2014

# Policy Without Purpose: The Misalignment of Policymakers' and Students' Perceptions of the Goals of Education

Carly Shannon Evans
*Cleveland State University*

POLICY WITHOUT PURPOSE: THE MISALIGNMENT OF POLICYMAKERS' AND

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GOALS OF EDUCATION


CARLY S. EVANS


Bachelor of Arts in English

Rutgers University

May 2003


Master of Arts in Education

Ursuline College

July 2006


Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSPHY IN URBAN EDUCATION: POLICY STUDIES

at the

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2014

We hereby approve the dissertation
of

**Carly Shannon Evans**

Candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy in Urban Education degree

This Dissertation has been approved for the
**Office of Doctoral Studies**,
College of Education and Human Services
and
**CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY**
College of Graduate Studies by

_____
Dissertation Chairperson: Anne M. Galletta, Ph.D.

Curriculum and Foundations_____
Department & Date

_____
Methodologist: Brian E. Harper, Ph.D.

Curriculum and Foundations _____
Department & Date

_____
Dr. Helen Liggett, Ph.D.

Urban Studies_____
Department & Date

_____
James R. Moore, Ph.D.

Teacher Education_____
Department & Date

_____
Paul Williams, Ph.D.

CASAL _____
Department & Date
**<u>October 23, 2014</u>**
Student's Date of Defense

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. Thank you--for every smile and every tear,

for every moment, every year. You've made me the woman I am today, and for that, I

am forever grateful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

**POLICY WITHOUT PURPOSE: THE MISALIGNMENT OF POLICYMAKERS'**

**AND STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GOALS OF EDUCATION**

**CARLY S. EVANS**

**ABSTRACT**

This dissertation focused on understanding high school students' perception of the goals of education as they relate to those of policymakers, as these perceptions have largely been absent in the dialogue of education reform and policy. These goals may compete with each other, as do broader educational goals, reflecting different societal views of the purpose of education. Understanding students' perception of the goals of education (as framed by the goals of policymakers) may provide greater insight into current policy, and serve as a compass in directing future reforms that is inclusive of all stakeholders involved in this complex system.

Using David F. Labaree's (1997a, 1997b, 2010) construct of the competing goals of education (democratic equality, social efficiency, and social mobility) as a theoretical framework, three research questions were examined through a quantitative design: to what extent do students identify with each of the competing goals of education? to what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to each of the competing goals of education? and to what extent do students' GPA and the competing goal with which students most strongly identify with predict membership in course of study?

This study employed $\chi^2$ analysis, multivariate dimension reduction factor and scale reliability, multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), and multinomial logistic regression as the statistical methods. Version 22.0 of Statistical Product and

Service Solutions (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. Survey results indicated that students most strongly identified with the goal of social efficiency, followed by the goals of district stakeholders, democratic equality and social mobility.  There was no statistically significant relationship between students' course of study and GPA, and the competing goals of education. The results from the multinomial logistic regression suggested statistically significant predictive values of social efficiency (positive) and district stakeholders (negative) for vocational programming, and a statistically significant predictive value of GPA for honors courses.

The study provides current and future policymakers and education reformers with an increased awareness of students' perception of the purpose of schooling, which may influence student performance in high school and may impact students' postsecondary opportunities.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## LIST OF TABLES

# LIST OF FIGURES

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Despite waivers and creative financing by way of public and private grant money, school districts continue to feel the unrelenting pressures of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and high stakes testing. In Ohio, recent legislation has increased teacher accountability, directly linking student achievement to teacher evaluation. Student achievement, based upon passage rates on high stakes test scores and Annual Measurable Objectives (Ohio's measure of Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP), along with student growth as measured by student performance on within-district and state assessments, now account for half of teacher evaluations; the other half is measured by administrators during classroom observations. Under the federal guidelines of NCLB, there has been a call for Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) and for new rigorous teacher evaluative measures, both at the state and local levels. Some new initiatives, such as the New Cleveland Education Plan (enacted July 2012), allow districts to terminate teachers who are rated "ineffective" for two consecutive years. Similarly, building and district ratings

under NCLB are also attached to student achievement. Poor performance ratings can result in schools and districts being labeled as *in need of improvement*, accompanied by stiff financial and administrative repercussions if progress is not made.

With language rooted in the voice of accountability terms, the discourse surrounding student success has seemingly been reduced to mere letters and acronyms, with an emphasis on AYP and HQT. Because student achievement test scores and teacher effectiveness are inherently embedded in the rhetoric of student success, the focus continues to be on *how* to improve test scores and district and school ratings. Some districts throughout the nation have looked to merit pay as a means to incentivize teachers to bolster student achievement (Grissom & Strunk, 2012). Implemented in varying degrees throughout the nation for well over 20 years, merit pay is not a new motivational strategy; however, the sustainability and equity of merit pay continue to be highly contested (Levin, 2011). Indeed, "the changes induced by accountability pressures corrupt the very purpose of schooling by causing practitioners to focus on the measure rather than on the goals of education" (Ravitch, 2010, p. 160).

Existing research points to instructional and motivational strategies in order to improve student achievement and teacher performance (Awan, Noureen, & Naz, 2011; Grissom & Strunk, 2012; Perry & Quaglia, 1993; Plucker & Quaglia, 1998; Senko, Hulleman, & Harackiewicz, 2011); however, remediating the problem of student underperformance may not lie solely in improving test scores at the student-teacher level. David Labaree (1997a, 1997b) suggests three competing goals of education: democratic equality, social efficiency and social mobility. Students' understanding of the purpose of

education and their relationship to the overall goals of education may therefore play a fundamental role in shaping their educational experience.

The existing frameworks used to understand student achievement under the umbrella of NCLB and subsequent waiver mandates create a fragmented picture of goal perception, purpose and attainment. That is, the conceptualization of student achievement is disjointed. Whereas achievement goal theory (Senko, Hulleman & Harackiewicz, 2011) and the self-system model (Green, Liem, Martin, Colmar, Marsh & McInerney, 2012) look to understand student motivation as it relates to achievement, aspirations look to motivate students and teachers to set and meet goals (Breen & Quaglia, 1991; Perry & Quaglia, 1993; Plucker & Quaglia, 1998). Developed from early achievement motivation work, achievement goal theory examines the adaptive and maladaptive responses of students when they are presented with achievement challenges (Senko et al., 2011). These responses are further analyzed by goal type: mastery goals and performance goals. The self-system model of motivational development examines the dynamic relationships between individuals' perception of self and context, engagement and outcomes (Green et al., 2012). Student achievement through an aspirations framework, on the other hand, places an emphasis on goal development from a shared belief system within a school or school district (Perry & Quaglia, 1993). What is problematic, however, is that the ultimate goal in education is pre-existing. This definitive goal has already been set by policymakers; state and local standards-based measures have already been prescribed. Ultimately, students and teachers are working to meet smaller goals to accomplish someone else's goal.

**Background**

Since the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
(ESEA) was signed in January 2002 as the No Child Left Behind Act, it has been
critically examined and heavily questioned by researchers and practitioners alike (Forte,
2010; Lagana-Riordan & Aguilar, 2009; Lee & Reeves, 2012). As with many top-down
mandates, NCLB outlined specific policy goals and objectives to be achieved by a 2014
deadline. According to Kraft and Furlong (2010), policy implementation depends on "the
development of the program's details to ensure that policy goals and objectives will be
attained" (p. 83); however, as the 2014 deadline has come and gone, many states are
responding to waivers and flexibility provisions extended to them as the goals of 100%
proficiency within NCLB was seemingly unattainable.

Educational policy can be understood from two directions: top-down and bottom-
up. The former implies an approach that requires state departments and local boards to
adopt federal mandates, whereas the latter implies policy initiatives that are consumer-
based and locally driven. In what David Labaree (2011a) refers to as a "marriage of the
standards movement and the civil rights movement" (p. 389), the No Child Left Behind
Act exemplifies a top-down policy approach to education reform at the national level.
Despite the considerable number of mechanisms in place to prevent unilateral top-down
approaches to making public policy (Kraft & Furlong, 2010), NCLB is one of the most
prominent pieces of top-down legislation in public policy and education reform. It is a
call for rigor and standardization of curriculum coupled with the decree to decrease social
inequality by way of increasing educational opportunity, although it can be argued that in
practice, it is by way of increasing educational accountability and decreasing opportunity.

This charge is not without its penalties, however, resulting in 44 states requesting "flexibility regarding specific requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in exchange for rigorous and comprehensive state-developed plans designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction" (U.S. Department of Education, 2013). True to the underlying economic framework of rational choice theory (Kraft & Furlong, 2010), NCLB can be viewed as a direct response to the nation's ability to respond to the implications of an ever-expanding global market. NCLB has been highly criticized for demanding unrealistic results in a seemingly impossible timeframe, without providing the funds to do so (Crum & Hellman, 2009; Dee, Jacob & Schwartz, 2013; Lee & Reeves, 2010; McDonnel, 2005; Mehta, 2013). Moreover, in his examination of the common core under NCLB mandates, James A. Beane (2013) cautions against "requiring anything of 'all' young people" (p. 6) as it has serious implications for what is in fact most salient for the success of students and for society as a whole. Indeed, the ubiquitous language of "all" in NCLB provides an impetus for a new conversation, one which focuses on the public good, and what is best for the good of the people. Moreover, it speaks to the dynamic shifting landscape of education as a public versus a private good.

David F. Labaree (1997a, 1997b, 2010) presents a construct of three competing goals for American education and posits that these goals are at the heart of educational conflicts at any given time. The first, democratic equality, suggests that schools should focus on the preparation of citizens; the second, social efficiency, suggests that schools' focus should be on training workers; and the third, social mobility, suggests that schools should focus on the preparation of individuals to compete within the existing

socioeconomic structures.  Each goal represents the educational perspective of different actors: the citizen (democratic equality), the taxpayer (social efficiency), and the consumer (social mobility).  Whereas education is seen as private good from the social mobility viewpoint, in the cases of democratic equality and social efficiency, education is seen as a public good.

According to Labaree, when one goal dominates the other two, the resulting education system is recognized by policymakers as being in crisis.  In his 1997 *How to Succeed in School without Really Trying*, Labaree submits that of these goals, "social mobility has emerged as the most influential factor in American education" (p. 19).  It continues to dominate the discourse and language, and thus its influence over practice and purpose.

Although there is much to be said about the education system, and what needs to be done to improve it, it is ultimately the students that need to do the work, to produce the desired measurable outcomes of so many stakeholders: higher test scores on standardized tests. To be sure, the responsibility to provide students with the necessary education to perform well on these tests lies with the teachers, schools, and districts, as they are the ones overtly penalized when these educational outcomes are not met. Despite numerous accountability measures and the potentially punitive consequences for failing to meet such measures, our nation continues to portray an image of one at risk of academic inferiority. Perhaps, then, policymakers need to look to the students to re-conceptualize outcome measures, and perhaps students need to understand that they are in school for more than simply producing proficient test scores. Students need to not only understand the purpose of education, but to feel that their sense of purpose of schooling is in synch

with that of the classroom teacher, school district, and policymakers. Understanding students' perception of the goals of education (as framed by the goals of policymakers) may provide insight as to how to best align all voices and visions involved in this complex system.

Presently, student motivation is heavily influenced by the social mobility goal or credentialism. In our current system of meritocracy and accountability, students are forced to concede to the goal of passing a test to get ahead. From the top down, districts and schools are faced with punitive measures for failing to attain goals set forth by state and federal policymakers. Teachers, then, concede to the goal of raising test scores and boosting building and district ratings, and in turn attempt to motivate and incentivize students to also concede to this same goal. Ravitch (2010) notes,

> Education is key to developing human capital. The nature of our education system…will affect not only our economy, but also our civic and cultural life. A democratic society cannot long sustain itself if its citizens are uninformed and indifferent about its history, its government, and the workings of its economy.
> (p. 223)

The goal here is to advance the individual and the individual's passing test score, rather than that of a collective good, or that of democratic equality or social efficiency. Ironically, although NCLB and the standards and accountability movements may have sought to establish equity throughout the nation's education delivery system, they have simultaneously created tension among researchers and advocacy groups for student subpopulations (e.g. minority students, students with disabilities, low income students, and English Language Learners), who hold differing views on what equitable education

looks like, how student achievement should be measured, and under what accountability system these students should be held (Cortiella, 2014; Harris, 2012; Martin, 2012; McLaughlin, 2010; Roach & Elliott, 2009). Moreover, this top-down meritocratic approach to reform is in opposition to the well-documented research on aspirations and student achievement (Breen & Quaglia, 1991; Perry & Quaglia, 1993; Plucker & Quaglia, 1998), as well as that of the learning organization, which promotes a shared vision and goal setting for the growth and success of organizations (Senge, 2006).

**Problem Statement**

As local, state and federal mandates push for an increase in student academic proficiency and greater teacher accountability, administrators and teachers are scrambling to find new incentives, motivational strategies, remedial programming and technology to enhance the learning experience for students both in and out of the classroom. Current literature suggests a relationship among student self-efficacy, attitudes toward school and motivation, and student performance (Green et al., 2012). However, the underlying problem for many educators still remains: how do teachers motivate students who are seemingly uninterested in school? This problem becomes increasingly difficult for high schools, which are faced with the challenge of ameliorating high drop rates, low graduation rates, and an overall decline in student performance on high stakes testing.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between student grade point average and course of study (e.g., tracked course of study such as special education classes, comprehensive classes, college preparatory classes and AP classes), and students' identification with the goal(s) of education as outlined by Labaree (1997a):

8

democratic equality, social efficiency, and social mobility. The following research questions and sub-questions directed this study:

1. To what extent do students identify with each of the competing goals of education?

   a. To what extent do students identify democratic equality as the goal of education?

   b. To what extent do students identify social efficiency as the goal of education?

   c. To what extent do students identify social mobility as the goal of education?

   d. To what extent do students identify district stakeholders' goals as the collective goal of education?

2. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to their identification with each of the competing goals of education?

   a. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of democratic equality?

   b. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of social efficiency?

   c. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of social mobility?

d. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goals of district stakeholders?

3. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and the competing goal with which students most strongly identify with predict membership in course of study?

   a. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of democratic equality as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

   b. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of social efficiency as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

   c. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of social mobility as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

   d. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of the collective goals of district stakeholders as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

**Significance of the Problem**

Just as existing literature is lacking in the area of students' perception of the purpose of education, students also seem to lack clarity of purpose for their education. If the ultimate goal set by local and state mandates is to achieve a predetermined level of proficiency, students are working to fulfill someone else's goal, the goal of social

mobility. Students' and teachers' perception of goals, however, do not align with Labaree's underlying alternative framework for the nation's educational system as it relates to democratic equality and social efficiency (Labaree 1997a, 1997b, 2010). Consumed by testing and what it means to have a high GPA, the discourse surrounding these educational goals is absent from the students' discourse of success.

One of the many suggested best practices for teachers is to clearly define the purpose of the lesson, so that students have a clear understanding of *Why am I learning this? Why are we doing this?* It is reasoned that if students have purpose, they will be more engaged and have a vested interest in the educational outcomes of the lesson. Ideally, the students' and teachers' learning goals should coincide. Following this line of thought, students should have a clear understanding of their overall purpose in school and should be working toward a mutually productive educational outcome. Their goal(s) of education should then align with, and/or reflect those of policymakers.

The researcher posits that the fundamental question is not simply one of student motivation, but a lack of students' understanding of the purpose of education. Without purpose and vision, one does not have a vested interest in pursuing or realizing a goal (Senge, 2006). Utilizing David Labaree (1997a, 1997b, 2010) as a theoretical framework to explore the historical competing goals of education (democratic equality, social efficiency and social mobility), through this study, the researcher hoped to examine students' perception of the goals of education in comparison to that of policymakers. The researcher suggests that as a consequence of top-down education reform efforts, our current education delivery system is grossly misaligned with its greatest stakeholders: the students. As noted by Moloney (2006), many citizens understand schooling to be a

common, shared experience.  In order to further the development of education reform and policies, it is important to conceptualize these experiences from the high school students' viewpoint.  The perception of current students may provide valuable input in this discourse.

**Limitations**

This study has two primary limitations: participant self-reporting and lack of homogeneity (non-normal distribution) of the variables GPA and the competing goals of education. The first limitation, participant self-reporting, may have impacted the representative level of its participants. Although the participant population is representative of the gender and race of the district, student course of study and grade point average are not proportionately represented.  The survey instrument may have allowed for the confounding of course selection.  Student participants had disproportionately high grade point averages (GPA), which may also be a reflection of student self-reporting via the survey.  While researchers rely on the accurate and honest responses of participants, the researcher cannot guarantee that participants answered honestly when asked their primary course of study or as to the accuracy of the self-reported.

The second limitation, lack of homogeneity (non-normal distribution) of the variables, violated the assumption of normality for the MANCOVA. The robustness of the statistical test allowed for it to be carried out (Mayers, 2013); however, due to the skewed variables, it was not possible for the researcher to compare means in a manner that was statistically significant. This limitation was addressed in this study using non-parametric *post hoc* analyses.

**Courses of Study**

      **Honors/AP**. Honors and Advanced Placement (AP) courses are the most academically rigorous courses offered at the high school where the data were collected. Due to their challenging curriculum, both Honors and AP courses are assigned a weighted grade contingent upon a semester grade of C or higher. In order to enroll in an Honor's level course, students and parents must submit an application to the guidance counselor at the time of scheduling. Students must demonstrate above-average achievement in the content area, and have completed prerequisite courses to enroll in AP courses. AP courses require students to work at a college freshman level and are designed to prepare students for the respective course's Advanced Placement Test. Select courses are offered at the AP level, and predominantly offered to seniors. Due to course offerings and student scheduling and preferences, students may take a mixture of Honors and AP courses throughout their high school career. Pertinent to this study, Honors English III is offered to juniors, which prepares students for senior level AP and Honors English courses.

      **College preparatory**. College Preparatory courses include activities that are designed to prepare students who plan to attend a four-year college after graduation. Although these courses are not as academically demanding as the Honors/AP courses, they are more demanding than Comprehensive courses, and require students to work more independently. According to the high school's 11th grade guidance counselor, there are more students enrolled in College Preparatory English courses than any other level (Table 1).

**Comprehensive courses**. Comprehensive courses include activities that are designed to prepare students who plan to enter the workforce or attend a junior or vocational college after graduation. Comprehensive courses may also include one co-taught section. Co-taught classes have a general education teacher (content area specialist) and special education teacher (intervention specialist) who work together to provide additional support for students with disabilities who are in their least restrictive environment, as well as general education students who are at-risk or below grade level in reading and/or writing.

**Special education**. Special education courses are only available to students who have been identified as having as having disability and are currently receiving special education services on an Individual Education Plan in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. These courses follow the curriculum guidelines of their general education counterparts at a pace that allows for specially designed instruction to meet the educational needs of students that learn best in a more restrictive environment. The average class size is eight, and capped at ten. Student placement in special education courses is a team-based decision, and made at the recommendation of the parent, the student, the intervention specialist, general education teacher(s), an administrator, and guidance counselor.

**Vocational programming**. In order for students to participate in vocational programming at the high school, students must first apply to the program during the tenth grade year. As tenth graders, all students attend an introductory assembly to the technical programs that are offered, followed by a voluntary field trip to explore the programs. Interested students must apply to the programs of choice (up to two), as well as interview

with program supervisors. The vocational program is part of a nine district consortium, and is a fairly competitive program. It includes college preparatory, tech prep, school-to-work, and other educational learning opportunities. The technical programming options include Auto Technologies and Mechanics, Culinary Arts, Business Academy, Early Childhood Education, Career Based Intervention, Environmental Education, Commercial Art, Hospitality & Food Service Careers, Computer-Aided Design, Interactive Media, Computer Networking & Electronics, Marketing, Construction Trades, Medical Career Technologies, Information Technology Programming, Medical Technologies, Cooperative Business Ed, Public Service Safety Academy, Performing Arts, and Audio & Video Production Arts. During their junior year, accepted students complete a half-day of technical programming at the respective site locations, and take additional required coursework (e.g. English Language Arts) at the high school during the remaining portion of the day. Students are not restricted to any particular level of English based on their vocational programming; rather, students are placed in courses that best meet their academic needs. The 11th grade assistant principal reported that during the 2013-2014 school year, 124 juniors (approximately one-third) were participating in vocational/technical programming.

**Online learning**. The high school also offers an online academy, which serves students on a continuum of academic abilities who have not been successful in the traditional high school setting. The online academy is housed in a repurposed elementary school that is adjacent to the high school. Students enrolled in the academy are still able to participate in all high school activities, including assemblies and extracurricular

activities. Upon meeting all high school requirements, students earn a regular high school diploma.

With rare exception, students are not considered candidates for attending the online academy prior to establishing at least one academic year at the high school. Students may be considered for the online academy for a variety of reasons. Students with significant credit deficiencies and those who learn more comfortably in an alternative setting are typical candidates for the academy. Students must be recommended for enrollment in the academy by parents, teachers and staff, and the student. This process is facilitated by the school guidance counselor.

Academy students attend either a morning or afternoon session. Students may be simultaneously enrolled in a vocational program, and many are employed, and receive work-study credits through the Career Based Intervention Program. While in the classroom, students complete a web-based curriculum, and are provided with assistance from certified teachers in English Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. An intervention specialist provides additional support and interventions for students receiving special education services. Academy students also have access to a guidance counselor and social worker. The 11th grade guidance counselor reported that during the 2013-2014 school year, 27 students were enrolled in the online learning academy.

Table 1

*English Course Enrollment, 2013-2014*

| Course | Number of Students Enrolled | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Honors English III | 53 | 19.3 |
| College Preparatory | 131 | 47.8 |
| Comprehensive | 82 | 29.9 |
| Special Education | 8 | 2.9 |

*Note.* As reported by 11th grade guidance counselor.

Figure 1

*Labaree Framework[a]*

| GOAL | PURPOSE | GOOD | ROLE | PERSPECTIVE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Democratic Equality** | Democratic society cannot persist unless we *prepare youth with equal care to take on the full responsibilities of citizenship in a competent manner* | public | prepare people for **political** roles | of the citizen |
| **Social Efficiency** | Economic well-being depends on our ability to *prepare the young to carry out useful economic roles with competence* | public | prepare workers to fill structurally necessary **market** roles | of the taxpayer |
| **Social Mobility** | Education is a commodity, whose only purpose is to *provide individual students with a competitive advantage in the struggle for desirable social positions* | private | prepare individual for successful competition for desirable **market** roles | of the individual educational consumer |

[a]Labaree, 1997a, 1997b

**CHAPTER II**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

The purpose of this chapter is to examine existing literature in education reform and policy as it pertains to student achievement, and develop the theoretical framework used to conceptualize the need for an understanding of high school students' perception of the goals of education as it relates to that of policymakers. First, the researcher will discuss student motivation and goal theory, which has been used to frame the discourse of student achievement in education research. Next, the researcher explains David Labaree's competing goals of education and their application to this study as a theoretical framework. This is followed by an overview of policymaking and education reform as conceptualized through Labaree's theoretical framework. Through this lens, the researcher discusses the prominence of the social mobility goal in education policy and reform. Finally, the researcher examines the influence of venture philanthropy on policymaking, and its impact on shaping the prevalence of the competing goals of education.

**Student Motivation**

In order to conceptualize student perception of purpose as it relates to the goals of education, it is important to examine the existing literature on student achievement and motivation. When one makes reference to "student goals," it is often associated with goal setting and motivation; however, a study of student goals and purpose as it relates to policymakers' goals of education is limited in the existing literature.

Sheridan and Williams (2011) note that one of the preconditions for goal attainment and knowledge acquisition is motivation to learn. Indeed, Anwar, Noureen and Naz (2011) posit that student motivation is one of the single, if not greatest challenges facing our current education system. Moreover, they suggest that it is such a critical component of student achievement, that lack of motivation is "a big hurdle in learning and a pertinent cause in the deterioration of education standards" (p.72). Similarly, much of the existing research is centered on student achievement as it relates to student motivation, goal theory, and best practices for teachers (Anwar et al., 2011; Breen & Quaglia, 1991; Plucker & Quaglia, 1998; Senko, Hulleman & Harackiewicz, 2011).

In their 2011 study, Anwar et al. examined and found a statistically significant relationship among student self-concept and self-perception, motivation, and achievement. In their study, the researchers employed a regression analysis, which indicated that approximately 37% of the variation in achievement in mathematics and 24% of the variation in achievement of English were accounted for by self-concept and achievement motivation. Additionally, the researchers examined the effects of self-concept in mathematics and English. Their results indicated a statistically significant

relationship between gender and self-concept that favored female students. The implications of the findings of this study strongly suggest the need for teachers to build students' academic self-concept, which in turn may foster growth in academic achievement, as well as highlight the need for teachers to utilize motivational strategies to increase academic achievement. Student academic self-concept is closely related to student perception of ability, which was studied by Senko, Hulleman and Harackiewicz (2011).

In 2011, Senko, Hulleman, and Harackiewicz explored the evolving theoretical framework of achievement goal theory, which is used to "understand students' adaptive and maladaptive responses to achievement challenges" (p. 27). Senko et al. note the differing theoretical approaches to this theory, which lead theorists to differentiate between mastery goals and performance goals. Accordingly, mastery goals refer to the development of an individual's competence, while performance goals refer to an individual's demonstration of competence by outperforming peers. At its core, achievement goal theory lends itself to understanding educational outcomes as they relate to students' perception of ability; however, there are two distinctions between goal frameworks. The first is whether ability is malleable (mastery goals) or fixed (performance goals); the second is how students define success and failure.

Students who pursue mastery goals perceive ability as a malleable trait, which can be developed by increasing effort. These students should enjoy challenges and face obstacles in a more positive manner. Students who pursue performance goals, on the other hand, perceive ability as a fixed trait. This outlook suggests that students with high

ability respond more positively to challenges, while their counterparts respond in a more negative, helpless manner (Senko et al., 2011).

The second difference between students who pursue mastery and performance goals is how they define success versus failure (Senko et al., 2011). Success as defined by performance goals necessitates the outperformance of peers, while the realization of success under a mastery goal necessitates one meeting either task-based or self-defined criteria.  Therefore, only a fraction of students can successfully attain a performance goal; however, in theory every student can attain a mastery goal.  When understood through the criteria set forth by NCLB and high-stakes testing, students pursue performance goals. Senko et al. (2011) provide comprehensive analyses of existing literature, as well as alternative views of performance goals. Specifically, they note the work of Dweck (1986 and 2003), who suggests that one of the critical elements of performance goals is the desire to demonstrate competence (as opposed to normative performance). Conversely, Senko et al. (2011) cite additional sources which support their own hypothesis that it is not the desire to demonstrate competence but the desire to outperform peers that is the defining characteristic of performance goals. In defining these two types of performance goals, the authors suggest that they may also produce different effects, and therefore yield conflicting or mixed research results.

Of the goal perspectives examined, however, Senko et al. (2011) were able to identify mastery goals as beneficial for two social outcomes. Their research findings suggest that the competitive nature of performance goals may undermine collaborative learning as well as increase students' tolerance for and engagement in cheating. Mastery goals were found to be beneficial for collaborative learning, which is promoted by the

democratic equality and social efficiency goals. The use of collaborative learning is a highly effective teaching practice and desired 21st century skill for the workforce (Bellanca & Brandt, 2010), but can be undermined by the competitive nature of the performance goals which are promoted by the social mobility goal.  Similarly, when confronted with the competitive aspect of performance goals, students' openness to cheating was increased. This suggests the need to outperform rather than learn, which is also emphasized by the social mobility goal. Although existing research points to performance stability associated with mastery goals and the implications of student competence perception on achievement, the standard by which students are expected to perform, and thus are measured, remains effectually unchanged.  That is, despite what empirically based research indicates, policymakers continue to require competence-based performance outcome measures to establish accountability systems in education.

Indeed, throughout their analyses, Senko et al. (2011) found many of the criticisms concerning the multiple goal perspectives to be largely unsupported, as much of the existing research provides mixed or conflicting results. This creates a roadblock of sorts for stakeholders in education as they look to research-based practices in goal theory and motivation to increase student achievement. This has prompted some researchers to explore models that include performance and mastery goals in beneficial combinations, resulting in an interactive model (positive interaction on an outcome), an additive model (positive main effects on an outcome), and a specialized model (unique effects on different outcomes) (Senko et al., 2011).[1]  Other research has examined achievement motives, goals, learning strategies and academic achievement, which further complicates

---

[1] While there implications for this research are great, for the purposes of this study, they will not be examined in depth.

goal theory (Diseth & Kobbeltvedt, 2010), as it suggests learning strategies play an important role in this framework.

Still other researchers have examined the dimensions of constructive competition in learning contexts as they relate to individual goals, shared goals, and goals of others (Sheridan & Williams, 2011). In their qualitative study, Sheridan and Williams (2011) examine the cultural and social phenomenon of constructive competition through Bronfenbrenner's ecological framework. They argue that "cooperation and competition exist simultaneously and are parallel motivations…in line with research based on multiple goal theory" (Sheridan & Williams, 2011, p. 148). They conclude that long-terms goals, which require maintaining both future and "here-and-now" perspectives, are important in constructive competitive situations, and that competitive situations may drive cooperation in learning situations.

While some researchers look to student self-perception and approaches to learning to better understand student motivation, others look at student aspirations. Aspirations, as defined by Perry and Quaglia (1993), refer to "specific personal educational, vocational, social and lifestyle goals in which people are willing to invest their personal resources to attain them" (p. 652). Through work at the National Center for Student Aspirations, aspirations have been further conceptualized to include two distinct facets: inspiration and ambitions (Plucker & Quaglia, 1998). Inspirations refer to one's "willingness to engage in activities in the present for both their inherent value and future worth" (p. 253) while ambitions reflect one's goal setting ability. The development of these two dimensions in students is supported by eight conditions: achievement,

belonging, curiosity, empowerment, excitement, mentoring, risk taking, and self-confidence.

Through this framework, student achievement, and moreover, the success of all individuals within the school community requires the school community to essentially buy into a shared belief system of aspirations (Breen & Quaglia, 1991; Plucker & Quaglia, 1998). This collaborated belief system should, in turn, become the foundation for goal setting and norms that apply to all members (Perry & Quaglia, 1993). A strong support system built of shared beliefs is one of several conditions that should foster educational reforms at the building and local levels. Senge (2006) posits that having a shared vision is "vital for the learning organization because it provides the focus and energy for learning" (p. 192). In order to have what he refers to as generative learning, or expanding one's ability to create, Senge suggests that it is necessary for an organization to have a shared vision. A shared vision, though, cannot be imposed; rather, it needs to be developed and agreed upon by the group to which it applies so that there is a true commitment to achieving the shared vision, and not simply a forced compliance to do so. Through the aspirations model and Senge's concept of shared vision, all actors in the education delivery system can be given voice and agency. This voice, however, is not necessarily heard nor acted upon by policymakers.

Moloney (2006) suggests that the voice of teachers is silenced in the NCLB discourse, which "leaves room for external authorities to frame and control the debate about school reform" (p. 19), which minimizes teachers' influence in defining the very terms by which they are held accountable. Similar to the notion expressed by Tyack and Cuban (1995), Moloney (2006) argues that many citizens feel qualified by virtue of the

shared experience of schooling, thus making them experts in matters of schooling and education reform. While many may take part in conversations about education, the results of the discourse by policymakers directly impact teachers. In her case study, Moloney (2006) explores teachers' self-perception and perception of teachers in what she refers to as the Era of No Child Left Behind by examining text in an online teaching forum. Through her analysis of the chat room text, Moloney reported that the phrase "highly qualified" was repeated 35 times by participants, and feelings resounded of being frustrated, ineffectual and silenced. Two main themes emerged, which she coded bodily knowledge and paper knowledge. Overwhelmingly, teachers noted their need to teach to the test, or paper knowledge, minimizing their ability to differentiate instruction and deliver bodily/visceral knowledge. Undoubtedly, teachers feel limited in the scope, selection, and overall purpose for which they deliver instruction beyond that which is measured by high-stakes testing.

