assistance from site directors and the online activities generally did not, it is possible that the higher percentage of videoconferences is due in part to the support provided by the site directors.

All of the teachers from Colombia, Illinois, Maryland, and Peru reported that their students engaged in videoconferences, while none of the teachers from North Carolina or Virginia responded affirmatively.

![Figure 6. Use of videoconferencing, teacher report (n=123).](image)

Of the teachers who used videoconferencing, about 80% found the activities to be Effective to Very Effective (see Figure 7). Videoconferences were not only more popular than online activities, but more of the teachers who used them believed them to be effective.

![Figure 7. Teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness of videoconferencing activities (n=79).](image)
Similar to the online activities, we asked teachers who did not engage their students in videoconference activities to provide a brief explanation. The most frequent responses are shown in Table 15.

Table 15

*Reasons Teachers Did NOT Engage Their Students in Videoconferences with Other Schools (n=41)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Giving Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers Giving Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Issues</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Communication With Partner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Access to Technology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties with Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages do not add up to 100 because teachers could cite multiple reasons. Reasons identified by less than 5% of the teachers are not included.

In the “Other” category were responses such as “Simply, we were not exposed to this option, and we did not do it” (Minnesota teacher). A North Carolina teacher simply wrote: “Logistics.” Two teachers from Virginia indicated that they would be engaging in videoconferences toward the end of the school year. Other responses included the following:

> A videoconference was scheduled for May. Unfortunately due to issues related to academic planning, we could not make that conference happen. (Ecuador, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

> We couldn’t find a convenient time to schedule a videoconference between the two schools. We are a night school that meets from 2:50 to 8:55 in the evening. (Mexico, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

All five of the teachers interviewed in Minnesota expressed disappointment with the lack of interactions with their partner country. During an interview, one of the teachers described disappointment with this aspect of the DDA Project:

> If we’d been able to connect with [teachers and students outside the United States] and they were sharing opinions, I think it would have made it a much more authentic experience, and more real... In addition, it was just kind of hard because at the beginning of semester I said [to students] we’re trying to work on this, and we’ll see if we can get there. And they were sort of excited about it, and then it went away, and then that also killed some of their enthusiasm for the project overall... And it kind of took the wind out of my sails, too, a little bit.
Another teacher also described the lack of international connections as his “biggest disappointment….Yes that’s been a bummer so far not to have that a part of the process.” He felt that the time spent in the workshop in Mexico could have been used better to establish these relationships.

_I was definitely a little frustrated coming out of Mexico….I certainly knew leaving there that – I’m like, “Wow, this is very open-ended here. How are we going to get in touch with Mexico and just” – hadn’t really firmly – I know we did a lot of things to try and establish relationships, but never really was able to do that with just the people we were working with….I would have been setting up who was going to work with who before we even got down there…_

**Teaching About the History and Culture of Other Countries**

An open-ended item on the teacher post-deliberation questionnaire asked teachers: “How have you addressed the democratic history of one of the DDA partner countries in your classroom? Please be specific.” Teacher responses indicate that in 8 of the 11 DDA sites, at least two-thirds of the teachers addressed the democratic histories of other countries in the project. All of the teachers (100%) from Colorado, Maryland, and North Carolina reported that they had introduced discussions about one of the partner countries in their classroom discussions.

Teachers who completed the Spanish version of the post-deliberation questionnaire were somewhat less likely to respond that they had addressed the democratic history of one of the DDA partner countries. We believe that the Spanish translation of this item did not clearly ask teachers to discuss the democratic history of a country other than their own, which likely means these results reflect an underestimate of the teachers’ practices. But many teachers, regardless of country, used the partner country’s histories to delve more deeply into discussions of democracy. For example, a teacher from Colorado developed activities specific to the subjects he was teaching:

_I teach Geography and Civics. For geography all students did a project on Peru with a focus on the history of the government and its people. In addition, during the civics portion of the class, we compared how elections work in the USA with a two party system vs. Peru and their multiple candidates system. (Colorado, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)_

Teachers sometimes drew on the knowledge and experiences of students who had lived in their partner countries.

_We have had the good fortune to work with Mexico and students from Mexico City. Many of my students are from Mexico, and as a result, much of the course is dedicated to Mexican history, literature, and current events. The democratic history is a major part of our Spanish AP course via projects, research, and literary studies of these very topics. (Illinois, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)_
I have used articles, lectures, and primary resources to teach about Ecuador. We compared American democracy to Ecuadorian democracy prior to deliberating. In addition, one of my students lived in Ecuador for a period. (North Carolina, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)

Comparisons of political and governmental systems were often the focus of the teachers’ efforts to develop international connections, as shown in the following responses.

I addressed Peruvian democracy in the first topic "voting" because is very similar with Ecuadorian history. Like Peru, we struggled with similar problems with our governments. In class we discussed the beginnings of our democracies. In the past, Peru and Ecuador were one country called, The Kingdom of Quito, so we have a common background. (Ecuador, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

Students researched Mexico's Constitution and laws and compared them to the constitutions of other countries like USA and Colombia. (Mexico, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

Classroom Observations

A total of 27 classroom deliberations (3 each in 9 classrooms) were observed by the evaluation team. Across our observations, teachers hewed to the process fairly closely. One teacher in Minnesota with a particularly large class (42 students) used a “fishbowl” exercise for the first deliberation so that some of his academically stronger students could model the deliberation process for other students. However, all of his students participated in the second and third deliberations.

Teachers were particularly diligent about reviewing the rules for deliberation, and distinguishing between deliberation and debate. All of the teachers used some supplemental resources in the deliberations, some of which had been supplied by the DDA Project and some the teachers had found themselves. All of the teachers made modest adaptations to the process, particularly after the first deliberation. Examples of adjustments include using a timer to better regulate the discussion, spending more time on vocabulary, and modeling clarifying questions.

In all but one of the nine teachers’ classrooms in Mexico and Minnesota, the evaluation team observed substantive conversations taking place during the whole group discussion. Dr. Fred Newmann, a prominent advocate for “authentic intellectual work (AIW)” in classrooms, defines substantive conversation as follows:

[Substantive conversation is when] students engage in extended conversational exchanges with the teacher and/or with their peers about subject matter, in a way that builds an improved and shared understanding of ideas or topics.
In classes characterized by high levels of substantive conversation, there is sustained teacher-student and/or sustained student-student interactions about a topic; the interaction is reciprocal, and it promotes coherent shared understanding.  

Following is an example of a sustained interaction between a teacher and two students. The class was discussing the question: Should our democracy allow schools to punish students for off-campus cyberbullying? In this exchange, the teacher had asked a student to explain her position.

Teacher: Okay, [name of student], please explain your position. Okay, listen up [she goes to her desk to get her notes].

Student 1: I don’t think [the school] should [punish students for off-campus cyberbullying] because you don’t punish students for any other off campus bullying, that’s the police’s job, and it will cut out funding for more important things, and education should be our prevention and not punishing. It really won’t do much if they don’t know what they are doing wrong. Do you want some more?

Teacher: Do you have more? Keep going. You are articulating it well.

Student 1: Kids will just stop using the controlled websites and schools are trying to overstep their authority.

Student 2: Could I add something? [Yes] If we have millions and billions to fight wars, why don’t we have money to prevent bullying? To prevent it.

Teacher: In terms of education or in terms of enforcement? Or both?

Student 2: Both.

Teacher: Well, I think it’s what our principal was talking about, you have to prioritize.

Student 2: What I’m saying, we’re giving useless money to fight wars that don’t even need to be fought and we’re losing people and all this for nothing but we don’t even have money to protect our citizens.

Teacher: Well, that’s what happens in a democracy is that we make decisions about resource allocation and the people who made those decisions decided the war was more important than educating people about bullying, alright, I think that’s a good point. Part of what happens in a democracy, in politics is how do you allocate resources and power?

In this excerpt, Student 2 challenges Student 1’s premise that schools devoting money to off-campus cyberbullying “will cut out funding for more important things” and the teacher’s comment that “you have to prioritize” by pointing out that resources are being used for what the student considers to be bad choices. The teacher then acknowledges the point, and moves to ask

---

another student his viewpoint on the deliberation question. Student 2, however, has made one of the arguments against schools’ involvement in off-campus cyberbullying a bit more problematic.

The teachers differed in the degree to which they deviated from the questions suggested by the *DDA Project* in the whole class discussion. One teacher put the discussion questions provided by the project on an overhead projector and went through each of them: “*Alright these are generic questions but it's our way of debriefing here. . . .Question #1: What were the most compelling reasons for each side?*”

Another teacher fostered deeper conversations by posing questions specific to the topic. During the debriefing of the *Compulsory Voting* topic (*Should voting be compulsory in our democracy?*), he asked a series of challenging questions:

*Is it your duty to vote? If you don’t vote, can you complain about your leader?*

*If I have a friend who says ‘Obama sucks’ and he didn’t vote, should he have the right [to say this]?*

*Why is voting a big part of democracy?*

*If you had a friend who did not want to vote, what reason would you use to persuade [your friend] to vote?*

The observer noted a high level of student involvement as students responded to these questions. The teacher appeared to succeed in getting them to think more deeply about the purpose of voting.

**Changes in Teaching as a Result of DDA Participation**

Finally, we asked teachers to respond to an open-ended item on the questionnaire indicating how, if at all, their teaching had changed as a result of their participation in the *DDA Project*. Table 16 shows that 100 of the 124 teachers (81%) responded to this item. The most frequent response was that teachers were focusing their pedagogy more on *DDA Project* goals, such as perspective taking, respecting one another, listening to different viewpoints, and citing evidence to support opinions.
Table 16

Teacher Report of Changes in Teaching as a Result of DDA Participation (n=100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Teaching</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Giving Response</th>
<th>Percentage of Teachers Giving Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focusing Pedagogy on 1 or More DDA Goals (e.g., perspective taking, respect)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Student-Centered Learning Activities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Deliberation Process More (including creating own deliberations)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvement in Teaching Skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in Leading Discussions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth (greater tolerance, willingness to look at different perspectives)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Teaching Controversial Issues and/or Current Events</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages do not add up to 100 because teachers could cite multiple reasons. Reasons identified by less than 5% of the teachers are not included.

