Marshall University
Marshall Digital Scholar

1-1-2008

Grade Retention as Perceived by Principals

Debora Ann Galford
galford@marshall.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://mds.marshall.edu/etd

Part of the School Psychology Commons

Running head: Grade Retention

GRADE RETENTION AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS

Proposal submitted to

Marshall University Graduate College

In partial fulfillment of the

Requirements for the degree of

Educational Specialist in

School Psychology

by

Debora Ann Galford

Fred Jay Krieg, Ph.D., Committee Chairperson

Stephen L. O'Keefe, Ph.D.

Sandra S. Stroebel, Ph.D.

Marshall University Graduate College

July 2008

Abstract

This study examined the perceptions of principals regarding academic, social, or emotional outcomes and alternative interventions to grade retention. The principals were asked to respond to the survey on grade retention as an intervention. Following the initial survey, an article entitled, "Grade Retention and Promotion" (Jimerson, Graydon, Pletcher, Schnurr, Kundert, & Nickerson, 2006) was given for review and post-survey was administered.

The results of this study revealed that principals' attitudes changed about using retention as an intervention in response to reading the article. These research results indicated that when research-based information on the negative effects of retention was presented, there was a significant change in principals' attitude as measured by these surveys. The effects on change in attitude compared to actual change in behavior should be studied.

Acknowledgement

I wish to thank my family and friends who have provided support and encouragement. I would like to express gratitude to the participants of this study. I would also like to give express gratitude to Dr. Krieg and to Dr. O'Keefe and Dr. Stroebel for their guidance and participation on the committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

GRADE RETENTION AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS

Chapter One: LITERATURE REVIEW

Research studies are clear that nonretained students demonstrate higher grades, better test scores, and fewer academic emotional and behavioral problems than retained students (Meisels & Liaw, 1993). Simply having a student repeat a grade is unlikely to address the multiple factors influencing poor achievement or adjustment that led to the student being retained (Jimerson, 2001). Retention at any point is associated with less optimal academic and personal-social outcomes (Holmes & Matthews, 1984; Meisels & Liaw, 1993).

The Effect of Grade Retention on Increasing School Dropout Rate

Research has demonstrated that repeating a grade provides limited remedial benefits over time and students are at a higher risk of dropping out of school (Jimerson, 1999, 2001; Jimerson, Anderson, & Whipple, 2001; Jimerson, Carlson, Rotert, Egeland, & Stroufe, 1997; Jimerson, Graydon, Pletcher, Schnurr, Kundert, & Nickerson, 2006; Roderick, 1995; Rumberger, 1995). Longitudinal studies indicate that retained students are more likely to drop out when compared to equally lower achieving but promoted peers (Ferguson, Jimerson, & Dalton 2001; Jimerson, 1999; Jimerson et al., 2001, 2006; Krantz, 2001). Research indicated that in Chicago schools one third of eighth graders that were retained did eventually drop out. Children who have been retained once are five times less likely to graduate high school. There is nearly a 100% probability that children will drop out when they have been retained two or more times (Shepard & Smith, 1990). A recently published longitudinal study failed to demonstrate the effectiveness of grade retention on academic achievement and suggested that retained students display more aggression during adolescence (Jimerson & Ferguson, 2007). These finding are consistent

with previous studies indicating that low achievement and behavior problems increase the risk of dropping out of high school (Jimerson, Ferguson, Whipple, Anderson, & Dalton, 2002; Roderick, 1994, 1995). In fact, grade retention has been identified as the single most powerful predictor of dropping out (Rumberger, 1995). Jimerson (1999) indicated that retained individuals receive lower educational and employment status ratings and are paid less per hour at age twenty. Students who drop out of school have difficulty finding and maintaining employment, and in addition experience higher rates of mental health problems, chemical abuse, and criminal activity than do high school graduates (Jimerson, 2001). Most youth who drop out are ill equipped for the modern workforce; thus ultimately paying less tax, adding costs to welfare programs, and being disproportionably represented in crime and incarceration statistics (Jimerson & Ferguson, 2007; Kirsch, Jungeblut, Jenkins, & Kolstad, 1993; Rumberger, 1987). The annual financial cost of the dropout problem has been estimated to exceed $240 billion (Dryfoos, 1990).