In addition, such high-stakes tests have been challenged as they have arguably done little more than measure achievement gaps rather than close them by simply ignoring other external factors such as culture, family background, and socioeconomic status (Ravitch, 2014; Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003). Put simply by Thernstrom and Thernstrom (2003): "Culture matters—that which informs a school, and that which students bring to a school" (p. 83). While they note a cultural habit, such as the strong academic work ethic typically associated with Asians, is a culturally transferrable trait, other minority subgroups such as African Americans and Hispanics have not historically reaped the same benefits from education as Asians and Whites due to oppressive structural forces and disenfranchisement. Thus, certain groups may not hold education in

the same esteem, which would directly influence their approach to schooling and learning. Conversely, measuring students' achievement with standardized-tests, or what Ravitch (2014) refers to as "cultural products," does little more than reflect this outlook, socioeconomic status and family education.

Although the existing frameworks of achievement goal theory and student aspirations lend themselves well to understanding and potentially improving student self-concept and perception of ability, and thus student achievement, there are challenging conditions in the broader policy context. The American education delivery system seems to be failing in its efforts to meet the goals of policymakers. Regardless of literature that suggests otherwise, policymakers continue to equate student achievement with success as defined by performance goals, rather than mastery goals. Ironically, student achievement is supposed to be measured by demonstrating "mastery" of content standards on standardized tests.  Furthermore, due to the limitations that performance goals inherently place on the number of individuals able to experience success, it increases the competition among students and fosters learning-for-the-test rather than critical thinking, collaboration and other necessary 21$^{st}$ century skills (Bellanca & Brandt, 2010; Ravitch, 2014).  Moreover, external factors, such as culture, socioeconomic status and family background continue to be overlooked by the notions of competition and pushing both teachers and students harder.

The resulting competitive climate and meritocratic mentality provide the building blocks for the social mobility goal, which David Labaree (1997a, 1997b, 2010) argues has become the forerunner of the three competing goals of education. However, with the passive acknowledgement of the nation's failure to meet the NCLB proficiency deadline

in 2014 through waivers and grant monies, the goal of social efficiency is stealthily gaining momentum, and it is by way of these very waivers and funds that social efficiency is being promoted.

**Education Reform and Policy**

Separating what is essential to education from that which is habitually done in education is an extremely trying task for the American public school system.  Initially, the common school was designed to educate the masses with two Jeffersonian ideals at its core:  citizenry and staging (Labaree, 1997b).  The former was to provide each child with the democratic basics; the latter served as a means for identifying the potential aristocratic scholars that would move on to secondary schooling. While one function served to meet the goals of the democracy, the other promoted individual credentialism and social mobility and cultivated leaders at a time of nation building. Currently, our education system does not serve solely as a mechanism for educating; rather, it has been relegated to an all-encompassing system to meet the societal demand of doing it all:  to form moral citizens; to prepare students with the necessary basic skills to function in society; to instill character; to train the athlete; to develop globally conscious and competitive learners; to produce college bound and ready students, and so on, with all outcomes aligned to societal norms as dictated by the current accountability system. Because our school systems operate under this standard of "teach it all," society has in turn created the very conundrum of attempting to sift out that which is unnecessary, as we have deemed all of these to be an essential part of the American school experience (Friedman & Mandelbaum, 2011; Ravitch, 2010; Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

Indeed, little has changed. As early as the 1870s, the American school system was in a perceived state of crisis, as teachers were faced with the challenge of educating an influx of students hailing from heterogeneous backgrounds (Reese, 2011). Similar to those challenges faced by today's educators, the difficulties associated with meeting the needs of a disparate student population in a single classroom posed great hurdles for the common school teacher. For example, teachers in Cincinnati were forced to wrestle with the challenge of educating a mix of culturally and linguistically diverse immigrant children alongside the rural, Appalachian impoverished school children, who had little or no prior schooling, in graded classrooms. As the common school become more accessible, expectations of what it could do mounted. By the turn of the century, public schools were identified as a solution to the social ills plaguing the streets. Sought as a remediating strategy for the troublesome inhabitants of urban areas, public schools were seen as a mechanism for the democratizing of citizens (Sheller, 2011). In cities like Baltimore, public schools were viewed as idyllic in that,

> immune to the biases of class and religious affiliation, the public schools could draw out and reward the natural talents of its students. In this impartial institution, all could compete and achieve on terms not hindered by the artificialities of class and caste. (Sheller, 2011, p. 39)

While the U.S. was not yet ready to address the racial inequities in education at this time, public schools were nonetheless charged as leveling mechanisms to serve the public good. Within the walls of these public institutions, students were to be developed into democratic citizens and afforded the opportunities of competition and achievement, in an effort to produce individuals ready to contribute to the societal good—the work force.

Although sound in theory, historical realities prove a much more turbulent past that led to a tumultuous pattern of failed reform efforts that continue to pervade our current education system (Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Labaree, 2010; Ravitch, 2010; Rury, 2011).

**Labaree's Competing Goals of Education.** In order to understand the contemporary purposes of the American public schools, it is necessary to trace the history of the rationales and policies that led its formation. Although the focusing event for ESEA can be traced to the Department of Education's 1983 commissioned report *A Nation at Risk,* which painted a grim and foreboding picture of our nation's incapacity to compete in a global landscape, the competing goals of education have long been at odds, which has created and perpetuated an imbalance of, and thus a perceived crisis in the U.S. public schools. According to David Labaree (1997a, 1997b), schooling has been shaped by three competing goals of education: social efficiency, social mobility, and democratic equality. Labaree submits that the problems with American education stem from the political implications of varying perspectives on these three goals, rather than a pedagogical, cultural, social or organizational argument.

The first goal, democratic equality, manifests itself in three facets: citizenship training, equal treatment and equal access. Through the process of citizenship training, schools are seen as mechanisms for instilling a sense of civic virtue in an effort to ensure a sense of contributing to the greater good: the republic and the economy. *A Nation at Risk* speaks to both of these measures in its call to maintain and improve upon the Nation's "slim competitive edge we still retain in world markets" and the need to secure students' "chance to participate fully in our national life" by way of educational excellence (National Commission Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 7). The second

democratic objective of equal treatment was thought to be remediated through the common school's ability to foster a common culture and sense of inclusivity within a community. Similarly, this idea of nurturing a common culture via education is also echoed within *A Nation at Risk*. This sense of shared membership translates into schools' concept of universal education, and the removal of perceived inequalities in treatment as seen through the push for secular practices and civil rights. The final form of the democratic equality goal is equal access, which Labaree (1997a) suggests may have exerted the most power among the three forms of democratic equality. In tandem with the equal treatment, equal access has required a mass expansion of not only public schools, but the personnel and financial means to meet the ever-expansive student body.

While trying to meet the democratic needs of the republic, Americans have simultaneously tried to create a system that serves as a mechanism for preparing students to meet the demands of the marketplace though social efficiency. The second goal of education, social efficiency is operationalized in schools in what Labaree (1997a, 1997b) refers to as vocationalism and educational stratification. The vocationalism movement is perhaps most apparent in the early 20th century, when vocational programs were introduced in the high school setting to better prepare students that were entering the workforce directly out of high school so that they may more effectively contribute to the workforce and economy. Not unique to *A Nation at Risk*, the argument in favor of the social efficiency goal can be found in most every educational address made by political heads (Labaree, 1997b). While these programs offer a very practical education for students, they also contribute to the stratification of students, which can be seen in direct conflict to the ideals of the democratic equality goal. The second mechanism,

educational stratification is reinforced and justified through the social efficiency goal's emphasis on the collective good, an increase in human capital. Moreover, the resulting hierarchy within the school structure mirrors that of the job market, thus providing individuals with preparedness for the existing socioeconomic structure.

Whereas both the democratic equality and social efficiency goals see education as a public good that prepares individuals to contribute to the common good, the third goal, social mobility, considers schooling as a private good (Labaree, 1997a, 1997b, 2010). Social mobility provides individuals not with the skills, but with the credentials needed to get ahead. Here, the needs of the individual are put before that of the greater good. Inequality is inherent within this goal. The implications of stratification are magnified by the social mobility goal, as it requires some to be left behind in order for others to move ahead. The social mobility goal manifests itself in three ways: graded hierarchy, qualitative differences between institutions at each level, and a stratified structure of opportunities within each institution. Through the graded hierarchy, students' progress from kindergarten to high school in a pyramidal structure, with not everyone making it to high school graduation. Fewer still are those that are accepted and matriculate in college and beyond. To further delineate among students within this hierarchical structure, qualitative differences between institutions provide the educational consumer with a competitive edge. Through the ability to generate financial resources or refine reputations, public and private institutions at any level vie for students. Paradoxically, as institutions move to set themselves apart from one another, equalizing measures (e.g. equal access and treatment) are put into place to ensure that all individuals are afforded the same opportunity to succeed. Social mobility further manifests itself through the

stratification within each institution. For those at the lower end of the social structure, the potential for social mobility has the possibility of immense growth; for others, it is a matter of maintaining an elite status. It is those met with the most to lose, rather than those with the most to gain, who are most competitive and are ultimately met with greater opportunities for continued success (Labaree, 2010).

David Labaree suggests that among these three goals, social mobility has grown to exert the most force in the political arena, and thus in reform efforts and in the education marketplace (1997a, 2010). In opposition to what many educational consumers may view as the purpose of education, "through the lens of social mobility, students at all levels quickly come to the conclusion that what matters most is not the knowledge they learn in school but the credentials they acquire there" (Labaree, 1997, p. 55). Thus, while teachers struggle to meet the pedagogical, social, cultural, organizational and political demands of each stakeholder, their efforts may seem remiss to the primary consumer and stakeholder, the student.

**Current Crises.** In order to separate what one may consider as most essential to the education process from that which is dispensable, one must understand the charge of public education in context. That is, what may be crucial through the lens of one goal may be of little consequence through another. This is further complicated when the goals overlap, or in some instances, serve as agents among each other. More recently, social efficiency and social mobility have been in more direct conflict, while the push to develop citizens of the republic has fallen to the wayside (Beane, 2013; Labaree, 2011a; Ravitch, 2010, 2014). Through their demands of education as a public good, the

consumers (both parents and students) are perhaps some of the greatest stakeholders and actors shaping education reform today (Labaree, 2011a).

At the consumer level, parents are a primary stakeholder in education and education reform.  Rightfully so, most want the best educational experiences and opportunities made available to their children in order to ensure postsecondary success. Once again, the rigors associated with NCLB along with a competitive marketplace reinforce ideals of social mobility.  The caveat here is that while there is a call for an increase in parental involvement in both *A Nation at Risk* and NCLB, it does little to increase parental accountability beyond that. Policy making at any level becomes increasingly complicated when it garners the appearance of parenting instructions, thus, beyond the law pertaining to compulsory education and child welfare, parents are not directly held accountable for their child's academic success, nor are they punished for weak student performance (Ravitch, 2010). Similarly, student accountability measures, which vary from state to state, have not historically rewarded nor penalized students for their performance on high stakes testing on an annual basis.

Over the course of the last decade, however, there has been an increase in the number of states that have incorporated passage of high-stakes testing at the high school level into graduation requirements.  In a critique of such policy, a 2010 *New York Times* article noted that 26 states had adopted state graduation requirements that included the passage of statewide high school exams; however, the standards by which these tests are created and scored vary from state to state, as do the number of testing attempts and alternative diploma options (Urbina, 2010).  This has left many students, especially those in subgroups, in a precarious position as they have been able to progress through the

33

eighth grade without ever having passed a standards-based test.  More recently states

have adopted what are known as third grade reading policies, which require students to

be proficient in reading, demonstrate reading proficiency by meeting a defined literary

benchmark, or meet scoring criteria on a state-wide reading exam in order to advance to

the fourth grade (Rose, 2012). Fourteen states and the District of Columbia have reading

policies in effect similar to Ohio's Third Grade Reading Guarantee (Ohio Department of

Education, 2013; Rose, 2012). While the effectiveness of these newly implemented

policies has yet to be seen, they will most certainly not benefit current students in grades

four and higher facing high-stakes testing.

It can be argued that because common schooling is one of the few experiences

that all Americans have shared, many feel indoctrinated by this experience, and thusly,

have gained honorary expertise in education, its reforms and policies (Moloney, 2006;

Ravitch, 2011; Reese, 2011; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Often times, however, recollections

of these common experiences are clouded by an air of nostalgia, leading parents,

policymakers and educators alike to believe that the present education system is in

eminent doom compared to the schooling of yesteryear, that it is in the midst of a crisis

that must be corrected—not for the sake of the children, but for the overall economic

well-being of the country (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). In their haste to blame the current

education delivery system for failing to remediate the country's lack of morals, students'

lack of respect and proper home training, economic woes, and social injustices, while

demanding the bolstering of student achievement, many fail to recognize that although

the social ills of the 1870s may present themselves differently in the 21$^{st}$ century, the very

same challenges still exist (Friedman & Mandelbaum, 2011; Ravitch, 2010; Reese, 2011;

Tyack & Cuban, 1995). The feelings of fear associated with losing our international competitive edge by virtue of an economic downturn due to a lack of prepared workers that have resonated with policymakers and education reformers for decades, came to a precipice in the 1983 commissioned report *A Nation at Risk.*

To be sure, *A Nation at Risk* served as a catalyst for NCLB; however, it can be argued that NCLB was not a radical departure from educational policies at that time, but one that is indicative of the evolution toward increased school accountability of longstanding policies, specifically Title I of the ESEA of 1965 (McDonnel, 2005). Undoubtedly, the implementation of NCLB marked an increase in the role of the federal government in the realm of public education, followed by a shift in the dynamics of the relationship between policies and interest (McDonnel, 2005) and the paradigm shift of education reform that resulted in a restructuring of the political landscape (Mehta, 2013).

It may also be argued, however, that the standards and accountability movements that followed *A Nation at Risk* presented a shift in focus from inputs, such as resources and equal access, to quantifiable outcomes. As Rebell and Wolff (2008) note, NCLB expands the "equity imperatives of Title I and combines them with educational reforms emerging from the state standards movement into a potent package that promises…equal educational opportunity and universal student proficiency" (p. 203), yet years after its enactment, has failed to do so. Inherently flawed in its mission, NCLB was primed for failure through its unrealistic expectation of 100% student proficiency by 2014. In an attempt to reconcile inequities in educational access and opportunity, legislators seemingly ignored fundamental societal contributing factors, like poverty and race, which only exacerbated the magnitude of achievement gaps for many (Martin, 2012; Rebell &

Wolff, 2008). This is due in part to a shift in focus, one that "mainly concentrates on accountability for results but largely neglects the resources and supports that students need to achieve those results" (Rebell and Wolff, 2008, p. 206). While both opportunity and proficiency are addressed in the primary purposes of NCLB, Rebell and Wolff suggest that the law's provisions largely ignore the former and place a disproportionate emphasis on the latter, which manifests itself as accountability. According to Rebell and Wolff (2008), "[m]andates and motivation will not result in significant reductions in the achievement gaps, let alone in full proficiency if meaningful educational opportunities are not first provided" (p. 206). As posited earlier, attempting to motivate students to achieve preset goals, performance or mastery, is not enough to increase student achievement or decrease achievement gaps. Students must have meaningful educational opportunities; they must have purpose.

The transformative force of *A Nation at Risk* extends beyond input and output analyses.  As Mehta (2013) posits, the paradigmatic shifts in education following *A Nation at Risk* reshaped politics and the subsequent changes to education policy and reform. The paradigm, "crystallized" by *A Nation at Risk*, "holds that educational success is central to national, state, and individual economic success" (Mehta, 2013, p. 286). By reframing the problem definition of education, adjusting the problem to include all students, not just the impoverished, and substantiating the dependency of the nation's economic well-being on the education policy, education reform found broad support (Mehta, 2013; Tenam-Zemach & Flynn, 2011). By making a direct connection between education and economics, education came into the purview of many outside actors, including non-profits, venture philanthropists, private businesses, textbook companies

and foundations.   While their agendas may have been different, both Republicans (skilled competitiveness) and Democrats (competitive equity) found a mutual agreement in the establishment of standards and accountability to meet future economic needs. Unlike previous reforms, however, the vision of schooling has become slighted by the standards and accountability movements, and the reach is extending into practice through narrowed curriculums and teaching to the test.

The standards-based movement, a state-led initiative, garnered support in the early 1990s, well before it was required by NCLB in 2001 (Mehta, 2013). By 1994, 42 states had adopted some form of standards.  Led by Democrats at the state level, the standards movement sought a state core curriculum to ensure that all students, despite locality, received the same level of education. This was not met favorably by conservatives, who felt it was infringing on local control; however, some measure of accountability was necessary to for state and national economic success. The accountability movement, led by Republicans, followed later in the 1990s. Their accountability was dual-fold; not only did provide a quantifiable comparative basis to measure students against themselves and their foreign counterparts (with whom we are globally competing in the marketplace), but it forced schools and teachers to make needed changes.

This paradigmatic shift in the 1990s paved the way for legislation like Bush's *America 2000: An Education Strategy* (which did receive congressional support), Clinton's *Goals 2000,* and the ESEA's reauthorization (Improving America's Schools Act), and ushered in the adoption of NCLB. NCLB was able to satisfy both political ends, and simultaneously allowed for states to maintain control via state standards, while

demanding greater accountability to the federal government and allowing for an

expanded role of the federal government (Kessinger, 2011; Mehta, 2013).

This education reform emphasizing school accountability serves as the voice of,

and thus the mechanism by which the private interests of groups (e.g. political groups,

venture philanthropists) and individuals (e.g. parents, families) can be realized. This is

closely mirrored by the underlying motives of social mobility. That is, NCLB is a means

that allows for the promotion of the self, for all stakeholders.  Although the broad

language of NCLB and its emphasis on achievement of proficiency for subgroups pushes

an agenda that speaks to the need for social efficiency and democratic equality (the

mandate's namesake), the manner in which this is measured and thus achieved is through

standardized test scores and individual academic achievement, or social mobility. So,

while the ultimate goal of NCLB may be to promote equality along with the preparation

of workers entering the workforce, a clear delineation exists between the type of good

that is responsible for such preparation (i.e. public versus private) and the market role that

these workers will fulfill (Labaree, 2011a, b). Whereas social efficiency is a public good

that prepares workers to fill necessary market roles; social mobility is a private good that

prepares the individual for successful competition for desirable market roles.  In the

former, the perspective is that of taxpayer, which can be either an individual or business.

In the latter, the perspective is that of the educational consumer. Here, it is clear that

rhetoric plays a significant role in not only the formation and implementation of NCLB,

but in policy making in general.  According to Mehta (2013), "[p]aradigms can shift the

direction and boundaries of debate, which actors are involved, and ultimately can provide

the impetus for institutional transformation" (p.287).

Indeed, some have heard the echoes of social mobility laced within the call for improving the quality of schools, and have recognized that the pursuit for excellence may compromise the educational equity that civil rights activists have fought for decades to achieve (Rebell & Wolff, 2008). That is, as the outcome requirements continue to increase (accountability), they are not met by an increase in inputs or resources, thus contributing to the achievement gap. At odds here are the goals of democratic equality and social mobility, with social mobility taking precedence. Furthermore, in the measurement of these standards, students need only demonstrate proficiency in academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading and science, which are markedly limited, compared to what one needs to contribute to society as outlined by the democratic equality and social efficiency goals. Moreover, this reductionist approach to standardization and accountability fails to provide a meaningful educational opportunity (Wolff & Rebell, 2008), and thus falls short of presenting students with purpose in their educational endeavors.

**Reform Rhetoric.** Examining the language used in No Child Left Behind in comparison to that of more recent legislation, including Ohio's 2001 Achieve More Plan, Ohio's 2013 Achievement Everywhere, and the Common Core movement, highlights the implications of such institutional transformation measures. At minimum, each reform effort provides a rationale, targets a population or subgroup, and makes assertions of performance indicators.

The rationale for the reform presented in *A Nation at Risk* and was the lack of student performance, especially on international comparative tests. This report provided a strong foundation for the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Interestingly, while the

language in NCLB points to student deficits, the recommendations for remedying them focus on schools, rather than students. Moreover, it targets subgroups as generalized minority populations to close achievement gaps. Together, this language seemingly places the immediate consumer in the background, and the reification of achievement in the foreground. Contrary to NCLB's mission to provide and thus require the same of all students, districts like Washington D.C. that have student populations comprised largely of historically low performing student subgroups, end up being left behind (Martin, 2012). Martin (2012) argues that the importance placed on accountability measures overshadows a greater problem, and suggests that "the misuse of test scores exemplifies what could be a general tendency to gloss over contextual factors that underlie our inequities rather than address them" (p. 7).

Within NCLB the funding language is very loose and punitive: those in leadership roles may be penalized or rewarded as the policy provides a reward/consequence program. Because of this vague language, the ensuing initiatives become open to interpretation that varies among states. Here, the primary stakeholders are states (funding) and parents (choice); however, the greatest impact is felt at the local level. The policy demands accountability measures be adopted (standards & testing) and makes a call for school safety; however, this is seldom recognized. Teachers are held accountable for this policy but are provided with very little tools and guidance.

In 2001, Governor Taft of Ohio convened the state's Commission on Teaching Success to develop what was known as the *Achieve More Plan* (Ohio, 2003). This top-down (state to local) state initiative was centered on best teaching practices with recommendations and suggestions. The impetus for the Plan was the decreasing student

performance in Ohio; specifically it targeted subgroups that are impacted most in Ohio as they related to demographic shifts. The language in the Plan focused on the success of students and included minimal funding language, with a strong emphasis on school and administrative leadership. Unlike NCLB, this document provided specific recommendations for educators with practical implications. It addresses stakeholders at the community, local and state level. Accountability measures were more dynamic, and stood to be redefined with suggestions and some direction, along with a strong teacher preparation and professional development component.

Kasich's 2013 *Achievement Everywhere* (Office of the Governor, State of Ohio, 2013) is different from both NCLB and the *Achieve More Plan* in that it is part of Ohio Governor John Kasich's FY2014-15 budget proposal. It is a State initiative that will impact districts at the local level. According to the proposal, it is designed to help provide all schools with the financial resources needed to ensure that all students can succeed throughout the state of Ohio by way of $1.2 billion in funds over the next two years for primary and secondary education in select districts. Within the funding formula are policies that focus on channeling funds to the classroom and special funds to help schools move from unsuccessful to successful models by adopting new strategies that work. The plan also allows districts flexibility with certain mandates that may be in opposition to educators' and students' success (provided that health and safety is prioritized). Similar to language in NCLB, the language in *Achievement Everywhere* is less child-centered, and geared more toward success and performance indicators at the building and district level rather than at the student level. While this plan does little to foster social mobility at the individual level, competition among schools and districts is bolstered.

41

The move to adopt the Common Core State Standards, on the other hand, is a state-led initiative that establishes a single set of educational standards (as opposed to each state's own state standards) for grades K-12 in English Language Arts and Mathematic which states voluntarily adopt (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). The impetus to adopt the Common Core State Standards is not simply a result of the standards movement; rather, the adoption of college- and career-readiness standards that are aligned to appropriate tests is essential in order for states to obtain NCLB waivers from the U.S. Department of Education and federal Race to the Top grants (McNeil, 2013). So while participation in Race to the Top is voluntary, as Ravitch (2014) argues, "[i]t has compelled almost every state to adopt so-called standards (that were not written by educators, included no early childhood educators, included no understanding of children with special needs, and which were never field tested anywhere" (p. 154).

Currently, 45 states, the District of Columbia, and four territories, along with the Department of Defense Education Activity, have adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The purpose of the standards is clear: student academic preparation. Through the standards, students graduating from high school should be prepared to enter a two- or four-year college or the workforce. This is not a federal or state mandate; rather it is a collaborative movement among the states that allow them to work jointly in the development of textbooks, digital media, and other teaching materials aligned to the standards; the development and implementation of common comprehensive assessment systems to measure annual student performance (in Ohio, to replace OAA and OGT); and recognize and make necessary changes needed to help support educators and schools in

teaching to the new standards. Under this movement, social efficiency and social mobility

are competing for the pole position. While the standards movement speaks to labor

preparation, it is with a competitive spirit, which urges students to compete in the

workforce, not just in the classroom. Students are no longer vying for college acceptance;

they are competing in a globally competitive marketplace. Tenam-Zemach and Flynn

(2011), however, offer a word of caution: "The notion that job preparation will solve the

nation's economic woes, and lead to a globally competitive workforce does not

necessarily meet the broader purposes of education" (p. 122). Ravitch (2014) offers a

similar view in her recent article, *Hoaxes in Educational Policy*, which lists NCLB and

Race to the Top as two among many reforms and the current state of education that are

influencing education rhetoric and policy today.

At the same time students are competing, school districts and states are competing

against one another to secure the funds necessary to meet accountability measures. Just as

Title I funds were tied to standards-based reforms and the reauthorization of ESEA in the

1990s (Mehta, 2013), Race to the Top funds are grossly connected to state adoption of

CCSS (Tenam-Zemach & Flynn, 2011). According to the Race to the Top Executive

Summary (2009), the Race to the Top Fund is a "competitive grant program" that

rewards states for, among other things, "ensuring student preparation for success in

college and careers" in four core reform areas, the first of which is: "Adopting standards

and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace to compete

in the global economy" (p. 2). This is followed by data systems to allow for student

growth and success (testing, accountability for value added measures), teacher and

principal effectiveness (teacher evaluations), and an all-encompassing, "turning around

our lowest-achieving schools."

Currently, the competing goals of education are playing out in very dynamic

system, yet the goal of social mobility appears to be the driving force at the local and

state level.  States and districts must compete for a portion of the $4.3 billion Race to the

Top funds, and those that are not awarded any or part of the requested funding must make

do.  In this system, children will be left behind. At the same time, the promises of these

funds fall short, and as many districts have learned, the funds do not provide a panacea

for their education ills. In the past year, at least five states, including Ohio, have had

some local districts or charter schools forfeit Race to the Top funds (Maxwell, 2014). In

Ohio alone, 107 of the 538 districts that originally signed up for Race to the Top have

since bailed out.  Reasons for the drop out vary across states, but include inconsistent

criteria at the state level, funds not sufficient to meet the demands of program, and data-

privacy concerns for data collection by third party vendors (Maxwell, 2014).

**Policy Analysis**.  David Labaree (1997a, 2010) provides a useful framework for

analyzing key goals evident in policy and reform efforts to improve public education.

Most recently, education reform has focused largely on the goals of social efficiency and

social mobility. To be sure, a policy is only as successful as the definition of the problem

that it sets out to rectify. That is, the analysis of the effectiveness, efficiency and equity of

the policy is dependent on the manner in which the public problem is defined (Kraft &

Furlong, 2010).  The pervasive broad language included in *A Nation at Risk* was similarly

translated into policy.  The redefined paradigm of the education delivery system in the

United States that resulted from *A Nation at Risk* shaped the manner in which the policy,

and indeed our nation, is evaluated: through standardized testing. Within five years of the report, states were required to operationalize levels of student achievement to be eligible for federal aid meet the call for increased accountability (McDonnel, 2005). This focus on increased accountability, however, is grossly misaligned with, and is thus a poor measurement of the effectiveness, efficiency and equity of the NCLB policy. Where both *A Nation at Risk* and its resulting policies prove to be inadequate is in their attempt to address underlying issues that directly influence student achievement through quantitative measures of perceived academic achievement. This problem is further complicated by the multitude of social issues that are pushed into the public school arena to be remediated by the school systems. Interestingly, as Mehta (2013) points out, in redefining the educational problem in policy as the result of the paradigm shift following *A Nation at Risk*, the responsibility for schooling is no longer a shared responsibility between parents, school, and government. There has since been a withdrawal from social responsibility for schooling, with educators taking primary responsibility; and yet public schools must still be accountable to the state and federal government.

When weak public policy results in an unreasonable risk to a particular party, "the pendulum swings the other way as public outrage convinces policymakers to take action" (Kraft & Furlong, 2010, p. 423). Similarly, in education, when there is an inequity in the delivery system, the proverbial pendulum is quick to swing in the opposite direction as a corrective measure. As aforementioned, one of the outlined goals of NCLB was to create an equitable learning opportunity for all students in the nation. The motivation behind this, however, was one of social efficiency as it relates directly to our global economic presence. Ironically, the very policy enacted to address the issue of academic inequalities

not only highlights but contributes to inequitable outcomes as they relate to educational goals, specifically that of social mobility.

Friedman & Mandelbaum (2011) suggest that two of the major challenges of the U.S. are globalization and the technological revolution. The challenges further complicate the goal of social efficiency in that they have produced a new type of worker: the low-wage, high-skilled worker. This prototype continues to eradicate the once needed low-wage, low-skilled workers that populated factory jobs and the like. The result of an increasingly competitive, globalized marketplace, the demand for low-wage, high-skilled worker complicates the goals of social efficiency and social mobility. Whereas students once held to the dictum of more education equals a better job with better pay, students are faced with the stark realization that more education equals more debt and a job. The rhetoric of policymakers and push toward reform efforts that promote college and career-readiness, however, has not caught up to the rapidly changing global marketplace. The standards and accountability movements have continued to deny the eminent global demands that require a shift toward critical thinking, creativity and products, in favor of a focus on productivity marked by efficiency and measured by test scores. Yet, researchers and practitioners recognize the demand for the shift from stellar test-takers, to individuals who can collaborate, communicate and compete in a global economy (Bellenca & Brandt, 2010; Collins & Halverson, 2009; Friedman & Mandelbaum, 2011), or what Friedman & Mandelbaum (2011) refer to as the three Cs—critical thinking, effective oral and written communication, and collaboration.

When examining policy, it is critical to examine both the intended and unintended consequences of a particular policy (Kraft & Furlong, 2010). Since its inception, there

has been no shortage of research and articles as they relate to the ineffectiveness of

NCLB (Beane, 2013; Giroux & Schmidt, 2004; McDonnell, 2005; Ravitch, 2010, 2011).

Through implementation analyses and program evaluations, districts have seen an

increase in the flexibility associated with expectations and penalties in terms of meeting

the guidelines of NCLB. What appears to be missing, though, is any discernible action on

behalf of policymakers to reevaluate their assessment measures and requirements based

on an increasing body of research.

　　　　In addition to the evaluative measures taken to analyze policy, it is important to

examine consequences as they relate to risk assessment. For the purposes of this policy,

there is no seemingly inherent risk as one might observe in environmental or health

policies; however, one might argue that the risk inherent in education reform comes at a

cost to the consumer: the student. In a startling departure from her role in *A Nation at

Risk,* Diane Ravitch (2010, 2011) submits that new accountability measures and

standardized testing are undermining the current education system in the United States.

She points out that "[o]ne of the unintended consequences of NCLB was the shrinkage of

time available to teach anything other than reading and math" (Ravitch, 2011, p. 29).

Although such a risk assessment or cost/benefit analysis might not seem fitting when

analyzing a policy that is embedded in the economic framework of rational choice  and

political systems theory, these and other consequences that impact the primary consumer

and stakeholder need to be analyzed and addressed. While there is no single best way of

educating, what is clear is our habit of instituting unrealistic outcome standards and

goals, and attempting to develop every single aspect (in spite of or despite parental and

community roles), is counterproductive.

