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This All Schools Report is broken down into two major parts:
Research Findings \& Student Feedback Questions

## All-Schools Report Overview

## Part 1: Research Findings

Seventy-five schools participated and thirty-four of the schools had useable data from 18 states in this study of student character and leadership perceptions and behavior. The schools represented in this analysis included schools that contributed more than one pre and one posttest for the analysis. There were a total of 2,525 pre tests and 1,344 posttests from 34 schools used in the analysis. Breakdowns are found in Appendices $1 \& 2$. Ninth grade students made up $39 \%$ of the participants. Gender was $52 \%$ female and $48 \%$ male. The agreement with schools was to analyze all data if there were more than one pre and posttest. All data reported by the schools pre and post is used in the analysis. This led to samples from schools with a large pre/post differences on the number of surveys contributed. Eighty-four variables were studied and divided into the nine distinct constructs shown below.

To demonstrate improvement in students, we ideally want to see the first four of these constructs decrease from pre to post (Group 1) and the second five of these constructs increase between pre and post- test (Group 2). Therefore, to make this report easier to interpret, the constructs were divided into two groups: Group 1-with four constructs \& Group 2-with five constructs. For each group, there are two tables:

The Means Table shows the mean scores for each construct pre and post allowing you to determine mean changes in scores from pre to post testing.

The Significance Table-T-Tests shows the level of significance for each construct, essentially alerting you if statistically significant change has occurred from pre to post testing for all students.

Group 1 Ideally These Constructs Decrease<br>School Behavior Problems<br>Student Safety<br>Substance Use<br>Anti Social Behaviors

## Part II: Student Feedback

At the end of the post-test, students are asked six evaluative questions that allow them to evaluate their experiences with the curriculum. We report student evaluations using tables, charts, and anonymous, unedited, and uncensored written feedback by your students. Note: Student comments are only reported in the Individual School Report.

Q1) Would you recommend this class to a friend?
Q2) Compared to other classes, rate this course on a scale of 0--4.

Q3) On a scale of 1--5, what kind of impact did this course have on you?
Q4) Rate the textbook on a scale of 1--5?
Q5) Who was your favorite role model in the textbook and why?
Q6) Who was your least favorite role model in the textbook and why?

## All Schools Program Report

Group 1 is made up of four constructs where lower scores on the post-test indicate the desired outcome- i.e. if scores go down from pre to post, change is in the desired direction and if scores go up on the post test, change is in a non-desired direction. The constructs are:
(1) School Behavior Problems
(2) Student Safety
(3) Substance Use
(4) Anti Social Behaviors

Understanding the Means Table: The first table gives a summary of the four constructs in Group 1. Interpretation of construct significance best occurs by taking into account the uniqueness of your school. While we have selected the .05 level of significance as our base you may want to interpret it differently for your schools individual report-as the sample size decreases it is harder to reach significance and some may move to the .10 level of significance to make their interpretations of what the constructs mean for them. In the end common sense should be your guiding tool. The means table allows the reader to examine the changes on the four constructs from pre to post-testing.

Group 1 Constructs
Character \& Leadership All Schools 2010
Mean Scores: Testing with Count: Pre/Post

|  | Testing |  |  |  | Group Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Pre |  | 2 Post |  | Count | Mean |
|  | Count | Mean | Count | Mean |  |  |
| School Behavior Problems | 2525 | (4.13) | 1344 | (3.39) | 3869 | (3.87) |
| Student Safety | 2525 | (2.38) | 1344 | (2.10) | 3869 | (2.28) |
| Substance Use | 2525 | (3.34) | 1344 | (2.83) | 3869 | (3.16) |
| Anti Social Behaviors | 2525 | (8.60) | 1344 | (8.06) | 3869 | (8.42) |

Group 1: All four constructs are moving in the desired direction for All (decreasing) from pre to post. All Group 1 constructs are statistically significant @ . 05 level: Comparison of Group Total: Mean

