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ABSTRACT

REUBEN JOVON GRESHAM
A STUDY OF PARENT PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOLS BEFORE AND AFTER REDISTRICTING AND IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL LEADERS
Under the direction of DR. EDWARD L. BOUIE

The purpose of this study was to examine parental concerns of schools through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents before and after school redistricting, and further examine school leaders' responses to perception data of their schools before and after school redistricting by way of a mixed methods design. The potential benefit to school districts from evaluating parental concerns as categorized by the theme areas of the RBES Perception Survey for Parents, and evaluating leader responses to parental concerns is that school districts may establish proactive steps to eliminate or reduce negative parent perceptions of redistricting efforts or sustain positive parent perceptions in school districts before and after redistricting takes place. Additionally, in places where parent perceptions are low or negative, school districts may be able to generate more buy-in that could potentially raise parent perceptions. If school districts know where the increases and decreases in parental concerns are prior to and after districting takes place, school leaders may be able to implement strategies to change or sustain those parental concerns. Inferential statistics by way of paired samples t-tests and school leader interviews were used to address the research questions of this study. Quantitative data
derived from the RBES Perception Survey for Parents, and qualitative data derived from interviewing school leaders about their awareness and responses to RBES Perception Survey for Parents data results were also used. Overall, quantitative data revealed there were significant decreases in parental concerns of schools after redistricting took place, or there were no significant differences in parental concerns of schools after redistricting took place. In response to RBES Perception Survey for Parents data, school leaders were very aware of the parental concerns of their schools, and each school leader responded with different leadership approaches in addressing parental concerns. Related literature supported the theoretical framework, research problem, conclusions, and recommendations for future study. According to the literature and school leaders, school districts must constantly communicate and develop outreach systems that will support parents during school redistricting initiatives.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Introduction of the Study

To many Americans today, the current issues of school rezoning and school redistricting have highlighted arguments concerning the equality of student resources, facilities, student achievement, and quality of neighborhoods (Kane, Riegg, & Staiger, 2006). Although, “Brown v. Board of Education has rightly become one of this nation’s foremost legal doctrines and an attempt to encourage the nation to reach a consensus on how to best achieve integrated public schools” (Crossland, 2004, p. 428), Brown v. Board of Education brought more attention to public opinion as to what is fair and equal for all students (Ansolone & Biafora, 2004). In addition, several historical cases (Briggs v. Elliot, 1952; Davis v. Prince Edward County School Board, Va, 1952; Gebhart v. Belton, 1952; Gong Lum v. Rice, 1927; Roberts v. The City of Boston, 1849) concerned with school redistricting, rezoning, and desegregation have examined many of the same equity issues as Brown.

In response to school quality, organizations must create feedback systems that will allow organizations to evaluate their own practices (Deming, 1982; Fleming & Asplund, 2007). The Results Based Evaluative System (RBES) is an accountability measure used by the large urban public school district in this study to evaluate organizational performance (Accountability Report, 2008). This accountability system
was designed to accurately communicate school district goals, objectives, and expectations. In addition, data from the RBES is used to help evaluate, support, increase, and examine the performance level of schools in the district (Accountability Report, 2008). This study will examine RBES Perception Survey for Parents themes (instruction, safety, discipline, leadership, communication, technology, climate, citizenships, and facilities) before and after school redistricting, and the implications those perceptions have on school leaders.

Unlike humans, organizations do not have sensors that send messages to the brain that warn the body when something is wrong, so organizations must continue to stay alert and monitor the quality of its practices (Fleming & Asplund, 2007). The efforts and quality of an organization depend on the needs and satisfaction of the consumer (Chang, 2009), and consumer satisfaction is the same as parent satisfaction (Falbo et al., 2003). Chiefly, if a person perceives a situation as true, their feelings will determine their actions (Fleming & Asplung, 2007). Whether a consumer is satisfied or dissatisfied, that consumer’s perception is their reality (Fleming & Asplund, 2007).

In some research, negative findings have been associated with school redistricting (Bogart & Cromwell, 2000; Clotfelter, 1975; Gill, 1983; Weinstein, 2009). Kane et al. (2006) reported that negative correlations exist between student demographics and its effects on housing markets as well as neighborhoods. According to Baum-Snow and Lutz (2008), school redistricting has created a sense of desegregation in some school districts. Although some research has been performed that focuses on the negative aspects of school redistricting, it is important to understand if school districts’ inability to address
parents’ concerns along with school administrators’ ability to manage change contributes to parents’ perceptions of school redistricting.