According to Kraft & Furlong (2010), when markets are unable to provide for the public, or collective, good, market failure occurs. They identify two criteria used to define a public good: whether or not one can be excluded from getting the good and if one has the ability to jointly consume the good; thus, a purely pubic good is one in which exclusion is not feasible and it is jointly consumed.  Because the private sector lacks incentive to provide them, such goods are not provided without government intervention. Until recent years, public education has been provided as a collective good (Friedman & Mandelbaum, 2011; Reese, 2011; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). To be sure, private schools have always tailored services to an elite market; however, only recently have vouchers, charter schools and most recently special education scholarships allowed for the confounding of common pool resources and pure public goods. Evident here is the move toward the privatization of the education marketplace as the goal of social mobility emerges as the dominant of the three competing goals of education.

Through the lens of Labaree's framework, the pattern in educational reform by way of the competing goals becomes evident. Although it served as one of the driving forces of the common school, the democratic equality goal has been undermined by the goals of economic efficiency and social mobility. Throughout the destabilization of America's leadership in the global economy, social efficiency allowed for an increase in the stratification of the education system. Capitalizing on this margin, the social mobility goal has gained momentum and appears to be in the forefront as the goals continue to compete in the race for educational excellence.

**Philanthropy, the Competing Goals and Reform.**

  **Education Philanthropy Background.** The Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act in 2002 set a precedent for educational reform—it increased the role of the federal government in a highly decentralized education system, and demanded measurable outcomes be met by schools and school districts without impunity. These changes required additional financial resources at the local and state levels, with little support at the federal level. Because NCLB permeates the education delivery system at the local, state and federal levels, the stakeholders are many. The roles of various stakeholders and actors differ greatly, as their roles vary on a continuum from individual interest to accountability. Under NCLB, the required outcome measures explicitly demand accountability of teachers. Similarly, by virtue of their positions as school building and district officials, administrators and superintendents are held accountable by this mandate. Those having a personal interest in accountability outcomes can vary, whether they are parent and child advocacy groups, for profit and non-profit educational organizations, think tanks, foundations, business leaders or politicians. While the primary concern for these actors may seem to be a vested interest in student achievement, there is much to gain both financially and politically for these agents as well.

  Agents in the philanthropic ring include foundations, corporations, and business groups. Scott, Lubienski and DeBray-Pelot (2009) examined the trends in philanthropic actors in the political arena following the reauthorization of ESEA. Although some may have already been active agents in education policy prior to, following NCLB there is an increase in activity among business groups, such as the Business Roundtable (Scott et al.,

2009; Kumashiro, 2012), National Alliance of Business, National Association of

Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Commerce (Scott et al., 2009).

Think tanks, foundations, and corporations continue to advocate for and

demonstrate targeted philanthropic efforts nested around their liberal or conservative

ideologies. From a liberal, neoliberal and progressive standpoint, mechanisms that speak

to the goal of democratic equality often top the agenda, such as equal educational

opportunity (access), equity (treatment) and social justice (access and treatment) (Scott,

et al, 2009), but are less visible at the state and federal levels (Kumashiro, 2012).

Conservatives (neoconservative and conservative grassroots), on the other hand, tend to

engage in advocacy efforts centered on parental choice, privatization, and moral issues

(Scott et al., 2009). Kumashiro (2012) notes that the use of funds is one of the greatest

strategic differences between the liberal and conservatives camps:

> Whereas the liberal philanthropies tend to fund a large number of organizations
>
> for specific projects of limited term and scope, the conservative ones are more
>
> likely to fund the general operations of a smaller number of organizations of
>
> longer periods of time in order to build institutional infrastructure. (p. 13)

As a result, conservative foundations tend to have extensive networks, as with the

Business Roundtable, which is made up the Broad Foundation, Harvard Graduate School,

the Annenberg Center and the Education Trust, among others (Kumashiro, 2012). With

such backing, the Business Roundtable is in a strong position to move forward its agenda

in support of the accountability and standards movements.

Philanthropists are no strangers to the education political arena. Through the

formation of foundations, the wealthy are able to make philanthropic donations to a cause

of their choice with the benefit of tax shelters (Ravitch, 2010). Education has been a popular agenda item for many foundations, including, but certainly not limited to: the Carnegie Corporation, Ford Foundation, Annenberg Foundation, the Lilly Endowment, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Broad Foundation, the Walton Family Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (Ferris, Hentschke & Harmssen, 2008; Ravitch, 2010; Scott, 2009). Initially, foundations that found their niche in school reform saw their philanthropic efforts as a means to respond to a unique crisis, giving grants and donations influenced largely by the current political climate (Ravitch, 2010). At this time, philanthropy was seen as an activity that was unique to wealthy individuals, not corporations (van Fleet, 2010). van Fleet (2010) notes that in Milton Friedman's opposition to corporate giving, he found charitable contributions to impede the shareholders' ability to decide on how funds should be spent, thusly placing philanthropy outside of the corporate realm. Philanthropic efforts enjoyed by the likes of the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Rockefeller Foundation were seen as providing for the public good (Scott, 2009).

One of the earliest, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching took part in what is known as the progressive reform effort of the early 1900s. Even then, the American school system was in a state of crisis. In the *A Nation at Risk* of its time, the *Cardinal Principles* report indicated two reform efforts needed to save the education system from its crisis on the heels of the Industrial Revolution: regulation and social efficiency (Labaree, 2010). The former is to be reconciled by a newly established professional administration. The latter is reconciled by way of a hierarchal, stratified

system within consolidated districts that mirrored that of the organization within schools. It is during this time, in 1906, that the Carnegie Foundation establishes perhaps one of, if not *the*, most enduring reforms in the history education: the Carnegie unit (Labaree, 2010). This reform effort marks one of the earliest contributions in the promotion of the goal of social mobility, which is characterized by not only the stratification of education institutions, but credentialism (Labaree, 1997a, 1997b). This, too, marks one of many forthcoming reform efforts that slowly but indubitably overshadow the goal of democratic equality.

Thereafter, foundations proceed to contribute to school reform in much the same way—focusing on a single school or district in a concentrated effort to create what they imagine as a more effective educational delivery system (Ravitch, 2010; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). At the turn of the 21$^{st}$ century, however, education philanthropy gets swept up by the entrepreneurial spirit of the marketplace (Ravitch, 2010). Foundations no longer find themselves as remedies for immediate, localized crises; rather, the foundations of the late 1990s set their sights on a massive undertaking: the reformation of the nation's education system. As Strickland (2009) observes, "Although the historical philanthropists created institutions, today's major donors are transforming them, just as they are reshaping philanthropy" (p. 20). In particular, new philanthropists are partial to deregulatory educational forms, such as privatization, charters schools, and school choice, and tend to favor standardization, competition, and high-stakes accountability (Scott, 2009), all which are closely aligned to the social mobility goal.

In her 2010 *The Death and Life of the Great American School System*, Diane Ravitch examines the impact of the philanthropic interests in current education reform

efforts. She notes that by 1998, foundations begin taking their modern form of what became known as mega-foundations, with 30% of all funds of the top 50 contributing foundations given by the top four foundations: the Annenberg Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Lilly Endowment, and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Just four years later, two new mega-foundations emerge as the top ranking donors. Of all funds contributed by the top 50 donors, the Walton Family Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation account for 25%. Shortly thereafter, the Walton Family Foundation and the Gates Foundation are accompanied by the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation and other corporate leaders in what is now known as venture philanthropy (Ravitch, 2010; Scott, Lubienski & DeBray-Pelot, 2009; Scott, 2009; Scott, 2011; Strickland, 2009). Although still in the top twenty-five of sixty-three private foundations in 2013, the Rockefeller Foundation, which was once the wealthiest, ranks sixteenth, while the Carnegie Corporation ranks twenty-third (Barkan, 2013).

It is estimated that in 2012, charitable donations exceeded $316 billion (Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2013), of which 13% or $41.33 billion went to education organizations (Giving USA Foundation, 2013). While it is estimated that charitable giving increased by 3.5% in 2012, giving by foundations increased by an estimated 4.4% and by an estimated 12.2% by corporations (Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2013). Interestingly, in relation to public funds, philanthropy makes up a considerably small amount. Compared to the nearly $600 billion spent on K-12 education in the U.S.in 2010, the top ten donors gave about $585 million (Hess, 2012). The appeal, then, is not necessarily the dollar amount, but the flexibility and fluidity with which the funds can be used. Unlike traditional school finance, which requires levied tax dollars to go into

allocated funds with voter approval, philanthropic dollars can be used to implement reforms that do not adhere to specific funding categories or timelines. Moreover, when these funds are targeted to a specific school or district, the philanthropic dollars disproportionately outweigh public funding (Barkan, 2013; Hess, 2005, 2012). Thus, one should not underestimate the extent to which philanthropists can influence the agenda setting, politics, and dynamics of school reform (Hess, 2005). It is through discretionary spending that policy is shaped and altered, often in the absence of the voice of some of the most critical stakeholders—the students (Barkan, 2013).

**Venture Philanthropists.** Indeed, venture philanthropists are reshaping philanthropy, and reshaping education. Named to closely mirror the venture capitalists of Silicone Valley with whom they share the corporate like-mindedness, venture philanthropists take a business approach to their giving. Whereas their predecessor dispersed funds to organizations to do with as they pleased, venture philanthropist view their contributions as an investment yielding measurable outcomes. If these venture philanthropists cannot find an organization that can promise the anticipated return on investment, they may simply create a new one, perhaps with the appearance of a grassroots movement (Barkan, 2013; Scott et al., 2009; Scott, 2009; Scott, 2011), or partner with another mega-foundation that shares a similar ideological platform (Shiller, 2012; Srivastava & Oh, 2010). As noted by Ravitch (2010), these private agencies are "bastions of unaccountable power" (p. 201) that go beyond that of the public sector. To be sure, in the democratic processes of democratic institutions there exists a system of checks and balances; however, philanthropy-driven public policy goes largely unchecked (Scott, 2009).

There is a distinct shift in the rhetoric surrounding venture philanthropy, which aligns itself more closely with the conservative camp both ideologically and strategically (Scott, 2009). Venture philanthropists emphasize market-based reform, introducing the rigors of the business world to education (Strickland, 2009), and in doing so, have changed the rhetoric in education policy. In traditional philanthropy, the relationship between donor and recipient was that of grantor and grantee. In today's market-based reforms, the donor is an *investor*, the grantee an *investee.* Similarly, grants are now considered *investments,* with venture philanthropists looking for a social *return on investment* with measurable outcomes. True to the term venture philanthropists, new programs are *ventures* that have been selected not by a grant proposal, but by a proposed *theory of change* (Scott, 2009). This shift in rhetoric drives discourse, which in turn drives policy, and can be seen in the discourse surrounding the accountability and standards movements.

The American education system has seen a gradual, and more recently a thrust toward alternative education and privatization by way of school choice (Barkan, 2013; Carl, 2011; Hochschild & Scovronick, 2003; Ferris et al., 2008; Labaree, 1997a, 1997b; Ravitch, 2010; Scott, 2009). This movement has been facilitated by the philanthropic engagement of foundations, such as the Bradley Foundation, the Walton Family Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (Carl, 2011; Ravitch, 2010; Strickland, 2009).  Privatization and school choice operate in tandem with the social mobility goal under the guise of the democratic equality goal. Although the two goals share in the progressive agenda of equal access, nonetheless, "in the name of social mobility, Americans have sought to push their education system in a direction that is in

any way directly opposite to the direction urged by the logic of democratic equality"
(Labaree, 1997b, p.65). Through the lens of social mobility, the needs of the market
rather than polity (as with democratic equality) or the collective (as with social
efficiency) is the focus, which closely mirrors that of the business model that has come to
embody the American education delivery system and is further perpetuated by venture
philanthropists. The key assumption here is that if schools operate in a competitive
marketplace with parent choice, there will be an increase in the quality and measureable
outcomes, which should be an indicator of greater accountability (Scott, 2009).

      **The Venture Philanthropists' Marketplace.** The Milwaukee-based Bradley
Foundation is one such example. After having left the Olin Foundation in 1986, Bradley
Foundation President Michael Joyce set out to fund programs and projects in support of
educational privatization, targeting the local, state and federal level (Carl, 2011). With
assets of over $410 million in 1992 (total fair market value) and Joyce's ties to the
Reagan Administration, the conservative Bradley Foundation becomes one of the
nation's most powerful foundations of its time. Much of the work supported by the
Bradley Foundation at the local level is within the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS).
Advocacy initiatives to bolster the credibility of choice programs, including privatization,
vouchers and parental choice are coupled with "Bradley-funded educational research
[that] tended to both disparage public educations (especially MPS) and discredit other
strategies of education reform" (Carl, 2011, p. 121). The Bradley Foundation's
partnerships with other corporate and foundation philanthropies and Marquette
University, along with sponsoring parental choice conferences, and other measures to
increase awareness and support of vouchers undoubtedly contributes to the passage of

Milwaukee's landmark 1990 Parental Choice Options Bill, which paved the way for vouchers to come to Cleveland shortly thereafter.

In the late 1990s, another mega-foundation substantiated itself within the philanthropic arena. Established in 1987 by the heirs of the world's largest corporation, Wal-Mart, the Walton Family Foundation provides substantial monetary contributions to conservative reform efforts (Kumashiro, 2012; Scott, 2009). The Walton Family Foundation funds pro-voucher organizations, think tanks and advocacy groups that support pro-voucher initiatives, and ballot initiatives for vouchers. According to Scott (2009), with assets of over $1.3 billion in 1996, it "has been the largest private funder of K-12 school choice reforms" (p. 122). Additionally, the Walton Family Foundation continues to contribute funds to charter and school choice organizations, such as the Green Dot Public Schools, New Schools Venture Fund, Charter School Growth Fund, Black Alliance for Educational Options and Teach for America.

In 1999, The Broad Education Foundation was established. By 2006, it had estimated assets of over $1.2 billion dollars (Scott, 2009). The Broad Foundation has a particular interest in advancing the entrepreneurship in education, with an emphasis on management strategies. The Broad Foundation supports charter and school organizations such as the KIPP Foundation and KIPP Schools, Teach for America, Green Dot Public Schools and New Schools Venture Fund. The Broad Foundation is unique in that it was established not with an interest in education philanthropy, but with "an explicit mission to shape public policy" (Ferris, Hentschke & Harmssen, 2008, p.707). In *The Death and Life of the Great American School System*, Ravitch (2010) recounts her meeting with Eli Broad, who describes his education management philosophy as one that is marked by

deregulation, competition, choice and tight management, and complemented by financial incentives. He does not find that school leaders need to be educators, but good managers. The Broad Foundation is also unique in its funding strategies. Whereas as some foundations may give grants and donations as well as make investments, the Broad Foundation makes investments. The Broad Foundation is the quintessential venture philanthropy. It takes full advantage of the benefits of philanthropy, in that it is "able to shape policy according to [its] sensibilities without the need to engage in public deliberation about the inclinations" (Scott, 2011, p. 584).

Perhaps one of the most well-known venture philanthropies, The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation was founded in 2000. With assets of over $30 billion, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has been diligently working to find a solution to America's low graduation rates in public K-12 schools and low college entry rates (Ravitch, 2010; Scott, 2009). The Gates Foundation focuses on reform efforts in support of small schools, school choice, charter schools, and corporate management organizations in order to overcome its greatest obstacle to increasing graduation rates: the comprehensive high school. Wide-spread indeed, the Gates Foundation has provided funds of approximately $2 billion to some 2,600 schools in 45 states and Washington D.C. between 2000 and 2008 (Ravitch, 2010). Despite some largely unknown failed school reforms, the Gates Foundation remains the richest and powerful foundation to date. It continues to move forward in changing policy at the local, state and national levels with the force of a blitzkrieg in the face of little or no opposition (Hess, 2012; Ravitch, 2012). This, as Ravitch (2010) notes, is a result of the Gates Foundation's dissemination of grants "to

almost every major think tank and advocacy group in the field of education, leaving

almost no one willing to criticize its vast power and unchecked influence" (p. 211).

Thus, the scope of the economic and political power of the Gates and other

foundations is seemingly limitless. In recent years, the Gates Foundation has partnered

with other like-minded, equally financially sound foundations, including the Michael and

Susan Dell Foundation, the Robertson Foundation, and during the 2008 election, the

Broad Foundation.  The 2008 jointly-funded Broad-Gates $60 million initiative put

education reform on the national agenda, with an emphasis on national standards, merit-

pay and an extended school day (Ravitch, 2010; Scott, 2009). The combined efforts of

the Gates Foundation and the Broad foundation were well received by the Obama

administration. The impacts of their political influence can be seen in the parameters set

forth in federal school funding programs, such as Race to the Top: states that cap the

number of charter schools or place restrictions on linking student test scores to teacher

and principal evaluations are excluded (Ravitch, 2010).

The extensive reach and influence of philanthropic support is also exemplified by

the Teach for America program. Backed by the Eli and Edythe Broad Education

Foundation, the Dell Foundation, the Gates Foundation, the Walton Family Foundation,

and the Fisher Foundation, Teach for America produces teachers that often replace staff

in cities like New Orleans, New York City, and Los Angles (Scott, 2009). In the

aftermath of the immolation of Hurricane Katrina, venture philanthropists saw an

opportunity to put into practice an alternative to the traditional public school system by

supporting efforts to replace traditional public schools with charter schools managed by

Charter Management Organizations (CMOs) and Education Management Organizations

(EMOs). With the help of continuous financial backing, Teach for America is able to

place an unprecedented number of teachers in New Orleans schools. However, according

to a study by Shiller (2012), after their two year commitment in low-income schools,

more than half of Teach for America teachers leave their placements. Despite these

numbers, in 2011 Teach for America doubled in size thanks to a $49.5 million donation

from the Walton Family Foundation (Shiller, 2012).

      **Think Tanks and Reform.** Other stakeholders, like think tanks, align themselves

with pedagogical and political ideologies as they relate to education reform. Supported

by foundations and private dollars, through targeted research and propagation strategies,

think tanks are powerful actors in education advocacy (Scott et al., 2009). According to

Scott et al. (2009), they are particularly effective in not only influencing the legislative

decision making of policymakers, but in "shaping public opinion through savvy media

relations" (p. 4). For example, the Washington D.C.-based think tank Alliance for

Excellent Education is a national policy and advocacy organization that is focused on

what it sees as the current crisis in education: student graduation rates. According to its

2013 website (http://all4ed.org/take-action/alliance-supporters/), the Alliance for

Excellent Education is supported by a host of foundations, including: AT&T Foundation,

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Charles Stewart

Mott Foundation, Ford Foundation, GE Foundation, Intel Foundation, James Irvine

Foundation, MacArthur Foundation, MetLife Foundation, National Public Education

Support Fund, State Farm and the William & Flora Hewlett Foundation. In a 2011

report, *A Framework and Recommendations for Federal Action on Secondary School*

*Reform*, the Alliance for Excellent Education notes that only approximately 70 percent of

high school students graduate in a four-year cohort with a regular diploma, and places almost six million secondary school students at risk for dropping out of school. In their call for a voluntary adoption of a national Common Core, the organization advocates for resources to be "allocated equitably and adequately and are used efficiently and effectively" (p. 2). Their overriding political ideology concerns itself with the "appropriate role of the federal government in the education policy process." Political undertones of big government and the role of top-down policies are implicit here, as is the goal of democratic equality. While the Alliance does not oppose NCLB, it does offer recommendations to improve the legislation to appease what they deem is the preeminent concern in education.

Ohio Education Matters, an Ohio-based think tank takes a more economically-based approached to policy. Ohio Education Policy Matters is a self-described non-partisan subsidiary of KnowledgeWorks Foundation, which touts itself as Ohio's largest public education philanthropy. This think tank recognizes financial and budgetary concerns as critical components to education. A key issue in allocating funds is to ensure that the process is equitable. In a January 2013 report, Ohio Education Matters released a statement in response to an Ohio school funding proposal. Of concern is the proposal's failure to assess the availability of resources, and moreover, the equitable distribution of these resources. Both think tanks highlight a form of the goal of democratic equality (Labaree, 1997b). This goal manifests itself in three forms, citizenship training, equal treatment and equal access. By calling for appropriate allocation of funds, The Alliance for Excellent Education and KnowledgeWorks Foundation underscore the importance of equal access in education as it relates to financial provisions. While both think tanks

examine the need for the equitable allocation of resources as they relate to recent legislative actions, both frame the need in a context that is consistent with the respective stakeholders' position.

When examined amidst the landscape of school reform, which requires that not only all children receive a free and appropriate public education, but that the educational delivery system be held accountable for their measured growth, these think tanks contribute to the discourse by stressing a position that is greatly overshadowed by the other two competing goals, social efficiency and social mobility. Equitable dispersion of funds and resources, however, is not indicative of their overarching goals or ideologies. In a 2005 press release by the KnowledgeWorks Foundation, the Foundation applauded a grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for an undisclosed amount. According to the press release by McCauley (2005),

> At the local level, KnowledgeWorks Foundation is providing funding and technical assistance to several Ohio communities to align their levels of education to ensure that more students graduate from high school and successfully transition to college. Additionally, this new grant is an important complement to the ongoing work that KnowledgeWorks Foundation, in partnership with the Gates Foundation, the Ohio Department of Education and others, is doing across the state to transform 15 large urban high schools into 56 smaller, successful high schools and also six Early College High Schools where students receive personal attention, and study academically relevant and rigorous material that inspires them to achieve and are better prepared for post-secondary work.

In this press release, it becomes increasingly clear that the underlying goal is in fact social mobility. Perhaps what is most telling is not what is explicitly noted, but what is overtly omitted. That is, what is explicitly and implicitly stated speaks directly to the goal of social mobility. The goal of social mobility takes on three forms: hierarchal and qualitative differences between institutions, and stratified structures of opportunities within each institution (Labaree, 1997b). In this statement, students are being prepared to "successfully transition to college;" an upward movement among the hierarchal rungs of the educational ladder in the midst of educational stratification. Absent in this discourse is a direct relationship between student achievement and the preparedness of future workers in the marketplace, or the goal of social efficiency. Although reference is made to postsecondary work, it is not indicative of the needs of the occupational marketplace.

Furthermore, the Foundation notes its commitment to "transform" existing high schools to create smaller high schools and early college programming. Once again, the rhetoric used here echoes in the chambers of social mobility as "transformation" is often used as a euphemism for school closure, which more often than not, leads to schools reopening as charter schools or under private management organizations. Evident is the move from schools as a public good, as seen through the lens of the democratic equality and social efficiency goal, to a private good, as seen through the lens of the social mobility goal. The qualitative differences that the Foundation hopes to make in the transformation process create a stratified system, one that "offers each child the chance to become clearly distinguished from his or her fellow students" (Labaree, 1997b, p.53). This is in direct opposition to the democratic ideals of equal treatment and equal access.

So, in providing a competitive edge to some, others will fall short of the personal attention and academic rigors that will be afford to some.

In the last 15 years, venture philanthropists have demonstrated their immense financial and political influence in education reform, with some of the most significant changes on the horizon. In a time when school finance hangs in the balance for many, and accountability is no longer a request but a demand, schools, districts, and states are quick to accept funds despite what is required in return. Moreover, these investees are often subject to the whims and ideologies of their investors (Strickland, 2009), who may withdraw funds at any time if their wishes are not met to their liking (Scott, 2009). This can met with disastrous effects, as with the case of the Atlanta Public Schools that were caught in a cheating scandal. When investigated, the Atlanta Public Schools admittedly did not want to fall short of the achievement expectations of the Broad and Gates foundations (Shiller, 2012). Furthermore, venture philanthropy has been criticized for overlooking the social ills that cannot be skirted away by increased school funding, like poverty and unstable home environments (Shiller, 2012), along with reform efforts that are disconnected from issues of social inequities of access and treatment (Scott, 2011).

The agency of the venture philanthropists is furthered by their participation in agenda setting and polity and the local, state and even national level. As some of the most influential and powerful foundations are not always forthcoming with failed reforms, it is imperative that potential partners and investees do their homework. As Barkan (2013) cautions, when a foundation project fails, it is not simply a failed investment with dollars lost, but also "the subjects of the experiment suffer, as does the general public" (p. 48). In education reform, the stakes are high. In education reform, the

outcome variable is not simply higher test scores and matriculation rates, but a child, whose education and future are on the line.

**Conclusion**

Undoubtedly, the three competing goals of education according to Labaree (1997a, 1997b, 2010) have long been at odds. While each has served the needs of politicians, attempted to meet the demands of society, and has tried to quiet the outcry of the public, their idiosyncratic niches and paradoxical mechanisms have led to an enduring competition that has placed the American schools in an unremitting state of crisis. Yet, the crisis of the American school system—whether it be that of yesterday, today or tomorrow—is not solely one of poor student achievement or low graduation rates. It is a web complicated by capital, mired in bureaucracy and tainted by personal gain. It is a problem that cannot be fixed by testing, imposing more penalties, or racing to catch up with the global achievement scores.

Decades ago we entered a global race, but we left the players on the bench with a different playbook. Policy and reforms have dictated what students should learn, how they should learn, and perhaps even why they should learn, yet students still struggle to meet the expectations of these policy formulations. What we demand and expect of our students according to the latest mandate or philanthropic theory of change, and how students' perceive these expectations do not seem to align. The bureaucratic culture is vastly different than that of students' experiences. This mismatch has resulted in the perpetual disappointment of the public and policymakers as the American school system continues to fall short of rescuing the nation of its economic, moral and scholastic

decline, while students continue to master the art of achieving higher grades and test scores, without learning.

# CHAPTER III

## METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the methodological framework for the Pilot Study (Study 1) and Main Study (Study 2), beginning with an overview of the purpose of the studies. This is followed by an explanation of the approach to and justification of analyses. Next, the researcher details the development, reliability and validity, and dimension constructs of the survey instrument used in both Study 1 and Study 2. Finally, the researcher presents an in-depth presentation of the research design and analyses.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between student demographics and attributes, and students' identification of the goal(s) of education as outlined by Labaree (1997): democratic equality, social efficiency, and social mobility. The following research questions and sub-questions directed this study:

1. To what extent do students identify with each of the competing goals of education?

a. To what extent do students identify democratic equality as the goal of education?

b. To what extent do students identify social efficiency as the goal of education?

c. To what extent do students identify social mobility as the goal of education?

d. To what extent do students identify district stakeholders' goals as the collective goal of education?

2. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to their identification with each of the competing goals of education?

a. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of democratic equality?

b. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of social efficiency?

c. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of social mobility?

d. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goals of district stakeholders?

3. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and the competing goal with which students most strongly identify with predict membership in course of study?

   a. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of democratic equality as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

   b. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of social efficiency as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

   c. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of social mobility as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

   d. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of the collective goals of district stakeholders as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

**Approach to Analyses**

A quantitative approach to research analysis was utilized for this study, which was guided by postpositivist deterministic and reductionist assumptions (Creswell, 2013; Creswell, 2003). This approach allowed the researcher to use statistical models in order to identify, examine and advance the understanding of the relationship among variables that may influence hypothesized outcomes, and generalize these findings. The researcher recognized the key assumptions of a postpositivist approach to research, which include the understanding that knowledge is conjectural; that this knowledge is shaped by data,

evidence, and rational consideration; and that objectivity, reliability and validity are essential components to the efficacy of the research process (Creswell, 2003).

The researcher used a multivariate analytic approach to design the study. The statistical analyses included both descriptive and inferential statistics. The study employed a $\chi^2$ test, an exploratory factor analysis and scale reliability for survey development. For data analyses, the study employed descriptive statistics, as well as the following inferential statistics: multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), and multinomial logistic regression. The software used to analyze the Pilot Study data was the 21$^{st}$ version of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). The 22$^{nd}$ version of SPSS was used to analyze the Main Study data. Through this quantitative design, the researcher aimed to maximize the generalization of findings and minimize the degree of research bias.

**Research Instrument**

Using a quantitative approach, the researcher developed a student survey that included the collection of student demographics and characteristics, along with questions that related to students' understanding of and perception of competing goals of education. The survey was administered to students in an inner-ring suburban high school located in the Midwest for the both the Pilot Study and Research Study. Successive student cohorts were used for each study.

**Rationale of survey.** An online survey was used to collect data for the pilot study and dissertation analysis. At the time of writing, the researcher has been unable to locate a preexisting survey that examines students' perception of the goals of education, thus in order to move forward with research, a survey was created. Labaree's (1997) theoretical

framework guided the conceptual definitions of the survey, which in turn guided the content of the questions, while the language of the survey questions was informed by high school students' use of language.

**Survey development.**

*Item construction.* As suggested by Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson (2010), the conceptual definitions for the summated scale of the survey were developed based on a theoretical framework (Labaree, 1997) and an extensive review of related literature (see Chapter 2). David F. Labaree (1997, 2010) presents three alternative goals for American education and posits that when in contention, these competing goals are at the heart of educational conflicts at any given time. The first, democratic equality, suggests that schools should focus on the preparation of citizens; the second, social efficiency, suggests that schools' focus should be on training workers; and the third, social mobility, suggests that schools should focus on the preparation of individuals to compete within the existing socioeconomic structures. Each goal represents the educational perspective of different actors: the citizen (democratic equality), the taxpayer (social efficiency), and the consumer (social mobility). Whereas education is seen as private good from the social mobility viewpoint, in the cases of democratic equality and social efficiency, education is seen as a public good.

According to Labaree, when one goal dominates the other two, the resulting education system is recognized by policymakers as being in crisis. In his 1997 *How to Succeed in School without Really Trying*, Labaree submits that of these goals, "social mobility has emerged as the most influential factor in American education" (p. 19). It continues to dominate the discourse and language, and thus its influence over practice

and purpose.  Although there is much to be said about the education system and what needs to be done to improve it, it is ultimately the students that need to do the work, to produce the results.  Interestingly, it is the teachers, schools, and districts that are overtly penalized when the educational outcomes are not met. Understanding students' perception of the goals of education (as framed by the goals of policymakers) may provide greater insight into current policy, and serve as a compass in directing future reforms that is inclusive of all stakeholders involved in this complex system.

In order to glean insight into the community stakeholders' goals for education, the language and focus of the school district's goals were also used to inform survey questions. Each of the district's goal statements was modified to incorporate language to reflect student belonging and ownership of the goal (e.g., *In my district…)*. As with the survey items constructed from the conceptual framework of Labaree, the district goals were worded to coincide with a four point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree).

*Content and face validity.* To ensure content and face validity, the researcher assessed the correspondence of student language to the conceptual definitions (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 2009). To gain a better understanding of students' use of language, a qualitative approach was used to hone in on student use of vocabulary, which appropriated the language used by the researcher in the development of survey questions (Creswell, 2013; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Merriam, 2009). According to Creswell (2013), a focus group is a common and particularly useful tool when conducting phenomenological studies. Focus groups are advantageous in that they facilitate participant interaction and discussion, especially when time is limited.  Moreover, focus

groups may elicit more information than a one-on-one interview when participants are hesitant to provide information or elaborate.  The facilitation of participant dialogue was an attractive feature for the researcher at this stage in survey development, as high school student participants may be shy or reluctant to elaborate. Upon IRB approval (Appendix A), a focus group with two high school students was conducted by the researcher. Participants for the focus group were recruited by the researcher in a Health class, which was a graduation requirement for all high school students, and thereby provided the researcher with a varied pool of students.  Questions used in the focus group can be found in Appendix B. Through an analysis of the dialogue from the focus group transcripts (Appendix C), the researcher was able to develop a survey with language that was reflective of that of upperclassmen high school students.