Following are representative comments from teachers in response to the open-ended item: *How has your teaching changed, if at all, as a result of your participation in the DDA Project?*

[My teaching] has changed a lot. Now I think about how student thinking builds upon the exchange of ideas with their peers. (Colombia, post-deliberation teacher questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

*I am more likely to use cooperative learning and have students discuss in groups. So my classroom is much more student-centered than it was previously. (Illinois, post-deliberation teacher questionnaire)*

*I try to do a better job of presenting multiple perspectives on issues and I try to encourage kids to develop a stance with evidence to support that particular stance. (North Carolina, post-deliberation teacher questionnaire)*

*I am more interested in talking about controversial issues and teaching students how to respect and acknowledge others’ opinions, while still forming an educated opinion of their own. (Maryland, post-deliberation teacher questionnaire)*

*Deliberation is now incorporated as part of my work in secondary classrooms. Also, I’m always guiding students to develop critical thinking and reflection on various public affairs of their community starting with their school. (Peru, post-deliberation teacher questionnaire, translated from Spanish)*
Responses suggest that the majority of teachers made changes in their pedagogy that ranged from modest (e.g., “I incorporate more readings and political cartoons in my teaching.” [California]) to more fundamental in nature (e.g., “I learned to present various views on the same topic. That will forever be a way of teaching in my life.” [Peru]).

**Most Meaningful Aspect of DDA Project**

In an open-ended item on the post-deliberation teacher questionnaire, teachers were asked: *In your opinion, what was the most meaningful aspect of the DDA Project overall?* Responses generally fell into five categories: the international aspect of the program, the deliberation method, the development of students’ knowledge and skills, the project’s focus on democracy, and the DDA program materials.

At least one teacher from each site cited the international nature of the program as one of the most meaningful aspects of the program. Following are representative comments:

*I formed strong professional relationships with other educators, learned a lot about democracy and Colombia in the process. My students received a cross-cultural and academically rigorous experience that they enjoyed.* (California, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)

*Share with teachers from other countries experiences, situations, ideas and positions on issues of common interest. Learning to deliberate and to implement this project in the classroom.* (Colombia, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

*For me it was learning how teachers in other countries approach controversial issues and how much knowledge was gained by myself and my students about Peru.* (Colorado, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)

*To really know and apply the discussion, to learn and communicate with teachers from other countries. It meant a lot to me to share with students from other countries.* (Peru, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

*How [the DDA Project] creates awareness of other democratic countries and how democracy can have multiple meanings.* (Virginia, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)

A teacher from Ecuador noted that deliberation will become a regular part of the school curriculum.

*[Deliberation] is so significant that we have institutionalized it. It is already part of our curriculum and we have the support of 100% of the institution. For this new school year we have 3 more deliberations.* (Ecuador, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)
A teacher from North Carolina wrote of how deliberation helped her students to develop skills in stating opinions and listening to the opinions of others.

*The best is when I saw a 9th grade female giving her opinion on National Service to a 12 grade male. She was positive and he was listening. That does not happen in many other education environments. The process allowed that interaction to happen in the right way.* (North Carolina, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire)

Some teachers wrote about how the DDA Project relates to democracy and democratic principles.

*The understanding that in a democracy there will always be disagreement and conflict. In a democracy we should not find that 100% of people have the same vision and values. We must demand that the government also does not impose rules or standards and without public deliberation.* (Ecuador, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

*Attitudes and behaviors developed in dealing with others that are essential in any democracy.* (Peru, teacher post-deliberation questionnaire, translated from Spanish)

Ninety-four percent (94%) of the teachers (117 of 124) responded to this item, indicating that the DDA Project was meaningful in a specific way to almost all of the teachers.

**Teacher Experiences Summary**

Teachers rated the quality of their DDA Project training experiences quite high. Almost all of the teachers felt they learned the skills needed to conduct effective deliberations, and knew what was expected of them. Teachers received support for their work from DDA Project materials, project personnel, and teacher colleagues.

In response to the three specific goals and objectives related to teachers’ practices, teacher reports indicate that the project was most successful in terms of teachers conducting the required number of deliberations. The project was less successful in encouraging the teachers to engage their students in public issues discussions with students outside their school or country. Most teachers indicate that they integrated content about their partner country’s history in at least a minimal way, and some developed more in-depth lessons about the culture, government, and history of their partner country.

Almost all of the teachers in the project reported that they plan to use deliberation in future classes; teachers were slightly less likely to indicate that they will used DDA Project materials in the future. Teachers were more likely to engage in the videoconference as opposed to online activities. Lack of time, lack of appropriate technology, and communication issues were among the most frequently cited reasons for not engaging in these activities. The majority of teachers reported some positive change in their pedagogy as a result of participating in the DDA Project. Many teachers commented on the significance of the international nature of the project for themselves as well as their students.
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The fifth evaluation question is: Are the goals and objectives of the project reflected in student learning? The evaluators looked for examples of students’ knowledge of democratic principles, engagement in controversial discussions, and interest in participating in deliberations. This section describes findings that relate to one aspect of Guskey’s evaluation framework: Student Learning.

Classroom Deliberations

Students’ participation in pre- and post-deliberation questionnaires and focus groups provided information regarding their experiences with the project. Of the 2,833 students who completed a post-deliberation questionnaire, 2,409 (85%) reported that they participated in three or more deliberations. Figure 8 shows the extent to which students participated in deliberations. The majority of students (65%) participated in three deliberations and 20% of students participated in four or more.

Figure 8. Students’ participation in deliberations (n=2,833).

Learning From the Deliberations

Students across all sites shared similar experiences with respect to what they learned from the deliberations. The following sections describe students’ responses during focus groups held in Mexico and Minnesota in fall 2011 and spring 2012.

Overall, students indicated that participation in the deliberations improved their perspective taking skills and level of engagement in civil discussions. Following are examples of students’ comments regarding these changes.
Perspective taking Skills

Some students believed that the deliberation process helped them to see the value of others’ opinions. The students said:

We also learn a lot from the ideas of our peers, because there are things that they know and you didn’t, and maybe, even if they don’t convince you, but, in the long run you end up knowing more about that topic which, at the same time, you learn while reading the papers. (Mexico student, focus group)

I think that people get a chance to hear each other out more and understand where each other is coming from during the deliberations than you would normal class time where you’re just learning from the book or something. (Minnesota student, focus group)

We’re learning something about how do other teenagers react with something of what's going on and they’re learning about this kind of stuff. It makes them realize not to do it or do it. (Minnesota student, focus group)

Another student said that the deliberation process provided an opportunity to reinforce and re-examine personal opinions about controversial topics. He said:

I think it helps move away from what we personally think or what we feel, depending on the topic because by doing both sides or doing deliberation, you learn, ‘Okay. This is why cyberbullying occurs,’ or ‘This is what happens because of cyberbullying.’ But if we went into the deliberation with, ‘Okay. So all cyberbullying is wrong,’ then this is like a chance to reinforce or re-examine the opinions you had going in. (Minnesota student, focus group)

Ability to Engage in Civil Discussions

One student believed that the deliberation process required students to pay close attention and that changing roles and respecting others’ time was important. She said:

I like very much their respect, they follow the time assigned, for example one person – first those who are in favor go first, and then those who are against and they have been assigned a space time to express their thoughts. And I really like the idea that they exchange roles because, in that way, it forces you and imposes the interest to say that there is more than one opinion, but there are several. (Mexico student, focus group)

Another said that the deliberations helped him to see how the process can be used in real world situations. He said:

I think it’s really applicable in today’s society to be able to look at both sides because even politically, we’re so split and people can’t see it from the other side and they’re just like no, I’m right, I’m right. They won’t ever back down. But this process kind of makes you have to think from the other side. You have to give them valid points. So going into
politically or even other aspects of it too you'll be able to draw on this and use it in the real world. (Minnesota student, focus group)

**Differences Between Deliberations and Other Class Activities**

Students uniformly reported that the deliberations were different from what they normally experienced in school. Across focus groups in Mexico and the Minnesota, students viewed deliberation as a more authentic learning activity with practical application compared to what they did in other classrooms. Some students described how deliberations differed from other pedagogical approaches focused on lectures and test taking. They said:

*Student 1:* These are topics that we experience in our daily life. For example, voting and delinquency, these are things that are present in our daily life.

*Student 2:* Maybe, as individuals we cannot change them, but we can offer small contributions that when added together make great changes happen, right? (Two students from Mexico, focus group, translated from Spanish)

For me, I love this activity! In reality, it is not only the [SAC] approach; it has to do more with the reality of the issues. What I like most is the contentiousness around issues like abortion and homosexuality. These are topics that are rapidly gaining importance. They’re about people my age, it’s like it catches our attention more. (Mexico student, focus group, translated from Spanish)

*It was different because we were working in partners, like in groups and we will understand better. You have to do it all by yourself. You get to think about it all by yourself. You don’t ask your classmates for their opinions like we do in here.* (Minnesota student, focus group)

*It was more of like us doing it than him just teaching it to us. We got to learn, or we got to make our own opinions. And it wasn’t just facts, like it was facts in there, but it wasn’t just this happened and this happened and that’s what you are going to put on your test.* (Minnesota student, focus group)

Another student recognized the difference between the deliberation process and debate. He described how he perceived that these classroom activities were different. He said:

*I think debate and deliberations are not the same. In a debate, they are trying to see if that person is wrong based on the arguments. And in a deliberation, you are supposed to share your objective and personal opinion, in order to get to an agreement or expose your view to the rest, even if it is right or wrong, but at least to know why, and you try to make the other person understand you, and no necessarily change your idea, but understand you.* (Mexico student, focus group, translated from Spanish)
Changing the Deliberation Process

When asked what they would change about the deliberation process, students in Mexico and the Minnesota offered several suggestions, such as eliminating the requirement that students physically change places during deliberations, providing more time for deliberations, and choosing topics that are more relevant to students (e.g., Should the driving age be raised from 16 to 18?). Students also suggested reducing the amount of reading for the deliberation topics and requiring less structure. A few students suggested moving the small group discussions to the end of the deliberation process to allow for more sharing. Following are examples of students’ suggestions.