As an example, in a small southeastern city bordering North Carolina, it was just a matter of time before its schools became populated to the point that new schools needed to be built (Silverman, 2007). There were community members that wanted tradition to stay intact, but growth requires facilities, and this city’s school board knew that tradition may not have been the best solution to achieve balance (Silverman, 2007). By building new schools and redrawing attendance lines, the city’s school board was able to create balance in many areas amongst its community. As a result of this city’s success at redrawing attendance lines, school board members were able to develop support from community members, hold public forums, and disaggregate data in a way that did not have any one neighborhood left with a perception that their community was singled out in this school redistricting effort (Silverman, 2007). A mid-western state had a city reform strategy known as the Renaissance 2010 that found “the small school movement has generated hundreds of successful schools, business, and university partnerships in which companies and community institutions have provided internships, resources, and acumen to help make schools successful” (Ayers & Klonsky, 2007, p. 456). With this in mind, the Renaissance 2010 was established to relieve overcrowded schools in areas that were going through extreme growth in population, and this reform was perceived in a positive manner amongst community stakeholders (Ayers & Klonsky, 2007).

Furthermore, school reform will require public schools to hire more teachers that implement high performing academic programs. In the end, when districts think of
rezoning, students' overall well being and academic achievement is put first (Silverman, 2007). Above all, rezoning is done to create an overall balance amongst students and schools (Silverman, 2007). Welner (2006) also indicates that schools with well balanced racial demographics decrease the separation of achievement from one race to another. Furthermore, positive correlations exist with neighborhood children attending schools that are zoned for their neighborhoods (Sinha, Payne, & Cook, 2005).

Currently, in relationship to closeness, convenience, and student achievement, parents value their students attending neighborhood schools, but if academic achievement and neighborhood attributes change as a result of school districts rezoning attendance lines, parents will consider moving their children to a school or neighborhood that exhibits high academic achievement (Hastings, Kane, & Staiger, 2006). According to Sinha et al. (2005), neighborhood schools produce high-performing students when those students attend schools with children from their own neighborhoods. Neighborhood schools are defined as schools that are in walking distance from a student's home, so this close proximity produces social encouragement and a sense of belonging to that community (Sinha et al., 2005).

In addition, parental involvement is increased, and students view community parents as role models, which in turn, inspires students to meet a positive standard that has been set by parents. Thus, social support from primary parents leads to academic achievement (Sinha et al., 2005). According to Clapp, Nanda, and Ross (2007), demographics play a very important role in the price variances of different neighborhoods, and homes do depreciate due to students being rezoned into
neighborhood schools where students performed below average on standardized tests. This being said, parents do not want their students to be rezoned into neighborhood schools that have lower-performing schools, and homebuyers concentrate on student test scores and demographics of the future schools where attendance lines have been redrawn (Clapp et al., 2007).

In essence, there needs to be other contributors to the issue of redistricting in order for community members to accept a plan that will affect where their students will attend school (Tse, 2006). Many communities have gone through changes in attendance zones before and if modifications are made to accommodate relocations, it is easier to accept such a proposal (Tse, 2006). If community members can be sold on the fact that change is beneficial, families will agree with that change (Tse, 2006). Redistricting takes place all over the country, and there is no way that all parties involved will be happy with the outcome (Fahey, 2007). However, Silverman (2007) stated that when it comes to neighborhood boundaries, it is important that everyone is a part of the plan. In addition, including everyone is very significant because no one area should conclude their neighborhood is the only area being chosen to be divided (Silverman, 2007).

Research Problem

“A redistricting plan with careless division of neighborhoods would be strongly opposed by the people living there” (Caro, Shirabe, Guignard, & Weintraub, 2004, p.1). School redistricting is a systematic procedure that has caused many problems with the equal division of students in communities, socioeconomic balancing, reduction of transportation costs, and the balancing of school populations (desJardins, Bulka, Carr,
Jordan, & Rheingans, 2007). In fact, the process of school redistricting presents technical and political problems for school districts (Caro et al., 2004). Coupled with school redistricting, a parents’ perceptions towards a school and their behaviors can impact how their student learns at school, and can affect school leaders’ ability to lead and teachers’ ability to teach students (Anderson & Minke, 2007). Furthermore, as school attendance lines are redrawn, parents concern for their student’s safety and the balancing of test scores can also present problems for school districts (desJardins et al., 2007). This study will examine RBES Perception Survey of Parents themes (instruction, safety, discipline, leadership, communication, technology, climate, citizenships, and facilities) before and after school redistricting, and the implications those perceptions have on school leaders.