*Pilot study reliability and validity.* Upon approval from the Cleveland State University IRB Committee (Appendix D), a pilot study was conducted in order to further analyze the validity and reliability of the researcher-designed survey instrument (Appendix E). Students enrolled in an $11^{th}$ grade English class at the time of the pilot study were asked to participate. All students must take an $11^{th}$ grade English class to graduate; thus, recruiting participants from these classes provided the researcher with the opportunity to potentially obtain a sample that was representative of the district and included students in a variety of courses of study with a myriad of GPAs. The final sample consisted of 87 participants, 37 (42.5%) of which were male and 50 were female (57.5%). Eighty-five participants self-identified themselves according to race as the following: 29% White/Caucasian, 47% Black/African American, 2.3% Hispanic, 5.7% Asian/Pacific Islander, 2.3% other.  Regarding their primary course of study, 11 students

(12.6%) were enrolled in Vocational programming, 26 (29.9%) in Honors/AP classes, 38

(43.7%) in College Prep classes, 9 in Comprehensive classes (9%) and 3 (3.4%) in Small

Group/Special Education classes). Having met the assumptions of normality (based on

the central limit theorem), homogeneity of variance and independence, as well as having

a measurement at the interval level, a two-tailed bivariate correlation analysis was used to

obtain the Pearson's r correlation coefficients among 36 survey items (questions 11-43,

45-48) (Field, 2009; Steinberg, 2011).   Correlation coefficients of ±.1 represent a small

effect; ±.3 a medium effect; and ±.5 a large effect (Field, 2009).

The bivariate correlation analysis for survey items 11 through 48 (Appendix H1*)*

indicated statistically significant correlation coefficients varying from *r =*.212, n=87,

*p*<.05 to *r* = .695, n=87, *p*<.001. In general, the results suggested that the following 30

survey items met the statistically significant correlation coefficient assumptions of a

Pearson's *r* correlation coefficient of  *r*(87) = ±.3 to be included in the multivariate factor

analysis (Field, 2009): 11, 13-18, 20, 22-27, 29-36, 40-43, 45-48, with only one

correlation coefficient less than *r*(87) = ±.3 at  *r* = .286, *p*<.05.

According to Hair et al. (2010), a multivariate factor analysis is an

interdependence technique whose "primary purpose is to define the underlying structure

among the variable in the analysis" (p. 94). This technique provided the researcher with

the ability to identify variables that were highly inter-correlated and assumed to represent

dimensions with the data set. These dimensions were used to create a new composite

variable which allowed for further statistical analysis.

The initial principal component factor analysis was exploratory, and used latent

root criterion with factor with eigenvalues greater than one, with a Varimax rotation.

Factor loadings  were set at ±.30 for minimum consideration (Field, 2009; Hair et al., 2010). This analysis identified 10 components. Based on the theoretical framework and literature review, the researcher then employed an exploratory factor analysis using a priori criterion with an anticipated four factors (Hair et al., 2009). The items converged at five iterations (Table 2).

To analyze the construct reliability of each component, a scale reliability analysis was performed. According to Hair et al (2010), "reliability is also an indicator of convergent validity" (p.687).  While a reliability of .7 or higher suggests good reliability, reliability between .6 and .7 may be deemed acceptable provided that the other constructs of the model demonstrate good reliability. Moreover, high construct reliability indicates internal consistency.  Table 3 illustrates the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the scale reliability analysis for the Pilot Study.

The Cronbach's alpha for Factors 2, 3 and 4 suggest good reliability. Although the Cronbach's alpha for Factor 1 is slightly below .60 ($r =.597$), the researcher found this to be relatively acceptable in that the other factors suggest good reliability and that the sample size in the Pilot Study was relatively small (n=87). Based on the theoretical framework, the Pilot Study survey analyses and the Pilot Study sample size, along with recommendations from the Dissertation Committee, the researcher moved forward with the administration of the survey for the Main Study. The researcher was aware that a larger sample size would be needed for further analysis of the survey instrument.

Table 2

*Pilot Study Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis With Varimax Rotation*

| Survey Item | Component | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Q.25 | .812 | | | |
| Q.45 | .738 | | | |
| Q.24 | .698 | | | |
| Q.46 | .695 | | | |
| Q.48 | .695 | | | |
| Q.23 | .692 | | | |
| Q.43 | .670 | | | |
| Q.47 | .645 | | | |
| Q.32 | .540 | | | |
| Q.42 | .467 | | .423 | -.427 |
| Q.22 | .432 | | | |
| Q.41 | .318 | | | |
| Q.15 | | .700 | | |
| Q.17 | | .618 | | |
| Q.14 | | .575 | | |
| Q.34 | | .551 | | |
| Q.16 | | .551 | | |
| Q.26 | | .512 | | .422 |
| Q.31 | | .507 | | |
| Q.21 | | .438 | | |
| Q.29 | | .361 | | |
| Q.12 | | .344 | | |
| Q.27 | | .325 | | |
| Q.33 | | .323 | | |
| Q.38 | | | .648 | |
| Q.37 | | | .582 | |
| Q.36 | .403 | | .472 | -.313 |
| Q.18 | | .311 | .465 | |
| Q.19 | | | .373 | |
| Q.39 | | | .342 | |
| Q.40 | | | .309 | |
| Q.11 | | | | .703 |
| Q.35 | | | .320 | .523 |
| Q.20 | | | | -.515 |
| Q.28 | | | | -.503 |

*Note.* Factor loadings <.30 are not shown.

Table 3

*Pilot Study Summary of Identified Factors for Scale Reliability Analysis*

| Factor | Items | # of Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|--------|-------|------------|------------------|
| 1 | 11, 13, 18, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41 | 8 | .597 |
| 2 | 15, 16, 17, 26, 31, 34 | 6 | .645 |
| 3 | 22, 23, 24, 25, 32 | 5 | .728 |
| 4 | 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48 | 6 | .787 |

**Dimension Analysis.** After analyzing the survey items within each construct, the researcher identified four underlying structures or dimensions which reflected the theoretical framework for this study: social mobility, societal and economic contribution, democratic equality, and district stakeholders' interests (Table 4). While the first three dimensions mirror the competing goals of education as outlined by Labaree (1997)— social mobility, social efficiency and democratic equality respectively—the latter captures the district level goals which reflect the collective interests of various stakeholders in education.

Table 4

*Pilot Study Summary of Identified Survey Constructs (Dimensions)*

| Factor | Items | Construct (Dimensions) |
|--------|-------|------------------------|
| 1 | 11, 13, 18, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41 | social mobility (competition) |
| 2 | 15, 16, 17, 26, 31, 34 | societal and economic contribution |
| 3 | 22, 23, 24, 25, 32 | democratic equality |
| 4 | 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48 | district stakeholders' interests |

After identifying each construct, the values from the participants' responses for the individual survey items were transformed into a new variable, which were named after the respective dimensions. For example, the mean value of the survey items 11, 13, 18, 35, 36, 37, 39 and 41 were transformed into a new variable, labeled social mobility. Each of these new variables was a continuous variable, and was used as both an outcome variable, and as a predictor variable in the analyses that follow.

*Main Study reliability and validity.* Upon approval from the Cleveland State University IRB Committee (Appendix G), the Main Study was conducted in order to further analyze the validity and reliability of the researcher-designed survey instrument (Appendix E). Students enrolled in an 11th grade English class at the time of the Main Study were asked to participate. The final sample consisted of 124 participants. Having met the assumptions of normality (based on the central limit theorem), homogeneity of variance and independence, as well as having a measurement at the interval level, a two-tailed bivariate correlation analysis was used to obtain the Pearson's r correlation coefficients among 36 survey items (questions 11-43, 45-48) (Field, 2009; Steinberg, 2011). Correlation coefficients of $\pm.1$ represent a small effect; $\pm.3$ a medium effect; and $\pm.5$ a large effect (Field, 2009).

The bivariate correlation analysis for survey items 11 through 48 (Appendix H1) indicated statistically significant correlation coefficients varying from $r = .177$, n=124, $p<.05$ to $r = .655$, n=124, $p<.001$. In general, the results suggested that the following 31 survey items met the statistically significant correlation coefficient assumptions of a Pearson's $r$ correlation coefficient of $r(124) = \pm.3$ to be included in the multivariate

factor analysis (Field, 2009): 12-18, 21-36, 38, 40-43, 45-48, with only one correlation coefficient less than $r(124) = \pm.3$ at $r = .282$, $p<.001$.

The initial principal component factor analysis for the Main Study was exploratory, and used latent root criterion with factor with eigenvalues greater than one, with a Varimax rotation. Factor loadings with were set at $\pm.30$ for minimum consideration (Field, 2009; Hair et al., 2010). This analysis identified 10 components. Based on the theoretical framework and literature review, and the Pilot Study, the researcher then employed an exploratory factor analysis using a priori criterion with an anticipated four factors (Hair et al., 2009). The items converged at six iterations (Table 5).

Table 5

*Main Study Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation*

| | Component | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Q.24 | .787 | | | |
| Q.25 | .775 | | | |
| Q.23 | .723 | .327 | | |
| Q.47 | .637 | | | -.315 |
| Q.34 | .611 | | | |
| Q.43 | .602 | | | .308 |
| Q.32 | .599 | | | |
| Q.46 | .553 | | | |
| Q.45 | .540 | | | |
| Q.27 | .532 | | | |
| Q.48 | .460 | | | |
| Q.22 | .401 | | .347 | |
| Q.28 | .379 | | .366 | |
| Q.12 | | .743 | | |
| Q.17 | | .698 | | |
| Q.14 | | .613 | | |
| Q.18 | | .606 | | |
| Q.16 | | .599 | | |
| Q.13 | | .554 | | |
| Q.15 | | .503 | | |
| Q.36 | | .354 | | |
| Q.11 | | .353 | | |
| Q.42 | .303 | .349 | | |
| Q.21 | | .319 | | |
| Q.30 | | .305 | | |
| Q.26 | | | .617 | |
| Q.38 | | | -.567 | .349 |
| Q.35 | | | -.499 | |
| Q.31 | | | .471 | |
| Q.19 | | | . 412 | |
| Q.40 | | | -.407 | |
| Q.29 | | .310 | .383 | .361 |
| Q.39 | | | | .612 |
| Q.37 | | | | . 569 |
| Q.33 | .311 | | | .511 |
| Q.20 | | .418 | | -.426 |
| Q.41 | | | | . 418 |

*Note.* Factor loadings <.30 are not shown.

80

Table 6

*Main Study Summary of Identified Factors for Scale Reliability Analysis*

| Factor | Items | # of Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|--------|-------|------------|------------------|
| 1 | 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41 | 11 | .717 |
| 2 | 17, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 | 7 | .624 |
| 3 | 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 | 8 | .701 |
| 4 | 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48 | 6 | .718 |

To analyze the construct reliability of each component, a scale reliability analysis was performed. Table 6 illustrates the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the scale reliability analysis. The Cronbach's alpha for Factors 1, 2, 3 and 4 suggest good reliability. These factors reflect different items than those that were included in the Pilot Study Scale Reliability Analysis (Table 3). The items included in the Main Study Scale Reliabilities Analysis more accurately reflect the theoretical framework of Labaree and coincide with the survey question items that were aligned with the theoretical framework. The Cronbach's alpha for all the four Factors in the Main Study suggest a stronger reliability than those of the Pilot Study.

*Main Study Dimension Analysis.* After analyzing the survey items within each construct, the researcher identified four underlying structures or dimensions which reflected the theoretical framework for this study: social mobility, societal and economic contribution, democratic equality, and district stakeholders' interests (Table 7). The first three dimensions capture the competing goals of education as outlined by Labaree

(1997)—social mobility, social efficiency and democratic equality respectively—and the fourth dimension reflects the collective educational goals of the district's stakeholders.

Table 7

*Main Study Summary of Identified Survey Constructs (Dimensions)*

| Factor | Items | Construct (Dimensions) |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41 | social mobility (competition) |
| 2 | 17, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 | social efficiency |
| 3 | 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 | democratic equality |
| 4 | 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48 | district stakeholders' interests |

Just as in the Pilot Study, after identifying each construct, the values from the participants' responses for the individual survey items were transformed into a new variable, which were named after the respective dimensions. For example, the mean value of the survey items 17, and 28-33 were transformed into a new variable, labeled social efficiency. Each of these new variables was a continuous variable, and was used as both an outcome variable, and as a predictor variable in the analyses that follow.

**Data Collection**

**Research site.**  The research site for the Pilot Study and Main Study was an inner-ring suburban high school located in the Midwest. The high school serves students in grades 9-12, with an approximate enrollment of 1500 students. Programming at the high school includes advance placement (AP) and honors, college preparation, and comprehensive and courses. Additionally, the school district participates in a vocational programming consortium (offered to juniors and seniors), offers alternative credit

recovery programming (online coursework), and provides on-site programming and interventions for students with special needs.

**Pilot Study sample.** During the fall of each school year, the district reports student demographic information to the state's Education Management Information System (EMIS). These annual reports are made public and published on the state's department of education website. A summary of the high school's 2012-2013 Fiscal Year demographic information as reported to EMIS can be found in Table 8.

Table 8

*Pilot Study High School Demographic Descriptive Statistics*

| Demographic Category | N (1468) | Building Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Gender, Male | 716 | 48.8 |
| Gender, Female | 752 | 51.2 |
| | | |
| Race, Black/African American | 924 | 62.9 |
| Race, White/Caucasian | 431 | 29.4 |
| Race, Hispanic | 21 | 1.4 |
| Race, Asian/Pacific Islander | 27 | 1.8 |
| Race, Mixed | 65 | 4.4 |
| | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 276 | 18.8 |
| Economically Disadvantaged[a] | 638 | 43.4 |

*Note.* As reported by the district to EMIS, FY 2013
[a] Students who qualify for free/reduced lunch program.

In order to obtain a sample that was both representative of the building population and included students in a variety of programming, the researcher targeted approximately 340 students that were enrolled in eleventh grade English classes at the high school and the adjacent Online Academy. As required by the state, all students must take four years of English; thus by identifying potential participants in eleventh grade English classes,

potential to maximize student participation and exposure to students in variety of courses of study were both maximized. All students enrolled in an eleventh grade English class were asked to participate, including students taking courses at the off-site credit recovery program.

A total of 91 students returned their required signed consent and assent forms and participated in the survey. Four of the participants submitted survey that were over 50% incomplete and were not included in the analysis, leaving a sample size of n = 87. Table 9 and Table 10 summarize the participant descriptive statistics.

Table 9

*Pilot Study Summary of Participants' Demographic Descriptive Statistics*

| Demographic Category | N | Percent of Sample |
|---|---|---|
| Gender, Male | 37 | 42.5 |
| Gender, Female | 50 | 57.5 |
| | | |
| Race, White/Caucasian | 29 | 33.3 |
| Race, Black/African American | 47 | 54.0 |
| Race, Asian/Pacific Islander | 5 | 5.7 |
| Race, Hispanic | 2 | 2.3 |
| Race, Other | 2 | 2.3 |
| | | |
| Courses, Vocational | 11 | 12.6 |
| Courses, Honors/AP | 26 | 29.9 |
| Courses, College Prep | 38 | 43.7 |
| Courses, Comprehensive | 9 | 10.3 |
| Courses, Small Group/Special Ed | 3 | 3.4 |
| | | |
| Post-Grad, Enter workforce full-time | 3 | 3.4 |
| Post-Grad, Go to 2- or 4 yr college | 76 | 87.4 |
| Post-Grad, Vocational Training | 1 | 1.1 |
| Post-Grad, Military | 4 | 4.6 |
| Post-Grad, Undecided | 3 | 3.4 |

*Note.* As self-reported by participants.

Table 10

*Pilot Study Summary of Participant's Descriptive Statistics for Student Profile Information*

| Profiling Trait | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GPA | 87 | 1.70 | 4.53 | 3.18 | .718 | .515 |
| Tardy to School per week | 85 | 0 | 4.00 | .55 | .982 | .964 |
| Tardy to Class per week | 87 | 0 | 5.00 | .57 | 1.14 | 1.29 |
| Absent per month | 86 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 1.32 | .829 | .688 |

*Note.* As self-reported by participants.

**Main Study sample.** Participants were recruited to participate in the Main Study during the following academic year (2013-2014). Once again, the researcher targeted a student population that was both representative of the building population and included students in a variety of programming. At the time of the administration of the study, there were 274 students enrolled in eleventh grade English classes at the high school and the adjacent Online Academy. With the exception of students who had previously participated in the survey, all students enrolled in an eleventh grade English class were asked to participate, including students taking courses at the off-site credit recovery program. A summary of the district's 2013-2014 Fiscal Year demographic information as reported to EMIS can be found in Table 11.

A total of 124 students returned their required signed consent and assent forms and participated in the survey. Table 12 and Table 13 summarize the participant descriptive statistics.

Table 11

*Main Study High School Demographic Descriptive Statistics*

| Demographic Category | N (1401) | Building Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Gender, Male | 678 | 48.4 |
| Gender, Female | 723 | 51.6 |
| | | |
| Race, Black/African American | 883 | 63.0 |
| Race, White/Caucasian | 408 | 29.1 |
| Race, Hispanic | 14 | 1.0 |
| Race, Asian/Pacific Islander | 27 | 1.9 |
| Race, Mixed | 69 | 4.9 |
| | | |
| Students with Disabilities | 276 | 18.8 |
| Economically Disadvantaged[a] | 638 | 43.4 |

*Note.* As reported by the district to EMIS, FY 2014
[a]Students who qualify for free/reduced lunch program

Table 12

*Main Study Summary of Participants' Demographic Descriptive Statistics*

| Demographic Category | N | Percent of Sample |
|---|---|---|
| Gender, Male | 49 | 39.5 |
| Gender, Female | 73 | 58.9 |
| Gender, Missing | 2 | 1.6 |
| | | |
| Race, Black/African American | 66 | 53.2 |
| Race, White/Caucasian | 42 | 33.9 |
| Race, Hispanic | 5 | 4.0 |
| Race, Asian/Pacific Islander | 1 | 0.8 |
| Race, Mixed | 9 | 7.3 |
| Race, Other | 1 | 0.8 |
| | | |
| Courses, Vocational | 28 | 22.6 |
| Courses, Honors/AP | 36 | 29.0 |
| Courses, College Prep | 35 | 28.2 |
| Courses, Comprehensive | 14 | 11.3 |
| Courses, Small Group/Special Ed | 6 | 4.8 |
| Courses, Online/Alternative | 4 | 3.2 |
| | | |
| Post-Grad, Enter workforce full-time | 3 | 2.4 |
| Post-Grad, Go to 2- or 4 yr college | 106 | 85.5 |
| Post-Grad, Vocational Training | 2 | 1.6 |
| Post-Grad, Military | 2 | 1.6 |
| Post-Grad, Undecided | 11 | 8.9 |

*Note.* As self-reported by participants

Table 13

*Main Study Summary of Participant's Descriptive Statistics for Student Profile Information*

| Profiling Trait | N | Min | Max | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GPA | 124 | 1.50 | 4.60 | 3.18 | .713 | .509 |
| Tardy to School per week | 124 | 0 | 5.00 | .73 | 1.20 | 1.45 |
| Tardy to Class per week | 124 | 0 | 6.00 | .89 | 1.36 | 1.84 |
| Absent/month | 124 | 0 | 7.00 | 1.40 | 1.63 | 2.65 |

*Note.* As self-reported by participants.

**Pilot Study Institutional Review Board**.

Before beginning the Pilot Study, the researcher submitted an Institutional Review Board (IRB) form to the IRB committee at Cleveland State University, describing the research and seeking permission to survey students at the high school during the 2012-2013 academic year. Approval from the IRB was contingent on site approval and cooperation from the superintendent of the school district.

After receiving approval from the IRB committee at Cleveland State University (Appendix D), the researcher met with the high school's English Department Coordinator, who granted permission on behalf of the English Department for the researcher to briefly introduce the Pilot Study in the eleventh grade English classes. An email was sent to the English Department staff to coordinate dates and times to introduce the Pilot Study to students, followed by additional emails and in-person meetings to establish dates for the implementation of the Pilot Study survey.

On the agreed upon days, the researcher introduced the Pilot Study to the students and passed out student consent, student assent and parental consent forms to all students in the class (Appendices I, J, K, respectively). Arrangements were made for form collection by the student researcher for later in the week. Students reserved the right to decide whether or not participate in the study without penalty.

Following the collection of signed consent and assent forms, students who returned all required forms were taken to a computer lab by the student researcher on days that were mutually agreed upon by the English Department. Students participated in the Pilot Study survey during their respective English class throughout the school day. All student participants received the same instruction regarding the survey and were given as much time as they needed to complete the survey. The average survey completion time was approximately 15 minutes. Upon completion of the survey, students returned to class.

**Main Study Institutional Review Board**.

Before beginning the Main Study, the researcher submitted an IRB form to the IRB committee at Cleveland State University, describing the research and seeking permission to survey students at the high school during the 2013-2014 academic year. After receiving approval from the IRB committee at Cleveland State University (Appendix G), the researcher met once again with the high school's English Department Coordinator, who granted permission on behalf of the English Department for the researcher to briefly introduce the Main Study in the eleventh grade English classes. An email was sent to the English Department staff to coordinate dates and times to introduce

the study to students, followed by additional emails and in-person meetings to establish dates for the implementation of the survey.

On the agreed upon days, the researcher introduced the Main Study to the students and passed out student consent, student assent and parental consent forms to all students in the class (Appendices L, M, and N, respectively). Arrangements were made for form collection by the student researcher for later in the week. Students reserved the right to decide whether or not participate in the study without penalty.

Following the collection of signed consent and assent forms, students who returned all required forms were taken to a computer lab by the student researcher on days that were mutually agreed upon by the English Department. Students participated in the Main Study survey during their respective English class throughout the school day. All student participants received the same instruction regarding the survey and were given as much time as they needed to complete the survey. The average survey completion time was approximately 15 minutes. Upon completion of the survey, students returned to class.

**Research Design.**

This quantitative study followed a descriptive research design. In this study, the researcher examined the relationship among six variables: student grade point average (GPA), student course of study, and the four dimensions of the goals of education (social mobility, societal and economic contribution, democratic equality and district stakeholders' interests). Of the six variables, student GPA and course of study were treated as covariate independent variables to determine the extent to which they influence

student perception of the competing goals of education. The four dimensions of the competing goals of education were treated as dependent variables.

**Data analysis**. To analyze the collected data, the researcher used descriptive statistics, a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) and a multinomial logistic regression. The descriptive statistics in this study included frequencies, mean, range, standard deviation, and variance. Frequencies were used to identify the participant population according to race and gender, as well student profile information for student course of study and student postsecondary plans. Mean, range, standard deviation, and variances were used to describe average student GPA. Mean scores of each goal dimension were used to address the first research question that examines the extent to which students identified with each of the competing goals of education.

The first statistical method used in this study was a MANCOVA. MANCOVA is a parametric test used to examine the relationship among variables when there are two or more continuous outcome variables and two or more predictors that are categorical and continuous (Field, 2009). In this study, the researcher wanted to examine the extent to which student GPA and course of study relate to competing goals of education as defined by the goal of democratic equality, the goal of social efficiency, the goal of social mobility and the collective goal of district stakeholders. Among the predictors, or independent variables, student GPA was a continuous variable, while student course of study was categorical. The dependent variables were the transformed variables that were computed using the dimensions of the competing goals of education. Additionally, all four of the outcome, or dependent, variables were continuous, which made MANCOVA an appropriate multivariate approach to analysis.

The following model (1) was used to examine the relationship among the dependent and predictor variables:

$$\gamma_{ij} = \mu + \alpha_j + \omega(X_{ij} - \bar{X}.) + \varepsilon_{ij} \tag{1}$$

where the outcome variable, $\gamma$, was the competing goal of education, $\alpha$ was the independent variable for group membership in course of study, $X$ was the covariate, grade point average, and $\varepsilon$ is the random error .

The researcher coded the independent categorical variable for student course of study in the following manner: "0" for "Comprehensive" classes; "1" for "Vocational" classes; "2" for "Honors/AP" classes; "3" for "College Prep" classes; "4" for "Small Group/Special Education" classes and "5" for "Alternative/Online" classes. The second independent variable, student GPA, was an open-ended question on the survey which allowed students to record their own GPA up to a value of 4.00. This independent variable was entered as an interval measurement. The four dependent variables were measured on a four point Likert scale, with "1" for "Strongly Disagree," "2" for "Disagree," "3" for "Agree" and "4" for "Strongly Agree." These scores were treated as continuous variables.

Finally, a multinomial logistic regression was used to explore the extent to which students' grade point average (GPA) and the competing goal with which the students most strongly identify with predicts membership in a specific course of study. Logistic regression is multiple regression that is used when the predictor variables are continuous or categorical and the outcome variable is categorical (Field, 2009). It is considered an appropriate analysis in many situations, as it does not adhere to the strict assumptions of discriminant analysis, and is a more robust analysis when assumptions are not met as

compared to the discriminant model (Hair et al., 2010).  Multinomial logistic regression

is an analysis used to predict membership of more than two categories (Field, 2009).

The following model (2) was used to predict student membership in course of

study using multinomial logistic regression:

$$\log \frac{\Pr(Y=j)}{\Pr(Y=j')} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon \tag{2}$$

where $X_1$ was the predictor variable student GPA and $X_2$ was the predictor variable mean

score of the competing goal of education with which students most strongly identified,

and $\varepsilon$ was the random error. The outcome variable $j$ was the course of study, and j´ was

the reference course of study. The outcome variable was coded categorically and

consisted of six different courses of study, or categories: Honors/AP, College

Preparatory, Comprehensive, Special Education, Vocational, and Online Learning. (A

description of each course of study can be found in Chapter 1.)  The College Preparatory

course of study was set as the reference category (*j*) in the multinomial logistic regression

to reflect the typical enrollment of juniors, pursuant to the eleventh grade guidance

counselor at the high school. The remaining courses of study (*j*) were compared against

this reference category. Ultimately, this model generated five separate equations:

$$\log \frac{\Pr(Y=Honors/AP)}{\Pr(Y=College\ Prep)} = \alpha + \beta_1 GPA_1 + \beta_2 GoalEdu_2 + \varepsilon \tag{3}$$

$$\log \frac{\Pr(Y=Comprehensive)}{\Pr(Y=College\ Prep)} = \alpha + \beta_1 GPA_1 + \beta_2 GoalEdu_2 + \varepsilon \tag{4}$$

$$\log \frac{\Pr(Y=SpecialEd)}{\Pr(Y=College\ Prep)} = \alpha + \beta_1 GPA_1 + \beta_2 GoalEdu_2 + \varepsilon \tag{5}$$

$$\log \frac{\text{Pr}(Y=Vocational)}{\text{Pr}(Y=College\ Prep)} = \alpha + \beta_1 GPA_1 + \beta_2 GoalEdu_2 + \varepsilon \qquad (6)$$

$$\log \frac{\text{Pr}(Y=Online)}{\text{Pr}(Y=College\ Prep)} = \alpha + \beta_1 GPA_1 + \beta_2 GoalEdu_2 + \varepsilon \qquad (7)$$

**CHAPTER IV**

**RESULTS**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between student grade point average and course of study, and students' identification of the goal(s) of education as outlined by Labaree (1997a): democratic equality, social efficiency, and social mobility. This chapter will report the descriptive and inferential statistical findings of this quantitative study, with respect to the following research questions and sub-questions that directed this study:

1. To what extent do students identify with each of the competing goals of education?

   a. To what extent do students identify democratic equality as the goal of education?

   b. To what extent do students identify social efficiency as the goal of education?

c. To what extent do students identify social mobility as the goal of education?

d. To what extent do students identify district stakeholders' goals as the collective goal of education?

2. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to their identification with each of the competing goals of education?

a. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of democratic equality?

b. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of social efficiency?

c. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of social mobility?

d. To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goals of district stakeholders?

3. To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and the competing goal with which students most strongly identify with predict membership in course of study?

a.  To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of democratic equality as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

b.  To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of social efficiency as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

c.  To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of social mobility as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

d.  To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of the collective goals of district stakeholders as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?

**Research Question 1: To what extent do students identify with each of the competing goals of education?**

a.  **To what extent do students identify democratic equality as the goal of education?**

b.  **To what extent do students identify social efficiency as the goal of education?**

c.  **To what extent do students identify social mobility as the goal of education?**

d.  **To what extent do students identify district stakeholders' goals as the collective goal of education?**

Descriptive statistics were used to examine the first research question and its sub-questions. Specifically, the means of the transformed variables for each of the competing goals of education were considered in order to determine the competing goal with which students most strongly identified. A summary of the descriptive statistics, including the minimum, maximum mean and standard deviation for each of the goal dimensions can be found in Table 14.

Table 14

*Main Study Descriptive Statistics*

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Democratic Equality | 124 | 1.43 | 3.88 | 2.72 | .425 |
| Social Efficiency | 124 | 1.43 | 4.00 | 2.84 | .407 |
| Social Mobility | 124 | 1.18 | 3.50 | 2.55 | .384 |
| DistrictStakeholders | 124 | 1.00 | 3.83 | 2.78 | .446 |

The survey instrument (Appendix E) utilized a Likert scale, which ranged from 1 (strongly disagreed) to 4 (strongly agreed). The computed variable for each competing goal of education reflected a mean score of the survey items associated with each goal. (A detailed description of the survey instrument can be found in Chapter 3). A mean score of 2.50 indicated a neutral rating. A mean score of 2.51 or higher suggested that the students identified with the competing goal of education. Similarly, a mean score of 2.49 or lower suggested that the students did not identify with the competing goal of education.

According to the descriptive statistics, students most strongly identified with the goal of Social Efficiency ($M = 2.84$, $SD = .407$), followed by District Stakeholders

($M = 2.78$, $SD = .446$), Democratic Equality ($M = 2.72$, $SD = .425$) and Social Mobility

($M = 2.55$, $SD = .384$).

**Research Question 2: To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to their identification with each of the competing goals of education?**

   a. **To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of democratic equality?**

   b. **To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of social efficiency?**

   c. **To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goal of social mobility?**

   d. **To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to student identification with the educational goals of district stakeholders?**

Inferential statistics were used to examine the second research question and its sub-questions. In order to assess the extent to which students' course of study and GPA related to each of the competing goals of education, a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was employed.

**Model assumptions.** According to the assumptions of MANCOVA, the dependent variables should be parametric data that are interval, with a reasonably normal

distribution (Field, 2009; Mayers 2013).  An exploratory analysis to test for sampling

distribution normality of the dependent variables was conducted using the Shapiro-Wilks

test, which is generally more accurate than the Kruskall-Wallace (Field, 2009).  The

distribution of data for Democratic Equality [$W(124) = .98$, $p<.05$], Social Efficiency

[$W(124) = .98$, $p<.05$], Social Mobility [$W(124) = .96$, $p<.05$] and District Stakeholders

[$W(124) = .95$, $p<.05$] all appeared to be significantly non-normal, thus indicating that the

assumption of homogeneity had not been met. However, according to Mayers (2013),

"multivariate normality is quite robust to violations so long as the sample size exceeds

20" (p. 381). Given the sample size of this study (N=124), the researcher was confident in

moving forward with the analyses. The researcher noted this assumption violation, and

analyzed and interpreted the data and findings with caution, as well as indicated the lack

of homogeneity in the study's limitations. To account for the lack of homogeneity, a

lower significance level ($p<.01$ rather than $p< .05$) was considered, however, it did not

yield any statistically significant changes in any of the outcomes.