Physically Switching Seats

According to one student, changing places during the process wastes time that could be used to help students stay focused on the thoughts they would like to share. She said:

*I feel that you waste time [physically switching seats] and during that time you could, maybe, you could use that time when you are debating because we don’t have enough time either. I would like them to give us more time to debate and that, I mean, during that time, whoever is in the two teams, and we are debating, because, this is supposed to be a debate and sometimes, we are just listening to the opponents and you, since you want to say something, but you can’t or vice versa. So, as – then, when it’s your turn, you forgot the idea and the time had already passed.* (Mexico student, focus group, translated from Spanish)

Topics Relevant to Students

Another student believed that students would take more interest in conducting deliberations if topics were more relevant for students. He said:

*Something that would catch their interest, something that would make everybody - I have a really good idea for a deliberation that everyone would probably get into. There’s a new law trying to be passed that would move the driving age up to 18 from 16. You won’t be able to get a driver’s license.* (Minnesota student, focus group)

Length of Reading

The deliberation reading requirements were challenging for some students. One student suggested that reading materials be shortened when they are read in class.

*It just seemed like it might have been too long instead of giving us like a condensed version, instead of having us read it over, maybe not with the class, because if we read it with the class of students we have, nobody, I know there is a few times when he asked people to read and they just argue and argue about not reading.* (Minnesota student, focus group)
Less Structure

Another student expressed an interest in having the deliberations less structured. According to this student, less structure would allow more time for students to discuss and understand the issues. The student said:

*It would be better if it were less structured and we could discuss more instead of having to follow the format so much because it helps to discuss. If you're on one side, if you're not just on one side the whole time and you discuss it, then it's better so you understand everything more.* (Minnesota student, focus group)

Small Group Discussions

One student was concerned that large group discussions do not allow for the participation of more students. According to the student, breaking the large group discussion into smaller groups would allow more students to participate. The student said:

*I feel like the deliberation would be more effective if after the deliberation the large group discussion was broken down into smaller groups ‘cause I’ve noticed that in the large group discussions, it’s usually a few people who dominate the discussion. And if it was broken into smaller groups, then it would allow more opportunities for more people to become engaged.* (Minnesota student, focus group)

Students’ Views on the Goals of Deliberation Processes

The students were asked what they thought the goals of the deliberations were. Across all focus groups, students said one of the major goals of the deliberations was to increase their abilities to form their own opinions and respect opposing opinions.

For example, one student believed that it was important for students to learn how to listen to other people. The student said:

*We also learn how to listen to the other people, right? Because, when you are giving your points of view, if you agree, then, the other person has to stay quiet, right? So, you have to learn to listen and respect their opinions, I agree or I disagree.* (Mexico student, focus group, translated from Spanish)

Another student valued the deliberation process as a way to help students form their own opinions. The student said,

*I think more people are interested when you, instead of just learning it, like you can make an opinion and you, yeah, like I think also, like not having a worksheet where you have to just fill in facts, you are just reading it, kind of just to read it and have an opinion. You are not searching through for answers, because then you really don’t get the whole story, you are just looking for the specific answers.* (Minnesota student, focus group)
Five items on the post-deliberation student questionnaire focused on students’ participation in the deliberations. Figure 9 shows that the majority of students who completed a post-deliberation questionnaire Agreed to Strongly Agreed that they enjoyed the deliberations (89%), they learned a great deal through their participation, (89%), and they developed a better understanding of issues discussed (90%). In addition, 81% of students indicated that they were more confident when talking about controversial issues, and 84% reported they increased their ability to state their opinions.
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**Figure 9. Students’ responses to their participation in the deliberations.**

Students were also asked to share their views about partnering with other classes. Overall, 43% of the students who completed a post-deliberation questionnaire reported that they participated in online discussions (n=1,236). Figure 10 shows that 77% of these students enjoyed their online experiences and they learned a lot by participating (74%). Similarly, 75% agreed that they had a greater understanding of the perspectives of students from other countries because of their online discussions.

Forty percent (40%) of the students who completed a post-deliberation questionnaire reported that they participated in a videoconference (n=1,127). Similar to the online experiences, 75% reported enjoying the experience, 73% learned a lot from it, and 76% reported that they had a greater understanding of the perspectives of students from other countries because of their participation in the videoconferences.
Forty-eight percent (48%) of the students who completed the post-deliberation questionnaire reported that they participated in either the online or videoconference activities or both. Slightly over half (52%) of the students participated in neither activity.

Figure 10. Students’ online and videoconference experiences.

Students’ Views on the Controversial Nature of the Deliberation Topics

The students were asked to identify the three deliberation topics that they participated in for the DDA Project, and to indicate the degree to which they felt each topic was controversial. Table 17 shows that across all deliberation topics, on average students perceived the deliberation topics ranged from slightly controversial to more than moderately controversial. Juvenile Justice received the highest ranking for the degree of controversy it generated in the deliberations, followed by Public Health, Cyberbullying, and so on. The environmental deliberation topic was the least controversial, according to students.
Students’ Perceptions of Degree of Controversy Associated With Deliberation Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliberation Topics</th>
<th>Degree of Controversy (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice (n=1,946)</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health (n=650)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyberbullying (n=962)</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration (n=359)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory Voting (n=2,304)</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Expression (n=320)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Demonstrations (n=389)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Service (n=166)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Trade (n=375)</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption &amp; Judicial Independence (n=152)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Democracy (n=292)</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (n=89)</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale. 1=Not Controversial, 2=Slightly Controversial, 3=Moderately Controversial, 4=Very Controversial. Students only rated the deliberation topics that they participated in.

Students’ Experiences with Classroom Deliberations: Paired Pre/Post Deliberation Questionnaires

Another indicator of how participation in the deliberations affected students is a comparison of student responses on the pre- and post-deliberation questionnaires. The evaluators were able to match the pre- and post-deliberation questionnaire responses for 1,938 students. On both questionnaires, students were asked to indicate the degree to which they engaged in discussions about controversial political issues with people their own age, parents, teachers, and other adults. The evaluators also asked students to report their willingness to talk about political issues before and after participating in the DDA Project.

A Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test shows that after participation in the DDA Project, students reported a small statistically significant increase in how often they discussed controversial issues with their peers \((z = 8.609, p = .000, r = .20)\) and teachers \((z = 5.598, p = .000, r = .13)\). There were no significant differences in students’ pre- and post-deliberation responses regarding how often they discussed controversial issues with parents or other adults. In relation to discussing political issues in general, students were slightly significantly more reluctant to talk about political issues after having participated in the DDA Project because they didn’t like to argue \((z = 2.098, p = .036, r = .048)\), because it creates enemies \((z = 2.938, p = .003, r = .067)\), and because they worry what people might think \((z = 3.145, p = .002, r = .072)\). One explanation for these results may be that students became aware of the difficulty of talking about political issues with peers who think differently than themselves. (A complete statistical table for students’ questionnaire items is presented in Appendix M.)
Students’ General Political Learning

Students’ pre- and post-deliberation perceptions about their general political knowledge and interest in political issues increased significantly in three areas, including how much they knew compared to their peers, what they understood, and whether or not they had something to say when political issues were discussed.

There was a small but statistically significant increase in students’ perceptions about how much they knew about political issues compared to most people their age ($z = 11.323, p = .000, r = .26$). Specifically, 21% of the matched paired students ($n=1,934$) agreed that they knew more before participating in deliberations, compared to 40% of students who knew more about political issues after their participation. Thirty-nine percent (39%) of these students reported no change in terms of knowing more than their peers. There was also a small but statistically significant increase in students’ perceptions that they “usually had something to say when political issues or problems were discussed” after the deliberations ($z = 5.457, p = .000, r = .12$) and that they were “able to understand most political issues” ($z = 5.749, p = .000, r = .13$).

More specifically, 33% of the students agreed that they usually had something to say after participating in the DDA Project, compared to 25% who reported they had something to say before the project (A complete statistical table showing students’ responses to questionnaire items pertaining to political knowledge and interest is located in Appendix N.).

Teachers’ Views on Student Learning

Nearly all of the teachers who completed a post-deliberation questionnaire (97%) indicated that by the third deliberation, their students were able to conduct small group work with minimal direction. In addition, Figure 11 shows teachers’ level of agreement with statements focused on how the deliberations helped their students. The majority of teachers agreed that deliberations helped their students to develop a deeper understanding of issues, engage in critical thinking, make decisions based on evidence and logic, respect others’ points of view, and identify multiple perspectives associated with the deliberation topics.
Teachers’ Perceptions of Classroom Deliberations

Forty-four percent (44%) of teachers who chose to deliberate Juvenile Justice in their classrooms also indicated that this topic promoted the deepest discussion in relation to the other two topics. The most frequently cited reason teachers gave for students’ interest in this topic was students’ ability to relate to the age groups being discussed (n=22). Teachers also felt that students were interested in juvenile justice issues in multiple societies (n=17), and believed that some of their students had personal experience with juvenile justice processes (n=9). The second and third most reported topics that teachers perceived evoked deep discussion for students were Cyberbullying (17%) and Compulsory Voting (11%).