The Effect of Grade Retention on Achievement

Prohaska (1991) reported when comparing the reading achievement of third graders who had attended kindergarten for one year with that of third graders who had been given two years of kindergarten there was no significant differences between the standardized test scores of the retained and promoted students.

Three meta-analyses on the outcomes and grade retention have been published (Holmes, 1989; Holmes & Matthews, 1984; Jimerson, 2001). The most recent meta-analysis (Jimerson, 2001) indicated that only 5% of the 169 analyses of academic achievement outcomes resulted in significant statistical differences favoring the retained students (Jimerson et al., 2006). In general, the confluence of research results failed to

demonstrate academic achievement advantages for retained students relative to comparison group (i.e., IQ, academic achievement, socioemotional and behavioral adjustment, SES, and gender) of promoted students (Jimerson, 2001). There are only nine studies that showed positive short-term achievement outcomes; however, these gains were shown to diminish with time (Holmes, 1989; Tomchin & Impara, 1992). Benefits to retained students have been reported, particularly when students received special interventions (Peterson, DeGracie, & Ayabe, 1987).

The Effect of Grade Retention on Self-Esteem

Researchers have linked retention and its impact on self-esteem to the problem of students dropping out of school (Natale, 1991; Smalls, 1997). Studies indicate that retained students experience lower self-esteem than promoted peers do (Jimerson, 2001). Research further indicated that children have rated the possibility of retention as extremely stressful, comparable to loss of parent (Yamamoto, 1980).

Meta-Analysis of Grade Retention Studies

Meta-analyses have indicated that evidence does not support the utilization of grade retention as an intervention strategy for academic achievement and for socio-emotional adjustment (Jimerson, 2001). The test scores of students, who are retained, may temporarily improve and then decline below those of equal low achieving but socially promoted peers.

Negative Effects of Retention

Anderson, Whipple, & Jimerson (2002) indicated the following:

Negative effects of grade retention including:
- absence of specific remedial strategies to enhance social or cognitive competence

- failure to address risk factors associated with retention (short-term gains following retention mask long-term problems associated with ineffective instruction)
- retained children are subsequently overage of grade, which is associated with… (stigmatization by peers and…socio-emotional adjustments problems). (p. 2)

Research-Based Alternative Interventions

Jimerson and Kaufman (2003) have reported that retention is more likely to have benign or positive impact when students receive specific remediation to address skill and/or behavioral problems that caused them to be retained. Many teachers and schools are currently engaging in a number of positive educational practices to help their students, including prevention and intervention strategies (Jimerson, et al., 2006). Other educational research presents evidence that alternative strategies, such as: parental involvement, modification of instructional strategies, early reading instruction, cognitive-behavioral modification, systematic formative evaluation, and assorted early intervention efforts, provide positive effects on subsequent school achievement and adjustment (Jimerson, 2001).

Jimerson, et al. (2006) recommended the following:

- Actively encourage parental involvement.
- Adopt age-appropriate and culturally sensitive instructional strategies.
- Establish multiage groupings in classrooms with teachers trained to work with students of mixed age and ability.
- Establish early intervention programs and preschool programs.
- Create the opportunity for students to have additional time to master material without becoming overage for grade by high-quality summer school, intersession programs, and before and after school programs.
- Create personal intervention plans for students.
- Reduce class size.
- Increase the use of one-on-one tutoring.
- Identify specific learning or behavior problems and design interventions to address those problems.
- Provide appropriate special education services.
- Establish full-service schools to provide a community-based vehicle to meet the needs of at-risk students. (p. 604)

Educators Attitudes Toward Grade Retention

Researchers indicate overall that educators believe that retention is beneficial to students (Bynes, 1989, Shepard & Smith, 1990; Tomchin & Impara, 1992). These educators believe an additional year of schooling can mean the difference between success and failure for certain students (Natale, 1991).

The idea of grade retention is quite popular as an intervention; despite the research-based evidence indicting retention is not a viable intervention. Several arguments for grade retention are not substantiated including the student will obtain mastery by retention thus increasing their self-esteem, and/or there will be opportunity to develop maturity. Teachers and administrators may be frequently pressured to implement policies to end "social promotion" in an effort to obtain higher test scores.