Prior to conducting the MANCOVA, a bivariate correlation among the dependent

variables and the covariate (competing goals, GPA) was employed to determine if there

was multicollinearity among the variables. Multicollinearity occurs when two or more

variables are closely related, which makes it difficult to determine the effects of each

variable (Field, 2009). A reasonable correlation between the variables for this test ranges

from $r = .30$ to $r = .90$ (Mayers, 2013). Values higher than $r = .90$ suggest

multicollinearity; values lower than $r = .30$ suggest a weak relationship between

variables.  The results of the correlation matrix (Table 15) indicated that the dependent

variables were reasonably correlated with each other; however, GPA had no statistically

Table 15

*Bivariate Correlations Among Dependent Variables and Covariate*

| | | Democratic Equality | Social Efficiency | Social Mobility | District Stakeholders | GPA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Democratic Equality | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .618** | .545** | .660** | .012 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 | .000 | .000 | .899 |
| | N | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 |
| Social Efficiency | Pearson Correlation | .618** | 1 | .525** | .413** | .093 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | | .000 | .000 | .303 |
| | N | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 |
| Social Mobility | Pearson Correlation | .545** | .525** | 1 | .426** | .041 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | | .000 | .651 |
| | N | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 |
| District Stakeholders | Pearson Correlation | .660** | .413** | .426** | 1 | -.087 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | | .337 |
| | N | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 |
| GPA | Pearson Correlation | .012 | .093 | .041 | -.087 | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .899 | .303 | .651 | .337 | |
| | N | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

significant correlation with any of the dependent variables. Descriptive statistics were used to further analyze the covariate GPA. According to the descriptive analysis, the mean GPA was 3.14 ($N = 124$, $SD = .648$), with a range of $1.50 – 4.00$. The median GPA (3.20) and mode (4.00) indicated that students who participated in the study reported

higher than average GPAs. Course of Study (Classes) was excluded from the bivariate correlation analysis because it is categorical and therefore entered as a fixed factor for the MANCOVA test, not a covariate. Because this was an exploratory study, all variables were included in the MANCOVA. Finally, an a priori Box's M test of equality of covariance was non-significant at $F(40, 2128) = 1.18$, $p>.05$, which indicated that the assumption of homoscedasticity was upheld. Although it is similar to the Levene's test of equality of error variance, a separate test is not performed for each dependent variable in the Box's M test. Because this assumption is critical to regression models, the researcher performed the Levene's test of equality of variance, as well.

**Levene's test.** After addressing test assumptions, a MANCOVA was conducted to explore the extent to which students' course of study and GPA related to each of the competing goals of education. The Levene's test of equality of error variance indicated that Democratic Equality [$F(5,117) = .476$, $p>.05$], Social Efficiency [$F(5,117) =.729$, $p>.05$] and District Stakeholders [$F(5,117) = 1.29$, $p>.05$] were not statistically significant, which suggests that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups (homoscedasticity). Social Mobility [$F(5,117) = 2.62$, $p<.05$] was statistically significant, which suggested that it did not have equal variance across groups.

**Multivariate tests.** Results from the multivariate tests were interpreted to determine the effects of GPA and course of study on the competing goals of education (Table 16). Using Wilks's statistic, there was a non-significant effect of GPA on the competing goals of education, $\lambda = 0.94$, $F(4,113) =1.86$, $p>.05$, and a non-significant effect of course of study on the competing goals of education, $\lambda = .803$, $F(4,113) = 1.29$, $p>.05$.

**Tests of between-subjects.** Results from the tests of between-subjects were analyzed to determine the effects of GPA and course of study on the competing goals of education (Table 17) demonstrated a non-significant effect of GPA on Democratic Equality [$F(1,116) = .006$, $p>.05$, $\eta_p^2 = .000$], Social Efficiency [$F(1,116) = 2.60$, $p>.05$, $\eta_p^2 = .022$], Social Mobility [$F(1,116) = 1.55$, $p>.05$, $\eta_p^2 = .013$], and District Stakeholders [$F(1,116) = .966$, $p>.05$, $\eta_p^2 = .008$]. Similarly, the tests of between-subjects demonstrate a non-significant effect of course of study on Democratic Equality [$F(1,116) = .464$, $p>.05$, $\eta_p^2 = .020$], Social Efficiency [$F(1,116) = 1.24$, $p>.05$, $\eta_p^2 = .051$], Social Mobility [$F(1,116) = 1.02$, $p>.05$, $\eta_p^2 = .0142$], and District Stakeholders [$F(1,116) = .596$, $p>.05$, $\eta_p^2 = .025$].

In sum, despite a lack of normal distribution among the dependent variables (competing goals of education), the robustness of the model allowed for the MANCOVA to be employed and the results were analyzed with caution. The central tendencies indicated that students reported higher than average GPAs ($M = 3.14$, $Mdn = 3.20$, Mode $= 4.00$). The results from the MANCOVA indicated that neither GPA nor course of study had a statistically significant effect on the goals of education. The test of between-subjects further demonstrated there was no statistically significant relationship between student course of study and GPA, and each of the competing goals of education.

Table 16

*Multivariate Tests of the Effects of GPA and Course of Study on Competing Goals of Education[a]*

| Effect | | Value | F | Hyp. df | Error df | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared | Noncent. Parameter | Obs Power[d] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | Pillai's Trace | .612 | 44.5[b] | 4 | 113 | .000 | .612 | 178 | 1.00 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | .388 | 44.5[b] | 4 | 113 | .000 | .612 | 178 | 1.00 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | 1.58 | 44.5[b] | 4 | 113 | .000 | .612 | 178 | 1.00 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | 1.58 | 44.5[b] | 4 | 113 | .000 | .612 | 178 | 1.00 |
| GPA | Pillai's Trace | .062 | 1.86[b] | 4 | 113 | .123 | .062 | 7.42 | .548 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | .938 | 1.86[b] | 4 | 113 | .123 | .062 | 7.42 | .548 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | .066 | 1.86[b] | 4 | 113 | .123 | .062 | 7.42 | .548 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | .066 | 1.86[b] | 4 | 113 | .123 | .062 | 7.42 | .548 |
| Classes | Pillai's Trace | .210 | 1.29 | 20 | 464 | .182 | .053 | 25.7 | .881 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | .803 | 1.29 | 20 | 376 | .185 | .053 | 21.2 | .784 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | .229 | 1.28 | 20 | 446 | .189 | .054 | 25.6 | .877 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | .120 | 2.77[c] | 5 | 116 | .021 | .107 | 13.9 | .814 |

[a]Design: Intercept + GPA + Classes

[b] Exact statistic

[c]The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.

[d]Computed using alpha = .05

Table 17

*Tests of Between-Subjects of Effects of GPA and Course of Study on Goals of Education*

| Source | Dependent Variable | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared | Noncent. Parameter | Observed Power[e] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | SOCEFF | 1.19[a] | 6 | .198 | 1.20 | .310 | .059 | 7.22 | .458 |
| | DEM | .439[b] | 6 | .073 | .389 | .885 | .020 | 2.33 | .158 |
| | MOBILITY | .797[c] | 6 | .133 | .889 | .506 | .044 | 5.33 | .340 |
| | DISTRICT | .793[d] | 6 | .132 | .646 | .693 | .032 | 3.88 | .249 |
| Intercept | SOCEFF | 18.1 | 1 | 18.1 | 110 | .000 | .487 | 110 | 1.00 |
| | DEM | 21.7 | 1 | 21.7 | 115 | .000 | .499 | 116 | 1.00 |
| | MOBILITY | 15.3 | 1 | 15.3 | 102 | .000 | .469 | 102 | 1.00 |
| | DISTRICT | 27.5 | 1 | 27.5 | 134 | .000 | .537 | 134 | 1.00 |
| GPA | SOCEFF | .428 | 1 | .428 | 2.60 | .109 | .022 | 2.60 | .360 |
| | DEM | .001 | 1 | .001 | .006 | .938 | .000 | .006 | .051 |
| | MOBILITY | .232 | 1 | .232 | 1.55 | .216 | .013 | 1.55 | .235 |
| | DISTRICT | .198 | 1 | .198 | .966 | .328 | .008 | .966 | .164 |
| Classes | SOCEFF | 1.02 | 5 | .204 | 1.24 | .294 | .051 | 6.21 | .427 |
| | DEM | .436 | 5 | .087 | .464 | .803 | .020 | 2.32 | .170 |
| | MOBILITY | .765 | 5 | .153 | 1.02 | .407 | .042 | 5.12 | .354 |
| | DISTRICT | .609 | 5 | .122 | .596 | .703 | .025 | 2.98 | .212 |
| Error | SOCEFF | 19.1 | 116 | .164 | | | | | |
| | DEM | 21.8 | 116 | .188 | | | | | |
| | MOBILITY | 17.3 | 116 | .149 | | | | | |
| | DISTRICT | 23.7 | 116 | .204 | | | | | |
| Total | SOCEFF | 1013 | 123 | | | | | | |
| | DEM | 934 | 123 | | | | | | |
| | MOBILITY | 816 | 123 | | | | | | |
| | DISTRICT | 973 | 123 | | | | | | |
| Corrected Total | SOCEFF | 20.3 | 122 | | | | | | |
| | DEM | 22.3 | 122 | | | | | | |
| | MOBILITY | 18.1 | 122 | | | | | | |
| | DISTRICT | 24.5 | 122 | | | | | | |

[a]R Squared = .059 (Adjusted R Squared = .010).
[b]R Squared = .020 (Adjusted R Squared = -.031).
[c]R Squared = .044 (Adjusted R Squared = -.005).
[d]R Squared = .032 (Adjusted R Squared = -.018).
[e]Computed using alpha = .05.

**Research Question 3: To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and the competing goal with which students most strongly identify with predict membership in course of study?**

   a. **To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of democratic equality as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?**

   b. **To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of social efficiency as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?**

   c. **To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of social mobility as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?**

   d. **To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and identification of the collective goals of district stakeholders as a goal of education predict membership in their course of study?**

   Inferential statistics were used to analyze the third research question and sub-question. A main effect multinomial logistic regression was employed to examine the extent to which students' grade point average (GPA) and the competing goal with which students most strongly identified with predicted their membership in their course of study. The main effect model examined the main effect of each of the predictor variables on the dependent variable, while controlling for the other predictors. Unlike the MANCOVA, this test does not hold the assumptions of normality, linearity, or homoscedasticity (Field, 2009; Starkweather & Moske, n.d.). The sample size for this

106

study (N = 124) meets the minimum guidelines for an adequate sample size for a multinomial logistic regression, which suggests at least10 cases per independent variable (Starkweather & Moske, n.d.). The assumptions of linearity, independence of errors and multicollinearity (Field, 2009) were met prior to running the multinomial logistic regression.

**Model fitting.** The model fitting summary suggested that the final model explained a significant amount of the original variability, $\chi^2(25) = 114$, $p<.001$. The Pearson test statistic [$\chi^2(585) = 454$, $p>.05$] and deviance test statistic [$\chi^2(585) = 269$, $p>.05$] were not significant, which indicated that the model was a good fit. The pseudo R-square statistic Cox and Snell suggested a pseudo R-square of .605, which can be interpreted as 60.5% of the variance of the model could be attributed to the five independent variables in the logistic model. The pseudo R-statistic Nagelkerke suggested a pseudo R-square of .633, which can be interpreted as 63.3% of the variance of the model could be attributed to the five independent variables in the logistic model.

According to the likelihood ratio test, which tests for the overall effect of the variables, GPA had a significant main effect on course of study, $\chi^2(5) = 92.1$, $p<.001$. This suggests that GPA had a meaningful effect in the overall model. Democratic Equality [$\chi^2(5) = 9.99$, $p>.05$], Social Efficiency [$\chi^2(5) = 7.62$, $p>.05$], Social Mobility [$\chi^2(5) = 5.50$, $p>.05$], and District Stakeholders [$\chi^2(5) = 8.12$, $p>.05$] did not have a significant main effect on course of study.

**Parameter estimates.** A summary of the individual parameter estimates can be found in Table 18. The results of the parameter estimates suggest the extent to which each of the predictors in the model (GPA, Democratic Equality, Social Efficiency, Social

Mobility, District Stakeholders) predicted the likelihood of student membership in each course of study (Vocational, Honors/AP, Comprehensive, Online Learning and Special Education classes) as compared to membership in the reference category, College Preparatory.

   *Vocational classes*. Student identification with the goal of Democratic Equality statistically significantly predicted student membership in Vocational Class, $b = .058$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 5.36$, $p<.05$, $\beta = 12.1$. For a unit of change in the predictor variable Democratic Equality, the logit of outcome relative to the referent group (College Prep) is expected to change by its respective parameter estimate, given the variables in the model are held constant. Thus, the odd ratio suggests that as a student's score on the Likert score increases (to favor Democratic Equality), the change in the odds of group membership in Vocational Classes is 12.1: students are 1,110% more likely to participate in Vocational Classes than in College Preparatory classes.

   Student identification with the goal of District Stakeholders statistically significantly predicted student membership in Vocational Class, $b = -1.71$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 4.00$, $p<.05$, $\beta = .180$. For a unit of change in the predictor variable District Stakeholders, the logit of outcome relative to the referent group (College Prep) is expected to change by its respective parameter estimate, given the variables in the model are held constant. Thus, the odd ratio suggests that as a student's score on the Likert score decreases (to disagree with District Stakeholders), the change in the odds of group membership in Vocational Classes is .180: students are 82% less likely to participate in Vocational Classes than in College Preparatory classes.

Grade point average ($b = .058$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = .013$, $p > .05$), Social Efficiency ($b = .053$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = .003$, $p > .05$), and Social Mobility ($b = -1.34$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 1.90$, $p > .05$) did not significantly predict membership in Vocational Classes.

Table 18

*Parameter Estimates for Individual Predictors on Course of Study*

| Classes[a] | | B | SE | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) | 95% CI for Exp(B) Lower | Upper |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Voc. | Intercept | .785 | 2.61 | .090 | 1 | .764 | | | |
| | GPA | .058 | .518 | .013 | 1 | .910 | 1.06 | .384 | 2.92 |
| | Soc Eff | .053 | .909 | .003 | 1 | .954 | 1.05 | .177 | 6.26 |
| | Dem Equal | 2.50 | 1.08 | 5.36 | 1 | .021 | 12.1 | 1.47 | 100 |
| | Soc Mobility | -1.34 | .969 | 1.90 | 1 | .168 | .263 | .039 | 1.76 |
| | Dist Stkhld | -1.71 | .856 | 4.00 | 1 | .045 | .180 | .034 | .966 |
| Honors | Intercept | -18.9 | 5.44 | 12.1 | 1 | .001 | | | |
| | GPA | 6.40 | 1.34 | 22.9 | 1 | .000 | 602 | 43.8 | 8286 |
| | Soc Eff | -2.09 | 1.20 | 3.03 | 1 | .082 | .124 | .012 | 1.30 |
| | Dem Equal | 2.16 | 1.55 | 1.95 | 1 | .163 | 8.70 | .418 | 181 |
| | Soc Mobility | -.522 | 1.13 | .215 | 1 | .643 | .593 | .065 | 5.39 |
| | Dist Stkhld | -.717 | 1.15 | .391 | 1 | .532 | .488 | .052 | 4.62 |
| Comp | Intercept | 4.30 | 3.00 | 2.06 | 1 | .152 | | | |
| | GPA | -.892 | .663 | 1.81 | 1 | .179 | .410 | .112 | 1.50 |
| | Soc Eff | -1.47 | 1.15 | 1.63 | 1 | .201 | .231 | .024 | 2.19 |
| | Dem Equal | 1.86 | 1.27 | 2.15 | 1 | .143 | 6.45 | .534 | 77.9 |
| | Soc Mobility | .285 | 1.09 | .069 | 1 | .793 | 1.33 | .158 | 11.2 |
| | Dist Stkhld | -1.59 | 1.05 | 2.27 | 1 | .132 | .205 | .026 | 1.61 |
| Online | Intercept | 1.71 | 6.21 | .076 | 1 | .783 | | | |
| | GPA | -.508 | .974 | .272 | 1 | .602 | .601 | .089 | 4.06 |
| | Soc Eff | .619 | 1.88 | .109 | 1 | .742 | 1.86 | .047 | 73.5 |
| | Dem Equal | -1.39 | 1.64 | .723 | 1 | .395 | .248 | .010 | 6.15 |
| | Soc Mobility | -2.29 | 2.48 | .858 | 1 | .354 | .101 | .001 | 12.9 |
| | Dist Stkhld | 1.76 | 1.66 | 1.13 | 1 | .288 | 5.82 | .225 | 150 |
| Spec Ed | Intercept | -2.94 | 4.58 | .411 | 1 | .521 | | | |
| | GPA | -1.51 | .988 | 2.34 | 1 | .126 | .221 | .032 | 1.53 |
| | Soc Eff | 1.75 | 1.68 | 1.09 | 1 | .297 | 5.728 | .215 | 1523 |
| | Dem Equal | -.481 | 1.75 | .075 | 1 | .784 | .618 | .020 | 19.2 |
| | Soc Mobility | 1.82 | 1.67 | 1.19 | 1 | .275 | 6.17 | .235 | 162 |
| | Dist Stkhld | -1.19 | 1.41 | .702 | 1 | .402 | .306 | .019 | 4.90 |

[a]The reference category is: College Prep .

***Honors/AP classes***. Student GPA statistically significantly predicted student membership in Honors/AP Classes, $b = 6.40$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 22.9$, $p<.001$, $\beta = 602$. For a unit of change in the predictor variable GPA, the logit of outcome relative to the referent group (College Prep) is expected to change by its respective parameter estimate, given the variables in the model are held constant. Thus, the odd ratio suggests that as a student's GPA increases, the change in the odds of group membership in Honors/AP is 602: students are 502% more likely to participate in Honors/AP classes than in College Preparatory classes as their GPA increases.

Democratic Equality ($b = 2.16$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 1.95$, $p>.05$), Social Efficiency ($b = -2.09$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 3.03$, $p>.05$), Social Mobility ($b = -.522$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = .215$, $p>.05$) and District Stakeholders ($b = -7.17$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = .391$, $p>.05$), did not significantly predict membership in Honors/AP Classes.

***Comprehensive classes***. Grade point average ($b = -.892$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 1.81$, $p>.05$), Democratic Equality ($b = 1.86$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 2.15$, $p>.05$), Social Efficiency ($b = -1.47$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = .163$, $p>.05$), Social Mobility ($b = .285$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = .069$, $p>.05$) and District Stakeholders ($b = -1.59$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 2.27$, $p>.05$), did not significantly predict membership in Comprehensive Classes.

***Online learning***. Grade point average ($b = -.508$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = .272$, $p>.05$), Democratic Equality ($b = -1.39$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = .723$, $p>.05$), Social Efficiency ($b = .619$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = .109$, $p>.05$), Social Mobility ($b = -.2.29$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = .858$, $p>.05$) and District Stakeholders ($b = 1.76$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 1.13$, $p>.05$), did not significantly predict membership in Online Learning Classes.

*Special education classes*. Grade point average ($b$ = -.151, Wald $\chi^2(1)$ = .234, $p$>.05), Democratic Equality ($b$ = -.481, Wald $\chi^2(1)$ = .075, $p$>.05), Social Efficiency ($b$ = 1.75, Wald $\chi^2(1)$ = 1.09, $p$>.05), Social Mobility ($b$ = 1.82, Wald $\chi^2(1)$ = 1.19, $p$>.05) and District Stakeholders ($b$ = -1.19, Wald $\chi^2(1)$ = .702, $p$>.05), did not significantly predict membership in Online Learning Classes.

**Model Classification and Summary.**  According to the classification chart (Table 19), the overall predictive accuracy of the model was 50.4%. The model fitting summary suggests that approximately 60-63% of the variance in the model could be attributed to the five independent variables (Course of Study). The likelihood ratio test indicated that GPA had a significant main effect on Course of Study. The parameter estimates suggested that students who identified with the goal of democratic equality were more likely to participate in Vocational Classes than College Prep classes. It also suggested that students who identified with the goals of district stakeholders were less likely to participate in Vocational Classes than College Prep classes. Finally, the parameter estimates indicated that students' GPA positively predicted student membership in Honors/AP Classes.

Table 19

*Observed versus Predicted Classification of Course of Study*

| | | Predicted | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Observed | Vocational | Honors/ AP | College Prep | Compre- hensive | Online Learning | Special Education | Percent Correct |
| Vocational | 9 | 4 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 32.1 |
| Honors/AP | 3 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86.1 |
| College Prep | 5 | 8 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62.9 |
| Comprehensive | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Online | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Spec Education | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Overall Percentage | 20.3 | 35.0 | 41.5 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 50.4 |

**CHAPTER V**

**SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

**Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to examine student grade point average, student course of study and student identification with the competing goals of education as outlined by Labaree (1997) to determine if a statistically significant quantitative relationship existed among them. Specifically, this study examined (1) to what extent students identified with each of the competing goals of education; (2) to what extent students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) related to each of the competing goals of education; and (3) to what extent students' grade point average (GPA) and the competing goal with which students most strongly identified with predicted membership in course of study.

This study was unique in that it examined an area of research that is lacking in existing literature: students' perception of the goals of education. It was argued that student motivation should go beyond teachers simply stating daily learning objectives.

Rather, students should have a clear understanding of their overall purpose in school, and both teachers and students should be working toward a mutually productive educational outcome. Most importantly, these outcomes should align with those of policymakers and stakeholders.  The researcher conceptualized and analyzed this problem utilizing David Labaree's (1997a, 1997b, 2010) theoretical framework on the competing goals of education, which served as the foundation for the research questions and survey development.  Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to investigate the research questions and sub-questions. In the next section, the results of each research question are discussed. This is followed by recommendations for practitioners, policymakers and future research, and concluding thoughts.

**Summary of Findings**

**Research Question 1: To what extent do students identify with each of the competing goals of education?**

Descriptive statistics were used to examine the extent to which students identified with each of the competing goals of education: democratic equality, social efficiency, social mobility, and district stakeholders.  The survey instrument utilized a four-point Likert scale to measure student agreement. A mean score of 2.50 indicated a neutral rating of the competing goal of education. The findings indicated that students most strongly identified with the goal of Social Efficiency ($M = 2.84$, $SD = .407$).  This was followed by the goals of District Stakeholders ($M = 2.78$, $SD = .446$), the goal of Democratic Equality ($M = 2.72$, $SD = .425$) and the goal of Social Mobility ($M = 2.55$, $SD = .384$).

Based on the literature review and current climate in education, the researcher anticipated that Social Mobility would rate highest among students; however, it was determined to have the most neutral rating among the competing goals of education. Instead, the findings from the first research question suggest that the student participants in this study most strongly identified the purpose of education as Social Efficiency. Based on the theoretical framework, these students would define education as a public good. Through this lens, the purpose of education is to prepare the youth to carry out useful economic roles with competence in order to ensure society's economic well-being (Labaree, 1997a). In turn, these students may perceive that the role of school is to prepare them as workers to fill structurally necessary market roles.

The researcher suggests two possible reasons for these findings. The first potential explanation draws on the high school curricular programming. As noted in Chapter 1, students who participate in vocational programming at this high school enroll simultaneously in traditional coursework to meet state graduation requirements. According to one of the school's administrators, approximately 33% of the junior class was enrolled in vocational programming. Approximately 23% of the participants in this study indicated that their primary course of study was vocational programming, although the actual percentage could be higher if students chose to indicate their content area course levels as their primary course of study. Labaree's (1997a, 1997b) theoretical framework suggests that social efficiency is operationalized in schools as vocationalism. To that end, it would stand to reason that Social Efficiency would be the primary goal with which students most strongly identified.

Another possible explanation may point to a shift in rhetoric, resulting in an increasingly enmeshed relationship of the goals of education. With the recent adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) by more than 44 states, including the state in which this study was conducted, the rhetoric in educational policy has shifted to promote college and career readiness.  The stratification within the schools typically mirrors that of the job market. The change in discourse and push toward a singular goal of college and career readiness, however, may be producing a different effect. For some students, this push for college and career readiness may be one and the same—career readiness must come by way of college. It may be that postsecondary schooling is perceived as the penultimate goal, while securing a job is the ultimate goal.  The student profiling responses reflect this path.  Even though 28 students indicated that they participated in Vocational Courses, only three students (2.4%) indicated that they planned to enter the workforce full-time after graduation, and only two students (1.6%) indicated that they planned to attend vocational training. An overwhelming majority of students (n=106, 85.5%) indicated that they planned on attending a two- or four-year college after graduation.  It may be that students perceive high school as merely one more step in the education process, and not necessarily final preparation for entering into adulthood. Because the high school is not seen as an institution of finality, but rather as one that serves as a bridge between learning experiences, there may be a misalignment between students' sense of urgency to do well and meet performance outcomes outlined by policymakers.

This could potentially be a burgeoning consequence of the "narrowing of purpose and curriculum" (Barton & Coley, 2011) in a test-based accountability system that places

a premium on college readiness, and is quickly becoming a one-size-fits all system. As such, this repurposing of education moves in opposition to the virtues of democratic equality, and inhibits students from developing their unique potential and exploring their individual aspirations, which may not include college or necessitate the ability to demonstrate proficiency as measured by 45-question multiple choice test.  In doing so, it reinforces the goal of social efficiency, not necessarily at the expense of social mobility, but most certainly at the expense of democratic equality.

The range of mean scores of the competing goals was a modest .29.  Interested by the implications of mean scores as they related to each other, the researcher conducted additional *post hoc* inferential analyses to examine their significance. Because the four variables of interest (Democratic Equality, Social Efficiency, Social Mobility and District Stakeholders) had non-normal distributions, and thus did not meet the assumptions to run dependent t-tests, the researcher examined the median scores using a non-parametric one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test. Each variable was tested against the null hypothesis of a median score that equaled 2.50. According to the test summary (Table 20), the observed median score for Democratic Equality (*Mdn* = 2.86) was statistically significantly different from the hypothetical median score (*Mdn* = 2.50), $z = 7.49$, $p<.001$, $r = .67$, as was Democratic Equality (*Mdn* = 2.75, $z = 5.42$, $p<.001$, $r = .49$), and District Stakeholders (*Mdn* =  2.83, $z = 6.09$, $p<.001$, $r = .55$). The observed median for Social Mobility (*Mdn* = 2.55) was not statistically significantly different from the hypothetical median score, $z = .928$, $p>.05$.

These findings are interesting in that while they do not support the argument by Labaree (1997a, 1997b) that social mobility is leading the charge in education rhetoric,

they may suggest that students' perception of education is structured along societal stratifications. This stratification may become more evident across certain student profiling traits, such as socioeconomic status or race. For example, approximately 43% of all high school students at the sampling site for this study were eligible for free/reduced lunch. In this community, the goal of social mobility may be suppressed in favor of social efficiency; whereas social mobility may be more evident in an upper middle class or affluent community.

It may also suggest that students simply have different perceptions of the overarching goal, or purpose of education than that of policymakers. To that end, it may be quite difficult to measure student success by indicators informed by policies and best practices which are guided by these competing goals, if students are not receiving and, more importantly, understanding the overarching purpose of education, whatever it might be. Similarly, if there are several goals of the education delivery system, students should be equally aware of and working towards these goals.

Table 20

*One-Sample Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test of Competing Goals of Education Median Scores*

Test value = 2.50

| | Observed Mean | N | Test Statistic | Standardized Test Statistic | Standard Error | Sig.[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Democratic Eq. | 2.75 | 124 | 5024 | 5.42 | 343 | .000 |
| Social Efficiency | 2.86 | 124 | 6770 | 7.49 | 395 | .000 |
| Social Mobility | 2.55 | 124 | 4180 | .928 | 395 | .353 |
| District Stkhld | 2.83 | 124 | 4919 | 6.09 | 325 | .000 |

[a] 2-tailed significance.

119

Correspondingly, the researcher was interested in the relationship among the competing goals of education. In order to determine if there were statistically significant differences between the median scores of each of the competing goals of education, a Wilcoxon signed-rank test was run (Table 21). This non-parametric test was chosen as an alternative to a dependent t-test because the dependent variables came from the same sample and had a non-normal distribution (Fields, 2009). Results from this test indicated that 75 of the 124 students (60.5%) ranked Social Efficiency higher than Democratic Equality, and 102 of 124 students (82.2%) ranked Social Efficiency higher than Social Mobility. Students ranked Social Efficiency and District Stakeholders very similarly, as 56 students (45.2%) ranked District Stakeholders higher than Social Efficiency (n = 65, 52.4%). Of the 124 student respondents, 90 ranked Democratic Equality (72.6%) higher than Social Mobility, and about half (n = 68, 54.8%) ranked Democratic Equality higher than District Stakeholders. Finally, 94 students (75.8%) ranked District Stakeholders higher than Social Mobility.

The test statistics from the Wilcoxon signed-rank one-sample paired test (Table 22) determined that there was a statistically significant difference in how students ranked Democratic Equality and Social Efficiency ($z$ = -3.26, $p$=.001, $r$ = -.29), which suggested that Social Efficiency received significantly more favorable rankings than Democratic Equality. Social Efficiency also received significantly more favorable rankings than Social Mobility ($z$ = -7.40, $p$<.001, $r$ = -.66). There was no statistically significant difference in rankings between Social Efficiency and District Stakeholders ($z$ = -1.01, $p$>.05). There was a statistically significant difference in how students ranked Democratic

Table 21

*Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Test for Competing Goals of Education*

| | | N | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Democratic Equality – Social Efficiency | Negative Ranks | 75[a] | 65.0 | 4873 |
| | Positive Ranks | 45[b] | 53.0 | 2387 |
| | Ties | 4[c] | | |
| | Total | 124 | | |
| Social Mobility – Social Efficiency | Negative Ranks | 102[d] | 65.2 | 6648 |
| | Positive Ranks | 20[e] | 42.8 | 855 |
| | Ties | 2[f] | | |
| | Total | 124 | | |
| District Stkhld – Social Efficiency | Negative Ranks | 65[g] | 62.8 | 4083 |
| | Positive Ranks | 56[h] | 58.9 | 3299 |
| | Ties | 3[i] | | |
| | Total | 124 | | |
| Social Mobility— Democratic Equality | Negative Ranks | 90[j] | 65.6 | 5903 |
| | Positive Ranks | 32[k] | 50.0 | 1601 |
| | Ties | 2[l] | | |
| | Total | 124 | | |
| District Stkhld – Democratic Equality | Negative Ranks | 51[m] | 57.7 | 2941 |
| | Positive Ranks | 68[n] | 61.8 | 4200 |
| | Ties | 5[o] | | |
| | Total | 124 | | |
| District Stkhld – Social Mobility | Negative Ranks | 28[p] | 56.0 | 1569 |
| | Positive Ranks | 94[q] | 63.1 | 5935 |
| | Ties | 2[r] | | |
| | Total | 124 | | |

*Notes.* [a]Democratic Equality< Social Efficiency. [b]Democratic Equality>Social Efficiency. [c]Democratic Equality=Social Efficiency. [d]Social Mobility<Social Efficiency. [e]Social Mobility>Social Efficiency. [f]Social Mobility=Social Efficiency. [g]District Stakeholders<Social Efficiency. [h]District Stakeholders>Social Efficiency. [i]District Stakeholders=Social Efficiency. [j]Social Mobility< Democratic Equality. [k] Social Mobility>Democratic Equality. [l]Social Mobility=Democratic Equality. [m]District Stakeholders<Democratic Equality. [n]District Stakeholders>Democratic Equality. [o]District Stakeholders=Democratic Equality. [p]District Stakeholders<Social Mobility. [q]District Stakeholders>Social Mobility. [r]District Stakeholders=Social Mobility.

Equality and Social Mobility ($z = -5.50$, $p<.001$, $r = -.49$) and District Stakeholders and

Social Mobility ($z = -5.58$, $p<.001$, $r = -.50$), which suggest that Democratic Equality and

District Stakeholders each received significantly more favorable rankings than Social

Mobility. There was no statistically significant difference in rankings between

Democratic Equality and District Stakeholders ($z = -1.67$, $p>.05$).