Significance Test is in the column (Sig. (2-tailed)

Understanding the Significance Table: The following table (significance table) gives a summary of the four constructs in Group 1 and helps the reader determine if statistically significant change has occurred. If statistically significant change has occurred between pre- and post-test, the first number under the Sig. (2-tailed) column will be less than or equal to .05. All Group 1 Constructs showed statistically significant change in the desired direction.

|  |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  | Lower |  |  |  |  | Upper |
| School Behavior Problems | Equal variances assumed |  | 5.336 | 3867 | . 000 | . 737 | . 138 | . 466 | 1.008 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | 5.588 | 3116.853 | . 000 | . 737 | . 132 | . 478 | . 995 |
| Student Safety | Equal variances assumed | 2.272 | 3867 | . 023 | . 282 | . 124 | . 039 | . 525 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | 2.263 | 2710.407 | . 024 | . 282 | . 125 | . 038 | . 526 |
| Substance Use | Equal variances assumed | 2.598 | 3867 | . 009 | . 502 | . 193 | . 123 | . 881 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | 2.681 | 2993.185 | . 007 | . 502 | . 187 | . 135 | . 870 |
| Anti Social Behaviors | Equal variances assumed | 2.602 | 3867 | . 009 | . 540 | . 207 | . 133 | . 946 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | 2.633 | 2835.485 | . 008 | . 540 | . 205 | . 138 | . 941 |

Example: Student Safety has a pre-test mean of 2.38 and a post-test mean of 2.10. The means decreased from pre to post-test, which is the desired direction of change. The magnitude and significance of change is found in the second table-Significance Test. Here we observe a Sig. (2Tailed) value of .023 indicating a significance level of .02 , which indicates statistical significance. The same method is used for the remaining eight constructs. All Group 1 Constructs showed statistically significant change in the desired direction.

Group 2 is made up of five constructs where higher scores on the posttest indicate a desired outcome- i.e. if scores go up from pre to post, change is in a desired direction and if scores go down on the post test, change is in a non-desired direction. The constructs are:
(5) Future Expectations
(6) Demonstrate Positive Traits
(7) Connecting Traits with Future Success
(8) Positive Social Behaviors
(9) Ethical Practices of Self \& Others

Understanding Means Table: The first table gives a summary of the five categories in Group 2.

Sometimes the category is not statistically significant, but meaningful change has occurred. The means table allows the reader to examine the changes on the five constructs from pre to post-test, with specific attention given to gender. Increasing means from pre to post is the desired direction. All Group 2 means increased from pre to post but two were not significant changes-Positive Social Behaviors and Ethical Practices of Self \& Others.

Group 2 Constructs
Character \& Leadership All Schools 2010
Mean Scores: Testing with Count: Pre/Post

|  | Testing |  |  |  | Group Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Pre |  | 2 Post |  | Count | Mean |
|  | Count | Mean | Count | Mean |  |  |
| Future Expectations | 2525 | (30.11) | 1344 | (30.69) | 3869 | (30.31) |
| Demonstrate Positive Traits | 2525 | (29.33) | 1344 | (29.97) | 3869 | (29.55) |
| Connecting Traits with Future Success | 2525 | (21.46) | 1344 | (21.83) | 3869 | (21.59) |
| Positive Social Behaviors | 2525 | (25.40) | 1344 | (25.65) | 3869 | (25.48) |
| Ethical Practices of Self and Others | 2525 | (25.11) | 1344 | (25.27) | 3869 | (25.16) |

The first three Group 2 constructs are moving in the desired direction and significant @ the .05 level. Not significant constructs are Positive Social Behaviors \& Ethical Practices of Self and Others

Understanding the Significance Table: The following table (significance table) gives a summary of the five constructs in Group 2 and helps the reader determine if statistically significant change has occurred. If statistically significant change has occurred between pre- and post-test, the first number under the Sig. (2-tailed) column will be less than or equal to .05 If the significance level is @ . 05 or lower, it meets generally accepted statistical standards. In this table the last two constructs were not significant.

