Copyright

by

Kadir Almus

December, 2010

THE BELIEFS OF PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

REGARDING HIGH-STAKES TESTING

A Dissertation Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

By

Kadir Almus

December, 2010

THE BELIEFS OF PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS REGARDING HIGH-STAKES TESTING

A Dissertation for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Kadir Almus

Approved by Dissertation Committee:

_____
Dr. Steven Busch, Chairperson

_____
Dr. Angus J. MacNeil, Committee Member

_____
Dr. Cheryl Craig, Committee Member

_____
Dr. Michael W. Emerson, Committee Member

_____
Dr. Robert K. Wimpelberg, Dean
College of Education

December, 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure for me to thank those who made this dissertation possible.

First, I am heartily thankful to my chairperson, Dr. Steven Busch, for his excellent guidance, encouragement, supervision, and support at every step of the research. I would like to thank Dr. Angus J. MacNeil for bringing me into this study, sharing his invaluable research experience, guiding my research and giving his best suggestions when needed most. I would also like to thank other committee members, Dr. Cheryl Craig and Dr. Michael W. Emerson, for their contribution and their good-natured support.

I am grateful to my friends, my colleagues at work, my fellow doctoral students and my professors in the university's doctoral program who assisted, advised, and supported me in this project.

Finally, I want to thank my family. My parents, my brothers and sisters were always supporting me and encouraging me with their best wishes. My lovely daughters, Sude and Irem, were always understanding when I was not available to spend time with them because of this work. Especially, I would like to thank one special person, my wife Melahat. She was always there to support me and stood by me through the good and bad times.

THE BELIEFS OF PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

REGARDING HIGH-STAKES TESTING

An Abstract
of
A Dissertation Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

By

Kadir Almus

December, 2010

ABSTRACT

This study examined the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing on their roles as administrators and the influences on parents, teachers, and students. The implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, requires states to administer statewide tests to measure student performance and to rank schools according to achievement. Low performing schools are subject to certain sanctions which create pressure on students, parents, and teachers and principals. Principals as instructional leaders of their schools (Lashway, 2000) have increased pressure on them to ensure positive student achievement on the tests (Findley &Findley, 1992; Day, 2007; Leithwood, 2005).

This study used archival data which had been collected from two larger studies entitled, "A Survey to Examine the Work, Attitudes and Perceptions of Public School Principals (MacNeil 2004) and "A Survey to Examine the Work, Attitudes and Perceptions of Public School Assistant-Principals" (MacNeil, 2006). Participants in this study consisted of 310 principals and 371 assistant principals in a large metropolitan area of the Gulf Coast Area of Texas. A cognitive interview technique was used in collecting the data for the survey. The study examines the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators and its influences on parents, students, and teachers.

The results indicated that statistically significant differences exists between principals' and assistant principals' beliefs. Assistant principals tended to have more negative beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing regarding their roles as administrators and the manner in which it influences parents, teachers, and students. Principals had negative beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing but were less negative than were the assistant principals. There were significant differences with gender and schools' socio economic status

(SES) with assistant principals'. Assistant principals having low SES student ratio tended to have more positive beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing; female assistant principals tended to have less negative beliefs than the male assistant principals. Principals and assistant principals with low minority student ratios had less negative beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION ……..	1
	Purpose of the Study ……..……..	2
	Research Questions ……...……..	3
	Significance of the Study …….	4
	Overview of Methodology……	5
	Organization of the Study…….	5
	Definition of Terms …….…….	6
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE …….	7
	History of Accountability System and High Stakes Testing	7
	The Status of Current Accountability System……..	11
	The Status of Current Accountability System in Texas……	12
	The Impact of High-Stakes Testing on Schools……..…….	13
	The School Leader – School Achievement Link …….	21
III.	METHODS …….	22
	Introduction ……...……...	22
	Research Design ……...	23
	Participants ……	25
	Instrument …….	27
	Procedures ……..…….....	27
	Validity and Reliability …….	29
	Limitations …….	31
IV.	RESULTS ……	32
	Research Questions One & Two……...……..…..	32
	Research Questions Three & Four……...……..……	59
	Research Questions Five ……	74
V.	SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSION……	79
	Summary ……...…….	79
	Findings & Discussions……...…….	81
	Limitations……...……	89

Implications ……... 90
Conclusion ……..……..……..... 91

REFERENCES …… 93

APPENDICES …… 97

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Accountability and high-stakes testing has been among of the most widely debated issues in the field of education in the last century. The issue of whether there should be an accountability system to measure the whole educational system has been discussed for years. Even though the existing system's effectiveness has been subjected to frequent and harsh criticism; yet, as time passes, the role of accountability and high-stakes testing continues to gain greater influence in our educational system and our individual lives. For instance, as unrelated as these two areas may seem, test scores have been shown to affect housing prices in recent years (Figlio & Lucas, 2000).

Currently, most states base their school accountability systems on high-stakes testing. The origin of this can be traced to the historical development of the U.S. schooling system. In chapter 2, major historical trends, events, laws and regulations that shaped today's system will be explained in detail. The current accountability systems of all states were shaped by the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001. This act was endorsed and subsequently signed into legislation by President George H.W. Bush on January 8th, 2002.With the implementation of NCLB, nearly all of the states began to administer statewide tests to measure student academic performance within specific school content areas. This act requires that states create their own assessment and accountability systems; more importantly, this is a necessary requirement in order to receive federal funding. As a part of the accountability system, states also rank schools and assign them achievement labels. The poor performing schools are subject to certain sanctions including giving students the option to transfer to another school, and replacing the administration and teaching team. Those students not able to reach the proficiency level at

certain grade levels in specific subject areas are not promoted to the next grade level or allowed graduate. In addition, states release annual school performance reports denoting the specific breakdown of student academic performance on the standardized state tests. It is mandatory for schools to send these reports to the parents. In addition, districts and states are required to meet rigid Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) standards. According to AYP targets, schools, school districts, and states should reach 100 percent proficiency level in year 2014.

As researches illustrates, principals are the instructional leaders of their schools (Lashway, 2000.) Therefore, the pressure from NCLB requirements and high-stakes test is considerably palpable for principals. In addition, other administrators, teachers, parents, and students also experience this pressure first hand. When there is an issue in regard to subpar test scores, the principal is often the first person in contact with parents, the superintendent, or officials from the state education agency. Principals, as the instructional leaders of their schools, are responsible to provide a quality education to all students. This can be achieved by adequately balancing the legal obligations of the accountability system with their other administrative responsibilities that include paying attention to the concerns of teachers, parents, and students with care and respect, and instituting a solid curriculum (Gross & Shapiro, 2002.) Thus, principals have to make all the necessary arrangements to successfully manage the requirements of the current accountability system along with other managerial duties.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to examine principals' and assistant principals' beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it influences parents, teachers, and students. The goal is to (a) analyze principals and assistant principals' beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as

administrators and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers, (b) determine if there is a statistically significant relationship between certain factors such as school demographics, administrators' characteristics, and the school's success level, and administrators' beliefs regarding high-stake testing, and (c) determine if there is a statistically significant difference between principals' and assistant principals' beliefs regarding the impact of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers.

Research Questions

The following questions will guide this study:

Research Question One: What are the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers?

Research Question Two: What are the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers?

Research Question Three: Is there a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school demographic factors, such as school level, urbanicity, minority student ratios, socioeconomic status, the school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their principals' characteristics, such as gender, race, and the years of experience?

Research Question Four: Is there a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors, such as school level, urbanicity, minority student ratios, socioeconomic status, the

school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their principals' characteristics, such as gender, race, and the years of experience?

Research Question Five: Is there a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers?

Significance of the Study

This study has a capacity to make contributions to the literature in this area and the overall understanding of principals' and assistant principals' behaviors toward high-stakes testing. Review of the literature shows that there is a lack of research in relation to Texas public school administrators' beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and also how its influences affect parents, students, and teachers. This study will include 310 principals and 371 assistant principals in greater Houston area (one of the largest metropolitan areas in US). The size and the representative power (survey/interview participants are from very different backgrounds and different types of schools) of the study will have a capacity to make it very valuable to the researchers who want to replicate or make generalizations in other areas including the other states. In addition, the cognitive interview technique, which is used to gather data, will also make this study unique since most of the other similar studies have used traditional survey techniques.

Furthermore, this study has a capacity to provide important information for administrator training programs at the universities and educational service centers as well as for district and state level administrators and policy makers who want to help current and prospective administrators cope with the challenges of high-state testing. Similarly, current and prospective

school administrators may find the results helpful in dealing with the high-stake testing challenges.

Overview of Methodology

The design of the study will use a combination of traditional survey and cognitive interviewing techniques to address a question related to high-stakes testing. Demographic information about participants' schools and participants' background information was obtained in a standard survey format. The high-stakes testing portion of the survey was administered in a face-to-face interview setting. A cognitive interviewing approach was used in these interviews. A mixed methods approach will be used in the study since the traditional survey part is quantitative while the interview portion consists of open-ended questions, which are associated with qualitative type of research.

Archived data will be used in this study. Participants of this study included two groups of school administrators from different school settings in a large metropolitan area (310 principals and 371 assistant principals). The survey instrument included the following three main sections: Section 1 includes 22 items for administrators' background information and school demographics; section 2 includes 62 Likert-scale items; and section 3 consists of 31 open-ended questions.

Organization of the Study

The study will contain five chapters. Chapter 1 includes the introduction, purpose of the study, problem statement, overview of methodology, hypotheses, and definition of terms. Next, chapter 2 reviews the related literature. This review will include the history of accountability and high-stake testing, NCLB, the relationship between NCLB requirements and principals' role as instructional leaders, and principals' and assistant principals' beliefs about NCLB and high-stake

testing. Then, chapter 3 describes the methodology that will be used in this study. The description will include the information about participants, the instrument, the data collection procedures, statistical procedures of treatment of data, and the limitations of the study. Next, chapter 4 will present the analysis of data. Finally, chapter 5 will present the findings, summary, conclusions, and recommendations for future study.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions will be used in this study:

No Child Left Behind (NCLB): The federal act which was enacted on January 8th, 2002. This act requires that states have to create their own assessment (testing) and accountability systems.

High-Stakes Testing: It refers to the state tests mandated by NCLB act of 2001.Texas

Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS): The state test in Texas that is used to measure student achievement in math, reading, science, writing, and social studies.

Accountability Rating: Texas Education Agency (TEA) rates individual campuses and school district, including charter schools, according to several indicators. The most important indicator is the TAKS test scores. Rating categories include exemplary, recognized, academically acceptable, and academically unacceptable.

School Success or Achievement Level: This refers to the accountability ratings of the schools in this study.

School Setting: Schools are categorized as elementary (PK-5 or K-5), middle (6-8), high (9-12), or mixed grade (PK-12 or K-12) schools in this study.

Geographical Setting: There are three categories: Rural, suburban, and urban.

Socioeconomic Status: This term refers to free and reduced lunch ration of the schools.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is organized to provide related literature about the beliefs of school principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it influences parents, teachers, and students. The chapter is divided into 4 main sections: (1) history of school accountability system and high-stake testing, (2) the status of current accountability system and high-stakes testing, (3) the status of current accountability system and high-stakes testing in state of Texas, (4) the impact of high-stakes testing on schools, and (5) the school leader- & school-student outcomes link.

History of School Accountability and High-Stakes Testing

This section explains the related literature in regard to the history of school accountability and high-stake testing in US schooling system starting from the beginning of the twentieth century. In her book *In Schooling America: How the Public Schools Meet the Nation's Changing Needs*, Patricia A. Graham (2005) presents the progress of schooling in America throughout the 20th century. Graham (2005) says that the focus of the American educational system was changed at the beginning of the 20th century. The new focus was serving the social and psychological needs of children instead of “Americanizing” massive crowds of immigrants. The new focus and need was “defined by informed, ambitious, and often affluent parents seeking a more supportive school environment for their children” instead of the focus defined by the nation, as it was in previous years. In addition, more and more children were attending structured schools, and remaining in the educational systems for longer periods of time; therefore, schools at the beginning of the century were forced to make changes in curriculum. Thus, a more flexible

approach that promoted child-centered instruction replaced the rigid approach utilized in previous years.

In the 1920s, educators "turned their attention starkly from schools that would principally serve the needs of the American democracy through the education of the youth" (Graham, 2005). Students were sorted academically into different ability groups using the newly developed IQ tests. Graham (2005) also indicates that this new approach worked well for the students who were already in good shape academically (e.g. gifted and talented students), and also for wealthy students. Yet, this new approach did not adequately suit the student groups coming from low-income families since they simply lacked the necessary parental support to be successful. Subsequently, the academic achievement gap between these two groups increased in this period of time. In addition, during the 1950s, public critics of schools increased in a way that not only the high achievers but all of the students including the ones coming from low-income families, those from minority groups, and students with disabilities should receive the same quality education (Graham, 2005). This particular educational focus led created another significant shift that emphasized the importance of providing a quality education to all students – not simply the most affluent. Following the abolishment of school segregation, and the *Brown v. Board of Education* Supreme Court decision in 1954, the same quality education became accessible for minority groups as well, even though this issue was not assuaged until the late 1970s (Graham, 2005).

Competition with the Soviet Union during the Cold War also had a huge impact on education during this period. For instance, the launching of Sputnik by the USSR in 1957 shocked America and created the notion that the youth in this country were not as well-educated and lack basic or essential knowledge and skills, especially in math and science. From this point

on, educators placed a great emphasis on the basic subjects and promoted the mastery of the core curriculum. Thus, a new generation of students would thrust America ahead of the communist Soviet Republic (Graham, 2005). In order to meet this demand of the American education system, math and science curriculum was enriched. With the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965, the federal government started to fund schools with high populations of students from low-income families, and this support aimed to improve educational equity in these schools (Graham, 2005.)

Sherman Dorn's book *Accountability Frankenstein* also provides a broader perspective on the historical development of high stakes testing and accountability. Dorn (2007) introduces "the rise and fall of the administrative authority in the twentieth century" as the very first trend or legacy that shaped accountability. The autonomy of administrators started to decline in the 1950s for a few different reasons. First, Dorn (2007) mentions the "popular discontent with the arrogance of administrators." Resistance to the desegregation forced by *Brown v. Board of Education* was the other side of this arrogance. In addition, the civil right movements accused schools of not treating poor and minority students equally (Dorn, 2007). The public education system received criticism from other areas of American society in the 1950s as well. Such critics include conservatives who were in favor of classical teaching methods (i.e., teacher-centered classrooms, essentialist curriculum, etc.) and who were not happy with the progressive shift in education. Also, some liberals criticized administrators for watering down the academic curriculum at high schools. Amidst the tense political environment of the 1960s and 1970s, with the Vietnam War and the Nixon Watergate scandal, public institutions experienced a significant decline in credibility. Given that the American educational system was one of the most visible institutions, its decline was also manifest during these critical years. In fact, according to public

opinion during this time, administrators were the individuals responsible for all these declines (Dorn, 2007). Dorn (2007) adds that not only administrators but also schools were under harsh criticism in the second part of the 20th century. There were high expectations from schools to solve social problems of the society. The increasing demand for a quality and equal education, in combination with the decline in administrators' authority, increased the expectations for accountability. Dorn lists these expectations as "helping the nation fight the Cold War, [sic] fight the war on poverty, fight prejudice, and fight for position for global economy." Both of these two conditions (i.e., the loss of prestige of administrators and high expectations from schools to solve the social problems) fostered accountability for schools (Dorn, 2007).