There has been little research done assessing teachers, principals, counselors, and school psychologists' attitudes towards grade retention and why educators continue to ignore the research regarding the practice of grade retention. Two studies (Byrnes, 1989; Tomchin & Impara, 1992) have interviewed teachers and principals about their position on grade retention (Viland, 2001). In one large school district seventy-four percent of principals, sixty-five percent of teachers, and fifty-nine percent of parents in this study felt children should 'usually' or 'always' be retained if they do not meet grade level requirements (Byrnes, 1989). Viland (2003) indicated that overall school psychologists perceived grade retention as an ineffective intervention for academic failure.

This study examined the perceptions of principals regarding academic, social, or emotional outcomes and alternative interventions to grade retention. The principals were

asked to respond to the survey on grade retention as an intervention. Following the initial

survey, an article entitled, "Grade Retention and Promotion" (Jimerson, Graydon,

Pletcher, Schnurr, Kundert, & Nickerson, 2006) was given for review and post-survey

was administered. The null hypothesis was that there would not be a change in attitude

after reading article on grade retention based on survey results. The null hypothesis was

used because of directionality of change was unknown, and it was a more conservative

approach.

Chapter Two: Method

Participants

The Grade Retention/Social Promotion Survey (See Appendix A) was given to school principals in Ohio and West Virginia. A total of 34 surveys were returned (10 out of 56 mailed were returned; 9 out of 10 handed out were returned; and 15 out of 15 given at principals meetings were returned). In addition, the information on the name of school and position held was collected for statistical comparison (See Design and Procedures). Nineteen surveys returned were from Ohio principals, and fifteen were returned from West Virginia principals.

Instrument

The Grade Retention/Social Promotion Survey (See Appendix A) was modified from a survey developed by Weissenburg & Viland (Viland, 2003) and was based on a review of literature on educators' perceptions on grade retention as an intervention. The survey was modified to a true/false format, and items deleted that were unreflective of behavior and attitude change. The survey consisted of a true/false questionnaire and a questionnaire section on intervention preferences based on the works and the recommendations of Jimerson et al. (2006). Areas addressed by questionnaire were the satisfaction with the county's/school district's policy on grade retention, outcomes of grade retention on students' academic achievement, social development, self-esteem, and attitude toward school. In addition, the effects of the dropping out of school and preference for alternative interventions were also areas addressed on the questionnaire.

Design and Procedure

A packet containing participant's copy of consent, the article, and the surveys was given to a selected sample of school principals by mailing, handing out individually, or given out at principals meeting. Participants were asked to respond to the survey on their opinions of grade retention as an intervention. Following the initial survey, an article, which is entitled, "Grade Retention and Promotion" (Jimerson, et al., 2006) was given for review and a post-survey was administered. The surveys were kept confidential by numbering the surveys and a separate key code was kept that had the number assigned to each person, school, and position. Thirty-four principals completed the study (10 out of 56 mailed were returned; 9 out of 10 handed out were returned; and 15 out of 15 given at principals meetings were returned).

Chapter Three: Results

An analysis of the principals' surveys revealed that reading the article improved the attitude about retention. The hypothesis that reading a research article on retention would not affect attitude on retention was not supported ($t (31) = -3.49$, $p < .05$). The mean and standard deviation for the total and individual items are shown in Table 1. Seven out of the twelve questions items were changed. The first survey question, "Grade retention is a good intervention to consider for academic failure", was significantly different ($t (30) = -2.11$, $p < .05$). After reading the article, respondents were less likely to believe that retention was a good intervention. The second survey question, "Grade retention can be a successful intervention for low achieving students", was significantly different ($t (30) = -2.79$, $p < .05$). After reading the article, respondents were less likely to believe that retention was a successful intervention for low achieving students. The third

survey question, "An extra year can help a child develop and become more successful in school", was significantly different (t (30) = -4.66, p < .05). After reading the article, respondents were less likely to believe retention increased student success. The fourth survey question, "An extra year can help a child catch up", was significantly different (t (30) = -4.06, p < .05). After reading the article, respondents were less likely to recognize that an extra year can help a child catch up. The fifth survey question, "The positive effects of grade retention can continue three or four years after a student is retained", was significantly different (t (29) = -2.76, p < .05). After reading the article, respondents were less likely to believe the positive effects of retention continued three or four years after a student was retained. The seventh survey question, "After a year of retention, a student can become more engaged in school", was significantly different (t (30) = -3.32, p < .05). After reading the article, respondents were more likely to recognize that a student would not become more engaged in school after being retained. The eighth survey question, "Grade retention can have a positive effect on a student's social development", was significantly different (t (29) = -2.97, p < .05). After reading the article on retention, the respondents were more likely to recognize the negative effects on a student's social development. Although not part of survey totals, the thirteenth question, "I am satisfied with my county's/school district's policy on retention", was significantly different (t (29) = 2.11, p < .05). After reading the article on retention, the respondent was less likely to be satisfied with their county's/school district's policy on retention. Reading a research article on retention and research-based interventions had a significant impact of increasing the number of interventions selected from a list of research-based interventions by principals (t (31) = -3.19, p < .05).