Research Questions

Parental concerns are based on parent’s perception of the school their students attend, and may generate from whether or not they have had positive or negative experiences with that particular school (Falbo et al., 2003). A parent’s level of commitment to a school is based on their satisfaction with that school, and their loyalty is similar to that of a consumer as it relates to business (Falbo et al., 2003; Salisbury, D., Branson, R., Altreche, W., Funk, F., & Broetzman, S., 1997). When parents are not satisfied with the services a public school has to offer their student, school choice becomes an issue and public education becomes second to private education (Salisbury et al., 1997). A lack of parental support results in a lack of community support. Without the two, the quality of student services becomes an issue (Bhote, 1996; Salisbury et al.,
1997). The research questions that guided this study address issues raised in the problem statement.

1. Is there a significant decrease in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted?
   Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant decrease in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted.

2. Is there a significant increase in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted?
   Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant increase in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted.

3. How have selected school leaders responded to the decrease of parental concerns revealed through RBES perception survey themes after schools were redistricted?

4. How have selected school leaders responded to the increase of parental concerns revealed through RBES perception survey themes after schools were redistricted?

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study derived from Deming (1982), Crosby (1979), and (Juran, 1951), and their theory of Quality Management and Consumer Satisfaction. Considered to be the father of quality management, W. Edwards Deming (1986) and other researchers (Crosby, 1979; Juran, 1951) seemingly derived quality management from three different areas of study. First, quality management is based on how much a quality leader contributes to the organization. Second, quality management derived from empirical measurement studies developed to improve organizational
performances. Last, quality management derived from assessment models used to evaluate organizational performances (Abdulah, Ahmad, & Ismail, 2008; Crosby, 1979; Deming, 1986; Juran, 1951). According to Deming (1986), quality is achieved when a customer’s satisfaction needs are met, and the expectation level of an organization exceeds that of the customer. In other words, organizations need to go beyond the expectation level of the customer to ensure the quality of an organization, and that organization should have quality standards in place to avoid customer dissatisfaction (Deming, 1986). Crosby (1979) notes that quality is built around the standards of an organization, deviation from standards are unacceptable, and that organizations’ standards must be clear and understandable to all stakeholders (Crosby, 1979). Last, Juran (1951) suggests that quality is quite simple; quality is achieved when a customer is satisfied.

An organization’s ability to produce high quality goods and satisfy consumers is based on that organization’s commitment to developing, managing, and improving the performances of its workers (Chung, 2009; Deming, 1986). Educational organizations must do the same as it relates to measuring parent satisfaction in their perception of high quality (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). Parents’ perceptions towards a school and their behaviors can impact how their student learns at school, and can affect school leaders’ ability to lead and teachers’ ability to teach students (Anderson and Minke, 2007). The Results Based Evaluative System (RBES) is an accountability measure used by the large urban public school district in this study to evaluate organizational performance (Accountability Report, 2008). This accountability system
was designed to accurately communicate school district goals, objectives, and expectations. In addition, data from the RBES is used to help evaluate school principals, support, increase, and examine the performance level of schools in the district (Accountability Report, 2008), because school redistricting is a systematic procedure that has caused many problems with the equal division of students in communities, socioeconomic balancing, reduction of transportation costs, and the balancing of school populations (desJardins et al., 2007).

Conceptual Framework

![Conceptual Framework Diagram](image)

**Figure 1.** Conceptual Framework

The independent variable in this study is the school redistricting process, and the dependent variables are parental concerns before and after the school redistricting process, and school leaders’ responses to parental concerns before and after school
redistricting takes place. The RBES Perception Survey for Parents is based on a Likert scale, and an exploratory factor analysis was used in grouping the survey questions together. From this, themes began to emerge from questions being grouped together and nine themes were developed (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). According to Martin (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009), a local district appointed statistician, the RBES is a "home grown, superintendent driven" evaluative system.

Initially, principals in the large urban public school district in which this research occurred, created a survey that was implemented during the 1997-1998 school year (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). Five years later, principals were reviewing survey items, and noticed that several themes were emerging from the results (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). As a result, an exploratory factor analysis was performed and survey questions were grouped together. Nine themes emerged from questions being grouped together and nine official categorical themes were developed (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009): instruction, safety, discipline, leadership, communication, technology, climate, citizenship, and facilities.

For example, two questions pertaining to safety asked parents if the school their students attend is safe and secure, and is their students' bus safe and secure. After performing an exploratory factor analysis, these two questions were group together and school leaders determined these two questions would fall under "safety" (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). School leaders examined the remainder of the analyzed data and looked for common terms used throughout each question.
Therefore, school leaders in this large urban public school district categorized the remaining questions according to the exploratory factor analysis and summarized the questions into common terms used throughout the survey such as instruction, safety, discipline, leadership, communication, technology, climate, citizenship, and facilities.