The goal was to provide equal opportunity (i.e., to provide a quality education) to all students after the implementation of the ESEA Act in the 1970s; yet, this educational objective provided extremely difficult. When it was started to test all students in 70s unlike testing the gifted and talented only in previous period, it was seen that test scores are lower and there are big differences between different student groups coming from different ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds (Graham, 2005). Then, in the early 1980s, the goal became to improve the academic performance of all student groups by using differentiated educational approaches. Initially beginning with the report titled *A Nation at Risk*, Graham (2005) defined this approach with the term "Achievement" for all. The report *A Nation at Risk*, which was released by the National Commission on Education in 1983, also played a major role in the development of today's accountability system. The report argued that students in US were performing poorly when compared to the other nations, which was putting the US global leadership in jeopardy. This was happening because of a weak curriculum and education system (Berliner & Biddle, 1995).

The Title I component of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 focused on schools having high percentages of students from low-income families (Dorn, 2007). Then, with Senator Robert Kennedy's endorsement, testing was implemented in order to oversee Title I programs. The usage of testing to monitor and evaluate Title I programs continued until 1990s. In 1994, the ESEA Act was changed. The updated version of the ESEA Act mandates states to create academic standards and annual assessments for certain grade levels. In fact, this was a necessary requirement for all schools, not only Title I schools. This marked the first time that Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) appeared in the history of school accountability. The goal here was "to create academic standards, match assessment to those standards, and...decide if the school had satisfied AYP standards." States had to develop a statewide assessment program and improve it. In 1997, with a reauthorization of the Act, students with disabilities were included in the system requirements (Dorn, 2007). Eventually, the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 elevated this entire system to a new level.

The Status of Current Accountability System

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, which was enacted on January 8th, 2002, introduced a variety of new changes that completely reshaped the American education system. The Act essentially requires states to develop their own assessment systems for certain grade levels for certain subject areas in order to be eligible for federal funds. It is the responsibility of individual states to develop their own systems and standards. NCLB also requires that these tests be standardized tests and administered annually. As a part of the accountability system, states also rank schools and assign them achievement labels. The poor performing schools are subject to certain sanctions including giving a chose to students to transfer to another school and replacing administration and teaching team. Students not able to reach the proficiency level at

certain grade levels in some of the subject areas are not allowed to be promoted to the next grade level or graduate. States annually release school performance reports. It is also mandatory for schools to send these reports to the students' parents. In addition, districts and states should meet AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress) standards, which are federal mandates. According to AYP targets, schools, school districts, and states should reach 100 percent proficiency level in year 2014.

The Status of Current Accountability System in Texas

State of Texas started to implement criterion-referenced TAAS (Texas Assessment of Academic Skills) in the late 1980s to measure the academic progress and performances of students and schools. Exit level students (11th graders) had to pass this test in order to graduate from high school. Some of the students who were receiving special education services and/or ESL (English as a Second Language) services were exempted from the TAAS test. Recommendations for exemptions were done by ARD (Admission, Review, and Dismissal) committees for students receiving special education services and by LPAC (Language Proficiency Assessment Committee) for students receiving ESL services (Natriello & Pallas, 2000).

After the implementation No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, the state of Texas revised its testing system. The new test to be administered was named as Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS). Through this assessment, all students in public and charter schools in grades 3 through 11 were now required to take the TAKS tests in reading and mathematics during the spring. In addition, students are tested in 4th and 7th grades for writing; in 5th, 8th, 10th, and 11th grades for science; and in 8th, 10th, and 11th grades for social studies. Students have to pass reading in grades 3, 5, and 8, and mathematics in grades 3 and 8 to be

promoted to the next class, and exit level students (11th graders) have pass in order to graduate from high school.

School districts and individual campuses are essentially rated annually according to their performances on the TAKS tests. There are four rating categories for all public and charter schools. These categories are as follows: Exemplary, which is the best one, Recognized, Academically Acceptable, and Academically Unacceptable. Schools have to maintain a passing percentage of 90 percent or higher to receive the Exemplary rating, not only for all the students but also for all the subgroups of White, Hispanic, African America, and economically disadvantaged students. The percentage needed to receive the Recognized rating is 75 percent. There are various cut scores for Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable categories. As it was for TASS, some of the students who receiving special education services and ESL services are exempt from TAKS test. Once again, these exemption recommendations are completed through an ARD (Admission, Review, and Dismissal) committee for students receiving special education services and by LPAC (Language Proficiency Assessment Committee) for students receiving ESL services (Texas Education Association [TEA], 2010).

The Impact of High-Stakes Testing on Schools

There is little consensus about the impact of high-stakes testing on schools and students (Natriello & Pallas, 2000). There are both positive and negative views. In a publication (Hamilton, Stecher, & Klein, 2002), Stecher (2002) lists the entire potential positive and negative effects of high-stakes testing for all stakeholders within the school community in a table format. Potential positive effects of high-stakes testing for students are that these assessments provide students with better information about their own knowledge and skills, they motivate students to work harder in school, and they send clearer signals in regard to what students should study. Yet,

high-stakes testing also have the potential to frustrate students and discourage them from trying, to make them more/overly competitive, and may cause them to devalue grades and school assessments.

Positive potential effects of high-stakes testing for teachers that are mentioned in Stecher's (2002) list includes that high-stakes testing supports better diagnosis of individual student needs, help teachers identify areas of strength and weakness in their curriculum, help teachers identify content not mastered by students and redirect instruction, motivate teachers to work harder and smarter, lead teachers to align instruction with standards, and encourage teachers to participate in professional development to improve instruction. Negative effects for teachers are listed as follows: High-stakes testing leads them to engage in inappropriate test preparation, force teachers to focus more on test content, and devalue teachers' sense of professional worth. According to Abrams at all.(2003) study, many teacher survey results indicated that teachers devote large amounts of classroom time to test preparation because of the pressure to raise test scores. They do it by emphasizing instructional and assessment strategies mirroring the content.

Stecher (2002) also lists the potential positive and negative effects of high-stakes testing for school administrators. The positive effects are that high-stakes testing force administrators to focus on curriculum and instruction, they provide valuable information so that administrators can evaluate the quality of their programs, and these tests can help administrators make better decisions in the allocation of resources. The negative effects are that high-stakes testing leads administrators to enact policies to increase test scores, but not necessarily increase learning; it causes them to reallocate resources to tested subjects at the expense of other subjects; it leads

administrators to waste resources on test preparation; and it distracts them from other school needs and problems.

However, Stecher (2002) mentions that all the potential effects mentioned above are difficult to measure. First, not all of them are assessable accurately. For the effects that can be measured, measuring their quality is not as easy as simply measuring the quantitative components. In addition, there is no common metric used to assess the effects that are measurable. Thus, it is difficult to produce a net result or judgment about the net impact by combining positive and negative effects.

Brown, Galassi, and Akos (2004) studied the perceptions of school counselors in regard to the impact of the North Carolina ABC (high-stakes) testing program. The researchers reported that a majority of 141 school counselors perceived that high-stakes testing had a negative impact on students. Almost 80 percent of the counselors in the study believed that high-stakes testing had increased the stress, anxiety, pressure, or the level of fear that students experienced. The other major perceived negative effects of the ABC testing program mentioned by the counselors in the study include teaching to the test, and the lack of creativity in the classroom. The perceived positive effects indicated by the counselors were that the testing program creates a common goal for their schools, more contact with the parents, higher expectations, increased accountability and a standardized curriculum.

Amrein and Berliner (2002) examined 27 states, including Texas, in order to assess whether academic achievement increases after the introduction of high-stakes testing. Each of the 27 states has attached high-stakes testing to their 1st-8th-grade system. The first objective of the study was to examine whether academic achievement increases after high-stakes tests were introduced to grades 1 through 8 by using National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

scores. The second objective of the study was to assess whether there was an improvement in academic achievement after the high school graduation exams were introduced. The second part, which includes Texas, also involved 18 states. Authors indicate that analysis of scores do not show sufficient evidence to support the proposition that high-stake testing increases academic achievement. In addition, they found that ACT, SAT, and AP scores decreased after the implementation of high school graduation exams.

Walt Haney (2000) studied TAAS data from the 1990s in Texas in order to examine so-called "Texas Miracle in Education." He claims that what led many other observers/researchers to conclude that Texas had made a huge progress in reducing drop-outs and increasing academic achievement is "more illusory than real." His analysis reveals that the progress in TAAS was due to the exclusion of certain students, such as students who are receiving special education services. In addition, comparison of five different sources of evidence about high school completion rates in Texas show that there is no progress in this area. Comparison of SAT scores with the national averages show reveals that SAT-Math scores have decreased relatively.

Clarke and Madaus (2001) studied the impact of high-stakes testing on minority students. The study used the data from a research conducted at Boston College over 30 years. Findings of study highlight four issues; high-stakes testing do not have significant positive effects on teaching and learning, do not motivate the unmotivated students, do not assess the students coming from different races, cultures, and ethnic backgrounds in an equitable way, and it was found that high-stakes testing increased high school dropout rates, particularly among minority populations.

In his book *Accountability Frankenstein*, Dorn (2007) lists the "opportunity costs," or indirect costs, of high-stake test accountability to schools. The first indirect cost is the use of

resources in the management of the testing. During the administration of annual state tests, duties (e.g. storing and organizing the test booklets, organizing the answer sheets, training the staff for test administration, proctoring the test, collecting, repackaging, sending the back, etc.) take too much time. According to the Congressional Office of Technology's estimation in 1992, the indirect cost of a test administration doubles the direct cost in a school district.

The second indirect cost is the loss of instructional time during the test administration. An average of two weeks is spent for most of the grade levels. Next, unnecessary test preparation is the third opportunity cost listed. In addition to regular course materials, schools buy many other materials for test preparation. It was the estimation of Congressional Office of Technology again that the cost of test preparation materials is 15-times more than the cost of tests.

The fourth indirect cost is the fact that teachers are narrowing the curriculum in order to focus more on test items. It is important to note that high-stake tests do not cover all things taught in the classroom. Teachers are focusing more on the subjects covered in the test to attain the best possible result. They either skip the objectives or subjects that are not covered on the test or spend less time on them. In addition, some schools reallocate teaching times of the other subjects in order to be more successful. For example, music classes of certain grades are rescheduled as math classes, or those students having problems with mathematics test portions are pulled out of music classes in order to attend math tutorials. Regrettably, those particular students miss the chance of covering music curriculum of that year.

"Triage" is another problem that was mentioned by Dorn (2007). This phenomena occurs in two different ways. First, schools are focusing more on the groups that are more important for them to get a better rating. For instance, if the passing percentage of the economically disadvantaged group is too low when compared to the others, the school pays more attention to

this group. Second, another way of attempting triage is referring low-performing students to special education services. In this way, those students are exempt from taking the regular tests and, therefore, will not be included in accountability calculations.

Cheating is one of the major problems in high-stakes testing, especially on the part of administrators and teachers. Stecher (2002) mentions that "cheating is the most extreme negative reaction to high-stakes testing" and it happens in many different ways. Stecher (2002) listed some forms of cheating happening during the administration of testing. The list includes "providing test items in advance, providing hints during test administration, suggesting revisions, making changes to answer sheets before scoring, and leaving pertinent materials in view during the testing session." In his 2002 publication, Stecher talks about how "cheating scandals surfaced frequently." One of these scandals occurred among a group of teachers in New York City who were charged for cheating over five years by providing students answers for mathematics and reading tests (Stecher, 2002). In a Kentucky study Koretz et al. (1996a) state, "36 percent of teachers reported seeing test questions rephrased during testing time either occasionally or frequently. Twenty-one percent reported seeing questions about content answered during testing time, and the same percentage reported seeing revisions recommended either during or after testing. Seventeen percent reported observing hints provided on correct answers" (Stecher, 2002).

In a publication titled *An Analysis of Some Unintended and Negative Consequences of High-Stakes Testing*, Amrein and Berliner (2002) listed cheating as one of the unintended and negative consequences of high-stakes testing. In this publication, it was stated that "the pressure associated with high-stakes tests" is the main cause for teachers and other staff to cheat. In addition to the list of cheating forms mentioned by Stecher (2002), Amrein and Berliner (2002)

mention that "increasing time limits on timed portions of tests, changing students' answers, and rephrasing or clarifying test questions as students take tests" are some other forms of cheating that occur around the country during the administration of high-stakes tests. In addition, students also felt threatened by school personnel through the notion that "if they do not perform well on high-stakes tests they will not get into college." It was also mentioned that as incentives increase, such as "monetary awards and consequences attached to high-stakes tests," the cheating will likely increase (Amrein and Berliner, 2002). Amrein and Berliner (2002) listed some of the scandals that surfaced in California, Houston, and Michigan. Namely, several teachers were charged with cheating on California's test (California's Academic Performance Index [API]) and some high-poverty Houston schools' principals and teachers were found cheating on TAAS test. Also, more than 71 schools in Michigan were charged with cheating on Michigan's high-stakes test (Amrein and Berliner, 2002).

In her book titled *The Death and Life of the Great American School System*, Diana Ravitch criticizes the testing, accountability and choice introduced mainly by the NCLB Act. Ravitch is a famous historian of American education, and she has also worked as the assistant secretary of education for the George W. Bush administration. Later in her career, President Bill Clinton appointed Ravitch as a member of the National Assessment Governing Board. As mentioned in the book, she was enthusiastic about the choice and testing at their outset, and she was also a supporter of charter schools and No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Now, however, she says that she has changed her mind. She claims that choice and testing did not work as planned. Voucher schools were not effective and charter schools did no better than traditional public schools, even though they select academically superior students with higher levels of motivation. As far as testing is concerned, teachers and schools focused on test preparation, which caused the

narrowing down of the curriculum. Schools are moving in this direction because the stakes are so very high at the end. Underperforming schools are subject to certain punishments including school closures. In addition, schools get federal funds as long as they hire “highly qualified teachers” and meet AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress) standards. In order not to lose federal funds, states decreased the standards since each state – according to NCLB – is allowed to establish its own standards and definition of proficiency, and school districts and campuses started to teach to the test.

Ravitch, as mentioned in her book, is not against tests. However, what she criticizes is the use of test scores as the only criterion for high-stakes decisions. Tests can be used as an element or as a part of a more comprehensive evaluation system for accountability purposes. Ravitch claims that NCLB failed because its heavy dependence on test results, and because it "ignored the importance of knowledge.” Further, Ravitch states, “It promoted a cramped, mechanistic profoundly anti-intellectual definition of education" (Ravitch, 2010). She believes that high standards can be achieved by not NCLB, choice, or testing, or any other “panaceas and magic bullets,” but by capable and dedicated teachers like her own high school teacher, Ruby Ratliff. The text concludes with the theme that it is important for these teachers to be “treated as professionals.”

On the other hand, there are many other research findings that show there are positive impacts of high-stakes testing. For instance, Roderick & Engel (2001) studied 102 low-achieving sixth and eighth graders who were placed in a high-stakes testing context. The majority of these students showed increased work performance in that context. It is reported that they showed greater attention to class work, increased academic press and support from teachers, and more

time spent studying outside school. Teachers confirmed these efforts. These efforts were translated into higher gains in learning.

In another study that demonstrates the various positive effects of high-stakes testing, Tuckman (2000) compared "two approaches for the recall and understanding of given text material: (a) frequent testing to provide incentive motivation, and (b) outlining as a homework assignment to provide a study strategy." Results showed that that frequent testing was more effective than frequent homework for improving their retention of information.

The School Leader- School/Student Outcomes Link

The effects of local school leaders on student outcomes are palpable and evident in many different ways (Leithwood & Wahlstrom, 2008). As many researches point out, principals are the instructional leaders of their schools (Lashway, 2000); therefore, principals' perceptions of accountability and high-stakes testing make a huge difference. Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) conducted a study "to improve the understanding of the nature, causes and consequence of school leader efficacy, including indirect influences on student learning." This study was a part of a larger project aimed at understanding "how successful leadership effects student learning." The researchers used student achievement data in language and math over a 3-year term along with survey data, which included 96 principal and 2,764 teacher respondents. The results show that school leaders' collective efficacy is an important link between district and school conditions and their effects on student achievement. Hallinger and Heck (1996) reviewed 40 studies conducted between 1980 and 1995 in order to examine "the role of principal leadership in school effectiveness." The results show that principals have an influence on student learning.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology of the study. This chapter includes the following 7 subsections: (1) introduction; (2) research design; (3) participants; (4) instrument; (5) validity and reliability; (6) procedures; and (7) limitations.