Five out of the twelve were not changed. The sixth survey question, "Grade retention can improve a child's self-esteem", was not significantly different (t (29) = -1.68, p < .05). The ninth survey question, "Retained students can become upset when they are removed from their familiar peer group", was not significantly different (t (30) = 1.44, p < .05). Most of respondents on the pre and post survey believed that retained students were upset when removed from their familiar peer group. The tenth survey question, "Grade retention can make a student more susceptible to dropping out of school", was not significantly different (t (29) = -1.00, p < .05). Most of respondents on the pre and post survey believed that grade retention made student more susceptible to dropping out. The eleventh survey question, "Students can be motivated to work harder when they know there is a possibility that they might be retained", was not significantly different (t (30) = -1.14, p < .05). The twelfth survey question, "Grade retention can apply a negative label to a child", was not significantly different (t (30) = -.572, p < .05). Most of respondents on the pre and post survey believed that grade retention could apply a negative label to a child. The mean and standard deviation for the total and individual items are shown in Table 4.

An analysis of each item and by total score (items 1-12) was completed to determine if changes in attitude on grade retention was indicated. Internal consistency on the true-false items was evaluated by Cronbach's alpha. Items one through twelve were analyzed using Cronbach's alpha to determine the reliability of the data. The results of the pre and post surveys were analyzed (Cronbach's alpha = .920, p<.05) indicated that the surveys were highly reliable when comparing the twelve survey questions related to principal attitude.

Chapter Four: Discussion

For this study, principals' perceptions on the effectiveness of educational retention were examined to understand their position for using retention as an intervention for academic failure. Previous research studied indicated that grade retention has a detrimental effect on students' academic, social, and emotional outcomes. This study examined the perceptions of principals regarding academic, social, or emotional outcomes, and the use of alternative interventions to grade retention.

The results of this study revealed that principals' attitudes changed about using retention as intervention in response to reading an article, "Grade Retention and Promotion" (Jimerson et al., 2006). This research showed that when research-based information on the negative effects of retention was presented there was overall significant change in attitude measured by surveys.

There has been little available research done assessing educators' attitude changes towards grade retention. Previous research studied indicated that educators believe that retention is beneficial to students (Bynes, 1989, Shepard & Smith, 1990; Tomchin & Impara, 1992). These educators believe an additional year of schooling can mean the difference between success and failure for certain students (Natale, 1991).

A long-standing and fundamental principle among helping professionals (e.g., psychology, medicine) is reflected in the early writings of Hippocrates, "Primum non nocere", [First, do no harm]. Taking into account that research from the last 100 years fails to support the use of grade retention as an intervention (Jimerson, 2001), the evidence clearly indicates that we must move beyond grade retention and social promotion (Jimerson & Ferguson, 2007).

Practical Implications

The results of this study indicate that principals, 67.8% of principals before reading the article and 80.6% following reading the article, did not see retention as an effective intervention for academic failure. As a group, they perceived both, before and after reading the article, that the possibility of retention would improve student academic performance. Further, this research indicates that following reading the article that approximately, 64% (38% before reading article) of the principals believed that grade retention was not a successful intervention for low achieving students. Approximately, 53% (15% before reading article) of the principals believed that an extra year did not help a child develop and become more successful at school. Approximately, 64% (29% before reading the article) of the principals believed that an extra year would not help a child catch up. Approximately, 77% (45% before reading the article) of the principals believed that the positive effects of grade retention would not continue three or four years after a student was retained. Approximately, 64% (32% before reading the article) of the principals believe that a student would become more engaged in school after an extra year. Approximately, 66% (42% before reading the article) of the principals believe that grade retention did not have a positive effect on a student's social development. Although not part of the total, 46% (31% before the survey) of the principals were not satisfied with their county's policy on retention.

Principals are in a position to influence retention decisions and policies. Since many educators may advocate for grade retention, it is important that principals have access and are current on the research on retention.