Teachers thought that Cyberbullying was of interest to students because it seemed relevant to students’ current experiences (n=17). For the Compulsory Voting topic, teachers suggested that students were interested in the discussions because it connected with students’ basic feelings, values, and personal ethics (n=7).

Teachers’ responses on the post-deliberation questionnaire were consistent with the views of the teachers from Mexico (n=4) and Minnesota (n=5) who participated in interviews. These teachers were asked, “From which topic did you think the students learned the most?” and “What topic do you think the students enjoyed the most?” Five of the nine teachers interviewed mentioned that students enjoyed and learned most from the Juvenile Justice topic, followed by Compulsory Voting.
Voting and Cyberbullying. Some examples of teachers’ views regarding these topics are provided below.

**Compulsory Voting**

One teacher thought the Compulsory Voting topic provided students with learning opportunities because students had little prior knowledge about the topic. The teacher said:

*I think they learned the most from the compulsory voting, I think they were most into that one. And I think they learned most about it because they were sort of removed from it as a topic. They didn’t have prior knowledge and prior opinions going into it, so therefore, they weren’t really struggling against those feelings to you know, stay to the facts and not state your opinion, or whatever. So I feel like they did a better job with that just because it was just sort of less known to them.* (Minnesota teacher, interview)

**Juvenile Justice**

Two teachers thought that students enjoyed and learned from the Juvenile Justice topic because it was the last one deliberated and students had more experience by that time. One teacher said:

*I think, you know, it’s kind of hard to say. The last one was probably our best one [Juvenile Justice], and it was probably the one they enjoyed most. But they were also most familiar with how to do deliberations. And so we could – we had to spend less time on learning the process, and we could spend more time with the content. So I don’t necessarily – you know, had we done them in a different order, simply being third may have been the trick.* (Minnesota teacher, interview)

Another teacher also mentioned that the use of a video helped to engage students in the discussion. He said:

*I think this last one on violent juvenile criminals probably because – well, in part because I used that FRONTLINE video, so that kind of got them thinking about what are the actual laws, and they seemed to be more interested than which countries make you vote and which ones don’t kind of thing.* (Minnesota teacher, interview)

One of the teachers from Mexico thought the readings and supporting materials for the topic of Juvenile Justice needed to provide additional detail.

*I think all of the topics were very useful; however, the topic of juvenile justice was a bit more difficult. Although the supporting materials were very good, I needed additional content to more effectively address the issue.* (Mexico teacher, translated from Spanish)

**Cyberbulling**

One teacher mentioned that his students connected most with the Cyberbullying topic because they may have had personal experiences with issues. The teacher said:
I think the cyberbullying one was definitely probably the one that they connected with the most, just in terms of the school setting and for them to kind of process through what happens in [the school] or even for them. And some of them, I don’t know if they would share their personal experiences, but there’s probably some in there that definitely – probably through middle school, even more I tend to hear – they tended to say in the reflections or in the conversation that it wasn’t happening as much, but they’re certainly one of the generations that has grown up with that first. (Minnesota teacher, interview)

**Student Learning Outcomes Summary**

Involvement with the *DDA Project* helped most students develop the skills and knowledge needed to engage in civil discussions about controversial issues. The majority of students enjoyed the deliberations, and after participating in them, felt more confident when they talked about controversial issues. Students reported a small, yet significant increase in their knowledge of political issues compared to people their own age as well as having something to say when discussing controversial issues with their peers and teachers. However, students were slightly more reluctant to talk about political issues because they didn’t like to argue, worried what others would think, and concerned about creating enemies. The project was less successful in providing opportunities for students to participate in online discussions and videoconferences. While less than half (48%) of the students who completed a post-deliberation questionnaire engaged in either or both of these activities, the students who did, enjoyed them and learned from them.
ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES

The following is a list of the stated outcomes as identified in the *Deliberating in a Democracy in the Americas Project* proposal, and the Evaluation Team’s assessment of the degree to which the outcomes were met.

**GOAL 1:** 120 secondary teachers will be trained to facilitate controversial public issues deliberations using Structured Academic Controversy (SAC) in Latin America (Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru) and the United States (California, Colorado, Illinois, Maryland, Minnesota, North Carolina, and Virginia) at the end of two years.

- **GOAL EXCEEDED.** 134 teachers from 11 sites were trained to facilitate deliberations in the DDA program during 2011-2012 school year.

**OUTCOME 1:** 90% or more of the teachers will be able to evaluate the professional development sessions favorably in terms of characteristics of high quality professional development.

- **OUTCOME ACHIEVED.** Ninety-one percent (91%) of the teachers who responded on the pre-deliberation questionnaire rated the workshop as *Above Average* or *One of the Best* and on five of the seven indicators (*Workshop organization, Clarity of goals, Quality of materials, Quality of collaborative learning, and Knowledge and skills of workshop facilitators*) more than three-quarters of the teachers rated the workshop *Very Good* to **Excellent**.

**OUTCOME 2:** 90% or more of the teachers will be able to explain the democratic principles in conflict in the controversial public issues being deliberated. (e.g., voting: rights of citizens v. democratic responsibilities of citizens).

- **OUTCOME ESSENTIALLY ACHIEVED.** Regardless of country or site, teachers reported that their understanding of democracy had deepened as a result of their participation in the DDA Project. One hundred and five (105) of the 120 respondents (88%) *Agreed* to *Strongly Agreed* with the statement, “*My participation in this project has deepened my understanding of democracy.*”

**OUTCOME 3:** 90% or more of the teachers will be able to conduct a minimum of three controversial issues deliberations a semester in their classrooms using the SAC method with DDA curriculum.

- **OUTCOME EXCEEDED.** One-hundred and twenty-three teachers of the 124 teachers who responded to this questionnaire item reported that they had conducted three or more deliberations in their classrooms (one teacher did not respond to the item). Given that the teachers were only required to conduct three deliberations, the number of deliberations exceeded project expectations.

**OUTCOME 4:** 90% or more of the teachers will be able to engage their students in discussions on controversial public issues with students in other classrooms and countries.
• OUTCOME PARTIALLY ACHIEVED. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the teachers indicated that they had used videoconferencing (64%) or online activities (40%) to connect with students from other countries. All of the teachers (100%) from Colombia, Illinois, Maryland, and Peru reported that their students engaged in videoconferences.

OUTCOME 5: 90% or more of the teachers will be able to identify key democratic events in the history of the participating countries.

• OUTCOME PARTIALLY ACHIEVED. An open-ended item on the teacher Post-Deliberation Questionnaire asked teachers: “How have you addressed the democratic history of one of the DDA partner countries in your classroom? Please be specific.” Teacher responses indicate that in 8 of the 11 DDA sites, at least two-thirds of the teachers addressed the democratic histories of other countries in the project. All of the teachers (100%) from Colorado, Maryland, and North Carolina reported that they had introduced discussions of one of the partner countries in their classroom discussions. Teachers who completed the Spanish version of the post-deliberation questionnaire were somewhat less likely to respond that they had addressed the democratic history of one of the DDA partner countries. We believe that the Spanish translation of this item did not clearly ask teachers to discuss the democratic history of a country other than their own, which likely means these results reflect an underestimate of the teachers’ practices. But many teachers, regardless of country, used the partner country’s histories to delve more deeply into discussions of democracy.

GOAL 2: Approximately 3,000 secondary students (assuming 25 students per teacher) will have the opportunity at the end of two years to engage in controversial public issues deliberations.

• GOAL EXCEEDED. Teachers reported that 9,443 students participated in at least one deliberation in their classes between August 2011 and June 2012. Teachers reported that they conducted 564 deliberations in their classrooms by the end of the project year and 100% of the teachers stated they had conducted three or more classroom deliberations.

OUTCOME 6: 80% or more of the students will be able to explain the democratic principles in conflict in the controversial public issues being deliberated.

• OUTCOME ACHIEVED. In classroom observations, democratic principles underlying the deliberation topic (e.g., freedom of speech, right to personal security, citizen participation) were frequently part of students’ positions. In identifying reasons for and against Compulsory Voting on the post-deliberation questionnaire, almost all students who responded to the item cited the obligation to participate in a democracy and freedom of choice.

OUTCOME 7: 80% or more of the teachers will report that their students were able to make a decision based on evidence and logic on three of the DDA controversial public issues lessons.

• OUTCOME EXCEEDED. Over 90% of teachers Agreed to Strongly Agreed that deliberations helped their students to develop a deeper understanding of issues (96%).
engage in critical thinking (94%), make decisions based on evidence and logic (93%), respect others’ points of view (91%), and identify multiple perspectives associated with the deliberation topics (94%).

OUTCOME 8: 80% or more of the teachers will report that their students were able to come to a consensus position with their peers on three of the DDA controversial public issues.

- THIS OUTCOME WAS DROPPED BY PROGRAM

OUTCOME 9: 80% or more of the teachers will report that their students were able to identify the multiple perspectives associated with three of the DDA controversial public issues.

- OUTCOME EXCEEDED. Over 90% of teachers Agreed to Strongly Agreed that deliberations helped their students respect others’ points of view (91%), and identify multiple perspectives associated with the deliberation topics (94%).

OUTCOME 10: 80% or more of the students will report greater confidence discussing controversial public issues with peers and adults.

- OUTCOME ACHIEVED. Eighty-one percent (81%) of students Agreed to Strongly Agreed that they were more confident when talking about controversial issues after participating in deliberations. Students also reported a significant increase in how often they discussed controversial issues with their peers and teachers.

OUTCOME 11: 80% or more of the students will report increased interest in people and issues outside their borders.