The purpose of the study is to examine principals' and assistant principals' beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it influences parents, teachers, and students. The goal is to (a) analyze principals and assistant principals' beliefs about the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators and its influences on parents, students, and teachers; (b) to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between certain factors such as school demographics, administrators' characteristics, and the school's success level; and (c) to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between principals' and assistant principals' beliefs regarding the impact of high-stakes testing.

The following research questions will guide the study:

Research Question One: What are the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers?

Research Question Two: What are the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers?

Research Question Three: Is there a significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors such as school

level, urbanicity, minority student ratios, socioeconomic status, the school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience?

Research Question Four: Is there a significant difference between the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors, such as school level, urbanicity, minority student ratios, socioeconomic status, the school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience?

Research Question Five: Is there a significant difference between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers?

Research Design

Archival data was be used in this study. The design of the study is a combination of traditional survey and cognitive interviewing techniques to address a question related to high-stake testing. Demographic information about participants' schools and participants' background information was obtained in a standard survey format. The high-stake testing portion of the survey was administered in a face-to-face interview setting. A cognitive interviewing approach was used in these interviews. A mixed methods approach was used in the study since the traditional survey portion is quantitative, whereas the interview portion consists of open-ended questions associated with a qualitative type of research.

The cognitive interview technique was used in the open-ended questions section of these interviews. This interview technique is one of the most successful interview techniques applied to real-life investigations (Bekerian & Dennett, 1993). The purpose of this type of interview is to

receive information from the cognitive processes of the interviewee (Willis, 1999). Willis (1999) describes two sub-types of cognitive interviewing methods; verbal probing and think-aloud techniques. There are six different types of probing questions in verbal probing. The goal in this method is to control the interview (Willis, 1999). Willis (1999) mentions that the "potential for artificiality" and "bias to occur" are two of the central disadvantages of this method. In verbal probing, the interviewer poses the question and tries to determine if the subject comprehends it, to see if the subject paraphrases it, and then to determine if the interviewee is confident in judging the meaning of the question. In think-aloud technique, the interviewer observes the subject's ability to think while talking and his or her process of thinking. Two of the greatest advantages of these methods are effective and easy to implement and they require very little training (Willis, 1999).

When compared to the regular survey methods, face-to-face cognitive interviews provide more valuable information since there is a chance of having more interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee. Interviewer can ask follow-up questions to go into detail or make more clarification about the answer provided. In addition, both parties (i.e., the interviewer and the interviewee) make time commitments for this type of interviews and this increases the meaningfulness and quality of answers when compared to the ordinary surveys that are mailed out to the respondents.

Participants

Participants of this study included two groups of school administrators from different school settings in a large metropolitan area (N=310 principals and 371 assistant principals). The population of principals consists of 183 female and 127 male principals. The demographic breakdown of respondents in this subgroup sample is 66 percent white, 21 percent African-American, 12 percent Hispanic, and 1 percent Asian. Participants' average years of experience in the principalship position is 7.3 years, and their average years of experience in education is 22.5 years. Age ranges of the respondents are as follows: five principals are in the 30 years of age and under category, 42 in 31-37, 83 in 38-45, 111 in 46-55, 59 in 56-62, and 8 in the 63 and older category. It should also be noted that age information of two principals was not reported.

282 of the respondents work in regular public schools, while 20 of the principals work in private, and eight principals work in charter schools. The average number of teachers of these schools is 69.8, and the average number of students is 1068. 21 of these schools are located in rural areas, 150 of them are located in suburban, and 139 schools are located in urban areas. The schools' various accountability ratings are as follows: 31- Exemplary, 99- Recognized, 145- Academically Acceptable, and 6- Academically Unacceptable. Private schools are exempt from administering state tests, so the accountability ratings of 9 schools were not reported.

According to Texas state accountability system, there are four rating categories for all public and charter schools. Thus, schools fall into one of these categories according to their performance on the state tests (i.e., the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills [TAKS]). The category breakdowns are as follows: Exemplary, which is the most prestigious category, Recognized, Academically Acceptable, and Academically Unacceptable. All the students of the public and charter schools in grades 3 through 11 take tests in reading and mathematics in the

spring. In addition, students are tested in 4th and 7th grades for writing, in 5th, 8th, 10th, and 11th grades for science, and in 8th, 10th, and 11th grades for social studies. Schools are required to maintain a passing percentage of 90 percent to receive the exemplary rating – not only for all students in general, but also for all the subgroups of white, Hispanic, African America, and economically disadvantaged students. The percentage necessary to achieve a Recognized rating is 75 percent. There are various cut scores for academically acceptable and academically unacceptable categories (Texas Education Association [TEA], 2010).

The population of assistant principals consists of 258 females and 113 males. The ethnic breakdown for this subgroup sample is as follows: White (51.8%), African-American (25.3%), Hispanic (18.9%), Asian (1.9%), and other (2.2%). The assistant principal participants' average years spent in education is 16.1, and their average years' of experience as assistant principals is 5.0 years. The age ranges of the respondents are as follows: 21 assistant principals in the 30 years of age and under category, 112 in 31-37, 102 in 38-45, 92 in 46-55, 37 in 56-62, and 5 in 63 and older category. Age information of two assistant principals was not reported. The average number of teachers within their schools is 83.1, and the average number of students is 1274. In regard to their schools' location demographics, 13 of these schools are located in rural areas, 160 of them are located in suburban, and 196 schools are located in urban areas. 32 of these schools have exemplary ratings, while 86 were rated as recognized, 152 were rated as academically acceptable, and 12 of were rated as academically unacceptable or low performing schools.

All the characteristics of principals and assistant principals represented in the survey and their schools will be provided in detailed tables later in this study. The tables will also include gender information, ethnic breakdown, age information, number of years spent in education, number of years spent as principal or assistant principal, and education backgrounds of the

participant principals and assistant principals. In addition, the tables will include the characteristics of participants' schools such as school type (public, private, or charter), grade levels served, school setting-urbanicity (rural, suburban, or urban), free and reduced lunch ratio, and numbers of students and teachers.

Instrument

The survey instrument included three main sections: Section 1 includes 22 items for administrators' background information and school demographics; Section 2 includes 62 Likert-scale items; and Section 3 consists of 31 open-ended questions. The complete version of the survey is also provided (see Appendix A). This instrument was developed by a professor with a group of principals and Masters of Education program students in an Educational Leadership Department within a College of Education of a large research university as a part of a larger study focused on school principals' attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs related to their leadership functions (Waxman, MacNeil, and Lee, 2006). After one semester of implementation, the survey was revised based on the feedback that came from students.

This study focuses on the responses of principals and assistant principals to the one of the open-ended questions in Section 3. This question asks participants how the high-stakes testing has influenced their role as administrators, and how it has influenced teachers, parents, and students.

Procedures

Archival data that was used in this study was collected through interviews. Interviews were carried out by the students of Educational Leadership Master's program as a part of their assignments in one of their core courses. Students were supposed to interview two principals and two assistant principals successfully to get full credit/grade from this portion of the class.

Students were trained in how to administer the interviews at the beginning of the course. Also, the graduate students were free to choose the administrators whom they want to interview.

In this study, Research Questions One and Two focus on the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing on their roles as principals and assistant principals, and its effects on parents, students, and teachers. First, all of the responses were categorized mainly if they were positively or negatively stated under the positive and negative response categories. The responses that do not fall under the positive or negative categories, including neutral themes and other type of responses, were categorized under the "other response category." In total there are three main categories: The positive response category, the negative response category, and the other response category. At this point, the responses in each main category were coded according to the main themes that emerged in each one of them. Sub-categories were created for each main category for further analysis of the responses. For example, the statement "It creates high pressure. I am on a 1-year contract based on the scores year to year. Stress on the teachers to move through curriculum. Parents sometimes realize too late the importance of exit level testing. Students stressed out" was categorized under the main negative response category. The subcategory for this statement is "High-stakes Testing Creates Pressure/Stress." In other words, this principal's response was coded under the negative response category because it essentially states that high-stakes testing creates stress. As another example of this categorization process, the following statement was coded in the same negative category: "It has caused too much stress on everyone. People are physically sick from all of the testing. We do not see a useful purpose to this."

Another consideration for this particular study is that responses can sometimes include both positive and negative themes. For example, the response "There has been academic

improvement for students, but more stress for all" is a multi-faceted, nebulous answer because it includes both negative and positive themes. Responses such as this, which identify more than one factor, were categorized under appropriate themes of the main categories "positive," "negative," and "other" more than once.

Research Question Three focuses on whether there are significant differences between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors such as school level, urbanicity, socioeconomic status, the school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience. The same process was repeated for assistant principals in Research Question Four. A Chi-Square Analysis was used to determine if there is a statistically significant difference for Research Questions Three and Four.

Research Question Five examined whether there is a significant difference between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers.

Validity and Reliability

This study focuses on the responses of principals and assistant principals in relation to a question that is related to high-stake testing in the open-ended questions section of the survey. Due to the nature of cognitive interview – a technique that allows more freedom and flexibility to both the interviewer and the subject – responses varied a great deal. In addition, 93 different interviewers carried out the interview process. Even though the large number of questioners is a safeguard against interviewer bias, it also contributes the variations in the responses. Thus, an important step was identifying the major themes that emerged among all these varying responses. After this process was complete, these themes were categorized and coded. A software program

was used to select 20 percent of responses of both principals and assistant principals randomly. Acting as assistant researchers, two fellow doctoral students coded 20 percent of both principals and assistant principals' responses, which were selected randomly in order to establish inter-coder reliability. The goal was to obtain 80 percent or more to establish inter-coder reliability. Those two assistant researchers were trained prior to the coding process. A comparison of results coded by the different researchers resulted in 92 percent agreement for principals and 90 percent agreement for assistant principals.

The selection of the interviewees might raise some questions about the representativeness of this group. In this survey, all the Master's program students who took the core class had to conduct the interviews as one of the class assignments. They were free to choose the administrators whom they want to interview. The principals and assistant principals interviewed were selected from a very large geographical area (Gulf Coast Region of Southwest Texas). 310 principals and 371 assistant principals represent 37 public school districts and more than 20 private and charter schools in that area. Therefore, representativeness of interviewee group can be considered as acceptable since the participants represent a very large number of districts in the area.

Administration of the survey took almost 18 months with the participation of all of the masters' students who took aforementioned core class. The administration of the survey, with its very large group over a very long time period by using the selection technique mentioned before (the interviewers were free to choose whom they want to interview), produced many duplicate answers. There were 178 duplicate responses for principals and 81 for assistant principals. All duplicate responses were analyzed. Analysis showed no major differences or opinion change regarding the influence of high-stakes testing between the duplicate answers of participants.

Only one (first one) of these duplicate responses was included in the main set of 310 principal and 371 assistant principal responses. Even though they were excluded from the main data set, an analysis of duplicate survey responses was used to establish test-retest validity of the responses in this study. The high percentage of consistency between duplicate responses that were administered by the different interviewers showed high instrument reliability.

Limitations

The selection process of interviewees might be a cause for some concern about the representativeness of the group. The interviewers were free to choose the principals and assistant principals whom they wanted to interview. They might have wanted to contact to the ones whom they know or the ones whom they could reach easily. This may create problems in relation to the representativeness of the group. However, since there were many students who conducted interviews and they were from all over the Gulf Coast area of Southeast Texas, the selected respondents represent almost all of the school districts in that region. 93 graduate students interviewed 310 principals and 371 assistant principals from more than 20 private and charter schools, and 37 public school districts, which include almost all of the large school districts in that area. This is a factor that decreases the selection bias and increases the representativeness power of the selected group.

The number of participants in one category may limit the generalizability of the results to all geographic areas. In both groups (i.e., principals and assistant principals) there were few rural principals when compared to the number of suburban and urban principals. Only 6.9 percent of the principals were from rural areas when compared to 48.9 percent suburban and 44.3 percent of urban areas. Similarly, only 3.6 percent of assistant principals were rural area principals when compared to 43.9 percent of suburban and 52.5 percent of urban area assistant principals.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The results of this study will be presented in this chapter. The first part of the chapter analyzed the responses of principals and assistant principals for Research Questions One and Two together. Research Question One and Two focus on the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers. Analysis of categorized responses and their frequencies were discussed in this part as well. The second part analyzed if there is a significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors such as school level, urbanicity, socioeconomic status, minority student ratios, the school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience. The same process was repeated for assistant principals. The third and the final part examines whether there is a significant difference between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers. In second and third sections of the chapter, Chi-Square techniques were used.

Research Questions One and Two

This part analyzes the responses of principals and assistant principals for Research Questions One and Two. Research Question One focuses on the beliefs of principals, and Research Question Two focuses on the beliefs of regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers. Both principals and assistant principals' responses were categorized under three main

categories: (1) positive response category, (2) negative response category, and (3) other response category. Table 4.1 provides the breakdown of principals' responses.

Table 4.1

Frequency of Principals' Responses on Positive and Negative Influence of High-stake Testing (N = 293)*

Type of Responses	f	%
Positive	117	33.9
Negative	184	53.3
Other	44	12.8
Total	345**	100.0

*Note. * Responses from seven principals in the sample are missing and ten principals answered as "NA" since they work for private schools. These 17"empty" or "NA" type answers were excluded from this table.*
***Total number of answers from 293 principals is 345 since there are multivariate answers from some of the principals.*

The total tally of categorized principals' responses is 345. The 345 of 293 calculation of respondents is due to the multivariate answers. Hence, some responses were categorized in more than one main category. For example, one of the principals' responses is "[because of the test] there has been academic improvement for students, but more stress for all. It's important but needs to stay focused on kids." This response includes both positive and negative themes and, therefore, it was categorized under both "negative response category" *and* "positive response category" at the same time. These types of multivariate responses will be examined in a later part of this chapter (See the "complexity of principals' and assistant principals' responses" section). The breakdown of 345 answers (of principals) for each category is as follows: Positive

Responses – 117 (33.9% of the answers); Negative Responses – 184 (53.3%); and Other Responses – 44 (12.8%).

Table 4.2The following table provides the breakdown of assistant principals' responses:

Table 4.2

Frequency of Assistant Principals' Responses on Positive and Negative Influence of High-stake Testing (N = 353)*

Type of Responses	f	%
Positive	100	25.7
Negative	243	62.5
Other	46	11.8
Total	389**	100.0

*Note. * Responses of fourteen principals in the sample are missing and four principals answered as "NA" since they work for private schools. These 18 "empty" or "NA" type answers were excluded from this table.*
***Total number of answers from 353 principals is 389since there are multivariate answers from some of the assistant principals.*

A similar pattern reoccurs due to multivariate responses in that the number of responses from assistant principals – namely, the 389 calculation outweighs the number of assistant principals asked, 353. The breakdown of the 389 answers from assistant principals for each category is as follows: Positive Responses – 100 (25.7% of the answers); Negative Responses: -243 (62.5 %); and Other Responses – 44 (11.8%). It is important to note that the "negative response category" is the highest among the three main categories for both principals and assistant principals. In addition, there is a large difference between two groups of participants in terms of their positive response and negative response percentages. For instance, 62.5 percent of assistant principals' responses were categorized in negative response category, while only 53.3

percent of principals' responses fell into this category. Statistical comparisons of principals' and assistant principals' responses were done in part 3 of this chapter.

The above-mentioned three main categories were divided into sub-categories according to the main themes that emerged in each of them for further analysis for both principals and assistant principals. The four sub-categories that emerged from positive responses include the following: that the high-stakes testing (1) "Creates High Standards/Expectations," (2) "Creates Accountability," and (3) "Creates More Focus and Sensitivity on Academics" and "Other Positive Responses." The other positive responses that do not fall into one of these three main themes were categorized in a "Other Positive Responses" sub-category.