The Superintendent of this large urban public school district met with principals during the 1996-1997 school year because he believed there was a need to survey stakeholders in the district (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). As a result of these meetings, the superintendent charged principals with the task of developing, evaluating, and administering survey items to key stakeholders (parents, teachers, and students) in the district (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine parental concerns of schools through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents before and after school redistricting, and further examine school leaders' responses to perception data of their school before and after school redistricting. The potential benefit to school districts from evaluating parental concerns as categorized by the theme areas of the RBES Perception Survey for Parents, and evaluating leader responses to parental concerns is that school districts may establish proactive steps to eliminate or reduce negative parent perceptions of redistricting efforts or sustain positive parent perceptions in school districts before and after redistricting takes place. Additionally, in places where parent perceptions are low or negative, school districts may be able to generate more buy-in that could potentially raise parent
perceptions. If school districts know where the increases and decreases in parental concerns are prior to and after redistricting takes place, school leaders may be able to implement strategies in changing or sustaining those parental concerns.

Importance of the Study

Likewise, this study may benefit schools because the findings of this study may allow school and district leaders to have a better understanding of parents’ perceptions towards schools in large urban public school districts. Furthermore, officials will have an opportunity to examine beneficial increases or negative decreases in themes that can be avoided or continued by forming redistricting focus groups, community outreach groups, and change parent perceptions of public education in their area. According to Martin (personal communication, November 17, 2009), school leaders need to understand parent perceptions as it relates to their particular school. With these findings, school leaders may be able to improve efforts towards eliminating any barriers in parent concerns that will prevent students from being successful, and school leaders from establishing positive learning environments in new schools or original schools affected by the redistricting process.

Limitations

The survey used by this large urban public school district was available to all parents, but not all parents were represented in the results. According to Martin (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009), “The survey has validity to the organization that designed it and uses it because the organization itself believes that it measures parent perception” (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009).
Therefore, the validity of the survey is a limitation, because the survey seems to only obtain face validity, and some researchers may feel as though this school district has not properly measured the validity of the survey. Currently, the return rate of the RBES Perception Survey for Parents is approximately 20%, and of those surveyed, there is a 10% return rate for Hispanics (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). 20% of the parent population is surveyed as a whole, and that 20% is generated by extracting one of five names from a list of parents produced by the Information Management Division (IMD) (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009).

In essence, several parents were not given the opportunity to take the RBES Perception Survey for Parents. As shown, survey return rate is always a concern when administering this type of survey and the veracity of the results are unknown. Furthermore, questions in this survey can be misconstrued by respondents, parents could intentionally taint their responses in efforts to positively or negatively reflect perceptions of local schools, and responses are provided through a Likert scale with no opportunity for parents to give a narrative reasoning for their responses (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). Surveys were sent through postal mail to physical addresses generated by IMD, and some parents may change their address and not properly report these changes to local schools. Therefore, a small percentage of the 20% of the parents chosen by IMD may not receive the survey. Lastly, when applying a paired samples t-test to analyze parental perceptions before and after redistricting, the researcher used aggregate data due to the impossibility of matching parent responses on the survey.
Delimitations

The northern area of the school district used in this study was not representative of the entire county where this district is located. This large urban public school district has nearly 160,000 students and 115 schools, 20 of which are high schools. This study only focused on the parents of high school students and did not evaluate data or speak to school leaders at the middle or elementary school level. Of the high schools chosen in this study, all five high schools have an average population of 3,000 students. This places the sample size of students to be approximately 15,000 out of approximately 45,000 high school students. As mentioned in the limitations section, one of five parents was offered the perception survey, so 20% of the parent population is served. While there are nearly 20 high schools in this large urban public school district, only parents and school leaders of five schools were studied as those schools underwent redistricting initiatives. Last, the entire RBES Perception Survey is a survey that has results from parents, teachers, and students, but only parents’ responses were chosen for this study.

Definition of Terms

School leaders from this large urban public school district used an exploratory factor analysis to create the nine categorized themes named in this study. The definitions of themes are determined from the questions asked in the survey that best describe the terminology of that given theme. Overriding ideas emerged after questions were grouped, and school officials labeled these ideas as themes in relationship to the survey.
1. RBES Perception Survey- a Results-Based Evaluation System 42 item questionnaire used by this large urban public school district to poll parents on their perception towards their local public school.

2. School Redistricting- “process of adjusting the boundaries of schools within a given system” (Caro et al., 2004, p.1).

3. Parental Concerns- beliefs that values and characteristics of a school are not in the best interest for their student in relationship to parental expectations (Gamble, Ewing, & Wilhlem, 2009).