- OUTCOME NOT ACHIEVED. There was no statistically significant difference in students’ pre- and post-deliberation questionnaire responses to the item: I am interested in political issues in OTHER countries. Of the students who participated in either the online discussions or the videoconferences, about 75% Agreed to Strongly Agreed that they had a greater understanding of the perspectives of students from other countries because of their participation in one or both of these activities. However, less than half (48%) of the students who completed a post questionnaire indicated that they participated in either or both of these activities.
Appendix A  
DDA Topics and Deliberation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliberation Topic</th>
<th>Issues Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corruption and Judicial Independence</td>
<td>Should our democracy elect judges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Should our democracy permit the cultivation of genetically modified foods?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Trade</td>
<td>Should our democracy participate in free trade agreements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>In our democracy, should violent juvenile offenders be punished as adults?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Service</td>
<td>Should all citizens in our democracy participate in one year of mandatory national service?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Should our democracy require schools to provide sex education programs that include contraceptive education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyberbullying</td>
<td>Should our democracy allow schools to punish students for off-campus cyberbullying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Democracy</td>
<td>Should our democracy allow national referendums?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Expression</td>
<td>Should our democracy block Internet content to protect national security?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>In our democracy, should legal foreign workers have the same labor rights as citizens?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Demonstrations</td>
<td>Should our democracy have the power to prohibit unauthorized public demonstrations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Should voting be compulsory in our democracy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Post Workshop (Pre-Deliberation) Teacher Questionnaire

PURPOSE
The University of Minnesota evaluation team invites you to complete the following questionnaire. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide the DDA project staff with information about how well the project’s specific goals are being met, and how to improve programming. No publication will include information that would make it possible to identify any specific teacher or school. Your answers will remain confidential.

1. Please write your first name and last name in the appropriate box.

First Name: _____________________________
Last Name: _____________________________

For questions 2-4, please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below. (Check only one response for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I know what is expected of me as a DDA project participant.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is important that students learn how to deliberate about significant issues.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have learned the skills needed to conduct effective deliberations in my classroom(s).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In a typical month during the school year, how often do you discuss controversial public issues with students in your classroom? (Select only one.)
   0 Not at all
   0 Less than once a week
   0 Once a week
   0 Two to three times a week
   0 Every day

5. How would you rate your current understanding of the deliberation process? (Select only one.)
   0 Poor
   0 Fair
   0 Good
   0 Very Good
   0 Excellent

Please provide short responses to questions 7-9 below.
6. Why were you interested in getting involved with the DDA Project?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

7. Please identify some ways that you expect your students will benefit from participating in deliberations.

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

9. Do you anticipate any barriers that might interfere with conducting deliberations in your classroom(s)? Explain.

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

WORKSHOP QUALITY

Complete the sentence below. (Check only one response.)

10. Compared to other professional development workshops I have attended, this one was…

0 One of the worst
0 Below average
0 Average
0 Above average
0 One of the best
0 Not Applicable

Indicate your judgment of the quality of the DDA workshop in questions 11-17 below. (Check only one response for each statement.)
### DDA Workshop Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Organization of DDA workshop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Clarity of DDA project goals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Quality of workshop materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Demonstration of good teaching practices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Adequate time for reflection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Collaborative learning environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Knowledge and skills of workshop facilitators</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Please share any recommendations you have for improving DDA staff development workshops.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

19. What additional information you would like to share with us regarding your experiences with the 2011 DDA summer workshop?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

To put your answers in context, we would like to gather some background information from you. Your answers will be held in the strictest confidence.

20. Your DDA Site is: (Check one.)

0 California 0 Colombia 0 Colorado 0 Ecuador 0 Illinois 0 Maryland 0 Mexico 0 Minnesota 0 North Carolina 0 Peru 0 Virginia

21. Indicate the courses in which you plan to conduct deliberations this coming school year. (Check all that apply.)

0 Business/Finance 0 Government/Civics 0 Philosophy/Ethics
0 Economics 0 History 0 Science
0 English Language 0 Humanities 0 Social Studies
0 Geography 0 Law
0 Other (Please specify)

22. Number of years of teaching experience (Check one.)

0 Less than 5 years
0 6-10 years
0 11-15 years
0 Over 15 years

23. Check the box that indicates your training prior to this workshop. (Check all that apply.)

0 I have NOT been trained in using this deliberation process.
0 I have been trained in using this deliberation process.
0 I have used deliberations in my classroom.

24. Your Gender:

0 Female 0 Male
Appendix C
Post-Deliberation Teacher Questionnaire

PURPOSE
This questionnaire is part of the Deliberating in a Democracy (DDA) Project involving teachers and students from five countries (Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and the United States). As a teacher and a participant, we are interested in your attitudes and experiences using deliberations in your classroom this year.

There are no right or wrong answers on this questionnaire. All of this information will be kept strictly confidential; no one other than the evaluation team at the University of Minnesota will see your responses.

1. Please write your first name and last name in the appropriate box.

First Name: 
Last Name: 

2. Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below. (Check only one response for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I know what is expected of me as a DDA project participant.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It is important that students learn how to deliberate about significant issues.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I have learned the skills needed to conduct effective deliberations in my classroom(s).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. By the third deliberation, my students were able to conduct small group work with minimal direction from me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In your opinion, what is the primary purpose of deliberation?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
4. How would you rate your current understanding of the deliberation process? (Select only one.)

- 0 Poor
- 0 Fair
- 0 Good
- 0 Very Good
- 0 Excellent

5. How have you addressed the democratic history of one of the DDA partner countries in your classroom? Please be specific.

___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

6. About how many times since August 2011 were you involved in these activities?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5+

a. Number of deliberations YOU have conducted in your classroom.
b. A DDA site coordinator observed you conduct a deliberation.
c. Another teacher observed you conduct a deliberation.
d. A school administrator observed you conduct a deliberation.
e. YOU observed another teacher conduct a classroom deliberation.
f. YOU co-facilitated a classroom deliberation with another teacher.
g. YOU visited a classroom in another country as part of the DDA Project.

7. If you did not complete at least three deliberations, what prevented you from doing so?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

8. Did students in your target class (the class that completed the questionnaires) receive a formal grade for their participation in deliberations?

- 0 Yes
- 0 No
9. Please list the topics that you deliberated in your classroom. (Note: Teachers were only required to conduct three deliberations, but some teachers chose to conduct more.)

Deliberation 1:
Deliberation 2:
Deliberation 3:
Deliberation 4:

List additional deliberation topics here:
_____________________________________________________________________________________

10. In your opinion, what topic was the best for developing deliberation skills (listening, reflecting, etc.)?

Best topic for developing deliberation skills:

Corruption and Judicial Independence
Cyberbullying
Environment
Direct Democracy
Free Trade
Freedom of Expression
Juvenile Justice
Migration
National Service
Public Demonstrations
Public Health
Voting

11. In your opinion, what was the best topic for promoting deep discussions in your classroom?

Best topic for promoting deep discussions

Corruption and Judicial Independence
Cyberbullying
Environment
Direct Democracy
Free Trade
Freedom of Expression
Juvenile Justice
Migration
National Service
Public Demonstrations
Public Health
Voting
12. Why do you think the topic you listed in Question 11 promoted the deepest discussions?
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

13. Please discuss any instances that your students used their deliberation skills outside of the structured deliberation process.
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

14. Did your students engage in online activities with students from other schools?
0 Yes (Skip to 15a)
0 No (Skip to 15b)
0 Not Sure (Skip to 16)

15a. If Yes, how effective were the online activities?
0 Very ineffective
0 Ineffective
0 Slightly ineffective
0 Slightly effective
0 Effective
0 Very effective

15b. If No, please explain briefly why your students did not engage in online activities.
_________________________________________________________________________________

16. Did your students engage in videoconference activities with students from other schools?
0 Yes (Skip to 17a)
0 No (Skip to 17b)
17a. If Yes, how effective were the videoconference activities?

0 Very ineffective
0 Ineffective
0 Slightly ineffective
0 Slightly effective
0 Effective
0 Very effective

17b. If No, please explain briefly why your students did not engage in videoconference activities.

__________________________________________________________________________________

18. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. I believe that the deliberations helped my students...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. develop a deeper understanding of the issues.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. engage in critical thinking.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. make decisions based on evidence and logic.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. respect others’ points of view.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. identify multiple perspectives associated with deliberation topics.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Please share some ways that your students benefited from participating in deliberations.

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

20. Please share any challenges that made it more difficult to conduct deliberations in your classroom.

__________________________________________________________________________________

21. Between August 2011 and June 2012, about how many of your students participated in at least one deliberation? Please include your target classes (those completing questionnaires) and any other classes conducting deliberations.

Number of students: __________________________
22. In a typical month during the school year, how often have you discussed controversial public issues with students in your classroom? (NOT including the DDA deliberations)?

- 0 Not at all
- 0 Less than once a week
- 0 Once a week
- 0 Two to three times a week
- 0 Every day

23. How has your teaching changed, if at all, as a result of your participation in the DDA Project?

_________________________________________________________________________________

24. Please indicate your level of agreement with the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I will continue using deliberations in my classroom next year.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I plan to continue using DDA materials in my classes next year.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My participation in this project has deepened my understanding of democracy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. In your opinion, what was the most meaningful aspect of the DDA project overall?

_________________________________________________________________________________

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The information you provide in this section will not be shared.

26. Your DDA Site is: (Check one.)

- 0 California
- 0 Colombia
- 0 Colorado
- 0 Ecuador
- 0 Illinois
- 0 Maryland
- 0 Mexico
- 0 Minnesota
- 0 North Carolina
- 0 Peru
- 0 Virginia
27. Number of years of teaching experience (Check one.)

0  Less than 5 years
0  6-10 years
0  11-15 years
0  Over 15 years

28. What is your gender?
0  Female  0  Male

29. Which resources were most helpful for you when you implemented deliberations in the classroom? (Check all that apply).