Reasons Mentioned for Positive Responses

Table 4.3 gives the frequency of principals' reasons and Table 4.4 gives the frequency of assistant principals' reasons for their positive responses on the influence of high-stake testing.

Table 4.3

Frequency of Principals' Reasons for Their Positive Responses on the Influence of High-stakes Testing (N = 117)

Subcategories of Reasons for Positive Responses	f	%
Creates High Standards/Expectations	25	21.4
Creates Accountability	31	26.5
Creates More Focus/Sensitivity on Academics	38	32.5
Other	23	19.7
Total	117	100.0

Table 4.4

Frequency of Assistant Principals' Reasons for Their Positive Responses on the Influence of High-stakes Testing (N = 98)

Subcategories of Reasons for Positive Responses	f	%
Creates High Standards/Expectations	15	14.6
Creates Accountability	26	25.2
Creates More Focus/Sensitivity on Academics	42	40.8
Other	20	19.4
Total	103*	100.0

*Note. * Total number of reasons from 94 assistant principals is 103 since there are multiple positive reasons that fall in different subcategories from some of the assistant principals for their positive responses.*

The first subcategory of reasons for positive responses: High-stakes testing creates high standards/expectations.

The total number of principals who gave a positive response is 117. Of these 117 responses, 25 (21.4 %) were categorized under the first subcategory. This subcategory includes statements indicating that the high-stakes testing creates high standards and expectations. More specifically, several principals commented that the high-stakes testing *"raises the bar," "brings more responsibility for schools, administrators, and teachers," "forces everyone to become more successful," "creates academic improvement," "increases the level of instruction," "sets clear standards and high expectations for all students," "bring additional assistance to those students who have been defined as at-risk," "provides an opportunity to measure effectiveness and guide improvement in a program," "intensifies the drive for student academic success," "forces all groups to collaborate more to be successful," "helps give us a vision for school improvement,"*

"makes administrators look at everything closer: budget, hiring, curriculum, instruction strategies and strive for continuous improvement in all areas," "has increased the span of management and supervision," and "has improved the level of teaching."

The total number of assistant principals who gave a positive response is 103. These 103 positive responses were recorded from 98 assistant principals. Only 15 (14.6 %) of these responses were categorized under the first main category that states that the high-stakes testing creates high standards and expectations. Like the principals who were surveyed, assistant principals discussed that high-stakes testing *"has set the standard for every student"* and schools and administrators *"are kept to a higher standard."* One assistant principal mentioned that *"it has made all of us aware that we must meet minimum standards in order to be prepared for university work."* Yet, another assistant principal stated that *"it has made me more aware of the necessity of maintaining high standards for the good of the learning environment."* Several assistant principals discussed how their role is beginning to change. The job is *"more challenging"* because it *"forces everyone to have high expectations."* In addition, there is *"more academic responsibility"* and the new role enforces them to *"provide everything to the teachers for them to be successful."* Several others mentioned that high stakes testing *"forces everyone to constantly work to improve the academic opportunities for all students,"* and that it *"has influenced everyone by giving us a goal to reach for," "has influenced administrator to make sure that my teachers have what they need in order to teach," "has influenced teachers, parents, and students by giving them a reason to teach the required material, a reason to be involved in helping their child be successful, and a reason to work hard in school."* A comment made by one particular assistant principal was that "*it weeds out the teachers so that the ones remaining are the ones that are more dedicated to teaching. With the role of high-stakes testing, there have*

been many positive changes taking place in schools. Nationwide, reading ability and comprehension has gone up."

21.4 percent of principals' reasons for their positive responses on the influence of high-stakes testing fall into this subgroup, which says that high-stakes testing creates high standards and expectations. This number is 14.6 percent for assistant principals.

The second subcategory of reasons for positive responses: High-Stakes testing creates accountability.

The second main theme under the positive response category includes statements underscoring the benefits of testing because it creates accountability for schools. These statements indicate that making teachers, students, and administrators more accountable helps increase the quality of education, that it helps them work smarter, and that it makes them more supportive of one another. In addition, it was stated that it creates an external accountability, which is of great need in the field of education. 26.5 percent (31 of 117) of the principals' and 25.2 percent (26 of 103) of assistant principals' reasons for their positive responses on the influence of high-stakes testing were categorized in this subcategory.

The third subcategory of reasons for positive responses: High-stakes testing creates more focus and sensitivity on academics.

The third main positive subcategory of the responses is that "High-stakes testing creates more focus and sensitivity on academics." This subcategory has the highest percentage of both principals' and assistant principals' reasons for their positive responses on the influence of high-stakes testing. For instance, 32.5 percent (38 of 117) of principals' and 40.8 percent (42 of 103) of assistant principals' positive responses were categorized in this group.

In this subcategory, several principals discussed how high-stakes testing forces everyone to focus on data analysis, program development for kids not passing, and to place a greater focus on the curriculum. It helps administrators maintain a focus on teaching and learning; further, it has heightened the awareness of student performance, and enhanced the competition for all groups. It was mentioned that the high-stakes testing has forced administrators to monitor the delivery of instruction closer, has led to a much bigger focus on the curriculum across the board, has given them more focus on instruction and student learning for all, has required them to tighten the curriculum and make sure it is aligned with the tests, and has made all of them more conscious of the things all students must learn.

Some of the principals stated that because of testing "*there is a renewed focus on a coherent curriculum," "students focus on instruction; teachers/administrators focus on what they are doing to prepare students,"* and it *"makes them look at everything closer: … curriculum, instruction strategies and strive for continuous improvement in all areas,"* and it *"makes the principal be an instructional leader."* It *"has been a good thing, helping schools become more focused," "has made them more aware of professional developments for teachers," "has helped all of them to make sure that they know what kids must know at each grade level, for each content area," "shows parents what needs to be learned," "influenced how they structure our student schedules -- allowing for remediation labs and encouraging teachers to follow layered lessons and other scripted programs to ensure that students are receiving similar instruction," "helps teachers keep up to date with the curriculum,"* and *"has provided them with important feedback that can be used to improve teaching, guide curriculum, set performance expectations for students and teachers and engage in self-improvement."*

Several other comments focused on the importance of data provided by the testing. One principal indicated that the testing has made him more *"data conscious,"* that now he is able to *"analyze the data more effectively"*, and that he is *"better able to make many decisions that drive the instruction."* A different principal stated that high-stakes testing data helped him to *"review the data, figure out weaknesses, and develop strategies against those weaknesses."* Another respondent indicated that *"data driven instruction helps them develop a profile of how the school is performing and then helps set goals and missions."* One principal said that *"everything is data driven now, so we are very focused on learning and measuring it."* Several other comments related to becoming more focused on the data and how being more data-driven has been helpful.

Reasons mentioned by assistant principals in this subcategory can be divided into two groups: (a) comments about reflecting an increase in data driven decisions as well as (b) a heightened focus and sensitivity toward academics. Several assistant principals indicated that the high-stakes testing has made them *"more data driven."* Because of this, they *"work more closely with teachers in regards to providing the best level of instruction possible"* and *"pay close attention to test scores."* Some of them indicated constant data monitoring *"in order to assess where they are and determine what needs to be done in order to close the gaps."* They *"segregate and use it in every aspect of planning and teaching."*

Another group of assistant principals' reasons in this subcategory include the statements that because of high-stakes testing there is a change in their role; they became *"curriculum enforcer"* and *"curriculum leader"* of their schools. They *"visit classrooms more often so that they know the level of instruction being presented to the students."* In addition, several assistant principals said that the high-stakes testing *"helped to ensure that their focus is on instruction,*

where it needs to be," forced them to *"become more involved with the curriculum," "has placed more emphasis on instructional supervision and the development of professional learning communities," "has focused their dialogue on academic achievement for all students," "raised awareness of the importance of every single kid every single day," forced them to do "closer teacher supervision," "has increased the opportunity to focus on student achievement," "increased awareness of their roles and awareness of instruction," "has impacted everyone at a very high level and made them better administrators through tracking data and student success," created "continuous movement toward improvement and achievement and forced everyone to continue learning and seeking new and better or more advanced knowledge,"* and *"has influenced the way it is viewed by the achievement of the school; academic instruction has become the main focus."*

The fourth subcategory of reasons for positive responses:

The other positive comments about high-stakes testing that do not fall into one of the three main sub categories were grouped under "Other Positive Responses" category. This subcategory of principals' responses includes the positive responses such as [because of testing] *"more funds spent on remedial sessions; after school and Saturday tutorials,"* and *"It makes sure that every student is successful and no one falls through the cracks," "it shifts your focus from high achievement to constantly worrying about the low performers," "it provides feedback on what needs to be done better in years to come," "it gives us many new ideas and program designed for student success," "it has driven home the need to reach all children,"* and *"it raises our credibility."* Sometimes there were comments that did not specify a point, rather it stated that testing is good/valuable. The following responses offer salient examples: *"I like the challenge. Mediocrity is not good,"* and *"It takes more time out of everyone's day, but worth the time*

taken." 19.7 percent of principals' and 19.4 percent of assistant principals' reasons for their positive responses were grouped in this subcategory.

Reasons Mentioned for Negative Responses

The sub-categories that emerged from negative responses include that the high-stakes testing (1) "Creates High Pressure/Stress," (2) "Creates Negative Effects on Curriculum/Teaching," and (3) "Too Much Time and Effort Spent on Testing." The responses that did not fall into one of these three main themes were categorized in "Other Negative Responses" sub-category.

Table 4.5 gives the frequency of principals' reasons for their negative responses on the influence of high-stake testing. The total number of principals who provided a negative response is 175. Total number of negative responses is 201 (from 177 principals) since there are multiple negative reasons that fall in different subcategories. Breakdown of principals' negative responses into subcategories is as follows: "Creates Pressure/Stress" is 107 (53.2 %); "Creates Negative Effects on Curriculum/Teaching" is 52 (25.9%); "Too Much Time and Effort Spent on Testing" is 22 (10.9%); and "other negative responses" is 20 (10.0%).

The frequency of assistant principals' reasons for their negative responses is given in Table 4.6 below. There are 284 negative responses from 234 assistant principals. The breakdown of these negative responses into subcategories is as follows: "Creates Pressure/Stress" is 131 (46.1 %); "Creates Negative Effects on Curriculum/Teaching" is 82 (28.9%); "Too Much Time and Effort Spent on Testing" is 49 (17.3%); and "other negative responses" is 22 (7.7%).

Table 4.5

Frequency of Principals' Reasons for Their Negative Responses on the Influence of High-stakes Testing (N = 184)

Subcategories of Reasons for Negative Responses	f	%
Creates Pressure/Stress	108	51.2
Creates Negative Effects on Curriculum/Teaching	57	27.0
Too Much Time and Effort Spent on Testing	23	10.9
Other	23	10.9
Total	211*	100.0

*Note. * Total number of reasons from 184 principals is 211 since there are multiple negative reasons that fall in different subcategories from some of the assistant principals for their negative responses.*

Table 4.6

Frequency of Assistant Principals' Reasons for Their Negative Responses on the Influence of High-stakes Testing (N = 240)

Subcategories of Reasons for Negative Responses	f	%
Creates Pressure/Stress	132	45.5
Creates Negative Effects on Curriculum/Teaching	83	28.6
Too Much Time and Effort Spent on Testing	52	17.9
Other	23	7.9
Total	290*	100.0

Note. Total number of reasons from 240 assistant principals is 290 since there are multiple negative reasons that fall in different subcategories from some of the assistant principals for their negative responses.*

The first subcategory of reasons for negative responses: High-stakes testing creates pressure and stress.

The most cited reason by the principals (51.2 %) and the assistant principals (45.5 %) for their negative responses is that high-stakes testing "creates pressure and stress." In their survey responses, principals and assistant principals indicated that *"everyone is stressed"* and *"teachers and students burned out."* They also reported that stress and pressure caused by the testing *"demoralized teachers," "deterred creativity,"* and*"has turned schools into boring environments."* Finally, they stated that*"[i]t stresses the teachers out and they can't teach other things"* because they *"spend a lot of time dealing with rising levels of stress."*

The second subcategory of reasons for negative responses: High-stakes testing creates negative effects on curriculum and teaching.

The second main category of principals' and assistant principals' reasons for their negative responses is that high stakes testing "creates negative effects on curriculum and teaching." 27.0 percent of principals' reasons for their negative responses fall into this subcategory. In their statements, principals indicated that high-stakes testing *"changed the way they do business,"* and that *"Testing has become the focus. Instruction is now designed around what is being tested."* One of the principals said that *"it drives all that I do--time students are on task, in/out of class, etc. The community perception of the campus's success is based, in large part, to the outcome of TAKS testing. It is the data by which we are judge and compared."*

Several other principals' comments in this subcategory are as follows: *"It is sometimes difficult to keep campuses from being more test driven than life long learner driven," "test prep takes too much out of curriculum," "It has focused instruction narrowly and it takes a lot of creativity out of teaching," "you can't teach other things that you know that students might be*

interested in. You have to prepare for the test," "High stakes, although necessary, has turned our schools into boring environments. We've created a system that tries to test and make everyone the same and I believe that puts our students at a disadvantage by placing too great a priority in certain studies and ignoring others," "It has made us focus on tests more than learning, changed the landscape of education, and influenced the emphasis of outcomes and how your campus is viewed, compared teachers with their peers and set the tone for teacher performance," "it has made teachers teach a much more narrow curriculum," "curriculum and teaching has been tailored to guarantee success on the tests. The result is that resources go towards those students on the bubble and not enough goes towards those above and below the bubble," "There is too much focus on the testing and not enough focus on the instruction and learning. There has been a shift from learning to teaching the test," "the value of the whole child is not seen anymore because of the pressures of high test scores," "it's taken the focus away sometimes from the whole child. Not every child is pre-AP. There are students who are not good in math, but are good artists or athletes," "It's taken over. High scores have replaced graduating productive citizens," "It has also hurt us in that we get so focused on the minimum expectations and making the grade, that we lose many wonderful experiences," "it created an intense teaching profession," "it has driven instruction and allowed for less input by the teachers of other information that might be interesting to the students," ""it has focused me to eliminate excellent programs to concentrate on the pursuit of a rating," "I do have to spend more time as more of an inspector general role than I like to because it is such a high stakes test. It is important to our school and our district. Teachers spend more time on what is on the test and have to give up some things they don't have time for, like projects (the good things)."

This subcategory of assistant principals' reasons for their negative responses of high-stakes testing comprised of 28.6 percent of all of their negative answers. Like principals, assistant principals stated that high-stakes testing *"became the main focus of education."* One assistant principal said that *"it defeats the purpose for the teachers and people like to pretend it's the only thing in February and April."* Another one said that the influence of this testing has forced him to *"readjust my thinking so that test results are always the ultimate goal."*

Some other statements of assistant principals that fall into this subcategory are as follows: *"It's removed the focus from everything such as character, citizenship - those things can't be on the test, so they tend to be pushed aside," "students have learned to simplify school down to just passing the test. So that they are not concerned with what happens during the year," "it has influenced teachers to teach to the test," "It is causing teachers to abandon important content and skills that are not tested," "everyone is so focused on test scores that we sometimes overlook other issues," "We have completely lost our focus. We say it is for the kids, but is it really. I think about my schooling when I was a kid. We had art. We had music. You had to try and play some instrument. You had to do something. The arts have been cut out," "high-stakes testing is a great deterrence to education. Students cannot get the full benefit of curriculum when teachers are teaching to a test and the fullbodiness of learning is diminished," "Changed instruction, focus, ways planning periods are utilized, less teacher collaboration," "I used to be more whole child centered and now I am more bottom line centered," "As assistant principal, I spend the majority of my time making sure that our school is in compliance with state and federal laws. It is frustrating when you know that the focus should be on the kids but you can't do anything about it so you try to comply while trying to minimize the irritation that teachers feel about the legislation," "That's too much of our focus. It's not about teaching the*

kids anymore, it's about teaching the kids how to pass this test," "It has had a negative effect on all of us because it has obfuscated student love of learning for robotic mastery," "High-stakes testing drives the curriculum and instruction. It also drives what we look for as teacher evaluators," "We have moved away from providing students with a "well-balanced" curriculum to providing students with more of what they need to be successful on TAKS - Reading, Math, Writing, and Science in my school. When more time is needed, good-bye art, good-bye PE, good-bye music time - and 'hello' to TAKS tutoring time!!!," "It has affected our perspective on learning that takes place in the classroom. It tends to taint our minds with percentages and numbers rather than treating students as humans," "A great amount of time is devoted to preparing the students for the assessment resulting in the narrowing of the curriculum."