Table 22

*Test Statistics for One-Sample Paired Tests*[a]

|  | Dem Equal - Soc Eff | Soc Mob - Soc Eff | Dis Stkhld - Soc Eff | Soc Mob - Dem Equal | Dis Stkhld - Dem Equal | Dis Stkhld - Soc Mob |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Z | -3.26[b] | -7.40[b] | -1.01[b] | -5.50[b] | -1.67[c] | -5.58[c] |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .001 | .000 | .311 | .000 | .095 | .000 |

[a] Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test.
[b] Based on positive ranks.
[c] Based on negative ranks.

This statistical significance from the Wilcoxon signed-rank test may suggest that

students do in fact identify the goal of Social Efficiency as the primary goal of education.

Additionally, because there were no statistically significant differences between District

Stakeholders and Democratic Equality, and District Stakeholder and Social Efficiency, it

may suggest that the district goals reflected in the variable for District Stakeholders more

closely align with the competing educational goals of democratic equality and social

efficiency. That is, the district goals in this particular district embodied the underlying

frameworks of democratic equality and social efficiency, which were translated to

students. Furthermore, these results may suggest that the ideals associated with social

mobility were missing from the district goals, and in turn were not emphasized to the

students. Following this logic, it makes sense that the median scores for Democratic

Equality, Social Efficiency and District Stakeholders were statistically significantly higher than the mean score for Social Mobility for this sample.

**Research Question 2: To what extent do students' course of study and grade point average (GPA) relate to each of the competing goals of education?**

The MANCOVA employed to address the second research question indicated a non-significant effect of GPA on the competing goals of education ($\lambda = 0.94$, $F(4,113) = 1.86$, $p > .05$), and a non-significant effect of course of study on the competing goals of education ($\lambda = .803$, $F(4,113) = 1.29$, $p > .05$). Likewise, the tests of between-subjects yielded results that were not statistically significant. These results are interesting in that although statistically non-significant, they may still allow for some analysis based on the theoretical framework, as well as inform future research.

As the first research question suggests, there is a clear distinction in the competing goals of education with which students identified; however, the two variables selected in the multivariate analysis of covariance, GPA and Course of Study, did not have a significant effect on the competing goals of education. This lack of relationship may suggest that stratification (course tracking), one of the mechanisms of social mobility and social efficiency (Labaree, 1997a), is not readily apparent to this student group. This would suggest that in this school, regardless of placement, students are receiving the same message; however, precisely what this message is warrants further investigating.[2]

On the other hand, the lack of relationship among these variables may indicate just that—that there is no relationship between student achievement as measured by

---

[2] This is intriguing because this is not typical across different tracks, and seems to run contrary to what we know about social stratification.

GPA, and the students' view of the outcome of schooling (the respective competing goal of education), nor is there a relationship between student course of study and the outcome of schooling. This suggests perhaps an even more troubling picture. This interpretation of the data would indicate that students do not have a clear perception of the purpose of schooling. Although the call for academic rigor for college and career readiness has been made, it has not been answered by the students. One reason for this may be the constant reform measures that these students have been subjected to throughout their school career, and the shift in focus and demands placed upon them without any clear reasoning or direction. For example, this cohort of students has seen K-8 high-stakes testing change names and criteria twice[3], and has been held accountable for a state graduation test which the lower classmen in their building will not be required to take. While the new testing practices may be just as, or perhaps more, rigorous than those in the past, it may send a mixed message to students as to the expectations and standards to which they are held. Throughout their final two years in high school, they will have become well-versed in the "college and career-ready" rhetoric, a result of the state's adoption of the CCSS in its effort to secure Race to the Top funds. In addition, during the development of this study, the sampled district acquired a new superintendent under whom the districts' goals, and mission and vision statements were changed. Undoubtedly, education reform is intended to benefit students, yet the unintended consequences of reform efforts are not always carefully considered. From major changes in accountability at the state and federal levels to changes in mission statements at the local level, students are asked to adopt and adapt to reform measures countless times throughout their K-12 career and produce annually

---

[3] Students in this cohort were originally tested in K-8 with the Ohio Achievement Test, which was replaced by the Ohio Achievement Assessment. The Ohio Graduation Test (OGT) is being phased out in favor of biannual testing that is aligned to the CCSS.

measurable outcomes that meet expectations that may not be consistent from year to year. It is no wonder then that students are not making achievement gains consistently that measure up to the desired outcome measures of policymakers.

So what does that translate to for students? Students are given tasks and directives as dictated by policy and reform that have been heavily influenced by economic pressures, business priorities, public pressure and alarm, and funding, with little or no explanation as to its purpose, aside from what can be reduced to a generic college preparation pep talk. In *The Mission of the High School: A New Consensus of the Purposes of Education?,* a report commissioned by Education Testing Service (ETS), Barton and Coley (2011) explore the ever-changing mission of the high school in the face of new reforms and the CCSS. Barton and Coley (2011) speak to the ambiguity of the mission of high schools to prepare students for college and careers, "…since the types of careers that require college-level academic preparation and the numbers of jobs they may represent are matters of some debate" (p. 3). They go on to note the short-comings of the standards, which they suggest do not align with the expectations of college and the workplace, "not with the applied knowledge used in occupational training or with the types of jobs that are typically available to non-college graduates" (Barton & Coley, 2011, p.3). Moreover, as their critique continues, it echoes that of Bellanca & Brandt (2010), who noted the high demand for, and inversely low availability of soft-skills among young adults. So what exactly are teachers preparing their students for? The only consistency that students have is the expectation of change and incongruity. If policymakers are unclear as to their expectations, it seems an impossible feat for students to measure up, in any capacity.

Another possible explanation is that a relationship simply does not exist with these particular variables. It is quite plausible that other factors, such as socioeconomic status, race and gender influence students' perception of the purpose of education, and thus may have manifest themselves within the goals in a relationship that is more readily identified. As the literature suggests, it is all but impossible to ignore the contribution of fundamental societal factors, like poverty and race (Martin, 2012; Rebell & Wolff, 2008; Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003) and cultural values (Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003). Research also suggests a difference in student perception of motivation and achievement between genders (Anwar et al., 2011), which may also be evident in students' perception of the goals of education.   Examining the competing goals of education as they relate to gender, race and socioeconomic status may provide greater insight into students' perception of the purpose of education. Because these factors are often examined in relationship to achievement measures such as high-stakes testing and standardized testing, utilizing these scores, rather than GPA may serve as a better indicator of student performance.

Similarly, more pronounced differences may exist within each subgroup of course of study. While the MANCOVA tests for between-group differences, parceling out each subgroup and employing alternative inferential statistics may produce more conclusive findings.

**Research Question 3: To what extent do students' grade point average (GPA) and the competing goal with which students most strongly identify with predict membership in course of study?**

      **Democratic equality and vocationalism.** The third research question was addressed using a multinomial logistic regression to predict group membership. The results indicated three statistically significant results. The first significant result indicated that student identification with the goal of Democratic Equality statistically significantly predicted student membership in Vocational Class ($b = .058$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 5.36$, $p<.05$, $\beta = 12.1$). These results suggested that students who identified with Democratic Equality were more likely to be enrolled in Vocational Class than in College Prep. Though the theoretical framework suggests that Social Efficiency aligns more closely with vocationalism, the researcher suggests that the underlying values of the goal of democratic equality may actually support the modern vocational and technical programming at this high school. As evidenced by the first research question and analyses, students in this high school appear to favorably identify with the goal of democratic equality which embodies three ideals: citizenship training, equal treatment and equal access. According to the theoretical framework, democratic equality is reflected in schools as they instill a sense of contribution to the greater good of the republic and the economy, and support the removal of perceived inequalities and promote equal access (Labaree, 1997b). As noted in the Introduction, all students, regardless of their current course of study, are able to apply to the vocational programming (equal access), and once in the program, students maintain choice in the academic level of their content area courses. The selection criteria vary by program, but academics are not the

primary factor. In fact, many of the programs place a high value on soft skills, such as attendance, promptness and collaboration skills. Because the programming is part of a consortium, students in the program become part of a collective that includes students from more affluent districts, but receive the same training (equal treatment).  Many of the programs are geared toward service (e.g. childcare, civil service, hospitality), which promotes the civic virtues of the goal of democratic equality. What vocationalism is today, and what it has been historically, no longer seem to match up. The vocational education that Dewey once criticized for compromising the 'efficiency of industrial intelligence' for 'technical trade efficiency' (Knight Abowitz & Boyles, 2000) may no longer be a threat. In fact, it seems as though these high school students may be developing the necessary skills that go beyond what policymakers have loosely coined as college and career ready—skills that are transferable to the workforce and society.

**District stakeholders and vocationalism.**  The second finding indicated that student identification with the goal of District Stakeholders statistically significantly predicted student membership in Vocational Class ($b$ = -1.71, Wald $\chi^2(1)$ = 4.00, $p<.05$, β = .180); however, this result suggested that these students are 82% less likely to participate in Vocational Classes than in College Preparatory classes. At first glance, this finding was surprising, as the analyses from the first research question hinted at a relationship between the goals of the district stakeholders and social efficiency. Because vocationalism is thought to be the mechanism by which the goal of social efficiency is operationalized, one may assume that the district stakeholders' goals would support vocationalism, and this would be translated to students.  However, as suggested earlier, college and career readiness have become all but synonymous. Thusly, students may

associate the goals of social efficiency with college, perhaps seen as the final step toward career readiness. If the district stakeholders emphasize this type of preparation, it would stand to reason that students who favored the goals of the district stakeholders saw less value in vocational training. Baron and Coley (2011) note that the operational definition for college readiness, the ability to score high enough on college placement tests to not need remedial courses, is

> also considered necessary for 'careers,' a term that seems to encompass all those who go to work, whether first to college or directly into employer-provided on-the-job training. Although the meaning of preparation for college is often explicit, very little is said about the type of and number of jobs that need this level of education. (p. 8)

Certainly, all students deserve the right to an education that prepares them to pursue higher education if they so desire, and all students should be encouraged to excel to their greatest potential; however, students should also have the opportunity to explore a myriad of postsecondary options, including avenues that may not require a college education. Students need to understand their options, so that they can craft and define their own futures, which would allow them to work with purpose toward their goal rather than a pre-defined readiness benchmark.

**GPA and honors/AP.** The third significant finding from the multinomial logistic regression was that student GPA statistically significantly predicted student membership in Honors/AP Classes ($b = 6.40$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 22.9$, $p<.001$, $\beta = 602$). This finding was anticipated, as students in Honors and Advanced Placement courses tend to do well

academically.  Additionally, there were a disproportionately high number of students that indicated Honors/AP as their primary course of study.

Based on the earlier findings and the literature review, the researcher also anticipated that there would be a predictive relationship between GPA and Vocational Classes, as it would suggest that students enrolled in a vocational program were purposefully pursuing a goal that they had actively sought out, as opposed to one that was chosen for them.  It is important to note, however, that although students had to apply for participation in the vocational programming, structural forces such as social stratification, and conforming to existing structurally necessary market roles (Labaree, 1997a, 1997b, 2010) may have played a role in influencing students' decisions to participate in vocational programming. While there was no statistically significant relationship between GPA and Vocational Classes, the subgroup of students who chose Vocational Classes as their primary course of study (n = 28), had a mean GPA of 2.94 which is just below a B average. This suggests that although statistically non-significant, these students are performing reasonably well in the courses. The remaining inferential statistics for the third research question were not statistically significant using a multinomial logistic regression. Future research to examine each subgroup as a unique sub-sample using additional inferential statistics may provide greater insight into student perception of the competing goals of education. Finally, according to the classification chart, the overall predictive accuracy of the model was 50.4%, which suggests that half of the cells for this analysis were accurately predicted.  Refinements in the survey instrument and sampling in the future may provide more accurate predictive values.

**Limitations**

  This study has two primary limitations: participant self-reporting and lack of

homogeneity (non-normal distribution) of the variables GPA and the four competing

goals of education.

  The first limitation, participant self-reporting, may have impacted the

representative level of its participants. Although the participant population is

representative of the gender and race of the district, student course of study and grade

point average are not proportionately represented.  For example, although the majority of

the 11th grade students were enrolled in a College Preparatory English (47.8%), only

28.2% of the participants self-reported a College Preparatory course of study. Similarly,

while only 19.3% of participants are enrolled in Honors English, 29.0% of participants

self-reported enrollment in Honors/AP course of study.  The survey instrument requested

that students self-selected their primary course of study, which may have included a

mixture of levels of courses, as well as alternative courses of study including vocational

and online courses. Thus, students may have been enrolled in a vocational program, as

well as a college preparatory class, but may have chosen to self-identify in Vocational

Programming.  The survey instrument may have allowed for the confounding of course

selection, as well. Future instrument development and research will address this issue.

  Student participants also had disproportionately high grade point averages

(GPA).  Although they may be accurate, the GPAs may also be a reflection of student

self-reporting via the survey.  While researchers rely on the accurate and honest

responses of participants, the researcher cannot guarantee that participants answered

honestly when asked their primary course of study or as to the accuracy of the self-

131

reported. Whether the GPAs were accurate or inflated, they did not provide a normally distributed sample, nor did they reflect the overall population.

The second limitation, lack of homogeneity (non-normal distribution) of the variables, violated the assumption of normality for the MANCOVA. As aforementioned in Chapter 4, the robustness of the statistical analysis allowed for test to be carried out; however, due to the skewed variables, it was not possible for the researcher to compare means in a manner that was statistically significant. This limitation was addressed in this study using non-parametric *post hoc* analyses, which allowed for median comparisons. Future research that includes a larger sample size and refined instrument may allow for more detailed analyses.

## Recommendations

### Implications for Practice

Teachers occupy a unique space in this discussion. In some ways, they may feel that they are simply the messenger, the middleman in a system of top-down reforms and policy. It is no surprise then, when there is little buy-in, especially when teachers feel that they have little input or when they are marginalized as professionals (Moloney, 2006). Testing requirements, benchmarks and standards can easily be presented to students as a task that must be performed because the state or the district says so, not because the teacher finds value in it. Here, teachers have an exclusive opportunity to intercept and reshape this dialogue.   To do so, teachers must have a clear understanding of the goals of the state and district, not a list of standards or testing requirements. Similarly, they need to have a clear understanding of what purpose, if any, students see for their being in school. This can be complicated, however, as Barton and Coley (2011) note,

132

In this modern era of common standards and assessments, having the purpose of

preparing students for college and careers, and a blueprint for the reauthorization

of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act having a similar concentration,

the message given to educators is about getting students to pass college placement

tests in reading and math. It is appropriate to ask how these messages play out at

the level of school.  (p. 29)

Though the collective understanding of the goals of education by all stakeholders

involved in the education delivery system should drive state and federal reform efforts,

policymakers should give careful consideration to those most directly impacted by these

measures: teachers and students.  While this is an ideal that education historians have

seen met with little success (Barton & Coley, 2011; Goodlad, Mantle-Bromley &

Goodlad, 2004; Labaree, 2010), educators can still assert their autonomy by beginning

the conversation with their students, thereby empowering not only themselves, but their

students.

By fostering open dialogue in the classroom early on in the school year, teachers

and students may collectively build and work toward a shared vision (Senge, 2006) that

also speaks to the mission of stakeholders. The discussion needs to be revisited, and most

importantly, go beyond career and college readiness. Certainly, teachers have much to

accomplish in a short window of time, and this is one more task to add to their to-do list;

however, engaging in meaningful dialogue, recognizing students as young adults and

practicing advocacy and goal setting may prove to be quite beneficial in developing the

soft-skills desired for many 21st century jobs.

In addition, this study provided insight into one district's high school students' perceptions of the goals of education. The data presented interesting findings that were counterintuitive to some of the literature. Practitioners at this school may benefit from reflecting on their own practices, and asking themselves what this school district is doing to promote social efficiency and moreover, democratic equality. This is particularly salient in that current reforms tend to overlook democratic equality in favor of both social efficiency and social mobility (Barton & Coley, 2011; Labaree, 1997a, 2010; Ravitch, 2011). This is a critical time for many districts as they move toward a new wave of testing and accountability with the Blue Print for the reauthorization of ESEA looming overhead. It is equally important for districts to recognize what they have done that is beneficial for students, just as it is to seek areas of improvement. Examining what districts are doing well besides raising test scores is greatly overlooked, and is certainly not the only critical component in student development and success.

**Implications for Policymakers**

The overarching task for policymakers is one that has proven itself to be all but impossible: to clearly identify the purpose or purposes of public education. Indeed, this task has troubled policymakers and practitioners alike since the inception of public schooling. McMannon (1997) notes that this is further complicated because "there is frequently some difference between what our educational institutions are *expected to do*, what they *actually do*, and what ideally they *should do*" (p. 1). Even with the mass adoption of the CCSS and the accompanying objective, albeit vague, of college and career readiness, many are still divided on the purpose of public education. It is ironic

that policymakers expect students to do well in school when it is not clear what they are doing there.

The changing landscape of public education requires an ongoing, dynamic conversation as to what education should be, and how this realistically translates to students. This study examined the perception of high school students, which may vary greatly from that of elementary or middle school students. To that end, policymakers may need to explore if different levels of schooling should have different goals, or if they are different parts of a continuum, as evidenced by bands in learning standards. If the former is true, then it may call for a radically different approach to schooling. In either case, the goals need to be defined and related to students beyond restating daily objectives.

Drawing on Foucault's locus of enunciation, Mignolo (2009) argues that "it is not enough to change the content of the conversation, that it is of the essence to change the *terms* of the conversation. Changing the terms of the conversation implies going beyond disciplinary or interdisciplinary controversies and the conflict of interpretations" (p. 4), and requires the shifting of the locus of enunciation. To that end, policymakers need to be receptive to the idea of shifting the locus of enunciation as it relates to education policy to allow for student input. This may require dismantling of not only the hegemonic structure of top-down policy, but a shift in thinking. It is a shift that does not dismiss policymakers and stakeholders, but incorporates additional stakeholders—the students— and shifts the locus of enunciation to allow for loci of enunciation. This shift allows for a truly collaborative effort that promotes shared visions and goal setting. For example, in a Youth Participatory Action Research (YPAR) project supported by Cleveland State University, faculty, doctoral, graduate, and undergraduate students, community members,

and staff and students from the Cleveland Metropolitan School District (CMSD) worked collectively to give CMSD students a platform to voice the impact of state and local policy on their school experiences. This on-going YPAR project has resulted in students presenting their findings to a variety of audiences, including The City Club of Cleveland (2014). Through this platform, students were able to present original research, as well as engage in dialogue with community members and organizations, district stakeholders, and the CMSD superintendent, among others.

Ultimately, students are the outcome measure, and they should be included in the dialogue. Students' educational experiences vary greatly, from district to district, state to state and from coast to coast. Similarly, their perceptions of the purposes of education may vary greatly. Policymakers and district stakeholders need to invite students to participate in the dialogue through student summits to gather a more accurate depiction of students' perception of their expected performance, and how their goals and language of the policies measure up to the students' understanding. These should take place locally, regionally and nationally, to reflect the variance in student experiences and perceptions. Additionally, student participation should not be limited to student government or top performing students; rather, they should be a fair representation of all students, including those struggling academically and behaviorally.

Finally, although there need to be accountability measures in place and means to ensure equitable and fair schooling for all students, policymakers need to ensure that what they are measuring is what they set out to achieve. Labaree (2011b) offers cautionary advice about the quantification of educational research, as it may actually work to the detriment of schooling, rather than to its benefit. He suggests that

quantification may draw the attention of researchers to issues that are quantifiable, rather than those issues that are more important, but difficult to reify quantitatively. It may also lead to false measure in an attempt to capture quantitatively characteristics that are often complex and subjective. The quantifying of education research, he argues, "…can radically reduce the complexity of the educational domain that is visible to policymakers and then lead them to construct policies that fit the normalized digital map of education rather than the idiosyncratic analog terrain of education" (Labaree, 2011b, p. 628). To that end, policymakers need to ensure that the required knowledge embodied by the education goals of policymakers aligns and resonate with students in their local settings.

**Implications for Future Research**

The sample used in this study (N=124) provided insight into the perception of high school students in an inner-ring suburb in the Midwest. The descriptive and inferential statistics not only allowed for the analysis and discussion of the research questions and educational policy as it relates to students, but raised questions for future research. To begin with, while the sample was diverse, and representative of the district's demographics, the researcher believes that results from the survey would vary by district. Therefore, a multiple district sampling, to include (but certainly not limited to) additional inner-ring suburbs, large metropolitan districts, wealthy suburban districts, and rural districts, as well as students from charter, private and parochial schools as comparative samples, could provide greater insight into students' perceptions of the competing goals of education.

Prior to expanding the research sample, the researcher would like to revisit the survey instrument to refine and clarify the language in the survey to ensure that it is

written in a manner that maximizes student comprehension while maintaining the efficacy of the goal characteristics. Additionally, the researcher would like to introduce a qualitative component to the survey that would allow for students to discuss their perceptions of the competing goals of education in a semi-structured focus group. Such dialogue may reveal a goal or mission of schooling that is understood by students, yet foreign to policymakers.  Today's students are digital natives, living in a culture dominated by social media and self-interest that permeates the walls of the classroom. Perhaps the goals of education, even in our most current reforms and policies, are already outdated by students' standards.

## Conclusions

Much of the dialogue in education speaks to the push for social mobility which can be seen in the competitive nature of the education delivery system; however, the competition seems to exist within the delivery system, not among students. Charter schools, online learning, private and parochial schools afford parents with many alternatives to traditional public schooling.  In the business model that has come to embody the education delivery system, competition to attract new clients (students) is more apparent between businesses (schools) than among the clients. The students seem to have a different perception of the goals of schooling, one that is not all together clear. The underlying ambiguity in students' understanding of academic preparation and educational purpose is perhaps the only aspect of policy that is clearly being translated to students.

To be sure, the competing goals of democratic equality, social efficiency and social mobility are not mutually exclusive. They coexist in a relationship that is

tumultuous at times, and becomes problematic when one goal is advanced, which is invariably at the expense of the other two. Labaree (1997b, 2010) argues that social mobility has been the most pronounced goal in recent years; however, with the help of the standards movement, social efficiency appears to be in the forefront. Based on the findings of this research, this imbalance is further complicated by the manner in which these goals are manifesting themselves within the framework of students. That is, while policymakers and stakeholders may have a clear view of the goals of education and the manner by which they hope to see them carried out in the school setting, it may not be the case with students. The misalignment between students and policymakers appears to be dual-fold. Not only do students seem to have a different perception of the goal of education, their perception of how to successfully meet this goal seems to differ as well.

The literature overwhelmingly suggests in an era of accountability and standards, social mobility is the primary driving force in the education delivery system from the perspective of policymakers. Global competitiveness, college and career readiness, and getting ahead are both fueled and measured by high-stakes testing. Students in this study, on the other hand, appear to view the goals of social efficiency and democratic equality as the more prominent goals of education. Their measures of success may not be performance-based, and their timelines for achieving success may not align with the benchmarks of standards-based measures. Students may be pursuing mastery goals at their own pace, rather than that of the performance-based goals of high-stakes testing and annually measured objectives. Perhaps the imbalance that we should be most concerned about is not one among the competing goals of education, but the disparity between the goals of policymakers and the goals of students. The continued misalignment of the two

will only serve to perpetuate the educational crisis that we have attempted to reconcile for

decades, at the cost of the greatest stakeholders, the students.

References

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2011). Education as a data-driven enterprise.

Retrieved from http://www.all4ed.org/files/EdAsDataDrivenEnterprise.pdf

Awan, R., Noureen, G., & Naz, A. (2011). A study of relationship between achievement

motivation, self-concept and achievement in English and Mathematics at

secondary level. *International Education Studies*, *4*(3), 72-79.

doi:10.5539/ies.v4n3p72

Barkan, J. (2013). Big philanthropy vs. democracy: The Plutocrats go to school. *Dissent,*

*60*(4), 47-54.

Barton, P.E., & Coley, R.J. (2011). The mission of the high school: A new consensus of

the purposes of public education? *Policy Information Perspective*, *July 2011*, 1-

39.

Beane, J.A. (2013). A common core of a different sort: Putting democracy at the center of

the curriculum. *Middle School Journal, January 2013*, 6-14.

Bellanca, J., & Brandt, R. (Eds.). (2010). *21$^{st}$ century skills: Rethinking how students*

*learn*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Breen, D., & Quaglia, R. (1991). Raising student aspirations: The need to share a vision.

*School Counselor*, *38*(3), 221.

Carl, J. (2011). *Freedom of choice: Vouchers in American education*. Santa Barbara, CA:

Praeger.

City Club of Cleveland. (2014, August 7). We the students: More than just a number [video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TYDbUOv2k gk&list=UUKf3bixa-gvh3Yb2rCd8wwQ

Collins, A., & Halverson, R. (2009). *Rethinking education in the age of technology: The digital revolution and schooling in America*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cortiella, C. (2014). Making sense of standardized tests. *National Center for Learning Disabilities*. Retrieved from http://www.ncld.org/students-disabilities/homework-study-skills/making-sense-standardized-tests

Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crum, K., & Hellman, G.V. (2009). School board decision making in the era of No Child Left Behind. *Educational Planning*, *18*(1), 11-25.

Dee, T.S., Jacob, B., & Schwartz, N.L. (2013). The effects of NCLB on school resources and practices. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *35*(2), 252-279.

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Diseth, A., & Kobbeltvedt, T. (2010). A mediation analysis of achievement motives, goals, learning strategies, and academic achievement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *80*, 671-687.

Ferris, J.M., Hentschke, G.C., & Harmssen, H.J. (2008). Philanthropic strategies for

    school reform: An analysis of foundation choices. *Educational Policy*, *22*(5), 705-

    730.

Field, A. (2009*). Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

    Publications, Inc.

Forte, E. (2010). Examining the assumptions underlying the NCLB federal accountability

    policy on school improvement. *Educational Psychologist*, *45*(2), 76-88.

Friedman, T.L., & Mandelbaum, M. (2011). *That used to be us: How America fell behind*

    *in the world it invented and how we can come back*. New York, NY: Picador.

Giroux H.A., & Schmidt, M. (2004). Closing the achievement gap: A metaphor for

    children left behind. *Journal of Educational Change, 5*, 213-228.

Goodlad, J.I., Mantle-Bromley, C., & Goodlad, S.J. (2004). *Education for everyone:*

    *Agenda for education in a democracy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Green, J., Liem, G.A., Martin, A.J., Colmar, S., Marsh, H.W., & McInerney, D. (2012).

    Academic motivation, self-concept, engagement, and performance in high school:

    Key processes from a longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Adolescence*, *35*, 1111-

    1122.

Grissom, J. A., & Strunk, K. O. (2012). How should school districts shape teacher salary

    schedules?  Linking school performance to pay structure in traditional

    compensation schemes. *Educational Policy*, *26*(5), 663-695.

    doi:10.1177/0895904811417583

Hair, Jr., J. F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., & Anderson, R.E. (2010). *Multivariate data*

    *analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

143

Harris, D. (2012). Postscript: Urban schools, accountability, and equity: Insights

    regarding NCLB and reform. *Education and Urban Society*, *44*(2), 203-210.

    doi: 10.1177/0013124511431571

Hess, F. M. (2005). Inside the gift horse's mouth: Philanthropy and school reform. *Phi*

    *Delta Kappan*, *87*(2), 131-137.

Hess, F.M. (2012). Philanthropy gets in the ring: Edu-funders get serious about education

    policy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *93*(8), 17-21.

Hochschild, J., & Scovronick, N. (2003). *The American dream and the public schools*.

    New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kessinger, T. (2011). Efforts toward educational reform in the United States since 1958:

    A review of seven major initiatives. *American Educational History Journal*,

    *38*(2), 263-276.

Knight Abowitz, K., & Boyles, D. (2000). Private interests or public good: Dewey, Rugg,

    and their contemporary allies on corporate involvement in educational reform

    initiatives. *Philosophy of Education Yearbook,* 131-139.

Knoll, M. (2009). From Kidd to Dewey: the origin and meaning of 'social efficiency.'

    *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *41*(3), 361-391. doi:10.1080/00220270801927362

Knowledge Works. (2012). *Transformational dialogue for public education: Sustained*

    *transformation for our public education system*.  Retrieved from

    http://knowledgeworks.org/transformational-dialogue-public-education

Kraft, M.E., & Furlong, S.R. (2010). *Public policy: Politics, analysis, and alternatives*

    (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Kumashiro, K. (2012). When billionaires become educational experts. *Academe*, *98*(3), 10-16.

Labaree, D. (2011). Consuming the public school. *Educational Theory*, *61*(4), 381-394.

Labaree, D.F. (1997a). *How to succeed in school without really learning: The credentials race in American education*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Labaree, D.F. (1997b). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goods. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(1), 39-81.

Labaree, D.F. (2010). *Someone has to fail: The zero-sum game of public schooling*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Labaree, D. (2011b). The lure of statistics for educational researchers. *Educational Theory*, *61*(6), 621-632.

Lagana-Riordan, C. & Aguilar, J.P. (2009). What's missing from No Child Left Behind? A policy analysis from a social work perspective. *Children and Schools, 31*(3), 135-144.

Lee, J. & Reeves, T. (2012). Revisiting the impact of NCLB high-stakes school accountability, capacity, and resources: State NAEP 1990-2009 reading and math achievement gaps and trends. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *34*(2), 209-231.

Levin, B. (2011). Eight Reasons Merit Pay for Teachers is a Bad Idea. *Our Schools / Our Selves*, *21*(1), 131-137.

Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (2013). Giving USA 2013 highlights. *Giving USA: The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the year 2012*. Chicago: Giving USA Foundation.

Martin, P. (2012). Misuse of high-stakes test scores for evaluative purposes: Neglecting

the reality of schools and students. *Current Issues in Education*, *15*(3), 1-11.

Maxwell, L. (2014). Districts bail on Race to the Top in five states. *Education Week*,

*33*(18), 8. Retrieved from www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2014/01/22/18rtt-

districts.h33.html

Mayers, A. (2013). *Introduction to statistics and SPSS in psychology*. Harlow: Pearson

Education.

McCauley, B. (2005). *Foundation applauds new grant for education in Ohio*. Cincinnati,

OH: KnowledgeWorks. Retrieved from http://www.knowledgeworks.org/

knowledgeworks-foundation-applauds-new-grant-education-ohio

McDonnell, L. M. (2005). No Child Left Behind and the federal role in education:

Evolution or revolution? *Peabody Journal Of Education (0161956X)*, *80*(2), 19-

38. doi:10.1207/S15327930pje8002_2

McLaughlin, M. (2010). Evolving interpretations of educational equity and students with

disabilities. *Council for Exceptional Children*, *76*(3), 265-278.

McMannon, T. J. (1997). Introduction. In J.I. Goodlad & T.J. McMannon (Eds.), *The

Public Purpose of Education and Schooling* (pp. 1-17). San Francisco, CA:

Jossey-Bass Inc.

McNeil, M. (2013). Impact on waivers, grants mulled in Common-Core pushback.

*Education Week*, *32*(31), 19. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles

/2013/05/15/31  standards-side.h32.html?qs=state+NCLB+waivers+and+ohio

Mehta, J. (2013). How paradigms create politics: The transformation of American educational policy, 1980–2001. *American Educational Research Journal*, *50*(2), 285-324. doi:10.3102/0002831212471417

Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mignolo, W.D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and de-colonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society, 26*(7-8), 1-23.

Moloney, K. (2006). Teaching to the test: A discourse analysis of teachers' perceptions of education in the era of No Child Left Behind. International Journal of Learning, *13*(6), 19-25.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). *Common core state standards*. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org.  Washington, D.C.:  National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers.