4. RBES Perception Survey Themes- nine focus areas identified in the perception survey through exploratory factor analysis: instruction, safety, discipline, leadership, communication, technology, climate, citizenship, and facilities.

   1. Instruction- parental comprehension of Academic Knowledge and Skills (AKS), learning expectation of students, and course rigor.

   2. Safety- schools’ ability to provide security and well being of students at school and on the bus.

   3. Discipline- behavior demonstrated to promote student learning.

   4. Leadership- schools’ ability to promote cohesiveness amongst staff, communicate to parents, and encourage parental involvement.

   5. Communication- schools’ ability to respond to parental concerns in a timely manner, provide clear school expectations, and keep parents informed of school initiatives.
6. Technology- schools’ ability to offer accessible technology to students, and promote technology literacy to parents.

7. Climate- schools’ ability to promote meaningful relationship amongst all stakeholders, resolves issues, celebrate successes, and show genuine care for parent concerns.

8. Citizenship- school’s ability to teach moral and ethic behaviors at school and in the community, and equip students with etiquette and manners needed to be respectful people.

9. Facilities- schools’ ability to maintain clean and functional amenities.

Summary

Current issues of school rezoning and school redistricting have highlighted arguments concerning the equality of student resources, facilities, student achievement, and quality of neighborhoods (Kane et al., 2006). A Parent’s belief towards a school and their behaviors can impact how their student learns at school and can affect school leaders’ ability to lead a school and teachers’ ability to teach students (Anderson & Minke, 2007). Chiefly, school leaders need to understand parental concerns as it relates to their particular school (Martin, 2009). Specifically, this study examined increases or decreases in parental concerns of schools through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents prior to and after school redistricting. In response, school leaders were interviewed pertaining to their reactions to such concerns prior to and after redistricting takes place.
The survey items were grouped into nine themes: instruction, safety, discipline, leadership, communication, technology, climate, citizenship, and facilities, and school leaders may be faced with challenges due to increased parental concerns as a result of redistricting. However, if parental concerns decrease according to survey themes, school leaders can sustain school practices that warrant positive perceptions. Therefore, school officials may have an opportunity to examine beneficial increases or decreases in parental concerns that can potentially be avoided by forming redistricting focus groups, community outreach groups, and change parent perceptions of public education in their area.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Chapter two discusses the historical framework of school desegregation, and the theoretical and empirical background of quality management, parent satisfaction, and school redistricting. School redistricting is organized into four sections: factors that cause school districts to redistrict, equity concerns with school redistricting, neighborhood concerns with school redistricting, and strategies for school redistricting. In studying parents’ perceptions of schools before and after school redistricting and implications for school leaders, Chapter two provides a comprehensive review of the related literature in the area of school and organizational leadership.

Historical Framework

To many Americans today, the current issues of school rezoning and school redistricting have highlighted arguments concerning the equality of student resources, facilities, student achievement, and quality of neighborhoods (Kane et al., 2006). Although “Brown v. Board of Education has rightly become one of this nation’s foremost legal doctrines and an attempt to encourage the nation to reach a consensus on how to best achieve integrated public schools” (Crossland, 2004, p. 428), Brown v. Board of Education and the Brown Cases brought more attention to public opinion about fairness and equality for all students (Ansolone and Biafora, 2004). Several historical cases (Briggs v. Elliot, 1952; Davis v. Prince Edward County School Board, Va, 1952; Gebhart
v. Belton, 1952; Gong Lum v. Rice, 1927; Roberts v. The City of Boston, 1849) aligned with school redistricting, rezoning, and desegregation have examined the same concerns as it relates to fairness and school equality.

The city of Boston in the 1840’s granted that the governing body of Boston and its constitution had the right under their commonwealth to furnish an education for its colored students in a separate academic setting that was established specifically for colored students (Roberts v. City of Boston, 1849) even though the Colony Law of 1647 directly stated that schools were created “for the instruction of children...for the benefit of all inhabitants of the town” (Roberts v. City of Boston, p. 201). Specifically, Sarah Roberts was denied admission into a public school that was located in her commonwealth because she was a black girl. The Robert’s case marked an excellent starting point for school desegregation, especially when discussions came about relating to the issues of *de facto* and *de jure* segregation in American education.