The third subcategory of reasons for negative responses: Too much time and effort spent on testing.

Third subcategory includes the group of mentioned reasons for negative responses stating that "too much time and effort spent on testing." This subcategory comprised 10.9% of principals' and 17.9% of assistant principals' reasons for their negative responses. In their statements, principals and assistant principals indicated that high-stakes testing is *"time consuming"* and *"taking a lot of time and taking a lot of instructional time away from teachers."* Teachers have spent *"too much time with test prep materials"* and *"teaching to the test."* In addition, principals and assistant principals stated that the paperwork and the time and effort spent on test administration are too great. One assistant principal stated that *"I spend too much time looking at data and the teachers can't just do their jobs without having to follow 50 million charts of statistics about the kids' performance levels, etc."* The time spent for mock tests is another issue among assistant principal respondents. For instatnce, one assistant principal stated

that *"We have to make sure there is testing every 3 weeks. We must have current data on every single child. Teachers, in the past, have always known their students capability. We don't need to be tested to death to find that out."* Yet, another stated that they were *"constantly assessing. It's not like the old days where you just gave a test at the end of the year. Now, we have weekly testing and we get to know the students' academic levels more. The teachers are overworked and overwhelmed. They must provide closer documentation. The students feel that they are tested more often."*

The fourth subcategory of reasons for negative responses:

The fourth and the final subcategory of negative responses include the responses that did not fall into one of the previous three subcategories. Statements in this subcategory include negative themes such as *"it hurts," " it created a system that tries to test and make everyone the same," "the rewards in this system are so high if a student succeeds that the results are actually skewed in his opinion," "it is frustrating and got out of hand," "We are consumed by TAKS," "It has a negative influence," "It impacts the mental health," "It has reached a point where it's completely overwhelming," "It hurts kids because we don't get longevity. I see teachers who don't care about the kid. They care about the scores, and I don't like that," "Let's start a group – PAT – Parents against TAKS!! ENOUGH SAID!!!" "It gets crazier each year, you are more vulnerable to losing your job," "I could lose my job behind this,"* and *"my job is on the line."* This subcategory comprised 10.9% of principals' and 7.9% of assistant principals' reasons for their negative responses.

Reasons Mentioned for Other Responses

Some of the principals and assistant principals' responses included either neutral themes, or they were not clear enough to be categorized under "positive response category" or a "negative response category." The total number of principals who gave reasons for their responses that were categorized under this category is 44 (12.8% of all reasons). In contrast, 11.8% (46) of assistant principals' reasons fall into this category. The reasons that were categorized in this section include statements stating that high-stakes testing has "no influence" or "little influence." Furthermore, some of the statements categorized under this main category were not easy to understand, especially in regard to whether they included positive or negative themes toward high-stakes testing. For example, one principal indicated that high stakes testing *"has an impact on principals, teachers, parents and students,"* but did not give any hint as to the specific reasons for such an influence. Similarly, another principal said that *"high-stakes testing has increased and changed the roles of the principal exponentially. It has had a huge effect on all parties concerned."* One of the assistant principal's statements was that *"high-stakes testing is very important. It is important to teachers, students and parents."* Again, no further explanation was offered in order to justify or clarify the said claim.

There were number of other statements relating to the notion that *"testing is not a matter"* in terms of teaching, and *"nobody within the school community is really stressed about it."* There is another group of responses saying that high-stakes testing *"is really not a big issue"* since their schools had been *"exemplary for years"* and because their students *"score well on TAKS."*

Analysis of Complexity of Responses

Because of the open-ended nature of the survey question there were no limitations placed on the number and nature of reasons mentioned by principals and assistant principals. Therefore, responses included both positive and negative reasons. In fact, participants also included more than one positive or negative reason in relation to their responses about high-stakes testing. Table 4.7 and Table 4.8 denote the summary of the number of reasons mentioned by principals and assistant principals for their responses regarding high-stakes testing.

Table 4.7

Summary of the Number of Reasons Mentioned by Principals for their Responses Regarding High-stakes Testing (N = 293)*

Number of Reasons Mentioned	f	%
1	199	67.9
2	78	26.6
3	12	4.1
4	4	1.4
5+	0	0.0
Total	293	100.0

*Note. * Responses from seven principals in the sample are missing and ten principals answered as "NA" since they work for private schools. These 17"empty" or "NA" type answers were excluded from this table.*

As shown in the Table 4.7, 199 principals (63.70% of 293 principals) gave only one reason for their responses of high-stakes testing. The remaining group of principals mentioned between two and four reasons; 78 principals (26.6%) gave two reasons, 12 (4.1 %) of them gave three reasons, and 4 principals (1.4%) gave four reasons for their responses. There were no principal who gave five or more reasons.

The following table denotes the breakdown of principals' reasons according to main categories:

Table 4.8

Breakdown of Principals' Reasons

Number of Reasons Mentioned	Principals' Responses			
	Positive	Negative	Other	Total
1	88	147	42	277
% within column	80.0	79.9	95.5	82.0
2	20	32	1	53
% within column	18.2	17.4	2.3	15.7
3	2	5	1	8
% within column	1.8	2.7	2.3	2.4
4+	0	0	0	0
% within column	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Total	110	184	44	338
% within column	25.4%	52.9%	21.7%	100

As shown in the Table 4.8, there are 110 principals who gave reasons for their positive responses. Further, 88 of 110 (80.0% of all principals who provided reasons for their positive responses) gave only one reason for their positive responses. 20 principals (18.2%) gave two reasons and only 2 principal (1.8%) mentioned three reasons for their positive responses. There were no principals who indicated four or more reasons. Of the 184 principals who mentioned reasons for their negative responses, 147 (79.9%) principals gave only one reason that was categorized under the negative response category. 32 principals (17.4%) mentioned two reasons for their negative responses. There were only 5 principals (2.7%) who gave three different reasons that were categorized under the negative response category. None of the principals gave 4 or more reasons for their negative responses of high-stakes testing. In total, 44 principals mentioned reasons that were categorized under the "other response category." 42 principals (95.5%) gave only one reason for their responses in this category. 1 principal (2.3%) mentioned two reasons and 1 other principal (2.3%) gave three reasons for their responses categorized under the "other response category." There were no principal who gave four or more reasons in this category.

Table 4.9 shows the summary of the number of reasons mentioned in multiple categories. As mentioned earlier, there were principals whose responses that were categorized in more than one of the main three categories (the positive, the negative, and the other response categories). As Table 4.1 shows, the total number of the frequencies of three main categories is 338. This is greater than the number of principals, which is 293 who gave reasons for their responses regarding high-stakes testing. The number of frequencies is higher than the number of participants because some of the responses contain more than one reason and, therefore, they fall into multiple categories. Table 4.9 provides a summary of the reasons categorized under one

category (univariate), two categories (bivariate), and under three or more categories (multivariate).

Table 4.9

Summary of the Number of Reasons Mentioned in Multiple Categories (N = 293)

Frequency of Univariate Responses	Positive Response Frequency	Negative Response Frequency	Other Response Frequency	Total
Univariate	71	142	35	248
Univariate %	28.6	57.3	14.1	100.0

Frequency of Bivariate Responses	Positive & Negative Frequency	Positive & Other Frequency	Negative & Other Frequency	Total
Bivariate	36	3	6	45
Bivariate %	80.0	6.7	13.3	100.0

Frequency of Multivariate Responses*	Positive &Negative &Other Response Frequency	Total
Multivariate	0	0
Multivariate %	0.0	0.0

Note. *There are no multivariate responses that can be categorized in any group that contains "other" category like "positive & negative & other"

As Table 4.9 shows, 248 principals gave reasons that can be categorized in one of the four categories. Of these principals, 71 (28.6%) of them gave reasons that were categorized under the positive responses category only. The highest number of univariate responses fall

under the negative responses category; 142 (57.3%) principals gave reasons that were identified for this category. Univariate responses given by 35 principals (14.11%) were sorted under the "other response category."

Responses of 45 principals were categorized as bivariate ones. 36 of these principals (80.0 percent of the 45 principals) gave reasons for their responses that were both categorized under the "positive response" and the "negative response" categories. Responses of 3 principals (6.7 %) were both categorized under the "positive response" and the "other response" categories. 6 of the principal responses (13.3 %) were categorized under both "negative response" and "other response" categories. Other than these three groups, there were no multivariate responses that could be categorized under any other categories. In other words, none of the responses could be categorized under three different categories – "positive response", "negative response", and "neutral response" categories.

Analysis of Complexity of Responses for Assistant Principals

Table 4.10

Summary of the Number of Reasons Mentioned by Assistant Principals for their Responses Regarding High-stakes Testing (N = 353)*

Number of Reasons Mentioned	f	%
1	264	74.8
2	80	22.7
3	8	2.3
4	1	0.3
5+	0	0.0
Total	353	100.0

*Note. * Responses of fourteen principals in the sample are missing and four principals answered as "NA" since they work for private schools. These 18 "empty" or "NA" type answers were excluded from this table.*

As shown in the Table 4.7, 264 assistant principals (74.8% of 353 assistant principals) gave only one reason for their responses of high-stakes testing. The remaining group of assistant principals mentioned between two and four reasons; 80 assistant principals (22.7%) gave two reasons, 8 (2.3 %) of them gave three reasons, and 1 assistant principal (1.4%) gave four reasons for their responses. There were no principal who gave five or more reasons.

The breakdown of principals' reasons according to main categories is shown in the following table:

Table 4.11

Breakdown of Principals' Reasons

Number of Reasons Mentioned	Principals' Responses			
	Positive	Negative	Other	Total
1	92	183	46	321
% within column	93.9	76.3	100.0	83.6
2	6	52	0	58
% within column	6.1	21.7	0.0	15.1
3	0	5	0	5
% within column	0.0	2.1	0.0	1.3
4+	0	0	0	0
% within column	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Total	98	240	46	384
% within column	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

As shown in the Table 4.11, the total number of assistant principals who gave reasons for their positive responses is 98. In addition, 93.9 percent assistant principals gave only one reason for their positive responses, while 6.1 percent of them gave two reasons and there were no assistant principals who gave three or more reasons for their positive responses. Of the 243 assistant principals who mentioned reasons for their negative responses, 76.3 percent of assistant principals gave only one reason that was categorized under the negative response category. 21.7 percent of them mentioned two reasons for their negative responses, while only 2.1 percent were giving three different reasons that were categorized under the negative response category. None of the assistant principals gave 4 or more reasons for their negative responses of high-stakes

testing. In total, 46 assistant principals mentioned reasons that were categorized under the "other response category." All of these respondents provided only one reason for their responses in this category. None of the assistant principals gave two or more reasons in this category.

Table 4.12 shows the summary of the number of reasons mentioned in multiple categories. This table also shows that the total number of the frequencies of three main categories is greater than the number of assistant principals. The number of frequencies is higher than the number of participants because some of the responses contain more than one reason and therefore they fall into multiple categories. Lastly, Table 4.12 gives the summary of the reasons categorized under one category (univariate), two categories (bivariate), and under three or more categories (multivariate).

Table 4.12

Summary of the Number of Reasons Mentioned in Multiple Categories (N = 353)

Frequency of Univariate Responses	Positive Response Frequency	Negative Response Frequency	Other Response Frequency	Total
Univariate	69	209	44	322
Univariate %	21.4	64.9	13.7	100.0

Frequency of Bivariate Responses	Positive & Negative Frequency	Positive & Other Frequency	Negative & Other Frequency	Total
Bivariate	29	0	2	31
Bivariate %	93.6	0.0	6.5	100.0

Frequency of Multivariate	Positive &Negative &Other Response

Table 4.12 (cont.)

Responses*	Frequency	Total
Multivariate	0	0
Multivariate %	0.0	0.0

Note. *There were no multivariate responses that can be categorized in any group that contains "other" category like "positive & negative& other"

As this data shows, 248 assistant principals gave reasons that can be categorized in one of the three main categories, while responses of 45 of them were categorized as bivariate responses.

As tables 4.9 and 4.12 show, there are six different groups of answers. These groups are as follows: (1) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the positive response category only; (2) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the negative response category only; (3) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the other response category only; (4) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the positive response categories; (5) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the other response categories; and (6) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the positive response and the other response categories. Chi-square analysis will use these groups in research question 2 through five.

Research Question Three and Four

This section analyzed the data to determine whether there is a significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school demographic factors, such as school level, urbanicity, socioeconomic status, a school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience. The same process was repeated for assistant principals.

A Chi-square analysis was used in this part to answer the following two research questions:

Research Question Three: Is there a significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors, such as school level, urbanicity, socioeconomic status, a school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience?

Research Question Four: Is there a significant difference between the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors, such as school level, urbanicity, socioeconomic status, a school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience?

In this part of the chapter, responses of principals and assistant principals were coded into six different groups to determine whether significant differences existed in the *obtained* versus *expected* frequencies of responses. The six groups are as follows: (1) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the positive response category only; (2) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the negative response category only; (3) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the other response category only; (4) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the positive

response categories; (5) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the other response categories; and (6) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the positive response and the other response categories.

Research Questions Three

Research Question Three asked whether there is a significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors, such as school level, urbanicity, socioeconomic status, a school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience. A Chi-square analysis was used to analyze the aforementioned differences. The results showed that – except schools' minority student ratio – in all of the cases for principals (school level, urbanicity, socioeconomic status, the school's achievement level, and principals' characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience) probability value was higher than the alpha level of significance of 0.05. In other words, except for schools' minority student ratio, there is no statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors, such as school level, urbanicity, socioeconomic status, a school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience.

Chi-square analysis yielded statistically significant differences between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and their schools' minority student ratio. The cross-tabulation of minority student ratio and principals' responses is given below in Table 4.13.

Table 14.3

Cross-tabulation of Schools' Minority Student Ratio and Principals' Responses (N: 292)

Minority Student Ratio	Responses									
	Positive	Negative	Other	Positive & Negative	Positive & Other	Negative & Other	Total	$\chi 2$	*df*	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
0-20	11	20	12	4	0	2	49	32.918[a]	20	0.034
Residual	(-.9)	(-3.7)	(6.1)	(-2.0)	(-.5)	(1.0)				
% Within Response	15.5	14.2	34.3	11.1	0	33.3	16.8			
21-40	14	29	1	7	0	1	52			
Residual	-1.4	-3.9	(-5.2)	(.6	(-.5)	(1.1)				
% Within Response	19.7	20.6	2.9	19.4	0	16.7	17.8			
41-60	8	15	6	3	2	1	35			
Residual	(-.5)	(-1.9)	(1.8	(-1.3)	(1.6)	(.3)				
% Within Response	11.3	10.6	17.1	8.3	66.7	16.7	12			
61-80	8	26	6	3	1	0	44			
Residual	(-2.7)	-4.8	(.7	(-2.4)	(.5)	(-.9)				
% Within Response	11.3	18.4	17.1	8.3	33.3	0	15.1			
81-100	30	51	10	19	0	2	112			
Residual	-2.8	(-3.1)	(-3.4)	(5.2	(-1.2)	(-.3)				
% Within Response	42.3	36.2	28.6	52.8	0	33.3	38.4			
Total	71	141	35	36	3	6	292			
% Within Response	100	100	100	100	100	100	100			

[a] 12 cells (40.0 %) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0.36.