| T- Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  | Lower |  |  |  |  | Upper |
| Future Expectations | Equal variances assumed |  | -2.841 | 3867 | . 005 | -. 573 | . 202 | -. 968 | -. 177 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | -2.872 | 2825.142 | . 004 | -. 573 | . 199 | -. 964 | -. 182 |
| Demonstrate Positive Traits | Equal variances assumed | -2.373 | 3867 | . 018 | -. 635 | . 267 | -1.159 | -. 110 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | -2.399 | 2827.669 | . 016 | -. 635 | . 264 | -1.153 | -. 116 |
| Connecting Traits with Future Success | Equal variances assumed | -2.742 | 3867 | . 006 | -. 367 | . 134 | -. 629 | -. 104 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | -2.787 | 2867.662 | . 005 | -. 367 | . 132 | -. 624 | -. 109 |
| Positive Social Behaviors | Equal variances assumed | -. 596 | 3867 | . 551 | -. 249 | . 417 | -1.067 | . 570 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | -. 593 | 2698.392 | . 553 | -. 249 | . 420 | -1.072 | . 574 |
| Ethical Practices of Self and Others | Equal variances assumed | -1.244 | 3867 | . 214 | -. 165 | . 133 | -. 426 | . 095 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed | -1.227 | 2635.426 | . 220 | -. 165 | . 135 | -. 430 | . 099 |

## Summary of Findings for Group1 and Group2 Constructs

Seven of the nine constructs were statistically significant in the desired direction. Two of the constructs were not statistically significant--Positive Social Behaviors and Ethical Practices of Self \& Others. These constructs did move in the desired direction, but did not have enough change for them to be significant. These findings are encouraging and should be interpreted with regard to the number of students participating and the climate of your school as well as the number of pre/ post tests completed.

## Survey Questions Grouped by Constructs

Actual Questions in the Survey: The nine constructs are made up by a group of questions within the survey. Below, we have provided the exact questions that make up each construct used in the analysis.

## School Behavioral Problems

About how many times did the following things happen to you this semester?
Q6: I was late for school.
Q7: I got in trouble for not following school rules.
Q8: I was put on an in-school suspension.
Q9: I was suspended or put on probation from school.

## Student Safety

About how many times did the following things happen to you this semester?
Q13: Bullied by someone on school property?
Q14: Had something stolen from you at school?
Q15: Someone from school offered to sell you drugs?
Q16: Someone threatened to hurt you at school?
Q17: Someone threatened or injured you with a weapon on school property?
Substance Use: During this semester, on how many days did you:
Q20: Have at least one drink of alcohol?
Q21: Smoke cigarettes?
Q22: Use chewing tobacco or dip?
Q23: Use marijuana?
Q24: Use more hardcore drugs?
Future Expectations: Think about how you see the future. How sure are you that:
Q28: You will graduate from high school.
Q29: You will go to college.
Q30: You will have a job that pays well.
Q31: You will be able to own your own home.
Q32: You will have a job that you enjoy doing.
Q33: You will have a happy life.
Q35: You will be respected in your community.
Q36: You will have good friends you can count on

Q37: Life will turn out better for you than it has for your parents.

Demonstrate Positive Traits: During this semester, how often did you demonstrate each of the following traits?
Q38: Responsibility
Q39: Honesty
Q40: Tolerance
Q41: Perseverance
Q42: Respect
Q43: Integrity
Q44: Appreciation
Q45: Self-control
Q46: Courage
Q47: Leadership
Q48: Empathy
Q49: Positive Attitude
Connecting Traits with Future Success: How important are the following traits?
Q50: Responsibility
Q51: Honesty
Q52: Tolerance
Q53: Perseverance
Q54: Respect
Q55: Integrity
Q56: Appreciation
Q57: Self-control
Q58: Courage
Q59: Leadership
Q60: Empathy
Q61: Positive Attitude

## Anti Social Behaviors: During this semester, how many times have you?

Q64: Cheated on a test or exam?
Q65: Plagiarized or copied something from the internet and used it as your own?
Q66: Stole something from a store?
Q67: Took money from a friend or relative?
Q68: Picked on another student at school?
Q69: Gave into peer pressure when you knew you shouldn't have?
Q70: Got into a verbal or physical confrontation with an authority figure at school (teacher, principal, coach...)?