Subsequently, the United States Constitution was created to protect all natural born citizens of this country, but the rights and protection of the 14th amendment was a major instrument used to support the arguments of most cases dealing with the separation of people. Section 1 of the 14th amendment states:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law. (Section 1, 14th Amendment, US Constitution)
Several other cases (Briggs v. Elliot, 1952; Davis v. Prince Edward County School Board, Va, 1952; Gebhart v. Belton, 1952; Gong Lum v. Rice, 1927) came about in regards to unconstitutional acts committed by citizens in America after the Roberts case. One case that demonstrated a complete disregard for African-American citizens occurred when Florida passed its Jim Crow Laws in 1887. According to Jim Crow, segregation was a requirement amongst American citizens in the south (Pilgrim, 2000). Blacks were regarded as unequal, and in the state of Florida, Jim Crow laws stated that schools for black and white children were to be segregated (Pilgrim, 2000). The passages of the 13th through 15th amendments excluded the rights of African-Americans, and such decisions demonstrated that a racially influenced Supreme Court cemented the Jim Crow Laws that restricted the constitutional protection of people of color (Pilgrim, 2000).

Setting precedence as one of the first cases in which black schools were closed and the federal government granted rights to the state for closing schools was Cumming v. Richmond County Board of Education, 175 U.S. 528 (1899). The outcome of this case stated that "The education of the people in schools maintained by state taxation is a matter belonging to the respective states, and any interference on the part of Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land" (1899, p. 545). Consequently, the issues of rezoning or the closing of schools was not all about the black race in the 19th and early 20th century. The case of Gong Lum v. Rice, 275 U.S. 78 (1927) had a different spin than the normal cases known around the country during the times of segregation and Jim Crow. In this case, a Chinese-American man was upset that
his daughter was forced to leave a white school in the Rosedale Consolidated School
district but was denied further attendance in that school district because she was not of a
Caucasian race.

"Desegregation is not and was never expected to be an easy task. Racial attitudes
ingrained in our Nation’s childhood and adolescents are not quickly thrown aside in its
middle years” (Milliken v. Bradley, p.249). According to Crossland (2004), the Brown
case was the citadel of all cases that scrutinized America’s constitutional protection of all
people. Crossland (2004) also points out that the Brown case, though positively and
negatively supported, became the precedent case that others followed. Being one of the
first states to both integrate and segregate its public school systems, South Carolina
became home of the Briggs v. Elliot case. South Carolina was not equally funding black
students the same as white students, allotting 10 times more money to the education of
white students than to black students. In addition, white students attended school on an
average of 173 days and blacks 114 days per year, teachers working with black students
earned one-fourth of what teachers working with white students earned in salary
compensation per month, and black students were attending schools that did not have
running water, electrical amenities, or adequate restrooms and eating facilities
(Crossland, 2004). Lastly, students of color could not receive transportation to school.

The Davis v. Prince Edward County School Board (1951) was one of the first
cases that involved students taking a stand in what they believed to be unequal treatment
in regards to school facilities not being as adequate as neighboring white schools in the
county. Specifically, 456 black students walked out of their over-crowded Moton High
School because of lack of class size amenities (Crossland, 2004). These students left class and refused to enter Moton High School until county officials provided colored students an equal learning opportunity. At the end of the Civil War, segregation of races in Virginia schools was all a part of the separate-but-equal laws in Virginia’s school systems (Crossland, 2004; Dobie, Hutcheson, & Bryan, 1952). In fact, “White and colored children shall not be taught in the same school” (Dobie et al., p. 528) in the state of Virginia according to the Virginia Constitution of 1902 (Dobie et al, 1952).

Prince Edward County Schools (PECS) resembled other schools in the state of Virginia during this time period (Crossland, 2004). PECS ensured that new high schools were built after the First World War for white citizens, and black citizens had to attend smaller schools. Black students did not have adequate eating facilities, medical aid stations, science laboratories, or a gymnasium as did the nearby white Farmville High School (Crossland, 2004). As school officials seemed to never get around to building new schools for black students, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) were called upon once again, and the idea of a strike was formed by students and parents. The school board’s response was to build tarpaper shacks in conjunction to the school building to provide a quick fix until a new school was built. The NAACP agreed to accept the case only if the group agreed that their goal was to not just get a new high school built for students, but their goal was to abolish the segregation of schools in Prince Edward County Schools (PECS) (Crossland, 2004).

As in the previous cases in Virginia and South Carolina, Delaware continued to have equal protection issues concerning black citizens as well. Even with the state of
Delaware being a part of the Union in the war between the north and the south, legislature refused to uphold the 14th amendment and its equal protection of all people (Crossland, 2004). With tension rising in the state of Delaware, African-American citizens were beginning to make their discomfort with segregation heard when a black student, Ethel Belton, was denied attendance at an all white high school in New Castle County (Gebhart v. Belton, 1952). With the segregation of schools, Belton was zoned to attend a school that was 11.5 miles away, making her school bus ride 21 miles each day.