292 principals were included in the above table. Responses of 17 principals were not tabulated since they gave either "NA- Non-Applicable" type of response, or because their responses to the survey question were missing. Another principal's school minority student ratio information is missing although they responded the survey question. Subsequently, this principal

was excluded from this table as well. The probability (p) value of the Chi-square test statistic was as p = 0.034 (χ^2 =32.918, *df* =20, *p* = .034). This is smaller than the alpha level of significance of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing and their schools' minority student ratio is rejected. In other words, it was found that a statistically significant difference exists between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing and their schools' minority student ratio.

However, the analysis showed that 12 cells (40.0 %) have expected counts less than 5. This is higher than the 20% exception allowed for tables larger than 2x2 (Sirkin, 2006). Thus, this reduces the power (Weiner, 2003). The usual response would be redoing the analysis after deleting a category (George & Malery, 2009). This will reduce the number of cells have expected count less than 5 "as long as care is taken to delete only variables that are not associated with the remaining ones (Milligan, 1980).

The categories that have the smallest number of frequencies were deleted in the second round of the analyses. These categories included (1) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the positive response categories, (2) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the other response categories, and (3) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the positive response and the other response categories. After this modification, Chi-square analysis was rerun.

The cross-tabulation for the new analysis is given below in Table 4.14, but there are three different groups this time. These groups are as follows: (1) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the positive responses category only, (2) Respondents who gave reasons

that were categorized under the negative response category only, and (3) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the other response category only.

After deletion, the total number of principals who were tabulated is 247. The p value of the Chi-square test statistic was as p = 0.048 at this round (χ^2 =15.642, *df* =8, *p* = .048). This is smaller than the alpha level of significance of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing and their schools' minority student ratio is rejected. In other words, it was found that there is a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing and their schools' minority student ratio. The results show that principals having low minority ratios in their schools tended to have less negative beliefs regarding high-stakes testing than the expected rate, while principals having high minority ratios in their schools tended to have more negative beliefs regarding high-stakes testing. In addition, 1 cell (6.7 %) has an expected value less than 5. This satisfies the 20 percent exception allowed for tables larger than 2x2 (Sirkin, 2006).

Table 4.14

Cross-tabulation of Schools' Minority Student Ratio and Principals' Responses (N: 247)

Minority Student Ratio	Perceptions						
	Positive	Negative	Other	Total	$\chi 2$	*df*	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
0-20	11	20	12	43	15.642[a]	8	.048
Residual	(-1.4)	(-4.5)	(5.9)				
% Within Response	15.5	14.2	34.3	17.4			

Table 4.14 (Cont.)

21-40	14	29	1	44
Residual	(1.4)	(3.9)	(-5.2)	
% Within Response	19.7	20.6	2.9	17.8
41-60	8	15	6	29
Residual	(-.3)	(-1.6)	(1.9)	
% Within Response	11.3	10.6	17.1	11.7
61-80	8	26	6	40
Residual	(-3.5)	(3.2)	(.3)	
% Within Response	11.3	18.4	17.1	16.2
81-100	30	51	10	91
Residual	(3.8)	(-.9)	(-2.9)	
% Within Response	42.3	36.2	28.6	36.8
Total	71	141	35	247
% Within Response	100	100	100	100

[a] 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.11.

Research Question Four

Research Question Four explores whether there is a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors, such as school level, urbanicity, socioeconomic status, a school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience. A Chi-square analysis was used to determine whether significant differences existed. Subsequently, the analysis yielded significant results in gender, socioeconomic status, and school's minority student ratio categories only. The cross-tabulation of gender and assistant principals' responses is given below in Table 4.15

Table 4.15

Cross-tabulation of Assistant Principals' Gender and Their Responses (N: 353)

Gender	Responses									
	Positive	Negative	Other	Positive & Negative	Positive & Other	Negative & Other	Total	χ2	*df*	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Female	58	141	26	21		2	248	10.605[a]	4	.031
Residual	(9.5	(-5.8)	(4.9)	(.6)		(.6)				
% Within Response	16.4	39.9	7.4	5.9		100	70.3			
Male	11	68	18	8	0	6	105			
Residual	(-9.5)	(5.8)	(4.9)	(-.6)	(-.6)	(2.4)				
% Within Response	15.9	32.5	40.9	27.6	0.0	2.0	29.7			
Total	69	209	44	29	0	2	353			
% Within Response	19.5	59.2	12.5	8.2	.5	.6	100			

[a] 2 cells (20.0 %) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0.59.

353 assistant principals were included in the table. Responses of 18 assistant principals were not tabulated since they gave either "NA- Non-Applicable" type of response or their responses were missing. Residual values that show the difference between "expected count" and "the real count" ("expected count" minus "real count) are given in parenthesis.

The probability (p) value of the Chi-square test statistic was 0.031 (χ^2=10.605, *df* =4, *p* = .031), smaller than the alpha level of significance of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and the participants' gender is rejected. In other words, the results show that there is a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals regarding

the influence of high-stake testing and the participants' gender. Female assistant principals tended to have less negative beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing on their roles as administrators and the manner in which it influences parents, teachers, and students than the expected rate, while male assistant principals tended to have more negative beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing. In addition, 2 of 10 cells (20.0%) have an expected value less than 5. This satisfies the 20 percent exception allowed for tables larger than 2x2 (Sirkin, 2006).

The cross-tabulation of socio economic status and assistant principals' responses is given in the following table:

Table 4.16

Cross-tabulation of Schools' Socio-Economic Status and Their Responses (N: 353)

Eco-Dis Ratio	Responses									
	Positive	Negative	Other	Positive & Negative	Positive & Other	Negative & Other	Total	$\chi 2$	*df*	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
0-20	11	23	12	1		0	47	39.697[a]	20	.005
Residual	(1.8)	(-4.8)	(6.1)	(-2.9)		(-.3)				
% Within Response	16.4	39.9	7.4	5.9		100	13.3			
21-40	3	15	4	6		0	28			
Residual	(-2.5)	(-1.6)	(.5)	(3.7)		(-.2)				
% Within Response	4.3	7.2	9.1	20.7		.0	7.9			
41-60	9	31	3	3		1	47			
Residual	(-.2)	(3.2)	(-2.9)	(-.9)		(-.7)				
% Within Response	13.0	14.8	6.8	10.3		50	13.3			

Table 4.16 (Cont.)

61-80	9	44	4	7		0	64
Residual	(-3.5)	(6.1)	(-4.0)	(1.7)		(-.4)	18.1
% Within Response	13.0	21.1	9.1	24.1		0.0	18.1
81-100	28	82	12	9		0	131
Residual	(2.4)	(4.4)	(-4.3)	(-1.8)		(-.7)	
% Within Response	40.6	39.2	27.3	31.0		0.0	37.1
Missing	9	14	9	3		1	36
Residual	(2.0)	(-7.3)	(4.5)	(.0)		(.8)	
% Within Response	13.0	6.7	20.5	10.3		50.0	10.2
Total	69	209	44	29	0	2	353
% Within Total	19.5	59.2	12.5	8.2	.5	.6	100

[a] 12 cells (40.0 %) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0.16.
Note. Eco-Dis= Economically Disadvantaged.

353 assistant principals were included in the above table. Responses of 18 assistant principals were not tabulated since they gave either "NA- Non-Applicable" type of response, or their responses to the survey question were missing. The school socioeconomic status information of 36 assistant principals is also missing. These assistant principals were tabulated. The analysis showed that a statically significant difference exists between assistant principals' beliefs regarding high-stake testing and their schools' socioeconomic status (SES). However, 12 cells (40.0 %) have expected count less than 5. This is higher than 20 percent exception allowed for tables larger than 2x2 (Sirkin, 2006). This reduces the power (Weiner, 2003). The usual response would be to redo the analysis after deleting a category (George & Malery, 2009). This would reduce the number of cells having an expected count less than 5 "as long as care is taken to delete only variables that are not associated with the remaining ones" (Milligan, 1980).

The categories that have the smallest number of frequencies were deleted in the second round of the analysis. These categories included: (1) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the positive response categories, (2) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the other response categories, and (3) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the positive response and the other response categories. After this modification, Chi-square analysis was rerun.

The cross-tabulation is given below in Table 4.17. There are three different groups this time. These groups are as follows: (1) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the positive responses category only, (2) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the negative response category only, and (3) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the other response category only.

The p value of the chi-square test statistic was as p = 0.011 at this round (χ^2 =22.973, *df* =10, *p* = .011). This is smaller than the alpha level of significance of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing and their schools' socio economic status is rejected. In other words, it was found that there is a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing and their school socioeconomic status. The results show that assistant principals having low socioeconomic (SES) student ratios tended to have more positive beliefs regarding high-stakes testing than the expected rate. In addition, 3 cells (16.67 %) have an expected value less than 5. This satisfies the 20 percent exception allowed for tables larger than 2x2 (Sirkin, 2006).

Table 4.17

Cross-tabulation of Schools' Socio-Economic Status and Their Responses (N: 353)

Eco-Dis Ration	Responses				χ2	*df*	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
	Positive	Negative	Other	Total			
0-20	11	23	12	46	22.973[a]	10	.011
Residual	(1.1)	(-6.9)	(5.7)				
% Within Response	15.9	11	27.3	14.3			
21-40	3	15	4	22			
Residual	(-1.7)	(.7)	(1.0)				
% Within Response	22	36	16	6.8			
41-60	9	31	3	43			
Residual	(-.2)	(3.1)	(-2.9)				
% Within Response	13.0	14.8	6.8	13.4			
61-80	9	44	4	57			
Residual	(-3.2)	(7.0)	(-3.8)				
% Within Response	13.0	7.0	-3.8	17.7			
81-100	28	82	12	122			
Residual	(1.9)	(2.8)	(-4.7)				
% Within Response	40.6	39.2	27.3	37.9			
Missing	9	14	9	32			
Residual	(2.1)	(-6.8)	(4.6)				
% Within Response	13.0	6.7	20.5	9.9			
Total	69	209	44	322			
% Within Total	21.4	64.9	13.7	100			

[a] 3 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.01.
Note. Eco-Dis= Economically Disadvantaged

In addition, the Chi-square analysis yielded statistically significant difference between the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and their schools' minority student ratio.

The cross-tabulation of minority student ratio and assistant principals' responses is given in the table below:

Table 4.18

Cross-tabulation of Schools' Minority Student Ratio and Assistant Principals' Responses (N:352)

Minority Student Ratio	Responses							$\chi 2$	*df*	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
	Positive	Negative	Other	Positive & Negative	Positive & Other	Negative & Other	Total			
0-20	11	22	15	2		2	50	30.620[a]	15	.015
Residual	(1.2)	(-7.5)	(8.8)	(-2.1)		(-.3)				
% Within Response	15.9	10.6	34.1	6.9		.0	14.2			
21-40	6	19	6	1		0	32			
Residual	(-.3)	(.1)	(2.0)	(-1.6)		(-.2)				
% Within Response	8.7	9.1	13.6	3.4		.0	9.1			
41-60	8	18	6	4		0	36			
Residual	(.9)	(-3.3)	(1.5)	(1.0)		(-.2)				
% Within Response	11.6	8.7	13.6	13.8		.0	10.2			
61-80	11	31	1	3		1	47			
Residual	(1.8)	(3.2)	(-4.9)	(-.9)		(.7)				
% Within Response	15.9	14.9	2.3	10.3		50.0	13.4			
81-100	33	118	16	19		1	187			
Residual	(-3.7)	(7.5)	(-7.4)	(3.6)		(-.1)				
% Within Response	47.8	56.7	36.4	65.5		50.0	53.1			

Table 4.18 (Cont.)

Total	69	208	44	29		2	352
% Within Response	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

[a] 11 cells (44.0 %) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0.18.

352 principals were included in the table. The responses of 18 assistant principals were not tabulated since they gave either "NA- Non-Applicable" type of response, or their responses to the survey question were missing. Another assistant principal's school minority student ratio information is missing although responded the survey question. Therefore, this principal was not included in his table as well. The probability (p) value of the Chi-square test statistic was as p = 0.015 (χ^2 =30.620, *df* =16, *p* = .015). This is smaller than the alpha level of significance of 0.05. This shows that there is a statistically significant difference exists between the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing and their schools' minority student ratio. However, the analysis showed that 11 cells (44.0 %) have expected count less than 5. This is higher than 20 percent exception allowed for tables larger than 2x2 (Sirkin, 2006). This is a factor that reduces the power of the analysis (Weiner, 2003). Therefore, the analysis will be done one more time after deleting categories having low cell counts. This is the usual response (George & Malery, 2009) as long as care is taken to delete only variables that are not associated with the remaining ones (Milligan, 1980).

The categories which that have the smallest number of frequencies were deleted in the second round of the analysis. These categories included (1) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the positive response categories, (2) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the other response categories, and (3) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under

both the positive response and the other response categories. After this modification, chi-square analysis was rerun.

The cross-tabulation for the new analysis is given below in Table 4.19. There are three different groups this time. These groups are as follow (1) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the positive responses category only, (2) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the negative response category only, and (3) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the other response category only.

After deletion, the total number of assistant principals who were tabulated is 321. The p value of the Chi-square test statistic was 0.003 at this round (χ^2 =23.414, *df* =8, *p* = .003). This is much smaller than the alpha level of significance of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing and their schools' minority student ratio is rejected. In other words, a statistically significant difference exists between the beliefs of assistant principals regarding the influence of high stakes testing and their schools' minority student ratio. The results show that assistant principals with low minority ratios in their schools tended to have fewer negative beliefs regarding high-stakes testing than the expected rate, while principals having high minority ratios in their schools tended to have more negative beliefs regarding high-stakes testing. In addition, 2 cells (13.3 %) have an expected value less than 5. This satisfies the 20 percent exception allowed for tables larger than 2x2 (Sirkin, 2006).

Table 4.19

Cross-tabulation of Schools' Minority Student Ratio and Principals' Responses (N: 247)

Minority Student Ratio	Perceptions						
	Positive	Negative	Other	Total	χ2	*df*	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
0-20	11	20	12	43	15.642[a]	8	.048
Residual	(-1.4)	(-4.5)	(5.9)				
% Within Response	15.5	14.2	34.3	17.4			
21-40	14	29	1	44			
Residual	(1.4)	(3.9)	(-5.2)				
% Within Response	19.7	20.6	2.9	17.8			
41-60	8	15	6	29			
Residual	(-.3)	(-1.6)	(1.9)				
% Within Response	11.3	10.6	17.1	11.7			
61-80	8	26	6	40			
Residual	(-3.5)	(3.2)	(.3)				
% Within Response	11.3	18.4	17.1	16.2			
81-100	30	51	10	91			
Residual	(3.8)	(-.9)	(-2.9)				
% Within Response	42.3	36.2	28.6	36.8			
Total	71	141	35	247			
% Within Total	28.7	57.1	14.2	100			

[a] 2 cells (13.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.25.

Research Question Five

This section of the chapter analyzed whether there is a significant difference between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers. Chi-square analysis was used in this part of the chapter to answer the following research question:

Research Question Five: Is there a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers?

A Chi-square analysis was used to determine the difference among these factors. The cross-tabulation of two participant groups (principals and assistant principals) and their responses is given below in Table 4.20. Responses of principals and assistant principals were coded in six different groups using the SPSS-19.0 statistical analysis program. The six groups are as follows: (1) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the positive response category only; (2) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the negative response category only; (3) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the other response category only; (4) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the positive response categories; (5) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the other response categories; and (6) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the positive response and the other response categories. No respondent gave a reason that could be categorized under the three

main categories (“positive response category,” “negative response category,” and “other response category”) at the same time.