Survey on Research-Based Interventions

In addition, the principals completed a pre and post survey subsequent to reading the article on research-based interventions. Reading a research article on retention and research-based interventions had an impact of increasing the number of interventions selected from a list of research-based interventions.

Research-based interventions programs have been demonstrated effectiveness, such as academic summer school programs, increased positive parental involvement, before and after school remedial programs and enrichment activities, individualized student educational programs (Jimerson, 2001; Jimerson & Ferguson, 2007; Jimerson, Pletcher, Graydon, Schnurr, Nickerson, & Kundert, 2005). In addition, more intense and enriched preschool experience was demonstrated effective intervention programs (Forness, Kavale, Blum, & Lloyd, 1997; Jimerson & Ferguson, 2007; National Association of Psychologist, 2003; Shinn, Walker, & Stoner, 2002; Slavin, Karweit, & Madden, 1989).

Limitations and directions for future research

A limitation of this study was the mail out response rate was very low; however, the rate was higher when the survey was given to principal meetings or handed out (10 out of 56 mailed were returned; 9 out of 10 handed out were returned; and 15 out of 15 given at principals meetings were returned). Of the 34 out of over 100 surveys returned, four participants returned surveys with the survey numbers torn off; two participants completed only the pre-survey, and an additional sixteen survey items/questions were left unanswered. The nonresponse to surveys and survey may have significantly altered the results depending on their reasons for nonresponse.

Some of the limitations of this study are the limited number of principals from the geographical area of Ohio and West Virginia rather than a national survey. Another limitation was the response rate; however, the research provided useful information for use in future research.

Future research

The issue of whether or not a change in attitude results in a change in behavior such as, to see if reading the article caused a change in the actual retention rates by comparing retention rates prior to reading the article with retention rates after reading the article should be studied. Additionally, research may evaluate if the same respondent feel they influenced the decisions of retention in their school following reading the article and utilized interventions rather than retention. Further research needs to be completed in the area of teacher (especially kindergarten and first grade teachers) and staff attitude toward retention before and after being presented with the article/research.

References

Anderson, G. E., Whipple, A. D., and Jimerson, S. R. (2002). Grade retention: Achievement

and mental health outcomes. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School

Psychologists. www.nasponline.org/pdf/graderetention.pdf

Byrnes, D.A. (1989). Attitudes of students, parents, and educators toward repeating a grade. In

L.A. Shepard & M.L. Smith (Eds.) *Flunking grades: Research and policies on retention.*

(pp. 108-131). Philadelphia: Falder Press.

Dryfoos, J. (1990). *Adolescents at risks: Prevalence and prevention.* New York: Oxford

University Press.

Ferguson, P., Jimerson, S., & Dalton, M. (2001). Sorting out successful failures: Exploratory

analyses of factors associated with academic and behavioral outcomes of retained

students. *Psychology in the Schools, 38(4),* 327-341.

Forness, S. R., Kavale, K. A., Blum, I. M., & Lloyd, J. W. (1997). Mega-analysis of meta-

analyses: What works in special education and related services. *Teaching Exceptional*

Children, 29, 4-9.

Holmes, C. T. (1989). Grade-level retention effects: A meta-analysis of research studies.

In L. A. Shepard & M. Smith (Eds.), *Flunking grades: Research and policies on*

retention. London: Falmer Press.

Holmes, C. T., & Matthews, K. M. (1984). The effects on nonpromotion on elementary on

elementary and junior high school pupils: A meta-analysis. *Reviews of Educational*

Research, 54, 225-236.

Jimerson, S. R. (1999). On the failure of failure: Examining the association of early grade

retention and late adolescent education and employment outcomes. *Journal of School*

Psychology, 37, 243-272.

Jimerson, S. R. (2001). A synthesis of grade retention research: Looking backward and

moving forward. *The California School Psychologist, 6,* 47-59.

Jimerson, S. R. (2001). Meta-analysis of grade retention research: Implications for

practice in the 21st century. *School Psychology Review, 30,* 42-437.

Jimerson, S. R., Anderson, G., & Whipple, A. (2001). Winning the battle and losing the

war: Examining the relation grade retention and dropping out of high school.

Psychology in the Schools, 39, 441-457.

Jimerson, S. R., Carlson, E., Rotert, M., Egeland, B., & Stroufe, L. A. (1997). A

prospective, longitudinal study of the correlates and consequences of early grade

retention. *Journal of School Psychology, 35,* 3-25.