Positive Social Behaviors: During this semester, how many times have you?
Q71: Gone out of your way to help another student?
Q72: Completed extra credit?
Q73: Worked hard to resolve a problem with a teacher?
Q74: Worked hard to resolve a problem with a classmate?
Q75: Put in extra time and effort to get a better grade?
Q76: Maintained your composure or controlled your temper when put in a tough situation?
Q78: Let a classmate know his/her behavior was inappropriate?
Q79: Told a parent or role model how much you appreciated them?
Q80: Chose the right option over the easy option?
Q81: Demonstrated positive leadership skills?

Ethical Practices of Self \& Others: To what extent do you agree with these questions?
Q82: I would lie or cheat if it would help me get what I want.
Q83: In order to get ahead in life, a person needs to do a little wrong.
Q84: Generally speaking, I am more ethical than the people I go to school with.
Q85: Being considered a positive role model is important to me.

Q86: I want adults to trust me.
Q87: Having strong character is important to me.
Q88: My teachers and principals emphasize the importance of having strong character.
Q89: My parents/guardians emphasize the importance of having strong character.

## Part II: Student Feedback

At the end of the class students received a post-test, students were asked six evaluative questions that allow them to evaluate their experiences with the curriculum. We report student evaluations using tables, charts, and anonymous, unedited, and uncensored written feedback by your students. Note: Student comments are only reported in the Individual School Reports.

## Quantitative Questions:

Q1) Would you recommend this class to a friend?
Q2) Compared to other classes, rate this course on a scale of 0--4.
Q3) On a scale of $1--5$, what kind of impact did this course have on you?
Q4) Rate the textbook on a scale of 1--5?

## Qualitative Questions:

Q5) Who was your favorite role model in the textbook and why?
Q6) Who was your least favorite role model in the textbook and why?

## Summary of First Four Questions

Student endorsed the program with very positive rating on the four summary questions.

Recommend Class to a Friend: $80 \%$ positive to very positive.
Ratings for the Character Curriculum: $81 \%$ positive to very positive.
Impact Character Class Had on Me: $78 \%$ positive to very positive.
Ratings for Role Model Text Book: $83 \%$ positive to very positive.

## Students Favorite \& Least Favorite Role Model

Students Favorite Role Models were: Mattie Stepanek 28\%, Martin Luther King $19 \%$, Tiger Woods $19 \%$, and Oprah Winfrey $11 \%$. These four role models accounted for $61 \%$ of the rankings.

Students Least Favorite Role Models were: Tiger Woods 43\%, Sherron Watkins $8 \%$, Oprah Winfrey $8 \%$, and Mike Krzyzewski 5\%.

Tables and Charts follow to detail these results.

Recommend Class to a Friend Year 2009-2010

|  | Gender |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Female |  | 2 Male |  | Count | Table \% |
|  | Count | Table \% | Count | Table \% |  |  |
| Recommend Class 0 No | 139 | 10.2\% | 128 | 9.4\% | 267 | 19.5\% |
| To Friend 1 Yes | 589 | 43.1\% | 512 | 37.4\% | 1101 | 80.5\% |
| Total | 728 | 53.2\% | 640 | 46.8\% | 1368 | 100.0\% |