Table 4.20

Cross-tabulation of Principals& Assistant Principals and Their Responses (N: 646)

Participant Group	Responses									
	Positive	Negative	Other	Positive & Negative	Positive & Other	Negative & Other	Total	$\chi 2$	*df*	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Assistant Principals	69	209	44	29	0	2	353	14.146[a]	5	.015
Residual	(-7.5)	(17.2)	(.8)	(-6.5)	(-1.6)	(-2.4)				
% Within Group	19.5	59.2	12.5	8.2	.0	.6	100			
Principals	71	142	35	36	3	6	293			
Residual	(7.5)	(-17.2)	(-.8)	(6.5)	(1.6)	(2.4)				
% Within Group	24.2	48.5	11.9	12.3	1.0	2.0	100			
Total	140	351	79	65	3	8	646			
% Within Group	21.7	54.3	12.2	10.1	.5	1.2	100			
Total	71	141	35	36	3	6	292			
% Within Response	100	100	100	100	100	100	100			

[a] 4 cells (33.33 %) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.36.

353 assistant principals and 293 principals were included in the above table. The responses of 17 principals and 18 assistant principals were not tabulated since they gave either “NA- Non-Applicable” type of response, or because their responses were missing. Residual values that show the difference between “expected count” and “the real count” (“expected count” minus “real count) are given in parenthesis.

The probability of the Chi-square test statistic (χ^2=14.146, *df* =5, *p* = .015) was p=0.015, smaller than the alpha level of significance of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers is rejected. In other words, the analysis results support the finding that there is a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing.

However, 4 of 12 cells (33.33%) have an expected value less than 5. This is more than 20 percent exception allowed for tables larger than 2x2 (Sirkin, 2006). Nonetheless, Weiner (2003) states, "Except some applications of chi-square, inadequate expected frequencies do not lead to increase in Type I error but rather to reduction in power, which can be notable as expected frequencies for two-way associations drop below 5 in some cells." The usual response would be to redo the analysis after deleting a category (George & Malery, 2009). This will reduce the number of cells "as long as care is taken to delete only variables that are not associated with the remaining ones" (Milligan, 1980).

The category that has the smallest number of frequencies was deleted in the second round of the analysis. This category included respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the positive response and the other response categories. After this modification, a chi-square analysis was conducted using SPSS 19.0. The cross-tabulation is given below in Table 4.21. There are five different groups this time in this analysis. These groups are as follows: (1) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the positive response category only; (2) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the negative response category only,; (3) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under the other response category

only; (4) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the positive response categories; and (5) Respondents who gave reasons that were categorized under both the negative response and the other response categories. No respondent gave a reason that could be categorized under the three main categories ("positive response category," "negative positive response category," and "other positive response category") at the same time.

Table 4.21

Cross-tabulation of Principals & Assistant Principals and Their Responses (N: 643)

Participant Group	Responses								
	Positive	Negative		Positive & Negative	Negative & Other	Total	χ2	*df*	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Assistant Principals	69	209	44	29	2	353	10.525[a]	4	.032
Residual	(-7.9)	(16.3)	(.6)	(-6.7)	(-2.4)				
% Within Group	19.5	59.2	12.5	8.2	.6	100			
Principals	71	142	35	36	6	293			
Residual	(7.9)	(-16.3)	(-.6)	(6.7)	(2.4)				
% Within Group	24.5	49.0	12.1	12.4	2.1	100			
Total	140	351	79	65	8	642			
% Within Group	21.7	54.3	12.2	10.1	1.2	100			

[a] 2 cells (20.00 %) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.61.

The p value of the chi-square test statistic was p=0.032 (χ^2=10.525, *df* =4, *p* = .032). This result is smaller than the alpha level of significance of 0.05. Again, the analysis results support that there is a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing. 2 of 10cells (20.0%) have an expected

value less than 5. This satisfies the 20% exception allowed for tables larger than 2x2 (Sirkin, 2006).

This result means that assistant principals tended to have more negative beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it influences parents, teachers, and students than the expected rate, while principals tended to have more positive beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing than the expected rate.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

The final chapter of the study is organized to provide a summary of the research, findings, discussions, limitations and implications of the study, and conclusions. The chapter is organized into the following five sections: (1) summary, (2) findings, (3) discussions, (4) limitations, and (5) Conclusions.

Summary

The purpose of the study is to examine principals' and assistant principals' beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it influences parents, teachers, and students. Currently, as a requirement by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, almost all of the states administer statewide high-stakes tests to measure student performance as a part of their accountability systems. Federal funding is directly tied to performance on high-stakes tests. As a part of their accountability system, states also rank schools and assign them achievement labels/ratings. The poor performing schools are subject to certain sanctions, which create pressure on the school community. As the leaders of their schools, principals and assistant principals feel direct pressure as a result of NCLB requirements and high-stakes testing. In addition, the NCLB Act holds the school principal legislatively "accountable" for their school's student academic achievement in relation to such assessments.

Current literature suggests that principals are the instructional leaders of their schools (Lashway, 2000), and that they have important direct and indirect effects on the school outcomes (Findley and Findley, 1992; Day, 2007; Leithwood, 2005). Leithwood and Wahlstrom (2008) points out that the effects of local school leaders on student outcomes are considerably palpable.

Principals have an influence on student learning (Hallinger & Heck, 1996); therefore, their perceptions of high-stakes testing are also vital.

Archived data, which was collected through face-to-face interviews, was used in this study. Interviews were conducted by Masters of Education program students enrolled in an Educational Leadership Department within the College of Education of a large research university in the Gulf Coast region of Southeast Texas. Participants of this study included two groups of school administrators from different school settings in the same large metropolitan area (310 principals and 371 assistant principals). The population of principals consists of 183 female and 127 male principals. The demographic breakdown of respondents in this group is as follows: White (66%), African-American (21%), Hispanic (12%), and Asian (1%). Participants' average years of experience in the principalship position is 7.3 years, and their average years of experience in education is 22.5 years. The population of assistant principals consists of 258 females and 113 males. The ethnic breakdown of this group is as follows: White (51.8%), African-American (25.3%), Hispanic (18.9%), Asian (1.9%), and other (2.2%). Participants' average years spent in education is 16.1, and their average years of experience as assistant principals are 5.0 years.

The survey instrument, which was developed by a professor with a group of principals and Masters of Education program students in Educational Leadership Department at College of Education of a large research university, included three main sections: Section 1 includes 22 items for administrators' background information and school demographics: Section 2 includes 62 Likert-scale items and section 3 consists of 31 open-ended questions: a the cognitive interview technique was used in section 3. This study focuses on the responses of participants to the one of the open-ended questions in section 3. The question focused respondents' beliefs of

how high–stakes testing influences their role as administrators, and how it influences teachers, parents, and students. Data collection took more than one and a half years.

This study was conducted using a mixed methods approach to (a) analyze principals and assistant principals' beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers; and (b) to determine whether there is a statistically significant relationship between certain factors such as school demographics, administrators' characteristics, and a school's success level, and administrators' beliefs regarding high-stake testing; and (c) determine if there is a statistically significant difference between principals' and assistant principals' beliefs regarding the impact of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers.

Findings and Discussions

Findings and discussions of the study will be presented for three different sections: (1) Research Questions One and Two, (2) Research Questions Three and Four, and (3) Research Question Five.

Research Questions One and Two

Research Questions One and Two that guided this study were about principals' and assistant principals' beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers. According to the reasons given in their responses, both principals and assistant principals' responses were categorized under the following three main groups: (1) positive responses, (2) negative responses, or (3) other responses.

In both groups of participants, negative responses outnumbered the positive ones. Negative responses comprised 53.3 percent of all of principals' responses compared to the positive response percentage of 33.9. A similar pattern reoccurs in assistant principals' responses - 62.5 percent of negative response percentage outweighs the 25.7 percent of positive response percentage.

Another important finding of this study is the identification of categories of reasons that lead to negative or positive responses to the question asked in the survey. Themes that emerged from responses in each of the main three categories were identified and placed into subcategories.

Four sub-categories emerged from principals' and assistant principals' positive responses. These subcategories include the identification that high-stakes testing (1) "Creates High Standards/Expectations," (2) "Creates Accountability," (3) "Creates More Focus and Sensitivity on Academics," and "Other Positive Responses." The other positive responses falling outside of these three main themes were categorized in yet a fourth sub-category: "Other Positive Responses."

The first subcategory of positive responses include statements stating that high-stakes testing creates high standards by increasing the level of teaching and instruction, and by setting high expectations and clear standards for all students. Such testing brings more responsibility and forces everyone to become more successful. Additionally, this creates more academic responsibility for administrators and holding them to a higher standard, thus yielding academic improvement. Teachers and administrators are afforded an opportunity to measure effectiveness and offer guidance for improvement, and ultimately creating a vision for school improvement. Because of the requirements, all stakeholders are forced to collaborate more in their quest

towards success. Furthermore, these restraints challenge administrators to provide the necessary and required resources to the teachers to ensure their overall success as well. Schools provide additional assistance to those students who have been defined as at-risk. Finally, such mandates increase professional standards by replacing ineffective teachers with those who will ensure student success.

Statements categorized in the second subcategory mention that high-stakes testing creates accountability for all, which helps increase the quality of education, helps teachers and administrators work smarter, and makes them more supportive toward one another. It was also mentioned that the external accountability created by high-stakes testing was a much-needed addition to the American education system.

Third subcategory of positive responses includes statements expressing that high-stakes testing creates more focus and sensitivity on academics. This happens because high-stakes-testing forces everyone to focus on data analysis, program development for failing students, and creates an increased focus on curriculum. Hence, administrators are forced to monitor the delivery of instruction much more closely. An unintended yet natural result of the increased administrator involvement with the actual curriculum and instruction delivered in the classroom is the development of administrators as curriculum leaders. By increasing their presence at the classroom level, administrators can directly understand the level of instruction being presented to the students. Teachers are provided important feedback that can be used to improve teaching, guide curriculum, set performance expectations for students and teachers and engage teachers in self-improvement. It was expressed in statements that high-stakes testing shows parent and student what needs to be learned. In addition, high-stakes testing makes administrators and

teachers more data conscious, which helps them review the data, figure out weaknesses, and develop strategies to combat identified weaknesses.

The last subcategory of positive responses was the group of responses that do not fall under one of the aforementioned three subcategories of positive responses. These were categorized as “other positive responses.” This subcategory includes responses stating that high-stakes testing is good because it brings additional funds to the school or provides valuable information. Some of the responses in this subcategory include statements stating that it is good or valuable but do not give further information about why or how.

There were four sub-categories that emerged from principals’ and assistant principals’ negative responses. These categories identified as high-stakes testing (1) “Creates Pressure and Stress,” (2) “Creates Negative Effects on Curriculum and Teaching,” (3) “Too Much Time and Effort Spent on Testing,” and (4) “Other Negative Responses.” The other negative responses that do not fall into one of these three main themes were categorized in a fourth sub-category titled “Other Negative Responses.”

The first subcategory of negative responses includes statements mentioning that high-stakes testing creates pressure and stress on everyone. For instance, as denoted in by respondents, teachers and students become burned out, and teachers can't teach other things because they spend a lot of time dealing with the rising levels of stress. Also, demoralized teachers have turned schools into boring environments. The second subcategory of negative responses includes statements saying that high-stakes testing has negative effects on curriculum and teaching. It was said that high-stakes testing affected curriculum and teaching negatively by narrowing down the scope of curriculum and removing the fun and creativity from classrooms. It was stated that the focus changed – namely, instruction is now designed around what is being

tested. Teachers are teaching the test, which has turned schools into boring environments by placing too much priority in certain studies and ignoring others. Also, it has led to the elimination of excellent programs (e.g., arts, sports, music, projects, etc.) in order to concentrate on the pursuit of a higher academic excellence rating.

Statements from principals and assistant principals that were categorized under the third negative subcategory say that too much time and effort is spent on testing. It was said that it takes a great deal of instructional time away from teachers. Teachers have spent too much time with test prep materials and teaching to the test. Mock tests take too much time. Administrators spend too much time looking at data and dealing with the paperwork. The other negative responses that could not be categorized in previous three subcategories were categorized in the fourth and final subcategory, which is titled "other negative responses."

In addition, a number of trends were identified regarding the frequencies of subcategories that emerged from the positive and negative responses of principals and assistant principals. First, that high-stakes testing "creates high standards/expectations" subcategory comprised 32.5 percent of principals and 40.8 percent assistant principals' for their positive responses. This is the most frequently cited reason for both principals and assistant principals in regard to their positive responses. Similarly, the majority (51.2 percent of principals and 45.5 percent of assistant principals) of reasons given for the negative responses were categorized under the subcategory "the high-stakes testing creates pressure/stress." In other words, that "high-stakes testing creates stress and pressure" is the most cited reason for principals' and assistant principals' negative responses.

Another interesting finding is that the majority of principals and assistant principals were inclined to give only one reason for their responses to the question regarding the influence of

high-stakes testing. Normally, because of the open-ended nature of the survey question, there was no limitation on the number and nature of reasons that could be mentioned. However, as shown in analysis of complexity of responses listed in chapter four, 199 of 293 principals (67.9 %) and 264 of 353 (74.8%) assistant principals preferred to give only one reason for their responses. The reason for this might be their confident beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing. Future research might be useful to explore the reasons of principals' and assistant principals' tendencies to give only one reason for their responses to an open ended question.

Research Questions Three and Four

Research Question Three and Four explored whether a statistically significant difference exists between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and school's demographic factors, such as school level, urbanicity, socioeconomic status, a school's achievement level (accountability rating), and their (principals') characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience. Chi-square analysis results did yield statistically significant results in minority ratios of schools only. It was found that a statistically significant difference exists between the beliefs of principals and their schools' minority student ratios. In other words, principals of the schools having low minority student ratios tended to have fewer negative beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing than the expected rate. No significant difference was found for all the other cases (school level, urbanicity, minority ratios, socioeconomic status, a school's achievement level, and principals' characteristics such as gender, race, and the years of experience).

The chi-square analysis produced statistically significant results in gender, socioeconomic status, and minority student ratio categories for assistant principals. The findings indicated the existence of a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of assistant

principals regarding the influence of high-stake testing and the participants' gender. In fact, female assistant principals tended to have less negative beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it influences parents, teachers, and students than the expected rate, while male assistant principals tended to have more negative beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing. Further research is needed to explore the reasons for this tendency.

In addition, in the chi-square analysis, statistically significant differences were found between assistant principals' beliefs regarding high-stake testing and their school socioeconomic status (SES); assistant principals having a low SES student ratio tended to have more positive beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing than the expected rate. Findings also revealed a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of assistant principals and their school minority student ratios; assistant principals of the schools having low minority student ratio tended to have less negative beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing than the expected rate.

The reason for the decreased tendency towards negative beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing than the expected rate for principals and assistant principals of low minority student ratio schools would be they experience less pressure and stress as compared to the principals and assistant principals of high minority ratio schools. It is very well known that schools with a high minority student ratios struggle more in relation to high-stakes tests. According to Texas Education Agency's 2010 Academic Excellence Indicator (AEIS) Report, African American and Hispanic students have the lower passing percentages when compared to the other ethnic groups (Texas Education Association [TEA], 2010). When all tests are considered, the African-American student population attained passing percentages of 60 percent

and 66 percent in 2009 and 2010 respectively. The Hispanic student population attained a 65 percent passing rate in 2009, and 71 percent in 2010. On the other hand, test-passing rate for White student population was 84 percent in 2009, and 87 percent in 2010. As a further comparison, the Asian student population attained a 90 percent pass rate in 2009, and 93 percent in 2010. Since pressure and stress created by high-stakes testing was mentioned by principals and assistant principals as the major reason for their negative beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing, it is normal for principals and assistant principals of the schools having high minority student ratio to have display an increased level of negative beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing. Similarly, the reason for assistant principals of schools with low SES student ratios possess higher than expected rates of positive beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing, would be they do not feel the pressure and stress coming from high-stakes testing as much as the assistant principals of the schools having low SES student do.