Jimerson, S. R. & Ferguson, P. (2007). A longitudinal study of grade retention: Academic and

behavioral outcomes of retained students through adolescence. *School Psychology*

Quarterly, 22, 314-339.

Jimerson, S. R., Ferguson, P., Whipple, A. D., Anderson, G. E., & Dalton, M. J. (2002).

Exploring the association between grade retention and dropout: A longitudinal study

examining socio-emotional, behavioral, and achievement characteristics of retained

students. *The California School Psychologist, 7,* 51-62.

Jimerson, S. R., Graydon, K., Pletcher, S. M., Schnurr, B., Kundert, D., & Nickerson, A.

(2006). Grade Retention and Promotion. In Bear, G. G. & Minke, K. M. (Eds.),

Children's Needs III: Development, Prevention, and Intervention. Bethesda, MD: NASP

Publications.

Jimerson, S. R., & Kaufman, A. M. (2003). Reading, writing, and retention: A primer on grade

retention research. *The Reading Teacher*, *56*, 8.

Jimerson, S. R., Pletcher, S. M., Graydon, K., Schnurr, B. L., Nickerson, A. B., & Kundert,

D. K. (2005). Beyond grade retention and social promotion: Promoting the social and

cognitive competence of students. *Psychology in the Schools, 43,* 85-97.

Kirsch, I., Jungeblut, A., Jenkins, L., & Kolstad, A., (1993). *Adult literacy in America: A first*

look at the results of the national adult literacy survey. Report prepared by Educational

Testing Service with the National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of

Education, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Krantz, D. (2001). *The Gram.* A Newsletter Published by the Learning Disabilities Association

of California.

Meisels, S. J., & Law, F. (1993). Failure in grade: Do retained students catch up? *Journal of*

Educational Research 87(2). 69-77.

Natale, J. (1991). Rethinking grade retention. *The Education Digest, 56*, 30-33.

National Association of School Psychologist (NASP) (2003). *Position statement: Student*

grade retention and social promotion. Bethesda, MD: Author.

Peterson, S. E., DeGracie, J. S., & Ayabe, C. R., (1987). A longitudinal study of effects the

of retention/promotion on academic achievement. *American Educational Research*

Journal, 24(1), 107-108.

Prohaska, L. (1991). Effects of two-year kindergarten programs at the end of third grade.

ED 340 463.

Roderick, M. (1994). Grade retention and social dropout: Investigating the association. *American Education Research Journal, 31,* 729-759.

Roderick, M. (1995). Grade retention and school dropout: Policy debate and research questions. *The Research Bulletin, 15,* 88-92.

Rumberger, R., (1987). High school dropouts: A review of issues and development. *Review of Educational Research, 57,* 101-121.

Rumberger, R. (1995). Dropping out of middle school: A multilevel analysis of students and schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 32,* 583-625.

Shepard, L. & Smith, M. (1990). Synthesis of research on grade retention. *Educational Leadership, 44*(3), 4-88.

Shinn, M. R., Walker, H. M., & Stoner, G., (Eds.) (2002). *Intervention for academic and Behavior problem II: Prevention and remedial approaches.* Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologist.

Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., & Madden, N. A. (1989). *Effective programs for students at risk.* Boston: Ally & Bacon.

Smalls, U. S. (1997). *Reacting in the best interest of our kids*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED415980).

Tomchin, E., & Impara, J., (1992). Unraveling teacher's beliefs about grade retention. *American Educational Research, 29(1),* 199-223.

Viland, K. R. (2001). *The effectiveness of grade retention as an intervention strategy for academic failure.* University of Wisconsin-Stout. Retrieved December 31, 2006, from http://www.uwstout.edu/lib/thesis/2001/2001vilandk.pdf

Viland, K. R. (2003). *The effectiveness of grade retention as an intervention strategy for*

academic failure. University of Wisconsin-Stout. Retrieved December 31, 2006, from

http://www.uwstout.edu/lib/thesis/2003/2003vilandk.pdfv

Yamamoto, K. (1980). Children under stress: The causes and cures. *Family Weekly: Ogden*

Standard Examiner, 6-8. In L. Shepard & M. Smith (299). Synthesis of Research on

grade retention. *Educational Leadership, 4(8),* 84-88.