## Recommend Class to a Friend

Character \& Leadership 2009-2010


Students Rating of Character \& Leadership Curriculum2
Low Rating = Negative High Rating = Positive

|  |  | Gender |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 Female |  | 2 Male |  | Count | Table \% |
|  |  | Count | Table \% | Count | Table \% |  |  |
| Impact 1 Very Low <br> Character 2 Low <br> Class Had 3 Medium <br> on Me 4 High <br>  5 Very High <br> Total  |  | 67 | 4.9\% | 70 | 5.1\% | 137 | 10.0\% |
|  |  | 53 | 3.9\% | 63 | 4.6\% | 116 | 8.5\% |
|  |  | 129 | 9.4\% | 112 | 8.2\% | 241 | 17.6\% |
|  |  | 210 | 15.4\% | 189 | 13.8\% | 399 | 29.2\% |
|  |  | 269 | 19.7\% | 206 | 15.1\% | 475 | 34.7\% |
|  |  | 728 | 53.2\% | 640 | 46.8\% | 1368 | 100.0\% |

All Schools: Year 2009-2010

## Students Rating of Character \& Leadership Curriculum

Character \& Leadership 2010


Impact Character Class Had on Me
Character and Leadership Class Rates
Low Rating = Negative High Rating = Positive

|  |  | Gender |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 Female |  | 2 Male |  | Count | Table \% |
|  |  | Count | Table \% | Count | Table \% |  |  |
| ImpactCharacterClass HadOnMe2 | 1 Very Low | 77 | 5.6\% | 74 | 5.4\% | 151 | 11.0\% |
|  | 2 Low | 73 | 5.3\% | 74 | 5.4\% | 147 | 10.7\% |
|  | 3 Medium | 131 | 9.6\% | 139 | 10.2\% | 270 | 19.7\% |
|  | 4 High | 192 | 14.0\% | 182 | 13.3\% | 374 | 27.3\% |
|  | 5 Very High | 255 | 18.6\% | 171 | 12.5\% | 426 | 31.1\% |
| Total |  | 728 | 53.2\% | 640 | 46.8\% | 1368 | 100.0\% |

All Schools: Year 2009-2010

## Impact Character Class Had on Me

Character \& Leadership 2009-2010


Students Ratings for Role Models Textbook

|  |  | Gender |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 Female |  | 2 Male |  | Count | Table \% |
|  |  | Count | Table \% | Count | Table \% |  |  |
| Students | 1 Very Low | 40 | 3.9\% | 32 | 3.1\% | 72 | 7.0\% |
| Ratings for | 2 Low | 61 | 5.9\% | 41 | 4.0\% | 102 | 9.9\% |
| Role Models | 3 Medium | 116 | 11.2\% | 99 | 9.6\% | 215 | 20.8\% |
| Textbook2 | 4 High | 138 | 13.3\% | 121 | 11.7\% | 259 | 25.0\% |
|  | 5 Very High | 201 | 19.4\% | 186 | 18.0\% | 387 | 37.4\% |
| Total |  | 556 | 53.7\% | 479 | 46.3\% | 1035 | 100.0\% |