Research Questions Five

Research Question Five examined whether a statistically significant difference between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it affects parents, students, and teachers. The chi-square analysis results show that a statistically significant difference exists between the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding the influence of high-stakes testing. In addition, assistant principals tended to have more negative beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing regarding their roles as administrators, and the manner in which it influences parents, teachers, and students than the expected rate, while principals tended to have more positive beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing.

Even though there is no explanation in their responses, the reason for assistant principals' tendency to have more negative beliefs regarding the influence of high stakes testing is likely because they are dealing with the issues most related with testing (e.g., dealing with teachers, tutorials, test scheduling, paperwork, etc.) when compared to principal. However, this is not supported by any analysis; therefore, further research is needed to explore the reasons of principals and assistant principals' tendencies regarding the influence of high-stakes testing.

Limitations

Since the interviewers were free to choose the principals and assistant principals whom they wanted to interview, the selection process of interviewees might cause some concerns about the representativeness of the group and the ability to generalize these findings. They might have wanted to contact principals whom they knew or the ones whom they could reach easily. This may create problems about the representativeness of the group. However, since there were many students who conducted interviews, and represented a variety of areas within the Gulf Coast area of Southeast Texas, the selected respondents represent the majority of the school districts within the region. Ninety-three graduate students interviewed 310 principals and 371 assistant principals from more than 20 private and charter schools, and 37 public school districts, which include the majority of the major school districts in that area. Thus, these factors decreases selection bias and increases the representativeness power of the selected group.

As another limitation, the number of participants in one category may limit the generalizability of the results to all geographic areas. In both groups (principals and assistant principals) few rural principals were represented when compared to the number of suburban and urban principals. Only 6.9 percent of the principals were from rural areas when compared to the 48.9 percent suburban and 44.3 percent urban areas principals sampled. Similarly, only 3.6

percent of assistant principals represented rural areas when compared to 43.9 percent of suburban and 52.5 percent of urban area assistant principals.

Another limitation is the way in which the open-ended question used in the study is constructed. The question asks participants how high-stakes testing influenced their role as administrators, and how it has influenced parents, students, and teachers. There are two parts in this question: (1) How high-stakes testing influenced their role as administrators and (2) How it has influenced parents, students, and teachers. In their responses, however, most of the respondents did not specify these two parts. Instead, they preferred to give a general answer regarding the influence of high-stakes testing on their roles as administrators and how it influences parents, students, and teachers. Separating these parts in the future with two different questions may provide more detailed information about participants' beliefs regarding how high-stakes testing influences different groups (i.e., administrators, students, teachers, and parents).

Implications

Findings of this study may provide valuable information for administrator preparation programs at universities and educational service centers. It is important for these administrator preparation programs to understand the real life challenges of the administrators in order to make adjustments to their programs. Specifically, it is important to know that, according to these findings, both principals and assistant principals have more negative beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing and administrators of schools having high SES student ratios and high minority ratios have tendency to have more negative beliefs than the others. Adjusting these administrator preparations programs by taking these findings into consideration would benefit future administrators.

In addition, the reasons identified in this study for principals' and assistant principals' positive and negative responses may inspire administrator preparation programs to make necessary adjustments. More specifically, with the implementation of high-stakes testing, the administrators are more involved with curriculum/instructional issues, and this requires increased preparation in regard to curriculum and instruction. Furthermore, since the stress and pressure created by high-stakes testing was identified as a major reason for administrators' negative beliefs regarding the influence of high-stakes testing, administrator preparation programs may focus on preparing candidates by equipping them with coping skills to combat pressure and stress created by high-stakes testing. Similarly, the findings of this study may provide valuable information for district and state-level administrators to help their administrators traverse the challenges of high-stakes testing. These findings contain benefits for current and prospective school administrators in understanding and managing the challenges of high-stakes testing as well. Lastly, the findings of the study may contribute to research literature in the area of the implications of high-stakes testing on principals and assistant principals.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study provides valuable information in understanding the beliefs of principals and assistant principals regarding high-stakes testing. Based on the findings of the study, there is also a need to further explore the reasons behind certain tendencies identified by this study. Exploring the reasons in relation to why principals' and assistant principals' beliefs are different, and why female assistant principals tended to have more negative beliefs than male assistant principals, would add valuable information to identified findings by this study. Further research in relation to the effects of socioeconomic status and minority student ratio of the

schools on the principals' and assistant principals' beliefs would provide valuable information to clarify the findings of this study as well.

References

Abrams, L. M. Madaus, G. F., & Pedulla, J. J. (2003). Views from the Classroom: Teachers' Opinions of Statewide Testing Programs. *Theory into Practice, 42,* (1) 18-29

Amrein, A. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2002). High-stakes testing, uncertainty, and student learning. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10* (18). Retrieved February 02, 2010, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n18/.

Amrein, A. L., & Berliner, D. C. (2002). *An Analysis of Some Unintended and Negative Consequences of High-Stakes Testing*. Retrieved October 10, 2010, from http://greatlakescenter.org/docs/early_research/pdf/H-S%20Analysis%20final.pdf

Berliner, D., & Biddle, B. (1995). *The manufactured crises.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Bekerin, D., & Dennett, J.L. (1993). The cognitive interview technique: Reviving the issues. *Applied Cognitive Psycology,* 7, 275-297.

Brown, D., Galassi, J. P., and Akos, P. 2004. School counselors' perceptions of the impact of high-stakes testing. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 31-39.

Clarke, M., & Madaus, G.F. (2001). *The Adverse Impact of High Stakes Testing on Minority Students: Evidence from 100 Years of Test Data.* Retrieved November 10, 2010, from http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED450183.pdf

Day, C., & Leithwood, K. (Eds.). (2007). *Successful principal leadership in times of change: An international perspective*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer

Dorn, S., (2007). *Accountability Frankenstein: Understanding and taming the monster*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Figlio D. N. & Lucas M. E. (2000). "Do High Grading Standards Affect Student Performance?" NBER Working Papers 7985, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Findley, B., & Findley D., (1992). Effective Schools: The role of the principal. *Contemprary Education, 63*, (2), 102-104.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2009). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. Pearson Allyn & Bacon.

Graham, P.A. (2005). *Schooling America: How the public schools meet the nation's changing needs.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gross, S. J., & Shapiro, J.P. (2002). *Toward ethically responsible leadership. In the changing world of school administration.* Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press.

Hallinger, P. H., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 32*, 5-44.

Haney, W. (2000). The myth of the Texas miracle in education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8* , 32.

Lashway, L. (2000). Developing instructional leaders. *ERIC Digest 160* (July), Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *44* (4), 496-529.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2005). What do we already know about educational leadership? In W. A. Firestone & C. Riehl (Eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership* (pp. 12-27). New York: Teachers College Press.

Leithwood, K., & Wahlstrom, K. L.(2008). *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 455-458.

Natriello, G., & Palas, A.M., (2000). *The development and impact of high stakes testing.* Paper presented at the Conference on Civil Rights Implications of High-Stakes Testing, sponsored by the Harvard Civil Rights Project, Teachers College, and Columbia Law School.

Ravitch, D. (2010). *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice Are Undermining Education*. New York: Basic Books.

Roderick, M., & Engel, M. (2001). The grasshopper and the ant: Motivational responses of low-achieving students to high-stakes testing. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 23* (3), 197-227.

Sirkin, R.M. (2006). *Statistics for the Social Sciences*. California: Sage Publications.

Stecher, B. M. Chapter 4: Consequences of large-scale, high-stakes testing on school and classroom practice. In *Making sense of test-based accountability in education,* ed. L.S. Hamilton, B.M. Stecher, and S.P. Klein, 79-100 . Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Texas Education Agency (2007). *2007 Accountability manual*. Retrieved March 05, 2010, from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2007/manual/index.html

Texas Education Agency (2010). *2010 Academic Excellence Indicator System(AEIS) Report*. Retrieved November 20, 2010, from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2010/state.html

Tuckman, B.W. (2000, May). The use of frequent testing to increase students' motivation to achieve. Paper presented at the 7th Workshop on Achievement and Task Motivation: An International Conference on Motivation, Leuven, Belgium.

Waxman, H. C., A. MacNeil, & Y. H. Lee. (2006, November). *Principals' perceptions of successful school leadership.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the University Council of Educational Administration, San Antonio, TX.

Weiner at al. (2003). *Handbook of psychology: Research methods in psychology.* Canada: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Willis, G. B. (1999). *Cognitive interviewing: A "How to" guide*. Retrieved December 10, 2009, from **http://appliedresearch.cancer.gov/areas/cognitive/interview.pdf**

APPENDIX A

Create School as Community Through Reflective Practice

University of Houston College of Education

COLLABORATION FOR LEARNING & LEADING

SECURITY CODE:

Graduate Student's Name

Section A:

Demographic Information

The Principal's name

Age in Years: ☐ 30 and Under ☐ 31-37 ☐ 38-45 ☐ 46-55 ☐ 56-62 ☐ Over 63

Sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female Years as a Principal Years in Education

Degrees Held: ☐ Bachelors ☐ Masters ☐ Doctorate

Management Certification Year

Institution

Ethnicity: ☐ White/Non-Hispanic ☐ Black/Non-Hispanic ☐ Hispanic ☐ Asian/Pacific Islander

☐ American Indian/Alaskan Native ☐ Non-Resident/International

Major teaching field

Extra-curricular activities directed while a teacher

The School's name

Location: Rural Suburban Urban The Grades in the school

Number of: Teachers Students

Percentage of students: White/Non-Hispanic Black/Non-Hispanic Hispanic
Asian/Pacific Islander American Indian/Alaskan Native
Non-Resident/International

Other certificated personnel Non-certificated personnel

TAKS Rating: Exemplary Recognized Acceptable Low performing

Percentage of students receiving free and reduced Lunch

Name of School District

Section B:

In this section we are trying to establish how principals conceptualize their notions of what makes a school a "good" school as opposed to a "fair or poor" school.

Much of the current educational leadership literature focuses on effective schools and more currently
how we develop our schools as community. The new nomenclature currently used is "good school."
How would you describe a good school?

For our purposes school culture is described as “What the school values.” How would you describe the culture of a good school?

Section C

We are trying to understand the importance of the relationship between the principal and the teachers.

Explain how the relationship between the principal and the teacher important for the school.

Describe what you think are the most critical feature for a successful working relationship between teacher and principal.

What do you do to create good relations with your teachers?

Do you look out for the personal welfare of your teachers? If so, how do you do it?

Section D

In this section we are trying to establish the attitudes beliefs and values that principals have with regard to teacher supervision.

What is the purpose of teacher supervision?

Do our assessment practices (TTAS, PDAS) really work? Do you believe that the process achieves the intended outcome? What do you believe are the outcomes?

Do you think that the principal is the best person in the school to do supervision? For example is there any value for a principal with no education or experience supervising a French language class.

When supervising teachers do you report on what you observe or do you consider other factors when writing your reports? Explain

Section E

We are trying to establish the understandings that principals have about leadership

Describe he difference between a “linear” leader contrasted to a critical thinker and systematic problem solver?

What do you believe are the most important characteristics of a good leader?

How would you describe yourself as a leader?

To what extent do you allow teachers to take risks to make the school better?

To what extent do you believe that teachers should be involved in leadership roles in your school?

Section F

We are trying to establish the understanding and value principals attach to the role of parental involvement in their student's education.

What do you believe is an appropriate and necessary level of parental involvement in the student's education? Explain.

What do you do to encourage and support parental involvement in their student's education?

When a parent asks you to change their student's teacher how do you react?
Check one category below

☐	I do so willingly
☐	I do so hesitatingly
☐	I do so begrudgingly
☐	I try my best to discourage it
☐	I resist their efforts to have a change

Explain your answer here:

Section G

In this section we are trying to establish the obstacles frustrations and changes principals are most concerned with

On a scale of **1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least**, rate the degree to which each of the following presents a feeling of frustration or being discouraged in being able to carry out your duties.

	1	2	3	4	5
Federal Bureaucracy					
State Bureaucracy					
School District Bureaucracy					
Lack of Money					
Lack of other resources					
Lack of parent involvement in the school					
Poor Preparation of Teachers					
Lack of Teacher Commitment					
Poor instruction of teachers					
Lack of parental involvement at home					
Lack of Student Motivation					
Poor basic skills of students					

On a scale of **1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least** rate the degree

to which each of the following presents a genuine obstacle or restriction that cause you the most concern as you try to carry out your duties as principal.

	1	2	3	4	5
Federal Bureaucracy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
State Bureaucracy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
School District Bureaucracy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of Money	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of other resources	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of parent involvement in the school	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor Preparation of Teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of Teacher Commitment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor instruction of teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of parental involvement at home	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of Student Motivation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor basic skills of students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

On a scale of **1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least** rate the following for the things that you would change to make you more enabled in your role as principal.

	1	2	3	4	5
Federal Bureaucracy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
State Bureaucracy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
School District Bureaucracy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of Money	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of other resources	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of parent involvement in the school	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor Preparation of Teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of Teacher Commitment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor instruction of teachers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Lack of parental involvement at home	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of Student Motivation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor basic skills of students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Section H

On a scale of **1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least** indicate the extent to which each of the following represents important knowledge you should have to be a successful principal.

	1	2	3	4	5
Knowledge of people	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Curriculum	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Law	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Fiscal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least indicate the extent to which each of the following represents important skills you should have to be a successful principal.

	1	2	3	4	5
Interpersonal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Communication	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Leadership	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Technical	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

On a scale of **1 to 5 with 5 being most and 1 being least** indicate the extent to which each of the following represents important attributes you should have to be a successful principal.

	1	2	3	4	5
Positive disposition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Visionary	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ethical Values	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Good Communicator	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Organizer	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Section I

We are trying to understand the importance of student behavior in the operation of the school

To what degree is student discipline an important aspect of a good school?

Explain

Do you know of teachers who rarely have student discipline problems?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, what is it that those teachers do that results in good student discipline.

Describe what it is that teachers' do that have poor student discipline.

Do you see a relationship between a teachers' classroom discipline and students' academic achievement?

Do you think that schools should teach "virtues" or "character?" Why or why not?
Do you have any formal programs in your school that focus on character education?

Section J

There is probably a lot of advice you could give to someone preparing to become a school principal but if there was one single piece of advice you could give what would advise.

Section K

How has the influence of high-stakes testing influenced your role as a principal?
How is it influenced teachers, parents, and students?

Section L

To what extent is the achievement gap a problem in your school? What efforts have you made to reduce achievement differences in school?

Section M

To what extent has technology make a difference in your school? How has it influenced teachers, counselors, and students? How has it influenced your role as principal?

Section N

Can you think of an example of research-generated knowledge which you found useful in some aspect of your job as principal?

If so please tell me about that knowledge.

All educators need access to new expert knowledge. What sources of information do you find most useful when looking for new professional ideas? On a scale of 1 to 10 (highest), how would you rate each of these types of information sources for the technical knowledge they provide:

a. Professional meetings of state or national education associations

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

b. Workshops

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

c. Professional Journals concerned with education

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

d. Professional Books concerned with education

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

e. Professional Bulletins from regional or national information sources

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

f. Professional Bulletins from district or state authorities

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

g. Newsletters from professional organizations

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

h. University or college courses that you attended for certification or a advanced degree

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

i. Internet

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9 ☐ 10

j. Other sources (please explain)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

On a scale of 1 to 10 (highest), how would you rate the quality of the educational research that you've read over the last year?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

What would it take for you to rate it a 10?

Submit Reset