Appendix A

Survey

Grade Retention/Social Promotion Survey

Please respond to all of the following items and indicate true or false to the following items.

In my opinion…

1. Grade retention is a good intervention to consider for academic failure.

> ___ True
> ___ False

2. Grade retention can be a successful intervention for low achieving students.

> ___ True
> ___ False

3. An extra year can help a child develop and become more successful in school.

> ___ True
> ___ False

4. An extra year can help a child catch up.

> ___ True
> ___ False

5. The positive effects of grade retention can continue three or four years after a student is retained.

> ___ True
> ___ False

6. Grade retention can improve a child's self-esteem.

> ___ True
> ___ False

7. After a year of retention, a student can become more engaged in school.

> ___ True
> ___ False

8. Grade retention can have a positive effect on a student's social development.

     ___ True
     ___ False

9. Retained students can become upset when they are removed from their familiar
  peer group.

     ___ True
     ___ False

10. Grade retention can make a student more susceptible to dropping out of school.

     ___ True
     ___ False

11. Students can be motivated to work harder when they know there is a possibility
    that they might be retained.

     ___ True
     ___ False

12. Grade retention can apply a negative label to a child.

     ___ True
     ___ False

13. I am satisfied with my county's/school district's policy on retention.

     ___ True
     ___ False

Please answer to the best of your knowledge.

14. Do you think any of the following interventions are preferable to grade retention? If so, mark all answer(s) that are applicable.

___ Actively encourage parental involvement

___ Adopt age-appropriate and culturally sensitive instructional strategies

___ Establish multiage groupings in classrooms with teachers trained to work with students of mixed age and ability

___ Establish early intervention programs and preschool programs

___ Create the opportunity for students to have additional time to master material without becoming overage for grade by high-quality summer school, intersession programs, and before and after school programs

___ Create personal intervention plans for students

___ Reduce class size

___ Increase the use of one-on-one tutoring

___ Identify specific learning or behavior problems and design interventions to address those problems

___ Provide appropriate special education services

___ Establish full-service schools to provide a community-based vehicle to meet the needs of at-risk students

Appendix B

Tables

Table 1

Survey Means and Standard Deviations

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Question 1 Pre-Survey	1.68	.48	31
Question 1 Post-Survey	1.81	.40	31
Question 2 Pre-Survey	1.39	.50	31
Question 2 Post-Survey	1.65	.49	31
Question 3 Pre-Survey	1.13	.34	31
Question 3 Post-Survey	1.55	.51	31
Question 4 Pre-Survey	1.29	.46	31
Question 4 Post-Survey	1.65	.49	31
Question 5 Pre-Survey	1.47	.51	30
Question 5 Post-Survey	1.77	.43	30
Question 6 Pre-Survey	1.57	.50	30
Question 6 Post-Survey	1.70	.47	30
Question 7 Pre-Survey	1.32	.48	31
Question 7 Post-Survey	1.65	.49	31
Question 8 Pre-Survey	1.43	.50	30
Question 8 Post-Survey	1.67	.48	30
Question 9 Pre-Survey	2.00	.00	31
Question 9 Post-Survey	1.94	.25	31
Question 10 Pre-Survey	1.90	.31	30

Table 1 (continued)

Survey Means and Standard Deviations

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Question 10 Post-Survey	1.97	.18	30
Question 11 Pre-Survey	1.32	.48	31
Question 11 Post-Survey	1.42	.50	31
Question 12 Pre-Survey	1.94	.25	31
Question 12 Post-Survey	1.97	.18	31
Question 13 Pre-Survey	1.67	.48	30
Question 13 Post-Survey	1.53	.51	30
Pre-Survey (1-12)	18.09	3.31	32
Post-Survey (1-12)	20.13	3.94	32

Table 2

Effects of Reading Article on Principals Perceptions on Grade Retention

Item	df	t-score

1. Grade retention is a good intervention to consider for academic failure.

                       30   -2.11

2. Grade retention can be a successful intervention for low achieving students.

                       30   -2.79

3. An extra year can help a child develop and become more successful in school.

                       30   -4.66

4. An extra year can help a child catch up.

                       30   -4.06

5. The positive effects of grade retention can continue three or four years after a student
is retained.

                       29   -2.76

6. Grade retention can improve a child's self-esteem.

                       29   -1.68

7. After a year of retention, a student can become more engaged in school.

                       30   -3.32

8. Grade retention can have a positive effect on a student's social development.

                       29   -2.97

9. Retained students can become upset when they are removed from their familiar
peer group.

                       30   1.43

10. Grade retention can make a student more susceptible to dropping out of school.

                       29   -1.00

11. Students can be motivated to work harder when they know there is a possibility
that they might be retained.

                       30   -1.14

12. Grade retention can apply a negative label to a child.

                       30   -.57

Table 2 (continued)