24.3\% of students did not use textbook: Data not included in table

Character \& Leadership Classes: Year 2009-2010

## Students Ratings for Role Models Textbook

Character \& Leadership 2009-2010


Students Favorite Role Model in Textbook

|  |  | Gender |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 Female |  | 2 Male |  | Count | Table \% |
|  |  | Count | Table \% | Count | Table \% |  |  |
| Who | 1 Mattie Stepanek | 135 | 12.4\% | 91 | 8.3\% | 226 | 20.7\% |
| Was | 2 Tiger Woods | 57 | 5.2\% | 67 | 6.1\% | 124 | 11.4\% |
| Your | 3 Booker T. Washington | 9 | .8\% | 12 | 1.1\% | 21 | 1.9\% |
| Favorite | 4 Dwight D. Eisenhower | 13 | 1.2\% | 10 | .9\% | 23 | 2.1\% |
| Role | 5 Sherron Watkins | 6 | .6\% | 5 | . $5 \%$ | 11 | 1.0\% |
| Model | 6 Jesse Ventura | 10 | . $9 \%$ | 11 | 1.0\% | 21 | 1.9\% |
|  | 7 Amelia Earhart | 19 | 1.7\% | 14 | 1.3\% | 33 | 3.0\% |
|  | 8 Christopher Reeve | 15 | 1.4\% | 9 | .8\% | 24 | 2.2\% |
|  | 9 Martin Luther King | 122 | 11.2\% | 87 | 8.0\% | 209 | 19.2\% |
|  | 10 Helen Keller | 42 | 3.9\% | 38 | 3.5\% | 80 | 7.3\% |
|  | 11 Bob Hope | 5 | . $5 \%$ | 7 | .6\% | 12 | 1.1\% |
|  | 12 Arthur Ashe | 3 | . $3 \%$ | 3 | . $3 \%$ | 6 | .6\% |
|  | 13 Pat Tillman | 36 | 3.3\% | 41 | 3.8\% | 77 | 7.1\% |
|  | 14 Nancy Reagan | 12 | 1.1\% | 9 | .8\% | 21 | 1.9\% |
|  | 15 Cal Ripken, Jr. | 16 | 1.5\% | 14 | 1.3\% | 30 | 2.8\% |
|  | 16 Oprah Winfrey | 59 | 5.4\% | 56 | 5.1\% | 115 | 10.6\% |
|  | 17 Mike Krzyzewski | 28 | 2.6\% | 29 | 2.7\% | 57 | 5.2\% |
| Total |  | 587 | 53.9\% | 503 | 46.1\% | 1090 | 100.0\% |

Character \& Leadership Program Year 2009--2010

## Students Favorite Role Model in Textbook

Character \& Leadership 2010


Students Least Favorite Role Model in Textbook

|  |  | Gender |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 Female |  | 2 Male |  | Count | Table \% |
|  |  | Count | Table \% | Count | Table \% |  |  |
| Who | 1 Mattie Stepanek | 14 | 1.3\% | 21 | 2.0\% | 35 | 3.4\% |
| Was | 2 Tiger Woods | 248 | 23.9\% | 201 | 19.4\% | 449 | 43.3\% |
| Your | 3 Booker T. Washington | 17 | 1.6\% | 12 | 1.2\% | 29 | 2.8\% |
| Favorite | 4 Dwight D. Eisenhower | 15 | 1.4\% | 11 | 1.1\% | 26 | 2.5\% |
| Role | 5 Sherron Watkins | 48 | 4.6\% | 34 | 3.3\% | 82 | 7.9\% |
| Model | 6 Jesse Ventura | 20 | 1.9\% | 15 | 1.4\% | 35 | 3.4\% |
|  | 7 Amelia Earhart | 17 | 1.6\% | 13 | 1.3\% | 30 | 2.9\% |
|  | 8 Christopher Reeve | 5 | . $5 \%$ | 9 | .9\% | 14 | 1.3\% |
|  | 9 Martin Luther King | 14 | 1.3\% | 10 | 1.0\% | 24 | 2.3\% |
|  | 10 Helen Keller | 17 | 1.6\% | 10 | 1.0\% | 27 | 2.6\% |
|  | 11 Bob Hope | 15 | 1.4\% | 21 | 2.0\% | 36 | 3.5\% |
|  | 12 Arthur Ashe | 17 | 1.6\% | 16 | 1.5\% | 33 | 3.2\% |
|  | 13 Pat Tillman | 8 | .8\% | 13 | 1.3\% | 21 | 2.0\% |
|  | 14 Nancy Reagan | 19 | 1.8\% | 8 | .8\% | 27 | 2.6\% |
|  | 15 Cal Ripken, Jr. | 18 | 1.7\% | 14 | 1.3\% | 32 | 3.1\% |
|  | 16 Oprah Winfrey | 45 | 4.3\% | 41 | 3.9\% | 86 | 8.3\% |
|  | 17 Mike Krzyzewski | 32 | 3.1\% | 20 | 1.9\% | 52 | 5.0\% |
| Total |  | 569 | 54.8\% | 469 | 45.2\% | 1038 | 100.0\% |