0  DDA Project Team Members
0  DDA Readings and Support Materials
0  School Administrators
0  Site directors
0  Teacher Colleagues
    Other: Please Specify ________________________________

30. If you would like to provide any additional comments about your DDA project experiences, please share them here.

____________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
Appendix D
Pre-Deliberation Student Questionnaire

Purpose

This questionnaire is part of the Deliberating in a Democracy (DDA) Project involving teachers and students from 5 countries (Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and the United States). We are interested in learning more about our attitudes about political issues and discussions. This questionnaire is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. All of this information will be kept confidential; no one other than the evaluation team at the University of Minnesota will see your responses.

You may choose whether to participate in the study. Your decision will in no way affect your grade in this or any other class, your relationship with your teacher, your school, or the University of Minnesota.

Would you like to participate in the questionnaire?

*Assent to participate.

☐ Yes, I would like to participate.
☐ No, I would not like to participate.

Your Personal Views about Politics

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement below. (Select one answer for each statement ☐.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I know more about political issues than most people my age.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When political issues or problems are being discussed, I usually have something to say.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am able to understand most political issues.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am interested in political issues in MY country.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am interested in political issues in OTHER countries.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I seek different points of view on issues that are important to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am reluctant to talk political issues Because I don’t like arguments.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am reluctant to talk about political issues Because it creates enemies.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am reluctant to talk about political issues Because I worry about what people might think of me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Personal Interest in Political Issues

How often do you engage in the following activities? (Select one answer for each statement ☐ .)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you . . .</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>At Least Once Monthly</th>
<th>At Least Once Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. read articles in the newspaper about what is happening in your country?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. read articles in the newspaper about what is happening in other countries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. watch news on television?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. listen to news on the radio?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. read about news events on the Internet?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often do you engage in discussions about controversial political issues with the people listed below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you . . .</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>At Least Once Monthly</th>
<th>At Least Once Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. People your own age [your peers]</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Parents</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Other adults</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Background Information

The information you provide in this section will not be shared. We use it only to learn about your school.

19. Please write your first name and the first letter of your last name in the spaces below.

First Name:
First Letter of Last Name:

20. Write the name of your teacher for this class.

________________________________________________
21. What is the subject of the course in which you are completing this questionnaire?

- [ ] Business Finance
- [ ] Government/Civics
- [ ] Philosophy/Ethics
- [ ] Economics
- [ ] History
- [ ] Science
- [ ] English Language
- [ ] Humanities
- [ ] Social Studies
- [ ] Geography
- [ ] Law
- [ ] Other: (Please specify)

22. What period of the day do you take this class?

- [ ] First Period
- [ ] Fourth Period
- [ ] Second Period
- [ ] Fifth Period
- [ ] Third Period
- [ ] Sixth Period
- [ ] Other: (Please specify)

23. Where do you live?

- [ ] California
- [ ] Illinois
- [ ] North Carolina
- [ ] Colombia
- [ ] Maryland
- [ ] Peru
- [ ] Colorado
- [ ] Mexico
- [ ] Virginia
- [ ] Ecuador
- [ ] Minnesota

24. What is your gender?

- [ ] Female
- [ ] Male

25. What month were you born?

- [ ] January
- [ ] July
- [ ] February
- [ ] August
- [ ] March
- [ ] September
- [ ] April
- [ ] October
- [ ] May
- [ ] November
- [ ] June
- [ ] December
26. What year were you born?

☐ 1991 ☐ 1997
☐ 1992 ☐ 1998
☐ 1993 ☐ 1999
☐ 1994 ☐ 2000
☐ 1995 ☐ 2001
☐ 1996 ☐ 2002
Appendix E
Post-Deliberation Student Questionnaire

Purpose

This questionnaire is part of the Deliberating in a Democracy (DDA) Project involving teachers and students from 5 countries. We are interested in learning more about young people’s attitudes toward social and political issues and discussions. This questionnaire is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. All of this information will be kept confidential; no one other than the evaluation team at the University of Minnesota will see your responses.

Your Personal Views about Politics

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement below. (Select one answer for each statement ☐.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I know more about political issues than most people my age.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When political issues or problems are being discussed, I usually have something to say.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am able to understand most political issues.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am interested in political issues in MY country.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am interested in political issues in OTHER countries.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I seek different points of view on issues that are important to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am reluctant to talk about political issues because I don’t like arguments.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am reluctant to talk about political issues because it creates enemies.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am reluctant to talk about political issues because I worry about what people might think of me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Your Interest in Politics**

How often do you engage in the following activities? (Select one answer for each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>At Least Once Monthly</th>
<th>At Least Once Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. read articles in the newspaper about what is happening in your country?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. read articles in the newspaper about what is happening in other countries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. watch news on television?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. listen to news on the radio?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. read about news events on the Internet?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often do you engage in discussions about controversial political issues with the people listed below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>At Least Once Monthly</th>
<th>At Least Once Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. People your own age [your peers]</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Parents</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Other adults</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perspectives since Deliberating**

19. I participated in ____ deliberations this year.

☐ 0  ☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4 or more

20. Please select the FIRST deliberation topic you participated in.

- [ ] Corruption & Judicial Independence
- [ ] Environment
- [ ] Free Trade
- [ ] Juvenile Justice
- [ ] National Service
- [ ] Public Health
- [ ] Cyber Bullying
- [ ] Direct Democracy
- [ ] Freedom of Expression
- [ ] Migration
- [ ] Public Demonstration
- [ ] Compulsory Voting

☐ Other (please specify)
21. To what degree do you think THIS was a controversial topic (stimulated significant discussion)?

☐ Not Controversial  ☐ Slightly Controversial  ☐ Moderately Controversial  ☐ Very Controversial

22. Please select the SECOND deliberation topic you participated in.

☐ Corruption & Judicial Independence  ☐ Cyber Bullying
☐ Environment  ☐ Direct Democracy
☐ Free Trade  ☐ Freedom of Expression
☐ Juvenile Justice  ☐ Migration
☐ National Service  ☐ Public Demonstration
☐ Public Health  ☐ Compulsory Voting

☐ Other (please specify)

23. To what degree do you think THIS was a controversial topic (stimulated significant discussion)?

☐ Not Controversial  ☐ Slightly Controversial  ☐ Moderately Controversial  ☐ Very Controversial

24. Please select the THIRD deliberation topic you participated in.

☐ Corruption & Judicial Independence  ☐ Cyber Bullying
☐ Environment  ☐ Direct Democracy
☐ Free Trade  ☐ Freedom of Expression
☐ Juvenile Justice  ☐ Migration
☐ National Service  ☐ Public Demonstration
☐ Public Health  ☐ Compulsory Voting

☐ Other (please specify)

25. To what degree do you think THIS was a controversial topic (stimulated significant discussion)?

☐ Not Controversial  ☐ Slightly Controversial  ☐ Moderately Controversial  ☐ Very Controversial

Think about your experiences in this class as you answer questions 26 through 31.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. My teacher encourages students to make up their own minds.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My teacher encourages students to express their opinions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My teacher brings up current political events for discussion in class.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Students express opinions in class even when their opinions are different from most of the other students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My teacher encourages us to discuss the issues with classmates who have different opinions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. My teacher presents several sides of the issues when explaining them in class.

Think about your experiences in this class as you answer questions 32 through 36.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. I enjoyed the classroom deliberations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I learned a great deal by participating in the deliberations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Because of my participation in the deliberations, I developed a better understanding of the issues discussed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. My participation increased my ability to state my opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Because of my participation in the deliberations, I am more confident when talking about controversial issues with my peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select one answer for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>I did not participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. I enjoyed participating in the online discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I learned a lot by participating in online discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I have a greater understanding of the perspectives of students from other countries because of the online discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I enjoyed participating in the videoconference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I learned a lot by participating in the videoconference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I have a greater understanding of the perspectives of students from other countries because of the videoconference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some countries have a law that requires its citizens to vote, while other countries have no such law.

43. What reasons are there to SUPPORT a compulsory voting law? List up to five.

(1) __________________________________________
(2) __________________________________________
(3) __________________________________________
(4) __________________________________________
(5) __________________________________________
44. What reasons are there to **OPPOSE** a compulsory voting law? List your reasons below.

1. ______________________________________________________________________________________

2. ______________________________________________________________________________________

3. ______________________________________________________________________________________

4. ______________________________________________________________________________________

5. ______________________________________________________________________________________

45. Choose ONE statement:

- [ ] I SUPPORT a compulsory voting law.
- [ ] I OPPOSE a compulsory voting law.

**Background Information**

The information you provide in this section will not be shared. We use it only to learn about your school.

46. Please write your first name and the first letter of your last name in the spaces below.

   First Name: __________________________

   First Letter of Last Name: __________________

47. Write the name of your teacher for this class.

   ______________________________________

48. What is the subject of the course in which you are completing this questionnaire?

- [ ] Business Finance  -  [ ] Government/Civics  -  [ ] Philosophy/Ethics
- [ ] Economics  -  [ ] History  -  [ ] Science
- [ ] English Language  -  [ ] Humanities  -  [ ] Social Studies
- [ ] Geography  -  [ ] Law  -  

- [ ] Other: (Please specify)
49. What period of the day do you take this class?