Office of the Governor, State of Ohio. (2013). *Achievement everywhere: Common sense for Ohio's classrooms*. Retrieved from http://www.governor.ohio.gov/ PrioritiesandInitiatives/K12Education/AchievementEverywherePlan.aspx

Ohio. (2003). *Achieving more: Quality teaching, school leadership, student success*. Columbus, Ohio: Governor's Commission on Teaching Success.

Ohio Department of Education. (2013, October 25). *Third grade reading guarantee parent resources*. Retrieved from http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Early-Learning/Third-Grade-Reading-Guarantee/Third-Grade-Reading-Guarantee-Family-Resources

Perry, C. M., & Quaglia, R. J. (1993). Open up TWM: Make room for school restructuring through aspirations. *Education*, *113*(4), 651.

Plucker, J. A., & Quaglia, R. J. (1998). The student aspirations survey: Assessing student effort and goals. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, *58*(2), 252.

Ravitch, D. (2014). Hoaxes in educational policy. *The Teacher Educator*, *49*(3), 153-165. doi: 10.1080/08878730.2014.916959

Ravitch, D. (2011).  Stop the madness. *Education Review, 23*(1), 27-34.

Ravitch, D. (2010).  *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education*. Philadelphia, PA: Basic Books.

Roach, A., & Elliott, S. (2009). Consultation to support inclusive accountability and standards-based reform: Facilitating access, equity, and empowerment. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, *19*, 61–81. doi: 10.1080/10474410802463320

Rose, S. (2012). *Third grade reading policies*. Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from www.ecs.org.

Rury, J.L. (2011). *Urban education in the United States: A historical reader*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Scott, J.T. (2011). Market-driven education reform and the racial politics of advocacy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *86*, 580-599. doi: 10.1080/0161956X.20113.616445

Scott, J. (2009). The politics of venture philanthropy in charter school policy and advocacy. *Educational Policy*, *23*(1), 106-136.

Scott, J., Lubienski, C., & DeBray-Pelot, E. (2009). The politics of advocacy in education. *Educational Policy*, *23*(1), 3-14.

Senge, P.M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York, NY: Currency Doubleday.

Senko, C., Hulleman, C. S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2011). Achievement goal theory at the crossroads: Old controversies, current challenges, and new directions. *Educational Psychologist*, *46*(1), 26-47. doi:10.1080/00461520.2011.538646

Sheller, T.H., (2011). The origins of public education in Baltimore, 1825 – 1829. In J.L. Rury (Ed.), *Urban education in the United States: A historical reader* (pp.17-36). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sheridan, S., & Williams, P. (2011). Developing individual goals, shared goals, and the goals of others: Dimensions of constructive competition in learning contexts. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 55*(2), 145-164. doi: 10.1080/00313831.2011.554694

Shiller, J. (2012). Venture philanthropy's market strategies fail urban kids. *Phi Delta Kappa*, *93*(8), 12-16.

Srivastava, P., & Oh, S. (2010). Private foundations; philanthropy, and partnership in

    education and development: Mapping the terrain. *International Journal of*

    *Educational Development, 30*, 460-471.

Starkweather, J., & Moske, A. K. (n.d.). *Multinomial logistic regression*. Retrieved from:

    http://www.unt.edu/rss/class/Jon/Benchmarks/MLR_JDS_Aug2011.pdf

Steinberg, W. (2011). *Statistics alive!* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications,

    Inc.

Strickland, S. (2009). The Kalamazoo Promise: A study of philanthropy's increasing role

    in the American economy and education. *International Journal of Educational*

    *Advancement*, *9*(1), 16-34.

Tenam-Zemach, M., & Flynn, J. (2011). America's race to the top, our fall from grace.

    *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, *13*(1/2), 113-124.

The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the year 2012. (2013). Retrieved from

    www.givingUSAreports.org. Chicago: Giving USA Foundation.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school*

    *reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (2013). Elementary and Secondary Education: ESEA

    Flexibility. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-

    flexibility/index.html

United States. National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at*

    *risk: The imperative for educational reform : a report to the Nation and the*

    *Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education*. Washington,

    D.C.: The Commission.

Urbina, I. (2010, January 12). As school exit tests prove tough, states ease standards. *New York Times,*, pp. A1.

van Fleet, J.W. (2010). Corporate giving to education during economic downturns: General trends and the difficulty of prediction. *International Journal of Education Advancement*, *9*(4), 234-250.

**APPENDICES**

# APPENDIX A

# FOCUS GROUP IRB APPROVAL

## Cleveland State University
*engaged learning*

## Memorandum

Institutional Review Board

**To:** Ann Galletta
Urban Studies

**From:** Diana Dubinsky
Interim Director
Office of Sponsored Programs & Research

**Date:** November 4, 2013

**Re:** Results of IRB Review of your project number: #29707-GAL-HS,
Co-Investigators: Carly Evans
**Title: Goals of Education: A Focus Group**

The IRB has reviewed and approved your application for the above named project, under the category noted below. It has been determined that the research being performed under this protocol is Exempt. This determination does not expire and does not require an annual review.

However, by accepting this decision, you agree to notify the IRB of: (1) any additions to or changes in procedures for your study that modify the subjects' risk in any way; and (2) any events that affect that safety or well-being of subjects. Notify the IRB of any revisions to the protocol, including the addition of researchers, prior to implementation.

Thank you for your efforts to maintain compliance with the federal regulations for the protection of human subjects.

---

**Approval Category:**

X     Exempt (b2)

**Approval Date:** November 13, 2012

cc: Project file

## FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1. What does it mean to be successful in school?

2. Based on your definition(s), do you feel that you have experienced success in school? Explain.

3. What do you think the purpose of school is?

4. Why do you think all kids must, by law, go to school?

5. How do you think school will prepare you for adulthood? To participate in society?

6. Let's pretend that is possible for two students to have the exact same teachers and classes from kindergarten through high school. Do you think they experience the same level of success? Why or why not?

7. What does it mean to be a good citizen?

8. How important is it for school to prepare you to be a good citizen?

9. Many parents say they want their kids to have more opportunities than they did when they were growing up. What role does school play in this goal?

10. What role does school play in preparing you to be a successful member of the workforce?

# FOCUS GROUP TRANSCRIPTION

Date: Tuesday, November 27, 2012        Location: High School
classroom
Time: 3:15 p.m                          Total Time: 29:23

Participants:   Student D, 17, female, AA        Researcher: Carly Evans
                Student S, 18, female, AA

**R: *Okay, um, so the first question, what does it mean to be successful in school?***

D:  Hmmm...Um, I think success could be anything, from like achieving any academic goals that you might have or um, pleasing your family and yourself.  And, doing well enough to get accepted into any college that you would like to.

S: I agree with her.

D:  That's it?

S: Yeah, I really agree with what you said.

**R: *Ok, um, based on your definition, do you feel that you have experienced success in school?***

S: Um, I don't think I really have because I think I could have done better my few years I've been in high school. So I don't think I did, as much I could have to be successful.

D:  I think that in some areas I have. Not...overall...I haven't succeeded with anything yet, but I plan on by the end, like when I graduate this year.  So, I mean, I'm pretty sure that I'll be successful at the end of my senior year in high school.  I just feel like, when it like, when it comes to math I hate it, but  there has been things I've been successful with in math itself, but like I don't know, overall I'm not successful yet.

**R: *Not yet?***

D: Not yet.

**R: *Okay, but do you think that you've experienced smaller, like even before you came to the high school, successes throughout? Like in elementary school, middle school, do you feel like you've experienced successes then?***

S: Yes.

D: Um, it's harder to experience success like as a young, as a kid, because like you don't really know what you want to do or what you want to have or what you want to achieve.

You don't know that like I don't, I wouldn't say that elementary school...but, possibly in middle school  I think I did 'cause that was like when, that was the beginning. Like, that was what led me up to now is my middle school career.  So, yeah...yeah...I was successful in the area of middle school.

S: Yeah, it makes you just more like mature enough to handle some things. So like when you get to high school you can , you know, be mature about some things and what areas you need to work on to be successful when you're in middle school, so it's like I got a fresh start so I can...I can just do better than what I was doing before.

*R:  Okay, so what do you think the purpose of school is?*

D:  Um, I think... (Phone starts vibrating in her bag)... I think the purpose of school is, um, to um, (phone still vibrating in bag) I mean...

 (S sees that D is distracted, so she starts to speak up.  D takes this opportunity to check her cell)

S:   I think the purpose of school is to like learn early because to gi-- to prepare you for like college so like you will know what you're getting yourself into. So, I think that's what high school is all about.  Like your learning like stuff before you get into college like, you know like do chemistry or whatever, you know. You got some, um, like majors you have to do that, so they're just preparing you for college that you have to get yourself into.  That's what I think school is for.

D:  Yeah, I think--

S: So you won't grow up with the...

D: No, I think, I think school is very important because if you don't have school, you're -- I don't wanna call it ignorant, but, I mean that's what it really is because you have no knowledge of history or what's going on in the world, or how to solve problems, or  make life decisions. Like you don't know that if you don't learn, and school helps you to learn that.  So I think school's important when it comes to everyday life, yeah.

*R: Okay, so why do you think all kids must, by law, go to school?  (pause, clarifies)  We have, you know we have compulsory education so in the United States, so you have to go to school.  Why do you think that is?*

D: Um, because like in history...well, I guess, I don't know 'cause I wasn't born--

S:  Maybe because they need, they want us to know, like, you know they want us to get a job and...I mean...I don't know, maybe...

D: Maybe we all deserve that, that equal chance of --

S: Yeah, and if, (D starts talking at same time, inaudible, stops and nods to let S keep talking) most of it, most of it like is free, if you go to college, I mean you can go to college or school for free and everybody need to take that opportunity to go to school.

D: And be able to experience the same thing as other people, 'cause, I mean, if you don't, if you don't go to school then you're not going to have a chance at life. Like, if you grow up and you're not, you haven't been to school, like, that doesn't even sound right. Not to being 23 years old and you've never been to school. Like that doesn't even sound right. How do you make it to that age or like you don't know anything. Unless it's like street smarts or something like that, you don't really know anything. So, in school it teaches you that.

S: And they want to make sure that you grow up to know your math and count money, because that's what you're doing out here in the real world. You have to, you know, count money and um, learn how to, you have to learn, you have to read stuff. Some people can't read. I mean, they want everybody to read, like... (mumbles)...I guess...

D: I guess it's like a part of humanity, (S agrees), it has to be done. It just has to. No matter if you go to college or you just graduate with your diploma, like, you just go to school.

S: Yeah...

*R: Okay, how do you think school will prepare YOU for adulthood?*

S: Um, it's gonna prepare me for adulthood because, like, it helps like I was saying about the college thing and it prepares me to what am I getting myself into when I go out to the real world and go to college. And, like, they teach us like...College professors are not gonna be like this. When you go off to college and, like, the real world, they're not, everybody's not going to take on you and tell you what you have to do. You have to, like, learn on your own, so, I can't explain it, but I'm trying...it's hard.

*R: No, no, you're doing a good job*

D: Yeah, um, I lost my thought, I don't know what I was gonna say...um...what was the question again?

*R: How do you think school will prepare you for adulthood?*

D: Um, like, if you, okay, like I said earlier, if you're not in school, then you're not aware of the world itself and your kind of oblivious to it. I mean, it helps for your future, like it can make or break you. Say if you're not good in social studies, school will help you to know you're not good in social studies. So maybe being a historian or a social studies teacher isn't what you should do and it kind of puts you on your own pathway for your career 'cause if you don't know what you're good at, then you'll never know.

S: It lets you know your weaknesses and your strengths.

*R: Okay, and it kind of leads to me to the second part, is how does it prepare you to participate in society?*

D: If you don't know anything about society, you can't participate in it. You can't, you can't speak on what you don't know and you can't act on what you don't know. So school, like, those are like the footsteps leading to the outside world. If you don't have school, you don't have knowledge of anything, you don't know the world, you don't know the society, nothing. You don't know about other countries, and their histories, and our history. Like, you just don't know. You're just blind by it, to everything. You just don't know.

S: I agree with what she is saying.

*R: Okay, so let's pretend that it is possible for two students to have the exact same teachers and classes from kindergarten through high school. Do you think they experience the same level of success? Why or why not?*

S: Probably not, because, like what we were talking about. Some people have their strengths and weaknesses. So might not be able to do that math problem like she can be able to do it. So it's gonna be hard, it's probably gonna be hard for me. She can, I mean, I probably can read better than she can, or n like understand the reading, and she probably can't. So, everybody's different. Like, even if you have a teacher, even if they have the same teacher, they're probably not going to know the same stuff. Like I might even blank out when someone else learns it.

D: Everybody misinterprets things or like, it's like...Well, it's not just like it, but it's like saying that there are two people who are the same. Like, I'm in physics, so it's like, I'm in a physics class and there's someone else who has an A in the physics class, and may understand something that I don't, or I may understand something they don't. I mean, it's always good to ask questions to other students if you don't understand something and your teacher isn't explaining it right. There's always that option to go to other students that may understand it. And, I mean, I think it's possible to have that same level of success just in different ways. Like, you could understand it and not need help, but you could also be willing to help someone who doesn't understand it, and so they can be just as successful as you.

*R: Okay, so there are different degrees of success?*

D: Yeah, yeah.

*R: Okay....what does it mean to be a good citizen?*

S: Like, helping out others, and...Um...just doing the right thing and like trying to, probably trying to be a leader and not a follower. So, you know, that's what I think.

D: Yeah, and abiding by all rules, and laws, and, I mean, you can be a good citizen and be a criminal, I guess, but it's just, I guess, about the type of person you are to people.

Not just family or friends, but to everyone.  If you're, if you litter all the time, you're mad, and mean to everybody, you're not a good citizen because you're not a good person.  And people aren't gonna want to be around a person who is just angry all the time and mean, and wrong towards other people.  I mean, that's not the way America or the world is supposed to run.  Like, you have to be a good citizen in order for things to stay in line, and to make sure that everything is organized and put together so that society could be okay, and at one level.

***R:  Okay, so how important is it for school to prepare you to be a good citizen?***

D: Because you're around a lot of people, so if you're around a lot of people, and you're in school, you're supposed to know how to handle all those people.  And if you don't, I mean that's part of a teacher's job to make sure that you're comfortable with your work, comfortable with who you're surrounded with, surrounded around, and you know, just make sure that you're okay as a person.  I mean, that's not, I don't think that's the school's biggest goal, or what they really should do, but, I mean it's like we had in government.  In government we had a guest speaker that came in yesterday and it was like a lot of people that were talking while she was presenting and stuff, and she actually stopped the presentation like two or three times and was telling them like, it's rude when you talk when someone else is talking and how are you going to go to college and do that?  So, it also goes like hand in hand with the way you're brought up and the way you're raised.  And if you're not raised correctly, you can't go to school and expect to not be rude and to not talk when people are talking.  And you just have to, it's something you should know, but it's also something that it can slip up, and forgot like, Oh, yeah, I'm not supposed to be talking when other people are talking.  The teacher should be able to get you back in line, and say, you know this isn't right, just be quiet, this is rude.

***R: So, it's not, you said it's not the main goal, it shouldn't be a main goal or it's not?***

D:  It should be, but it's not 'cause, I mean, when you walk into a teacher's classroom, of course they're going to have  a set of rules on the wall or on the board or whatever, and they expect you to follow those rules, and--

S:  And yeah, but that's not what they're teaching--

D: Yeah, they want you to apply what you already know and to not just work, but you know, listening to them, listening to the rules and learning how to be a good person or citizen.  Like, all of your life you're gonna have a set of rules that you need to follow, whether it's the Constitution or classroom rules, or rules in your household, there's always going to be a set of rules that you have to follow, and if you don't you'll probably get consequences for them.

S: Yeah (pause) and you should know off hand what you're supposed to be doing.  Like when they tell you when you first come to school on that first day and they give you those rules, that's not what they're going to be teaching every day, every single day those rules.  They just tell you those rules, and you just go by it.  Every day.  And they teach you what they're there to teach, not to teach rules.

*R:  Okay.  So many parents say they want their kids to have more opportunities than they did when they were growing up. What role does school play in this goal?*

S:  Um, they, 'cause some parents didn't graduate from high school, so, um, by graduating from high school, that's a role that plays in school. When you graduate from high school and you go off to college, you know, that's a goal.   And some, if they were bad in school, maybe some parents were bad, and they want you to go to school and have manners and you know and act like a civil person, and not just act all bad.  So that's probably a role that plays in school.

D: Yeah, and like, maybe like they didn't take advantage of opportunities they had when they were in school.  Maybe they didn't achieve all their goals, or maybe they felt like they weren't successful in school, so they feel like they want you to do that because you have that chance now that you're in school that you can do what you have to do to be successful in your own mind.  And, I mean, like she said, some parents don't go to high school -- or don't go to college, and don't graduate from high school, so they don't want their children to be the same way.  They want them to be better because you when you learn -- When you make mistakes, you want people that you know to try to avoid making the same mistakes you do.  Now that you can tell them, okay, this is what you should do, this is what you probably should and shouldn't do, so I just hope you don't do it.  They just, parents are always there to just lead you in the right direction when it comes to, especially when it comes to school, and like --

S: Well, at least try to be--

D:  Yeah--

S:  In the right direction.

*R:  Okay, what role does school play in preparing you to be a successful member in the workforce?*

S:  By, um, by getting, you have to be at school at a certain time, so, you know, you have to be at work on time, and if you're tardy, then you're going to get consequences.  But, like, the consequences in the real world, you gonna get fired.  Like if you're tardy so many times but you know if you're still in school, you get like a, uh, I um, a Wednesday School or something like that.  So they're preparing you to come to school on time every day.  And you gotta go to work every time, I mean, on time every day. So that's what they're preparing us for.  That's what I think.

D: Yeah, and like the workforce, it's, it's basically the real world, where you're supposed to know how to treat people and know how to do your job right, because that's what they gave you the job for.  I feel like, like she said, I feel like attendance is important in school, and at work, because you get consequences.  Or if you're late, or whatever, you get consequences for that, in both, I think in school and in your job.  But the difference between school and your job is the money.  If you lose out on your money, you lose out on your work; you can't just go to work whenever you feel like it 'cause you won't keep that job for long.  So school, it gives you like life lessons or how to be, um...how to be...I guess, I mean, there.  It shows you, Hey, you do it like this when you have a job, you're

not going to keep your job for long. Like school prepares you for that. And it, so, yeah, school is very important for the workforce, when it comes to the workforce. And it also like, if you, in order to get a job, you have to have some type of education. And if you don't have education, no one is going to want an -- not stupid, but an ignorant employee. You're not going to get the job if you don't know what you're doing. So school plays a big role in that, too. If you don't know what you're doing, or you don't have an education to do what you want to do, then you can't do it. They're not going to let you.

*R: It sounds like, um, a lot of the success you ladies are talking about has to do with college, and going on to college. Can you be successful without college being your end goal? And what would that look like?*

D: Um, some people don't go to college because they don't need to go to college for what they want to do in life. Some people don't go to college because they can't afford it, and maybe they think its best that they don't go to college because school probably isn't good for them, or college isn't for them. And they could like, they could maybe be more successful without going to college. Like I bet there's people out there that are like, Okay, maybe I can just graduate high school, and then start my family or start my life and my career without going to college if they can do it on their own. It's probably like that for them.

S: Or, if some people, like when they're in high school and think like, I don't need to go to college, I'm already, some people have jobs. They'll be like, I don't need to go to high school, I got this job. Which is not going, it's probably not going to like, finance you later on, you know, like what if you have kids, or something. They feel like, Oh, I don't need to go to college because I got a job already, and I'm getting paid so I don't need to. But if like, they're being successful that way by having their little job, but not a career, so...yeah...

D: I don't think you can like have a successful career if you don't go to college because if you could have a great career without going to college, a lot of people would not go to college. But college sets you up a little bit ahead of people who don't go to college, and it gets you better jobs, better paying, and you know, better, probably a better lifestyle than people who don't go to college. Not unless you end up like famous or something.

*R: Well, is there anything else you would like to add?*

D: Uhh, well, I plan on going to college, and I just want to know if you have any, like, any advice when it comes to that or college itself?

*R: Well, I have a ton, so I'll have to stop the recorder, because it may take a little time! (D and S laugh). But is there anything else that you think is important for me to know or for policymakers to know for the purposes of this work? Or for policymakers to know, um, about school or the purpose or what you guys do here?*

D and S: Hmmm....um...

D: I don't know, I mean, I just, I think there should be a better way of getting out the importance of school and college to all students. I think that just, I mean a focus group I think is good because it like kick starts something for other people, but I think that there should be something else to let kids know how important school is because a lot take it for granted. And I'm not one of the people that does, 'cause I know the history and everything, like I don't take school for granted at all and I don't take advantage of it. I try to do my best and there's a lot of students that don't and just think that need to, those people need to know, why college or why school is so important, and what it gets you ready for. And why it's so important for you to be able to live life knowing that you went to school and being like, okay this is why I went to school, this is what I learned, and apply it to their life.

*R: Do you think kids understand that WHY piece? Do you think they have an answer to their why*?

D: Um, I think they would if they knew. If they knew, um, why they were in school, if they knew the importance of it. I mean, I don't think kids think that deep into it (S: Yeah), because they just don't really care. Like nowadays, kids will just copy off of other kids, because they don't want to do something or they feel lazy or they don't know it, and they'll want to cheat, but they won't want to ask for help. It's just like, in this generation, in this society, it's not like that anymore.


(PA system interrupts)


S: I mean, um, some people just don't think about why they have to go to school every day, because I know I don't. I just, I mean, I just know this is what I have to do, everyday. There's no question about it. It's something I have to do like...like...I never had a thought of, Why do I have to get up and go to school (D: yeah)...it' just something--

D: That's just a part of life. You know, that's what I feel like--

S: It's just something you have to do, whether you like it or not...

(girls talking at same time, inaudible, I want to go to college)

D: Yeah, I want to go to college. If you make that decision to go to college, get up, (S: stick with it) go to class because yeah, that was your decision, and stick with it. I mean, it will end up paying off in the long run, but you just have to do it now. Because like my mom, my mom always tells me to do what you don't want to do--

S: And it pays off in the long run, and you'll probably like it. When you go through the bad, when you go through hard things to get to the easy things, so...

D: Yeah, you gotta work hard now, and play even harder later and just, that's just the way life is built. I guess, 'cause I know for a fact that I want to do will. I guess it will pay off for me in the long run, 'cause I know I gotta go to college and school for years in order to do what I wanna do, but I know that's what I want to do and I know that that's what's going to set me up on the right path. So, I think that kids just need to dig more into that and try to understand why it's so important. And, 'cause if you don't have school, you don't have anything. So, I think that kids just need to understand that.

*R: And you ladies both plan on going to college, I see?*

S & D: mmhmmm.

*R: (commenting on t-shirt) S, you're in AVID here?*

S: Yeah

D: I am, too.

*R: Oh! You're both in AVID!*

D: Yeah, college is very important, especially in AVID, because they're like preparing us for it and...(inaudible/mumbling)

*R: Do you think it's too far away for some people to understand that it's important? I know you keep saying they need to know, but in the long run. Do you think for some people, it's hard for them (S: of course) to think, It's so far away. How is going to help me right now?*


D: Yeah, because they don't think like that. They just, because they're struggling right now, they wanna know why it's going to help them right now. But, in order for them to understand that it's not going to help them necessarily right now, it's going to help them for their future; they have to know the struggle of wanting to be successful and it not happening. So I think some kids are so spoiled, they just don't understand how things are going to get bad before they get good. So, I just think that they have, they have in mind that like everything is supposed to be given to me because that's just the way life is for me. And that's for most people in this society and that's not how it is. You have to work for what you have or what you want. And it's not always going to be handed to you. Like, that might be hand in hand with the way some people are brought up. Some people are brought to know that you have to work for what you want. Some people just want to take what they want--

S: And some people know they have to work hard 'cause they don't want to live like the lifestyle they're probably living, and they wanna, you know, work harder than what their mom or dad did. It's something like, they're low on money and stuff like that, and I don't want to live like this. You know, but in school, I'll get my education, so I'll be okay. And I'll live okay. I'll live decent.

D: yeah

S: I'll live comfortable, you know.  You don't have to work off, like if their parents get a low paycheck, they're gonna work off of everyday, but to still have some money to spend or to save.  So, basically, just to live comfortable, that's how you wanna live.

*R: What would you say to someone who says that they haven't had the success in school, in middle school, maybe even in elementary school, and they don't want to go to college because they don't feel like they've been successful in middle school and high school? It's really not in their future.  So why are they in high school? What would you tell them?*

D: Keep trying and just know that, of course you're probably not going to feel successful right now, because you haven't seen anything yet.  You don't know.  You're in elementary school, or you're in middle school, you don't know anything yet--

S: You should not feel anything like that in middle school or elementary school--

D: Like, yeah, if you don't know yet.  You have to experience the low road to get to the high road. Like, you know, if you don't you will never know anything.  You'll never know how it is to struggle if you don't struggle.  So, I just think that it's important for kids to know how to struggle and how to succeed.  It's important to know both things.

*R:  Okay, well ladies, thank you very much*

# APPENDIX D

# PILOT STUDY IRB APPROVAL

## Cleveland State University
*engagedlearning*

## Memorandum

Institutional Review Board

**To:**  Brian Harper
Curriculum & Foundations

**From:**  Craig M. Zullig
Director
Office of Sponsored Programs & Research

**Date:**  April 26, 2013

**Re:**  Results of IRB Review of your project number: #29828-HAR-HS
Co-Investigator: Carly Evans
**Title: Goals of Education: A Survey**

The IRB has reviewed and approved your application for the above named project, under the category noted below. Approval for use of human subjects in this research is for a one-year period as noted below. If your study extends beyond this approval period, *you must contact this office to initiate an annual review of this research.*

By accepting this decision, you agree to notify the IRB of: (1) any additions to or changes in procedures for your study that modify the subjects' risk in any way; and (2) any events that affect that safety or well-being of subjects. Notify the IRB of any revisions to the protocol, including the addition of researchers, prior to implementation.

Thank you for your efforts to maintain compliance with the federal regulations for the protection of human subjects.

---

**Approval Category:**

_X_  Exempt Review: Category b(2)

**Approval Date:**  April 23, 2013

**Expiration Date:**  April 22, 2014

cc:  Project file

## SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. What is your current grade?
   - 9
   - 10
   - 11
   - 12

2. What is your gender?
   - male
   - female

3. Which of the following best identifies your race/ethnicity?
   - African American, non-Hispanic
   - White, non-Hispanic
   - Hispanic
   - Asian
   - Mixed
   - Other

4. The type of classes I mostly take are:
   - Vocational (Excel TECC)
   - Honors/AP classes
   - College Prep
   - Comprehensive
   - Online Learning (Arc Tech)
   - Small Group

5. Currently, my grade point average (GPA) is:
   - OPEN ENDED RESPONSE

6. On average, how many **times per week** are you tardy to school?
   - OPEN ENDED RESPONSE

7. On average, how many **times per week** are you **tardy** to class?
   - OPEN ENDED RESPONSE

8. On average, how many **times per month** are you **absent** from school?
   - OPEN ENDED RESPONSE

9. If I miss school, it is most likely because:
- I am never absent
- I am sick or have a doctor's appointment
- I have a family matter to take care of
- I don't feel like coming to school
- I am suspended

10. After I graduate high school, I plan to:
   a. Get a full-time job and enter the workforce
   b. Go to a two or four-year college
   c. Go into vocational training
   d. I am not sure yet

11. In order to be successful in life, all you need to do is try your best.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly Disagree
12. In order to be successful, you need to get As and Bs.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly Disagree
13. In order to be successful, you need to participate in a sport in high school.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly Disagree
14. In order to be successful, you need to participate in a club or extracurricular activity.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly Disagree
15. In order to be successful, you need to be a good citizen and have good character.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly Disagree
16. In order to be successful, you need to go to college
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Disagree
   d. Strongly Disagree

17. In order to be successful in life, you need to get a good job.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
18. In order to be successful, you need to learn as much as you can.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
19. If you are happy, you are successful.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
20. As a high school student, I have been successful.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
21. A good citizen is someone who is knowledgeable about the world around them.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
22. All students have the same opportunity to become a good citizen.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
23. My school is preparing me for adulthood.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
24. My school is preparing me to participate in society.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
25. My school is preparing me to become a good citizen.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree

26. It is more important for me to contribute to society than it is for me to get ahead as an individual.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
27. The purpose of school to prepare me to be a good citizen.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
28. According to the law, all kids must go to school. I think this is a good law.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
29. Our economy depends on students being prepared to enter the workforce.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
30. It is more important to me to contribute to the collective good than to get ahead as an individual.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
31. It is important for school to prepare students to enter the workforce.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
32. I am being prepared to compete in a competitively global market as an adult.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
33. The purpose of school is to prepare students to become workers to fulfill the needs of the workforce.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree

34. Many parents say they want their kids to have more opportunities than they did when they were growing up. School plays a major role in this.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
35. If it were possible for two students to have the exact same teachers and classes from kindergarten through high school, they would be able to experience the same level of success.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
36. It is important for school to give me a competitive edge over others.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
37. In order for some to get a competitive edge, it is necessary for others to have unequal educational opportunities.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
38. I am more interested in doing well on a test than I am interested in learning the material on the test.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
39. In the long run, it's not about what you learn in school, but how good your grades are that matters.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
40. It is more important for me to get ahead and be successful as an individual than it is for me to contribute to the workforce or society.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree

41. The purpose of school is to prepare individuals to get a competitive advantage over others to get ahead in life.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
42. In our district it is important for each and every student to meet the highest level of academic achievement.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
43. In my school, we have an exceptional learning and teaching environment.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
44. In my school, most of my teachers have been:
    a. Excellent
    b. Good
    c. Not very good
    d. Terrible
45. My school district provides quality education with proper funding.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
46. Our school district has strong connections with the community.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
47. Our school district provides opportunities for excellence for each and every student.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree
48. In my district, the staff members (teachers, administrators, counselors, etc.) are highly trained.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Disagree
    d. Strongly Disagree

**APPENDIX F1**

*Pilot Study Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 11-23 x 11-23*

|     | Q 11 | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 | Q15 | Q16 | Q17 | Q18 | Q19 | Q20 | Q21 | Q22 | Q23 |
|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Q11 | ---- |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Q12 | .015 | ---- |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Q13 | .240* | .106 | ---- |   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Q14 | -.103 | .282** | .078 | ---- |  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Q15 | .013 | .166 | .181 | .695** | ---- |  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Q16 | .216* | .199 | .090 | .018 | .301** | ---- |  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Q17 | .200 | .118 | .034 | .130 | .166 | .236* | ---- |  |     |     |     |     |     |
| Q18 | .306** | .118 | .302** | .061 | .096 | .284** | .179 | ---- |  |     |     |     |     |
| Q19 | .183 | -.021 | -.071 | .079 | .103 | -.114 | .151 | .181 | ---- |  |     |     |     |
| Q20 | -.367** | -.046 | -.112 | .069 | .061 | -.063 | .070 | -.132 | .149 | ---- |  |     |     |
| Q21 | .253* | -.003 | .074 | -.087 | .063 | .191 | .160 | .152 | .133 | -.046 | ---- |  |     |
| Q22 | .089 | .122 | .012 | .008 | -.108 | -.030 | .062 | .041 | .161 | .027 | .076 | ---- |  |
| Q23 | .024 | .121 | .250* | .132 | .075 | .127 | .131 | .169 | -.177 | .026 | -.034 | .194 | ---- |