Character \& Leadership Program Year: 2010

## Students Least Favorite Role Model in Textbook

Character \& Leadership 2010


## Appendix 1

Schools participating in the study:

All Schools for 2009--2010
School by Testing Pre/Post
Pre Tests=2525 Post Tests=1344

|  | Testing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 Pre | 2 Post |
| School 8 Broadmoor High School | 37 | 88 |
| Name7 10 Charlton County High School | 46 | 21 |
| 13 Caro Middle School | 106 | 22 |
| 14 Clarksville High School | 24 | 23 |
| 18 Creston Middle School | 78 | 23 |
| 19 Crest High School | 20 | 19 |
| 20 Eagle Grove High School | 14 | 14 |
| 28 Glen Oaks High School | 35 | 35 |
| 32 Hampton Dumont High School | 61 | 27 |
| 34 Holt High School | 103 | 49 |
| 36 Holy Savior Menard HighSchool | 45 | 47 |
| 38 Jefferson High School | 21 | 3 |
| 42 Lake Attendance Center | 64 | 58 |
| 44 MARRS Program | 30 | 12 |
| 46 Monroe County Middle College | 38 | 31 |
| 50 Montgomery Catholic High School | 17 | 19 |
| 52 Morton High School | 55 | 28 |
| 54 Mount Pleasant High School | 541 | 167 |
| 57 Oscoda High School | 69 | 16 |
| 60 Osage High School | 14 | 14 |
| 62 Pampa Juinor High School | 204 | 202 |
| 64 Paterson Charter High School | 73 | 73 |
| 72 Reidsville High School | 20 | 14 |
| 76 Rutland High School | 19 | 17 |
| 77 Sturgis High School | 301 | 167 |
| 78 Sanderson High School | 9 | 6 |
| 80 Scott Central Attendance Center | 20 | 31 |
| 82 Sebastopol Attendance Center | 13 | 15 |
| 84 Southern Arizona Community Academy | 245 | 13 |
| 88 Talladega High School | 82 | 65 |
| 90 Tara High School | 63 | 3 |
| 94 West Bend High School | 36 | 5 |
| 95 Wyoming East High School | 6 | 4 |
| 99 Yorktown High School | 16 | 13 |
| Total | 2525 | 1344 |

## Appendix 2

## Grade x Race x Gender

Appendix 2
Gender by Race by Grade of Students in the Analysis


Character \& Leadership: Year 2010

## Summary \& Limitations of Character \& Leadership 2010

Students from thirty-four schools contributed 2,525 pre tests and 1,344 posttests that were useable. Data was collected via the Internet, downloaded to Excel, and analyzed with the SPSS Statistical Package. The amount of useable data was $44 \%$ due mainly to post tests not being returned.

The data in this report is comprised of two types of feedback. The first one is the research findings comprised of nine scales divided into two groups-Group1 and Group2. Reliability of the Scales was established from the previous year's data. T-Tests were used to examine the mean differences between pre and post testing. Group 1 variables were all significant in the desired direction @ the .05 level. Group2 variables had three of five significant constructs @ the .05 level in the desired direction.

The second set of feedback was Student Satisfaction Questions about the course, textbook, impact, and role models. Here we found students to be highly satisfied with the class. Of particular note is the divisiveness of Tiger Woods. All of the feedback in the report came out after his affairs were revealed in November of 2009. With that being said, he was ranked third as Favorite Role Model (11\%) and first as Least Favorite Role Model (43\%). You can provide your own commentary here.

The results are positive and encouraging. The research and the student feedback are suggesting that something meaningful happened for students and hopefully for the schools and communities who participated in the study.