According to Cascio, Gordon, Lewis, and Reber (2005), there were several financial incentives causing the desegregation of schools. The laws that govern whether or not particular funding is offered to schools fall under the 1964 Civil Rights Act (CRA) that gives permission to federal agencies to not permit funding to those systems that discriminate against people on the basis of race (Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VI). Even with the threats of southern schools not receiving funds because of the fact that many states remained segregated, there were some school boards that attempted ways to remain segregated (Cascio et al., 2005). As a result of wanting to remain segregated, several school boards, all white school boards, came up with formulas to raise the taxes of its citizens in the event that federal aid was not offered from government agencies (Cascio et al, 2005). As noted in Cascio’s et al. (2005) study, Louisiana and the state of Mississippi led the charge in elevating local economic taxes and the expenditure of school goods in order to cover the deficit that would have been created if federal funding was not offered to those states.
Under the Civil Rights Act (CRA) of 1964, another accountability act surfaced called the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) that was initiated by President Lyndon B. Johnson’s fight against poverty (Cascio et al., 2005). According to Cascio et al. (2005), Title I, designed to benefit socioeconomic disadvantaged students was clearly to the greatest attempt under ESEA to help aid poverty stricken students in America (Cascio et al, 2005). The Civil Rights Act (CRA) specifically pointed out its discrepancies with how funding would be distributed by stating, “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program of activity receiving federal financial assistance” (CRA, Title VI, sec 601). Even under this stipulation, some states felt the best way to avoid any disputes over Federal funding and participation of blacks in any school programs was to remain segregated. According to Cascio et al. (2005), school boards that decided to desegregate their schools were considered to be “token desegregation” (p.33).

Quality Management and Parent Satisfaction

“An explosion of new knowledge, mounting demands for accountability, and proliferation of educational choice put great pressure on the public educational systems. The task before schools is to find methods to improve their effectiveness while serving stakeholders better” (Brown & Cooper, 2000, p. 77). In response to school quality, organizations must create feedback systems that will allow organizations to evaluate their own practices (Deming, 1982; Fleming & Asplund, 2007). Fleming & Asplund (2007) insist that, “Over time, a company’s ability to improve operational efficiency and product
quality incrementally hinged less on the particular contributions of individual employees and more on specifying and controlling the process and systems used to produce the goods” (p. 31). Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) also point out that continuous evaluation of goals and objectives is very important in order to measure a program’s success.

Coupled with factual data, organizations use perceptual data to make quality improvements. Parents’ perceptions towards a school and their behaviors can impact how their student learns at school, and can affect school leaders’ ability to lead and teachers’ ability to teach students (Anderson & Minke, 2007). Thus, these data are used to improve organizational practices and performance levels of its employees (Abdulah et al., 2008), and organizational performances are based on its relationship to high quality (Chung, 2009; Deming, 1986). Considered to be the father of quality management, W. Edwards Deming (1986) and other researchers (Crosby, 1979; Juran, 1951) seemingly derived quality management from three different areas of study. First, quality management is based on how much a quality leader contributes to the organization. Second, quality management derived from empirical measurement studies developed to improve organizational performances. Last, quality management derived from assessment models used to evaluate organizational performances (Abdulah et al., 2008; Crosby, 1979; Deming, 1986; Juran, 1951).

According to Deming (1986), quality is achieved when a customer’s satisfaction needs are met, and the expectation level of an organization exceeds that of the customer. In other words, organizations need to go beyond the expectation level of the customer to
ensure the quality of an organization, and that organization should have quality standards in place to avoid customer dissatisfaction (Deming, 1986). Crosby (1979) notes that quality is built around the standards of an organization, deviation from standards are unacceptable, and that organizations’ standards must be clear and understandable to all stakeholders (Crosby, 1979). Last, Juran (1951) suggests that quality is quite simple; quality is achieved when a customer is satisfied.

Unlike humans, organizations do not have sensors that send messages to the brain that warn the body when something is wrong, so organizations must continue to stay alert and monitor the quality of its practices (Fleming & Asplund, 2007). Continuous monitoring of an organizations’ employee-customer relationship is now pivotal, and the majority of organizations have invested a lot of time and money in doing so (Fleming & Asplund, 2007). The efforts and quality of an organization depend on the needs and satisfaction of the consumer (Chang, 2009), and consumer satisfaction is the same as parent satisfaction (Falbo et al., 2003). Chiefly, if a person perceives a situation as true, their feelings will determine their actions (Fleming & Asplund, 2007). Whether a consumer is satisfied or dissatisfied, that consumer’s perception is their reality (Fleming & Asplund, 2007).