**p < 0.01 level
 *p < 0.05 level

*Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 11-23 x 24-36*

| | Q 11 | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 | Q15 | Q16 | Q17 | Q18 | Q19 | Q20 | Q21 | Q22 | Q23 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q24 | -.077 | .031 | .145 | .133 | .170 | .083 | .111 | .110 | .007 | .147 | -.088 | .206 | .518** |
| Q25 | .006 | .196 | .010 | .059 | -.024 | .128 | -.009 | .187 | -.002 | -.081 | .021 | .390** | .558** |
| Q26 | .338** | .103 | .118 | .138 | .250* | .297** | .286** | .082 | .227* | -.061 | .157 | .074 | -.062 |
| Q27 | .185 | -.026 | .092 | .114 | .042 | .070 | .148 | .071 | -.013 | -.099 | .174 | .012 | .141 |
| Q28 | -.198 | .131 | -.082 | .040 | .035 | .150 | .016 | .097 | -.149 | .113 | .021 | -.045 | .236* |
| Q29 | .128 | .105 | -.012 | .032 | -.068 | .159 | .215 | -.009 | -.121 | -.084 | .258* | .007 | -.063 |
| Q30 | .258* | .082 | -.054 | -.016 | .010 | .105 | .215* | -.009 | .228* | -.104 | -.029 | .094 | .127 |
| Q31 | .115 | .037 | -.300** | .130 | .071 | .052 | .284** | .002 | .157 | -.083 | .181 | .157 | -.112 |
| Q32 | .109 | .059 | .158 | -.089 | .062 | .237* | .013 | .078 | .086 | -.035 | .068 | .205 | .340** |
| Q33 | .208 | .136 | .116 | .030 | .085 | .148 | .137 | .082 | -.094 | -.016 | .021 | .000 | .123 |
| Q34 | .048 | .011 | -.035 | .110 | .237* | .315** | .250* | .239* | .119 | -.006 | .115 | -.054 | .250* |
| Q35 | .368** | .057 | .096 | -.191 | -.161 | .111 | .165 | .102 | .010 | -.257* | -.118 | .144 | .032 |
| Q36 | -.124 | -.064 | .157 | .052 | .102 | .158 | -.114 | .345** | .166 | .049 | .107 | .039 | .237* |

**p < 0.01 level

 *p < 0.05 level

173

*Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 11-23 x 37- 48*

|       | Q11    | Q12    | Q13    | Q14   | Q15    | Q16   | Q17    | Q18    | Q19   | Q20   | Q21   | Q22    | Q23    |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Q37   | .222*  | .208   | .080   | -.066 | -.056  | .150  | -.049  | .094   | .047  | -.166 | .040  | -.192  | -.146  |
| Q38   | -.078  | -.017  | .092   | -.052 | -.094  | -.037 | .080   | .144   | .124  | .180  | .046  | -.113  | -.253* |
| Q39   | .095   | .248*  | .073   | .007  | .062   | .188  | -.030  | .065   | -.019 | -.112 | .046  | .015   | -.004  |
| Q40   | .110   | .065   | .055   | -.059 | .002   | .149  | .202   | .298** | -.053 | -.106 | .087  | -.004  | .002   |
| Q41   | .039   | .174   | .293** | .102  | .259*  | .129  | -.002  | .168   | -.035 | .020  | .077  | .153   | .090   |
| Q42   | -.027  | .133   | .123   | -.038 | .117   | -.020 | .129   | .169   | .167  | .160  | .065  | .228*  | .174   |
| Q43   | .152   | .127   | .177   | -.106 | -.074  | .118  | -.001  | .101   | -.128 | -.088 | -.117 | .142   | .466** |
| Q45   | .170   | .114   | -.067  | -.190 | -.012  | .101  | .003   | .115   | -.018 | -.133 | -.022 | .159   | .365** |
| Q46   | .082   | -.031  | .145   | -.046 | -.025  | .128  | .040   | .068   | .069  | -.061 | .045  | .358** | .304** |
| Q47   | .068   | .082   | -.020  | -.082 | -.032  | .174  | .031   | .151   | -.042 | -.022 | -.117 | .169   | .421** |
| Q48   | -.062  | -.021  | -.083  | -.076 | -.074  | .055  | -.073  | -.043  | -.087 | .206  | -.015 | .272*  | .432** |

**p < 0.01 level

*p < 0.05 level

*Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 24-36 x 24-36*

| | Q24 | Q25 | Q26 | Q27 | Q28 | Q29 | Q30 | Q31 | Q32 | Q33 | Q34 | Q35 | Q36 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q24 | ---- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q25 | .536** | ---- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q26 | -.039 | .142 | ---- | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q27 | .254* | .354** | .268* | ---- | | | | | | | | | |
| Q28 | .082 | .086 | -.199 | .131 | ---- | | | | | | | | |
| Q29 | -.151 | .068 | .065 | .206 | .309** | ---- | | | | | | | |
| Q30 | -.035 | .109 | .407** | .101 | -.006 | -.023 | ---- | | | | | | |
| Q31 | -.119 | .001 | .215* | .145 | .086 | .212* | .118 | ---- | | | | | |
| Q32 | .430** | .297** | .085 | .020 | -.019 | -.012 | .027 | -.037 | ---- | | | | |
| Q33 | -.016 | .124 | .064 | .174 | -.038 | .111 | .071 | .102 | .065 | ---- | | | |
| Q34 | .282** | .261* | .230* | .167 | .199 | .021 | .178 | .197 | .249* | .157 | ---- | | |
| Q35 | .062 | .102 | .142 | -.050 | -.155 | -.002 | .029 | -.011 | .208 | .104 | -.069 | ---- | |
| Q36 | .162 | .277* | -.053 | .007 | .170 | .045 | -.146 | .027 | .286** | .202 | .211 | -.033 | ---- |

**p < 0.01 level
 *p < 0.05 level

*Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 24-36 x 37- 48*

|     | Q24 | Q25 | Q26 | Q27 | Q28 | Q29 | Q30 | Q31 | Q32 | Q33 | Q34 | Q35 | Q36 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Q37 | -.037 | -.004 | .043 | .006 | -.121 | -.062 | .134 | .056 | .044 | -.135 | -.156 | .196 | .193 |
| Q38 | -.046 | -.178 | .007 | -.027 | .068 | .220* | -.099 | .030 | .073 | -.168 | -.154 | .048 | .160 |
| Q39 | -.269* | -.037 | -.019 | -.242* | -.007 | .111 | .094 | .054 | .005 | .155 | -.016 | .198 | .187 |
| Q40 | .064 | .063 | -.190 | .089 | .057 | .019 | -.160 | .224* | -.012 | .141 | .156 | -.102 | .156 |
| Q41 | .138 | .073 | -.009 | .019 | .128 | .078 | .009 | -.065 | .241* | .333** | .065 | .038 | .329** |
| Q42 | .219* | .319** | -.005 | .010 | .253* | .034 | .018 | .130 | .040 | .148 | .146 | -.056 | .280** |
| Q43 | .408** | .342** | -.147 | .133 | .166 | -.009 | -.041 | -.047 | .357** | .215* | .052 | .204 | .209 |
| Q45 | .310** | .417** | -.057 | .088 | .016 | -.065 | .031 | -.105 | .344** | .307** | .191 | .225* | .263* |
| Q46 | .526** | .513** | .074 | .228* | .102 | .044 | .065 | .011 | .441** | -.078 | .197 | .075 | .185 |
| Q47 | .500** | .521** | -.118 | .195 | .251* | -.080 | -.035 | .016 | .154 | -.013 | .223* | .115 | .176 |
| Q48 | .312** | .501** | -.018 | .112 | .135 | .024 | -.093 | .067 | .226* | .173 | .207 | -.029 | .293** |

**p < 0.01 level
 *p < 0.05 level

*Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 37-48 x 37-48*

| | Q37 | Q38 | Q39 | Q40 | Q41 | Q42 | Q43 | Q45 | Q46 | Q47 | Q48 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q37 | ---- | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q38 | .112 | ---- | | | | | | | | | |
| Q39 | .192 | .042 | ---- | | | | | | | | |
| Q40 | .146 | .027 | .076 | ---- | | | | | | | |
| Q41 | .066 | -.010 | .245* | .102 | ---- | | | | | | |
| Q42 | .059 | .073 | -.079 | .119 | .070 | ---- | | | | | |
| Q43 | .071 | -.036 | .127 | -.063 | .181 | .218* | ---- | | | | |
| Q45 | .035 | -.236* | .165 | .007 | .194 | .303** | .634** | ---- | | | |
| Q46 | -.099 | -.205 | -.061 | .026 | .252* | .367** | .341** | .396** | ---- | | |
| Q47 | -.033 | -.065 | .002 | .064 | .027 | .270* | .480** | .480** | .314** | ---- | |
| Q48 | -.123 | -.058 | .060 | -.017 | .108 | .313** | .393** | .431** | .430** | .303** | ---- |

**p < 0.01 level
 *p < 0.05 level

# APPENDIX G

# MAIN STUDY IRB APPROVAL

## Cleveland State University
engaged learning

## Memorandum
Institutional Review Board

**To:**    Brian Harper
        Curriculum & Foundations

**From:**  Craig M. Zullig
        Director
        Office of Sponsored Programs & Research

**Date:**  April 26, 2013

**Re:**    Results of IRB Review of your project number: #29828-HAR-HS
        Co-Investigator: Carly Evans
        **Title: Goals of Education: A Survey**

The IRB has reviewed and approved your application for the above named project, under the category noted below. Approval for use of human subjects in this research is for a one-year period as noted below. If your study extends beyond this approval period, you must contact this office to initiate an annual review of this research.

By accepting this decision, you agree to notify the IRB of: (1) any additions to or changes in procedures for your study that modify the subjects' risk in any way; and (2) any events that affect that safety or well-being of subjects. Notify the IRB of any revisions to the protocol, including the addition of researchers, prior to implementation.

Thank you for your efforts to maintain compliance with the federal regulations for the protection of human subjects.

---

**Approval Category:**               **Approval Date:**    April 23, 2013

  X    Exempt Review: Category b(2)      **Expiration Date:**  April 22, 2014

cc:    Project file

*Main Study Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 11-23 x 11-23*

| | Q11 | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 | Q15 | Q16 | Q17 | Q18 | Q19 | Q20 | Q21 | Q22 | Q23 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q11 | ---- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q12 | .413** | ---- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q13 | .063 | .396** | ---- | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q14 | .079 | .407** | .485** | ---- | | | | | | | | | |
| Q15 | .220* | .331** | .200* | .314** | ---- | | | | | | | | |
| Q16 | .355** | .441** | .455** | .293** | .298** | ---- | | | | | | | |
| Q17 | .232** | .417** | .194* | .194* | .266** | .422** | ---- | | | | | | |
| Q18 | .205* | .288** | .113 | .310** | .261** | .335** | .471** | ---- | | | | | |
| Q19 | .119 | .005 | -.077 | .193* | .290** | -.005 | -.094 | .062 | ---- | | | | |
| Q20 | .212* | .398** | .077 | .288** | .207* | .097 | .232** | .327** | .165 | ---- | | | |
| Q21 | .052 | .183* | .269** | .231* | .217* | .147 | .134 | .149 | .064 | .120 | ---- | | |
| Q22 | .222* | .191* | .105 | .222* | .164 | .168 | .058 | .146 | .228* | .222* | .118 | ---- | |
| Q23 | .317** | .318** | .276** | .181* | .262** | .320** | .133 | .294** | .194* | .257** | -.021 | .274* | ---- |

**p < 0.01 level
 *p < 0.05 level

*Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 11-23 x 24-36*

| | Q11 | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 | Q15 | Q16 | Q17 | Q18 | Q19 | Q20 | Q21 | Q22 | Q23 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q24 | .268** | .227* | .286** | .172 | .222* | .412** | .085 | .205* | .052 | .177* | .065 | .225* | .611** |
| Q25 | .230* | .290** | .224* | .273** | .170 | .232** | .002 | .204* | .009 | .194* | .105 | .381** | .532** |
| Q26 | -.038 | -.154 | -.127 | -.043 | .049 | .009 | .008 | .039 | .243** | .148 | -.093 | .149 | .155 |
| Q27 | .094 | .113 | .142 | .144 | .198* | .225* | -.053 | .116 | .123 | .068 | .125 | .104 | .419** |
| Q28 | .040 | .079 | .131 | .230* | .093 | .378** | .056 | .251** | .105 | .219* | .136 | .315** | .324** |
| Q29 | .084 | .077 | .207* | .274** | .138 | .183* | .269** | .265** | .101 | .097 | .348** | .188* | .088 |
| Q30 | .121 | .151 | .075 | .219 | .188* | .075 | .161 | .084 | .225* | .219* | -.007 | .057 | .193* |
| Q31 | .137 | .036 | -.004 | .136 | .094 | .053 | .075 | .055 | .120 | .153 | .083 | .239** | .113 |
| Q32 | .191* | .075 | .201* | .126 | .115 | .251** | .054 | .303** | .176 | .150 | .020 | .182* | .542** |
| Q33 | .171 | .167 | .300** | .167 | .093 | .256** | .210* | .161 | .037 | -.034 | .089 | .120 | .321** |
| Q34 | .187* | .051 | .093 | .163 | .161 | .202* | .123 | .095 | .230* | .146 | .135 | .222* | .405** |
| Q35 | .139 | .185* | .026 | .097 | -.015 | .005 | .026 | .044 | .021 | .004 | -.166 | .000 | .125 |
| Q36 | .079 | .264** | .233** | .219* | .152 | .142 | .187* | .177 | .082 | .187* | .055 | .119 | .315** |

**p < 0.01 level
 *p < 0.05 level

*Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 11-23 x 37- 48*

|     | Q11 | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 | Q15 | Q16 | Q17 | Q18 | Q19 | Q20 | Q21 | Q22 | Q23 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Q37 | -.025 | -.059 | -.076 | .143 | .058 | .014 | .092 | -.003 | .114 | -.027 | -.009 | .062 | -.001 |
| Q38 | .126 | .159 | .306** | .069 | -.028 | .220* | .107 | -.005 | -.053 | -.056 | .005 | -.055 | .210* |
| Q39 | .007 | -.063 | .100 | .032 | .125 | .123 | .113 | -.037 | .060 | -.157 | -.150 | .062 | -.066 |
| Q40 | .025 | .101 | -.055 | -.130 | .107 | .101 | .097 | .211* | .032 | -.033 | .056 | .002 | .272** |
| Q41 | .020 | .076 | .230* | .187* | .145 | .195* | .169 | .151 | .092 | .008 | .112 | .065 | .195* |
| Q42 | .210* | .255** | .156 | .173 | .312** | .161 | .065 | .145 | .169 | .212* | .015 | .251** | .363** |
| Q43 | .167 | .021 | .139 | .103 | .073 | .168 | .065 | .122 | .088 | .072 | .028 | .351** | .415** |
| Q45 | .143 | .057 | .194* | .116 | .167 | .269** | .164 | .136 | .057 | .097 | .079 | .277** | .373** |
| Q46 | .101 | .200* | .076 | .157 | .181* | .173 | -.001 | .138 | -.034 | .228* | .031 | .203* | .332** |
| Q47 | .247** | .124 | .190* | .214* | .215* | .157 | -.014 | .122 | .133 | .191* | .012 | .287** | .501** |
| Q48 | .144 | .200* | .067 | .239** | .213* | .186* | -.001 | .171 | .199* | .169 | .071 | .268** | .326** |

**p < 0.01 level
 *p < 0.05 level

*Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 24-36 x 24-36*

|     | Q24 | Q25 | Q26 | Q27 | Q28 | Q29 | Q30 | Q31 | Q32 | Q33 | Q34 | Q35 | Q36 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Q24 | ---- | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q25 | .655** | ---- | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q26 | .164 | .058 | ---- | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q27 | .392** | .497** | .262** | ---- | | | | | | | | | |
| Q28 | .384** | .356** | .268** | .196* | ---- | | | | | | | | |
| Q29 | .146 | .122 | .209* | .129 | .226* | ---- | | | | | | | |
| Q30 | .082 | .117 | .435** | .124 | .072 | .046 | ---- | | | | | | |
| Q31 | .218* | .267** | .248** | .093 | .261** | .311** | -.020 | ---- | | | | | |
| Q32 | .611** | .452** | .201* | .322** | .241** | .218* | .185* | .346** | ---- | | | | |
| Q33 | .442** | .327** | .154 | .356** | .147 | .333** | .108 | .262** | .432** | ---- | | | |
| Q34 | .431** | .452** | .093 | .179* | .421** | .078 | .109 | .211* | .364** | .103 | ---- | | |
| Q35 | .079 | .188* | -.088 | .122 | -.180* | -.117 | .145 | -.128 | .147 | .045 | .105 | ---- | |
| Q36 | .236** | .271** | -.047 | .160 | .179* | .131 | .085 | .110 | .276** | .144 | .202 | .081 | ---- |

**p < 0.01 level
*p < 0.05 level

*Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 24-36 x 37- 48*

|     | Q24 | Q25 | Q26 | Q27 | Q28 | Q29 | Q30 | Q31 | Q32 | Q33 | Q34 | Q35 | Q36 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Q37 | -.057 | .043 | .066 | .095 | -.094 | .048 | .178 | .135 | .037 | .134 | .012 | .106 | .125 |
| Q38 | .162 | .175 | -.092 | .196* | .015 | .066 | .168 | -.067 | .160 | .301** | .084 | .238** | .289** |
| Q39 | .047 | -.067 | .166 | -.021 | -.098 | .010 | .102 | .031 | .028 | .146 | -.011 | .186* | .002 |
| Q40 | .153 | .157 | -.186* | .233** | .020 | .108 | -.153 | -.116 | .109 | .091 | .088 | .102 | .282** |
| Q41 | .205* | .251** | .030 | .255** | .116 | .266** | -.034 | .029 | .357** | .395** | .156 | .164 | .322** |
| Q42 | .185* | .398** | .028 | .071 | .179* | .003 | .247** | .196* | .231* | .194* | .274** | .185* | .149 |
| Q43 | .490** | .391** | .121 | .322** | .224* | .221* | -.003 | .108 | .294** | .235* | .345** | .169 | .021 |
| Q45 | .375** | .350** | .103 | .255** | .167 | .221* | .046 | .187* | .285** | .181* | .267** | .136 | - .022 |
| Q46 | .412** | .386** | .042 | .179* | .277** | .075 | -.005 | .195* | .301** | .120 | .410** | .160 | .142 |
| Q47 | .486** | .501** | .028 | .116 | .248** | .039 | .137 | .090 | .317** | .053 | .470** | .193* | .195* |
| Q48 | .324** | .354** | .143 | .200* | .190* | .208* | .039 | .194* | .283** | .038 | .258** | .172 | -.021 |

**p < 0.01 level
 *p < 0.05 level

*Bivariate Correlations Among Survey Questions 37-48 x 37-48*

| | Q37 | Q38 | Q39 | Q40 | Q41 | Q42 | Q43 | Q45 | Q46 | Q47 | Q48 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Q37 | ---- | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q38 | -.004 | ---- | | | | | | | | | |
| Q39 | .312** | .215* | ---- | | | | | | | | |
| Q40 | .021 | .210* | .075 | ---- | | | | | | | |
| Q41 | .090 | .353** | .057 | .247** | ---- | | | | | | |
| Q42 | .005 | .143 | -.008 | .017 | .089 | ---- | | | | | |
| Q43 | .234* | .052 | .172 | .164 | .145 | -.005 | ---- | | | | |
| Q45 | .066 | -.035 | .095 | .115 | .073 | .230* | .505** | ---- | | | |
| Q46 | .025 | .079 | -.044 | .142 | .096 | .253** | .337** | .318** | ---- | | |
| Q47 | -.162 | -.017 | -.120 | .093 | .091 | .361** | .345** | .237** | .291** | ---- | |
| Q48 | .109 | -.109 | .084 | .047 | .084 | .186* | .427** | .361** | .371** | .392** | ---- |

**p < 0.01 level
 *p < 0.05 level

**PILOT STUDY STUDENT CONSENT FORM**



Student Consent Form
**(for students 18 and older only)**

Dear Student:

My name is Carly Evans, and I am a teacher at Brush High School currently working on my Ph.D. in Urban Education at Cleveland State University. This semester, I am developing a survey under the supervision of Dr. Brian Harper, Associate Professor in the Curriculum Foundations department within the College of Education and Human Services at Cleveland State University. I am interested in learning about high school students' understanding of the goals of education, particularly students' perspectives on secondary education. To study this topic, I am conducting an online survey. The research will contribute to the implementation of more effective programming and policies.

In order to learn more about students' view on this topic, I am requesting your participation in an online survey. The online survey will consist of 48 questions and will be administered through Survey Monkey in your English class. It should take most students approximately 20 minutes to complete. The English Department has agreed to allow students time to take the survey during class.

Your consent and participation are completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. All participants will be entered in a random drawing for one of three $25 gift cards. There is no consequence for not participating. Your participation in this survey will not impact your grade in your English class in any way.

You may decide not to participate in the survey on the day it is held, and are free to stop the survey once it has begun should you wish to do so. All responses will be collected anonymously through an online survey. Student participation in the survey will remain confidential. Your name will not be linked to your responses to the survey questions nor will your name be used in any written materials related to this study.

The risks of this study are not beyond those experienced in daily living. In terms of benefits, you may find survey to be useful to your thinking about the purpose of education.
(see next page)


For further information regarding this research please contact Dr. Brian Harper (216) 875-9770, email: b.harper1@csuohio.edu or Carly Evans at (216) 691-7052, ext. 4253, email: c.s.evans@vikes.csuohio.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the Cleveland State University Institutional Review Board at (216) 687-3630.

There are two copies of this letter. After signing them, keep one copy for your records and return the other one to your school. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

If you agree to participate, please sign below. After signing your name, return this sheet to the school.

Student Signature: _____

Student's Name: _____ (Please Print)

Date: _____

**PILOT STUDY STUDENT ASSENT FORM**

# Cleveland State University

College of Education and
Human Services

Student Assent Form

Dear Student:

My name is Carly Evans, and I am a teacher at Brush High School currently working on my Ph.D. in Urban Education at Cleveland State University.  This semester, I am developing a survey under the supervision of Dr. Brian Harper, Associate Professor in the Curriculum Foundations department within the College of Education and Human Services at Cleveland State University.   I am interested in learning about high school students' understanding of the goals of education, particularly students' perspectives on secondary education. To study this topic, I am conducting an online survey.  The research will contribute to the implementation of more effective programming and policies.

In order to learn more about students' view on this topic, I am requesting your participation in an online survey.  The online survey will consist of 48 questions and will be administered through Survey Monkey in your English class.  It should take most students approximately 20 minutes to complete.  The English Department has agreed to allow students time to take the survey during class.

Your consent and participation are completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. All participants will be entered in a random drawing for one of three $25 gift cards.  There is no consequence for not participating.  Your participation in this survey will not impact your grade in your English class in any way.

You may decide not to participate in the survey on the day it is held, and are free to stop the survey once it has begun should you wish to do so.  All responses will be collected anonymously through an online survey.  Student participation in the survey will remain confidential.   Your name will not be linked to your responses to the survey questions nor will your name be used in any written materials related to this study.

(see next page)

The risks of this study are not beyond those experienced in daily living. In terms of benefits, you may find survey to be useful to your thinking about the purpose of education.

(see next page)

There are two copies of this letter. After signing them, keep one copy for your records and return the other one. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

For further information regarding this research please contact Dr. Brian Harper (216) 875-9770, email: b.harper1@csuohio.edu or Carly Evans at (216) 691-7052, ext. 4253, email: c.s.evans@vikes.csuohio.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the Cleveland State University Institutional Review Board at (216) 687-3630.

Please read the following and sign below if you agree to participate.

I understand that:
- if I don't want to participate in the survey, that's ok and I won't get into trouble
- anytime that I want to stop participating that's ok
- my participation will not affect my grade in class


Signature: _____

Name: _____ (Please Print)

Date: _____

**PILOT STUDY PARENTAL CONSENT FORM**



Parental Consent Form

Dear Parent or Guardian:

My name is Carly Evans, and I am a teacher at Brush High School currently working on my Ph.D. in Urban Education at Cleveland State University. This semester, I am developing a survey under the supervision of Dr. Brian Harper, Associate Professor in the Curriculum Foundations department within the College of Education and Human Services at Cleveland State University.  I am interested in learning about high school students' understanding of the goals of education, particularly students' perspectives on secondary education. To study this topic, I am conducting an online survey.  The research will contribute to the implementation of more effective programming and policies.

In order to learn more about students' view on this topic, I am requesting your child's participation in an online survey.  The online survey will consist of 48 questions and will be administered through Survey Monkey in your child's English class.  It should take most students approximately 20 minutes to complete.  The English Department has agreed to allow students time to take the survey during class.

Your consent and your child's participation are completely voluntary and your child may withdraw at any time. All participants will be entered in a random drawing for one of three $25 gift cards.  There is no consequence for not participating.  Your child's participation in this survey will not impact your child's grade in English class in any way.

Your child may decide not to participate in the survey on the day it is held, and is free to stop the survey once it has begun should s/he wish to do so.  All responses

(see next page)

will be collected anonymously through an online survey.  Student participation in the survey will remain confidential.  Your child's name will not be linked to his/her responses to the survey questions nor will his/her name be used in any written materials related to this study.

The risks of this study are not beyond those experienced in daily living.  In terms of benefits, your child may find the survey to be useful in thinking about the purpose of education.

For further information regarding this research please contact Dr. Brian Harper (216) 875-9770, email: b.harper1@csuohio.edu or Carly Evans at (216) 691-7052, ext. 4253, email: c.s.evans@vikes.csuohio.edu.

If you have any questions about your child's rights as a research participant you may contact the Cleveland State University Institutional Review Board at (216) 687-3630.

There are two copies of this letter. After signing them, keep one copy for your records and return the other one to your school. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

If you agree to participate, please sign below. After signing your name, return this sheet to the school.

Parent's Signature: _____

Parent's Name: _____ (Please Print)

Child's Name: _____ (Please Print)

Date: _____

**MAIN STUDY STUDENT CONSENT**



Student Consent Form
**(for students 18 and older only)**

Dear Student:

My name is Carly Evans, and I am a teacher at Brush High School currently working on my Ph.D. in Urban Education at Cleveland State University. This semester, I am developing a survey under the supervision of Dr. Brian Harper, Associate Professor in the Curriculum Foundations department within the College of Education and Human Services at Cleveland State University.  I am interested in learning about high school students' understanding of the goals of education, particularly students' perspectives on secondary education. To study this topic, I am conducting an online survey.  The research will contribute to the implementation of more effective programming and policies.

In order to learn more about students' view on this topic, I am requesting your participation in an online survey.  The online survey will consist of 48 questions and will be administered through Survey Monkey in your English class.  It should take most students approximately 20 minutes to complete.  The English Department has agreed to allow students time to take the survey during class.

Your consent and participation are completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time.  There is no consequence for not participating.  Your participation in this survey will not impact your grade in your English class in any way.

You may decide not to participate in the survey on the day it is held, and are free to stop the survey once it has begun should you wish to do so. All responses will be collected anonymously through an online survey.  Student participation in the survey will remain confidential.   Your name will not be linked to your responses to the survey questions nor will your name be used in any written materials related to this study.

(see next page)

The risks of this study are not beyond those experienced in daily living.  In terms of benefits, you may find survey to be useful to your thinking about the purpose of education.

For further information regarding this research please contact Dr. Brian Harper (216) 875-9770, email: b.harper1@csuohio.edu or Carly Evans at (216) 691-7052, ext. 4253, email: c.s.evans@vikes.csuohio.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the Cleveland State University Institutional Review Board at (216) 687-3630.

There are two copies of this letter. After signing them, keep one copy for your records and return the other one to your school. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

If you agree to participate, please sign below. After signing your name, return this sheet to the school.

Student Signature: _____

Student's Name: _____ (Please Print)

 Date: _____

**MAIN STUDY STUDENT ASSENT FORM**



Cleveland State University
College of Education and
Human Services

Student Assent Form

Dear Student:

My name is Carly Evans, and I am a teacher at Brush High School currently working on my Ph.D. in Urban Education at Cleveland State University. This semester, I am developing a survey under the supervision of Dr. Brian Harper, Associate Professor in the Curriculum Foundations department within the College of Education and Human Services at Cleveland State University. I am interested in learning about high school students' understanding of the goals of education, particularly students' perspectives on secondary education. To study this topic, I am conducting an online survey. The research will contribute to the implementation of more effective programming and policies.

In order to learn more about students' view on this topic, I am requesting your participation in an online survey. The online survey will consist of 48 questions and will be administered through Survey Monkey in your English class. It should take most students approximately 20 minutes to complete. The English Department has agreed to allow students time to take the survey during class.

Your consent and participation are completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. There is no consequence for not participating. Your participation in this survey will not impact your grade in your English class in any way.

You may decide not to participate in the survey on the day it is held, and are free to stop the survey once it has begun should you wish to do so. All responses will be collected anonymously through an online survey. Student participation in the survey will remain confidential. Your name will not be linked to your responses to the survey questions nor will your name be used in any written materials related to this study.

(see next page)

The risks of this study are not beyond those experienced in daily living.  In terms of benefits, you may find survey to be useful to your thinking about the purpose of education.

There are two copies of this letter. After signing them, keep one copy for your records and return the other one. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

For further information regarding this research please contact Dr. Brian Harper (216) 875-9770, email: b.harper1@csuohio.edu or Carly Evans at (216) 691-7052, ext. 4253, email: c.s.evans@vikes.csuohio.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the Cleveland State University Institutional Review Board at (216) 687-3630.

Please read the following and sign below if you agree to participate.

I understand that:
- if I don't want to participate in the survey, that's ok and I won't get into trouble
- anytime that I want to stop participating that's ok
- my participation will not affect my grade in class


Signature: _____

Name: _____ (Please Print)

Date: _____

**MAIN STUDY PARENTAL CONSENT FORM**



Parental Consent Form

Dear Parent or Guardian:

My name is Carly Evans, and I am a teacher at Brush High School currently working on my Ph.D. in Urban Education at Cleveland State University. This semester, I am developing a survey under the supervision of Dr. Brian Harper, Associate Professor in the Curriculum Foundations department within the College of Education and Human Services at Cleveland State University.  I am interested in learning about high school students' understanding of the goals of education, particularly students' perspectives on secondary education. To study this topic, I am conducting an online survey.  The research will contribute to the implementation of more effective programming and policies.

In order to learn more about students' view on this topic, I am requesting your child's participation in an online survey.  The online survey will consist of 48 questions and will be administered through Survey Monkey in your child's English class.  It should take most students approximately 20 minutes to complete.  The English Department has agreed to allow students time to take the survey during class.

Your consent and your child's participation are completely voluntary and your child may withdraw at any time.  There is no consequence for not participating.  Your child's participation in this survey will not impact your child's grade in English class in any way.

Your child may decide not to participate in the survey on the day it is held, and is free to stop the survey once it has begun should s/he wish to do so.  All responses will be collected anonymously through an online survey.  Student participation in the survey will remain confidential.  Your child's name will not be linked to his/her

(see next page)

responses to the survey questions nor will his/her name be used in any written materials related to this study.

The risks of this study are not beyond those experienced in daily living. In terms of benefits, your child may find the survey to be useful in thinking about the purpose of education.

For further information regarding this research please contact Dr. Brian Harper (216) 875-9770, email: b.harper1@csuohio.edu or Carly Evans at (216) 691-7052, ext. 4253, email: c.s.evans@vikes.csuohio.edu.

If you have any questions about your child's rights as a research participant you may contact the Cleveland State University Institutional Review Board at (216) 687-3630.

There are two copies of this letter. After signing them, keep one copy for your records and return the other one to your school. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

If you agree to participate, please sign below. After signing your name, return this sheet to the school.

Parent's Signature: _____

Parent's Name: _____ (Please Print)

Child's Name: _____ (Please Print)

Date: _____