- [ ] First Period
- [ ] Second Period
- [ ] Third Period
- [ ] Fourth Period
- [ ] Fifth Period
- [ ] Sixth Period
- [ ] Other: (Please specify)

50. Where do you live?

- [ ] California
- [ ] Colorado
- [ ] Ecuador
- [ ] Colombia
- [ ] Colorado
- [ ] Maryland
- [ ] Mexico
- [ ] Minnesota
- [ ] North Carolina
- [ ] Peru
- [ ] Virginia

51. What is your gender?

- [ ] Female
- [ ] Male

52. What month were you born?

- [ ] January
- [ ] February
- [ ] March
- [ ] April
- [ ] May
- [ ] June
- [ ] July
- [ ] August
- [ ] September
- [ ] October
- [ ] November
- [ ] December

53. What year were you born?

- [ ] 1991
- [ ] 1992
- [ ] 1993
- [ ] 1994
- [ ] 1995
- [ ] 1996
- [ ] 1997
- [ ] 1998
- [ ] 1999
- [ ] 2000
- [ ] 2001
- [ ] 2002
Appendix F
Teacher Interview Protocol

Good morning (good afternoon, good evening) and welcome to our session. My name is (Carol, Delia, Jessamay, Pat, Tim) and I am a member of the DDA evaluation team from the University of Minnesota. [Hand person business card.]

Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences with the Deliberating in a Democracy (DDA) program. I’d like to know more about your teaching experiences while participating on the DDA program. We will be interviewing several teachers in Mexico and Minnesota. Our interview today should last no longer than 30-45 minutes.

Today we will be discussing your experiences with the DDA program. This includes your involvement with the DDA program, and experiences with deliberations, professional development sessions, and any online exchanges or videoconferences.

There are no right or wrong answers. Please feel free to share your point of view.

Before we begin, let me remind you of some important information. I would like to tape record the session because I don't want to miss any of your comments. If at some point you would like the tape recorder turned off for any reason, let me know.

In any reports we write, there will not be any names attached to comments. You may be assured of complete confidentiality.

Interviewer: When you start taping, begin by saying:

This is [interviewer’s name], and it’s [date]. I’m in [city and county], and I’m interviewing [name of interviewee], a [role—civics/history/social economics teacher] at [name of school].

Teacher Interview Questions

General

1. Would you mind sharing with me how many years you have been teaching?

2. Why did you want to participate in this program?

Classroom Deliberations

3. What were your goals for your students as you conducted the deliberations? To what degree do you think you met them?
   a. From which issue do you think students learned the most?
   b. Which issue discussion do you think students most enjoyed?
   c. How would you describe the students’ reactions?
4. In your classroom, do you often discuss public controversial issues, aside from those you’ve discussed as part of the DDA project? Can you give examples of some issues you’ve talked about this past semester? What value do you see in these discussions?

5. What types of issues tend to generate the most controversy in your classroom? How do you treat those issues in your classroom?

6. Are there issues that you tend to avoid discussing in your classroom?

7. Do you perceive any resistance (e.g., school, parents) to teaching issues that may cause controversy in the classroom? If so, from whom?

8. To what extent do you think classroom deliberations are a “good fit” with your existing curriculum? Do you feel as if you will be able to do more of them in the future?

**Professional Development Workshops**

9. How helpful were the professional development meetings?
   a. How helpful were instructional strategies?
   b. How helpful were curriculum/teaching materials?
   c. How helpful were your discussions with other teachers?
   d. What problems, if any, did other teachers report having?

**On-line Exchanges**

10. Were your students able to participate in the online exchanges? What happened? How successful do you think they were?
   e. What issues did you discuss?
   f. How did the students react?
   g. How long did the discussions last?
   h. To what extent did students deepened their understanding of issues?

**Videoconferences**

11. Did a videoconference with your partner site take place? If so,
   a. What was most meaningful to you about the videoconference?
   b. What do you think was most meaningful to your students?
   c. Can you think of any way in which the videoconference could be improved?

**Concluding Thoughts**

12. What knowledge and skills do you feel you developed as a result of participating in this program?

13. How has your participation in DDA Project affected or changed your teaching?

14. Of the things you learned this year, what are you most likely to continue using? What are you least likely to continue using? Why?
15. Were there any barriers that prevented you from doing everything that you wanted to in connection with this program? Is there anything the program planners could do that would eliminate those barriers in the future?

16. Are there any questions you would like to ask of me?

Interviewer: Thank you so very much for your time. It’s been a pleasure to meet and talk with you.
Appendix G
School Administrator Interview Protocol

Good morning (good afternoon, good evening). My name is (Carol, Delia, Jessamay, Pat, Tim) and I am a member of the DDA evaluation team from the University of Minnesota [Hand person your business card.].

Thank you for taking the time to share your experiences with the Deliberating in a Democracy (DDA) program.

I want to get some insight into your experiences while participating with the DDA program. The evaluation team will be interviewing several administrators from [Mexico/Minnesota]. Our interview today should last no longer than 15-20 minutes.

There are no right or wrong answers. Please feel free to share your point of view.

Before we begin, I’d like to remind you of some important information. I would like to tape record the session because I don’t want to miss any of your comments. If at some point you would like the tape recorder turned off for any reason, let me know.

In any reports we write, there will not be any names attached to comments. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. Keep in mind that we’re just as interested in negative comments as positive comments, and at times the negative comments are the most helpful.

Here is a standard consent form that is required by my university as well as the U.S. Department of Education in order for me to conduct the interview. Please take a moment to read it, and then I’ll be happy to answer any questions you might have.

**Statement of Consent**

I have read the above information. I have received answers to my questions. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature ___________________________________________ Date ______________

Interviewer ___________________________________________ Date ______________

**Interviewer: When you start taping, begin by saying:**

This is [interviewer’s name], and it’s [date]. I’m in [city and county], and I’m interviewing [name of interviewee], a [role—civics/history/social economics teacher] at [name of school].
Administrator Interview Questions

1. What was your involvement with the DDA program? How were you informed of the DDA program?

2. Did the program raise any problems for either you or your staff?

3. If any problems arose, were project personnel helpful?

4. Were you able to resolve any problems which might have arisen?

5. Did any parents or community members come to you with questions about the program? If so, what kinds of questions?

6. Do you feel as if participation in this program benefited your school community in any way? How?

7. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about how this program impacted the school or community?

Interviewer: Those are all of my questions about the DDA Project. I would like to ask you some questions about your school so we have a better sense of the context in which the DDA Project is taking place.

8. Approximately how many students attend the school?

9. What grade levels does the school serve?

10. [Mexico Only]: Would you say most of your students come from homes with low, average, or high incomes?

11. Approximately what percentage of students will go on to the universities or colleges after graduating from this school?

12. What do you see as the greatest strength of the school?

13. What do you see as the greatest challenge the school faces?

14. Is there any other information you’d like to share about your school?

15. Are there any questions you would like to ask me?

Interviewer: Thank you so much for your time. I know you are a very busy person. It’s been a real pleasure to meet and talk with you.
Appendix H
Mid-Year Interview Protocol for Site directors (SC1)
To Be Completed December 2012

1. What’s been happening at your site? If you’ve had a professional development session, what kinds of things did you do?

2. What do your teachers report about their experiences with the deliberations?

3. Successes?

4. Challenges?

5. If you’ve had a chance to observe any of your teachers, what were your impressions?

6. Do you have any concerns about the project at this point?

7. Final Thoughts?
Appendix I
End of Program Interview Protocol for Site directors (SC2)

1. What are you most proud of in relation to your work with DDA this past year?

2. What was your biggest challenge over the past year?

3. We are interested in learning about any additional activities your site may have engaged in above and beyond what was required by the DDA project.

4. If CRFC were going to do another project/replicate this, what changes would you suggest?
### Appendix J

#### Classroom Observation Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer:</th>
<th>Avery Freeman Kundin Sheldon Thompson</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School_name:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class_Start_time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher_name:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finish_time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School_period:</td>
<td></td>
<td>num_females:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delib_issue:</td>
<td></td>
<td>num_males:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes to the observer:**
- **Review** deliberation procedures below *before* observing the deliberation.
- **Request** any hand-outs/assignments students received in preparation for the deliberation.
- **Script** entire lesson and note the times for each transition (step 2 → step 3).
- **Observe** whether the teacher is leading the students through the steps. Note the level of student engagement (Are the students observed deliberating? What percentage?) How “structured” is the Structured Academic Controversy? How does the teacher enforce the schedule? Does the teacher share their opinion during deliberation?

### PART I (In class the day before)

**TIME:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME:</th>
<th>X. Lesson Introduction. How does the teacher begin the class?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em>_</td>
<td>1. Introduction to Deliberation. Teachers review the meaning of deliberation, the reasons for deliberating, and the rules for deliberation. Ask teacher if they introduced the deliberation in class the day before.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART II (approximately 30 minutes)**

**TIME:**

| TIME: | 2. Careful Reading of the Text. Students read the text individually, in small groups of 4, or as a whole class to reach a common understanding of the reading. As a whole class or in their small groups, students agree on at least three interesting facts and/or ideas. |

**Note on Supplemental Resources.** Each deliberation includes both a basic reading and one or more supplemental resources. Supplemental resources are optional materials that can be used to provoke discussion and critical thinking. These materials may be used by teachers as part of the lesson— as part of the Introduction (Step 1), Careful Reading of the Text (Step 2), Presentation of Positions (Step 4), Reversal of Positions (Step 5), or Reflection (Step 8). Teachers can use these materials to differentiate instruction with some or all the students in class.

---
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3. **Clarification.** After checking for understanding of the terms and content, teacher makes sure students understand the deliberation question. (Handout #2)

4. **Presentation of Positions.** Students work in small groups of 4 divided into pairs (A & B). Each pair is assigned a position. The position of the A’s is to find at least two compelling reasons to say YES to the deliberation question. The position of the B’s is to find at least two compelling reasons to say NO to the deliberation question. A’s teach B’s at least two reasons to say YES to the deliberation question. B’s teach A’s at least two reasons to say NO to the deliberation question. (Handout #2)

5. **Reversal of Positions.** The pairs reverse positions. The B pair now adopts the position to say YES to the deliberation question; the A pair adopts the position to say NO to the deliberation question. The A’s & B’s should select the best reason they heard from the other pair and add at least one additional compelling reason from the reading to support their new position. (Handout #2)

**PART III (approximately 15-20 minutes)**

6. **Free Discussion.** Students drop their assigned roles and deliberate the question in their small groups. Each student reaches a personal decision based on evidence and logic.