Effects of Reading Article on Principals Perceptions on Grade Retention

Item	df	t-score
13. I am satisfied with my county's/school district's policy on retention.		
	29	2.11
Pre/ Post Survey (Items 1-12)	31	-3.49

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages of Principals' Perceptions on Grade Retention

Item	n	%

1. Grade retention is a good intervention to consider for academic failure.

        Pre-Survey

True	11	32.4
False	23	67.6

        Post-Survey

True	6	19.4
False	25	80.6

2. Grade retention can be a successful intervention for low achieving students.

        Pre-Survey

True	21	61.8
False	13	38.2

        Post-Survey

True	11	35.5
False	20	64.5

3. An extra year can help a child develop and become more successful in school.

        Pre-Survey

True	28	84.8
False	5	15.2

        Post-Survey

True	15	46.9
False	17	53.1

4. An extra year can help a child catch up.

        Pre-Survey

True	24	70.6
False	10	29.4

        Post-Survey

True	11	35.5
False	20	64.5

5. The positive effects of grade retention can continue three or four years after a student is retained.

        Pre-Survey

True	18	54.5
False	15	45.5

        Post-Survey

True	7	22.6
False	24	77.4

Table 3 (continued)

Frequencies and Percentages of Principals' Perceptions on Grade Retention

Item	n	%
6. Grade retention can improve a child's self-esteem.		
Pre-Survey		
True	15	45.5
False	18	54.5
Post-Survey		
True	9	29.0
False	22	71.0
7. After a year of retention, a student can become more engaged in school.		
Pre-Survey		
True	23	67.6
False	11	32.4
Post-Survey		
True	11	35.5
False	20	64.5
8. Grade retention can have a positive effect on a student's social development.		
Pre-Survey		
True	19	57.6
False	14	42.4
Post-Survey		
True	10	33.3
False	20	66.7
9. Retained students can become upset when they are removed from their familiar peer group.		
Pre-Survey		
True	34	100.0
False		
Post-Survey		
True	2	6.5
False	29	93.5
10. Grade retention can make a student more susceptible to dropping out of school.		
Pre-Survey		
True	4	12.1
False	29	87.9
Post-Survey		
True	1	3.2
False	30	96.8

Table 3 (continued)

Frequencies and Percentages of Principals' Perceptions on Grade Retention

Item	n	%

11. Students can be motivated to work harder when they know there is a possibility
    that they might be retained.

	Pre-Survey		
	True	21	61.8
	False	13	38.2
	Post-Survey		
	True	18	58.1
	False	13	41.9

12. Grade retention can apply a negative label to a child.

	Pre-Survey		
	True	3	8.8
	False	31	91.2
	Post-Survey		
	True	1	3.2
	False	30	96.8

13. I am satisfied with my county's/school district's policy on retention.

	Pre-Survey		
	True	10	31.3
	False	22	68.8
	Post-Survey		
	True	14	46.7
	False	16	53.3

Table 3 (continued)

Frequencies and Percentages of Principals' Perceptions on Grade Retention

Item	n	%
Total Pre-Survey (Items 1-12)		
13	3	8.8
14	1	2.9
15	5	14.7
16	4	11.8
17	3	8.8
18	3	8.8
19	1	2.9
20	6	17.6
21	1	2.9
22	2	5.9
23	2	5.9
24	3	8.8

Table 3 (continued)

Frequencies and Percentages of Principals' Perceptions on Grade Retention

Item	n	%
Total Post-Survey (Items 1-12)		
11	1	3.1
13	1	3.1
15	5	15.6
16	1	3.1
17	1	3.1
18	2	6.3
19	1	3.1
20	2	6.3
21	1	3.1
22	2	6.3
23	8	25.0
24	7	21.9

Table 4

Survey Means and Standard Deviations

Principals Preferring Research-Based Interventions to Grade Retention

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Pre-Survey	9.09	2.19	32
Post-Survey	9.88	2.12	32