**PART IV (approximately 10-15 minutes)**

7. **Whole Class Debrief.** The teacher leads the whole class in a discussion to gain a deeper understanding of the question, democracy, and deliberation.
   - What were the most compelling reasons for each side? What were the areas of agreement? What questions do you still have? Where can you get more information?
   - What is your position? (Poll the class on the deliberation question.) In what ways, if any, did your position change?
   - Is there an alternative policy that might address the problem more effectively? What, if anything, might you or your class do to address this problem?
   - What principles of democracy were inherent in this discussion? Why might deliberating this issue be important in a democracy?
   
   Add other questions relevant to your curriculum.

**PART V (15-30 minutes either in class or for homework)**

8. **Student Reflection.** Students complete the reflection form either at the end of class or for homework. (Handout #3)
Appendix K
Student Focus Group Protocol

Interviewer: As students are entering room, have them complete the Focus Group survey.

Good morning (good afternoon, good evening) and welcome to our session. My name is [Delia, Jessamay, Pat, Tim] and I am a member of the DDA evaluation team from the University of Minnesota.

Thank you for taking the time to join our discussion of your *Deliberating in a Democracy* (DDA) experiences. We will be conducting several focus groups in Mexico and Minnesota.

I am interesting in learning about your deliberation experiences while participating on the DDA program.

Today we will be discussing your deliberation experiences. This includes your understanding of the deliberation process, things you have learned through the deliberation activities, and ideas you have for improving the deliberation process.

There are no right or wrong answers but rather differing points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even if it differs from what others have said.

Here is a standard consent form that is required by my university as well as the U.S. Department of Education in order for me to conduct the focus group. [Read the Consent Form to the students.] I’ll be happy to answer any questions you might have. [Have students sign Consent Form]

Before we begin, let me remind you of some ground rules. Please speak up—only one person should talk at a time. We're tape recording the session because we don't want to miss any of your comments. If several are talking at the same time, it will be very difficult if not impossible to hear your comments. Before you speak, please state your name. For example, “This is [Delia, Jessamay, Pat, Tim]. I think the deliberation process was very interesting.”

We will be on a first name basis today, and in our later reports there will not be any names attached to comments. You may be assured of complete confidentiality.

Keep in mind that we're just as interested in negative comments as positive comments, and at times the negative comments are the most helpful. However, although you may not agree with others, you must listen respectfully as others share their views.

I ask that you turn off any cell phones. If you cannot, and if you must respond to a call, please do so as quietly as possible and rejoin us as quickly as you can.

Our session will last about one hour. Well, let's begin. I've placed name cards on the table in front of you to help us remember each other's names. Let's find out some more about each other
by going around the room one at a time. Tell us your name and one thing you enjoy doing in your free time.

**Interviewer:** When you start taping, begin by saying:

This is [interviewer’s name], and it’s [date]. I’m in [city and county], and I’m about to begin a focus group with [number of students] at [name of school].

**Beginning the Focus Group Discussion**

**Interviewer:** As students are entering room, have them complete the Focus Group survey.

Good morning (good afternoon, good evening) and welcome to our session. My name is [Delia, Jessamay, Pat, Tim] and I am a member of the DDA evaluation team from the University of Minnesota.

Thank you for taking the time to join our discussion of your *Deliberating in a Democracy* (DDA) experiences. We will be conducting several focus groups in Mexico and Minnesota.

I am interested in learning about your deliberation experiences while participating on the DDA program.

Today we will be discussing your deliberation experiences. This includes your understanding of the deliberation process, things you have learned through the deliberation activities, and ideas you have for improving the deliberation process.

There are no right or wrong answers but rather differing points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even if it differs from what others have said.

Here is a standard consent form that is required by my university as well as the U.S. Department of Education in order for me to conduct the focus group. [Read the Consent Form to the students.] I’ll be happy to answer any questions you might have. [Have students sign Consent Form]

Before we begin, let me remind you of some ground rules. Please speak up--only one person should talk at a time. We're tape recording the session because we don't want to miss any of your comments. If several are talking at the same time, it will be very difficult if not impossible to hear your comments. Before you speak, please state your name. For example, “This is [Delia, Jessamay, Pat, Tim]. I think the deliberation process was very interesting.”

We will be on a first name basis today, and in our later reports there will not be any names attached to comments. You may be assured of complete confidentiality.

Keep in mind that we're just as interested in negative comments as positive comments, and at times the negative comments are the most helpful. However, although you may not agree with others, you must listen respectfully as others share their views.
I ask that you turn off any cell phones. If you cannot, and if you must respond to a call, please do so as quietly as possible and rejoin us as quickly as you can.

Our session will last about one hour. Well, let's begin. I've placed name cards on the table in front of you to help us remember each other's names. Let's find out some more about each other by going around the room one at a time. Tell us your name and one thing you enjoy doing in your free time.

**Interviewer:** When you start taping, begin by saying:

> This is [interviewer’s name], and it’s [date]. I’m in [city and county], and I’m about to begin a focus group with [number of students] at [name of school].

**Focus Group Questions**

1) Tell me about the deliberations in your class. What did you learn from this process?

2) Are the deliberations different from the types of activities you do in other classes? If so, how?

3) If you could change something about the deliberations, what would it be?

4) What do you think the goals of these deliberations were? How successfully do you think they were met?

5) How successful were your online interactions with other classes? Which type of activity did you prefer more, the online discussions or the face-to-face discussions?

6) [If students participated in the videoconference]…How successful was the teleconference with your partner site? What was the most important thing you learned from the videoconference?

7) The directors of the project are always trying to improve it. Is there anything you would want the project directors to know that would be helpful to them?

8) Do you have any questions you would like to ask me?

Thank you so much for your time. I very much appreciate your sharing some of your thoughts and ideas with me.
Appendix L
Student Focus Group Survey

Thank you for participating in the DDA Focus Group. Please answer the following questions before we start our focus group.

1. What is your first name? __________________________________________

2. Circle your grade in school:
   
   5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12  other ________

3. Circle your gender: female male

4. Circle the most appropriate response to the following statements:
   
   a. “I am very interested in political issues.”
      
      Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

   b. “I enjoyed participating in the deliberations.”
      
      Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

   Thank you for completing this short survey!
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Appendix M  
Students’ Self Report: Discussing Controversial Public Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“How often do you have discussions about controversial public issues with the people listed below?”</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Never %</th>
<th>Once a Month %</th>
<th>Once a Week %</th>
<th>Daily %</th>
<th>% of Students</th>
<th>z test</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People your own age (your peers).</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Adults</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test was used to compare the difference between students’ pre and post responses.  
***Indicates a statistically significant result p<.001.
### Appendix N

**Students’ Self-Report: Political Knowledge and Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of Students Selecting Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>% of Students</th>
<th>z test</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Decrease (Pre&gt;Post)</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Increase (Post&gt;Pre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I know more about political issues than most people my age.</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When political issues or problems are discussed, I usually have something to say.</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am able to understand most political issues.</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am interested in political issues in MY country.</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am interested in political issues in OTHER countries.</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I seek different points of view on issues that are important to me.</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test was used to compare the difference between students’ pre and post responses. 

***Indicates a statistically significant result p<.001.
**Students’ Self Report: Talking About Political Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of Students Selecting Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>% of Students</th>
<th>z test</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease (Pre&gt;Post)</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Increase (Post&gt;Pre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am reluctant to talk about political issues because I don’t like arguments.</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>Pre 24.8</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 28.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am reluctant to talk about political issues because it creates enemies.</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>Pre 15.9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am reluctant to talk about political issues because I worry about what people might think of me.</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>Pre 11.7</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test was used to compare the difference between students’ pre and post responses.  
**Indicates a statistically significant result p <.01. *Indicates a statistically significant results p <.05.**
### Appendix M

**Students’ Self Report: Discussing Controversial Public Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“How often do you have discussions about controversial public issues with the people listed below?”</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Never %</th>
<th>Once a Month %</th>
<th>Once a Week %</th>
<th>Daily %</th>
<th>% of Students</th>
<th>z test</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People your own age (your peers).</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Adults</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test was used to compare the difference between students’ pre and post responses.

***Indicates a statistically significant result p<.001.
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### Appendix N
**Students’ Self-Report: Political Knowledge and Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of Students Selecting Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>% of Students</th>
<th>% (Decrease (Pre&gt;Post)</th>
<th>% (No Change)</th>
<th>% (Increase (Post&gt;Pre)</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I know more about political issues than most people my age.</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>Pre 40.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11.323</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 58.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When political issues or problems are discussed, I usually have something to say.</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>Pre 69.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5.457</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 74.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am able to understand most political issues.</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>Pre 78.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5.749</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 83.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am interested in political issues in MY country.</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>Pre 80.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 80.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am interested in political issues in OTHER countries.</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>Pre 65.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 64.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I seek different points of view on issues that are important to me.</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>Pre 85.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 83.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test was used to compare the difference between students’ pre and post responses.  
*** Indicates a statistically significant result p<.001.
### Students’ Self Report: Talking About Political Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of Students Selecting Agree or Strongly Agree</th>
<th>% of Students</th>
<th>z test</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease (Pre&gt;Post)</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>Increase (Post&gt;Pre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am reluctant to talk about political issues because I don’t like arguments.</td>
<td>1.896</td>
<td>Pre 24.8</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 28.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am reluctant to talk about political issues because it creates enemies.</td>
<td>1.913</td>
<td>Pre 15.9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am reluctant to talk about political issues because I worry about what people might think of me.</td>
<td>1.925</td>
<td>Pre 11.7</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post 15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test was used to compare the difference between students’ pre and post responses.  
**Indicates a statistically significant result p <.01. *Indicates a statistically significant results p <.05.