In the efforts of monitoring customer satisfaction, assessments given to measure customer satisfaction must be developed in the efforts of encouraging continuous quality improvements, and not be implored to criticize previous organizational performances (Eastmo, 2008). Particularly, Eastmo (2008) noted that Educational Benchmarking, Inc (2005) stated that “Assessments should be for the right reason, using the right method to
get information into the hands of the right people at the right time to make the right
decisions” (p.15). Consequently, Eastmo (2008) adds that there are few empirical studies
that explore parent satisfaction as it relates to their perception of quality in schools.
Reality Check, Gallup Poll, and School Quality Satisfaction Survey are measurement
tools used to address perceptions of public education, but not many systems elude
measurement perceptions and expectations of public education (Eastmo, 2008).

Human Sigma (Fleming & Asplund, 2007) is an evaluative tool that explores and
measures employee-customer relationships. According to Fleming and Asplund (2007),
“Human Sigma offers a disciplined approach to measuring, managing, and improving the
performance of your most volatile and valuable assets-your customers and employees”
(p. 24). Fleming and Asplund (2007) suggest that Human Sigma is narrowed down into
five rules:

**Rule 1.** You can’t measure and manage the employee and the customer experience
as separate entities. **Rule 2.** Emotion frames the employee-customer encounter.
**Rule 3.** You must measure and manage the employee-customer encounter at a
local level. **Rule 4.** We can quantify and summarize the effectiveness of the
employee-customer encounter in a single performance measure. **Rule 5.**
Improvement in local Human Sigma performance requires deliberate and active
intervention through attention to a combination of transactional and
transformational intervention activities. (p. 24-27)

The basis of forming these five rules is to challenge organizations to evaluate practices
that have been put into place to measure employee-customer relationships (Fleming &
Asplund, 2007), and educational organizations must do the same as it relates to
measuring parent satisfaction (Martin, 2009). Likewise, The Results Based Evaluative
System (RBES) is an accountability measure used by the large urban public school
district in this study to evaluate organizational performance (Accountability Report,
2008). This accountability system was designed to accurately communicate school district goals, objectives, and expectations. In addition, data from the RBES is used to help evaluate, support, increase, and examine the performance level of schools in the district (Accountability Report, 2008).

As mentioned, consumer satisfaction is the same as parent satisfaction (Falbo et al., 2003), and parents are the number one customers when it comes to education (Schlechty, 1990). As consumers for youth services, parents' dollars determine if a school will continue to stay operative (Schlechty, 1990). As noted, “Marketing begins with the customer, what the customer values and what the customer needs. Effective marketing organizations are effective because they relate their production capacities to what their customer values” (Schlechty, p. 84). The emotional needs of customers have laid the foundation for pursuing customer relations, and an organizations’ ability to satisfy customers will determine their success (Fleming & Asplund, 2007). In order to build or sustain a level of success, leadership must be focused on continuous improvement and a desire to go beyond what is required (Mulford & Moreno, 2006).

Factors that Cause School Districts to Redistrict

According to Armstrong, Lolonis, and Honey (1993), “School district administrators must constantly monitor the geographic and demographic composition of students within their jurisdiction because changes in residential development patterns and demographic processes play an important role in determining school staffing and infrastructure requirements” (p. 40). Over-crowded classrooms create problems for school leaders, and when student populations continue to grow, school leaders have to re-
evaluate how school attendance lines are drawn (Armstrong et al., 1993; Diamond, 2007; Erzen, 2007). As a result, school redistricting may take place in order to alleviate schools from having to use trailers, reduce school populations, or even resolve transportation issues (Armstrong et al., 1993). Lastly, redistricting may lead to neighborhoods being split which has the potential of creating a racial imbalance in a given school (Armstrong et al., 1993; Bogart & Cromwell, 2000; Kane et al., 2006; Weinstein, 2009).

Growth has been the driving force that splits up school districts (Armstrong et al., 1993; Erzen, 2007). Although neighborhoods are taken into consideration, when potential growth is evident in the distant future, lines have to be redrawn and facility usage leads the charge for such a change (Erzen, 2007). Keeping neighborhoods together (Hastings et al., 2005) would be ideal, but by doing so, it is important to establish feeder systems that will sustain or improve academic success (Erzen, 2007). In addition, lines must be drawn that will balance growth for a long period of time (Diamond, 2007; Erzen, 2007). Erzen (2007) agrees that socioeconomic balancing is a priority, but rezoning plans have to be carefully drawn to pinpoint this disparity if feasible.

What are districts supposed to do when overpopulated schools become an issue? Tse (2006) stated that redistricting is a plan that will always take place when districts continue to grow. There need to be other contributors to the issue of redistricting in order for community members to accept a plan that will affect where their students will attend school (Silverman, 2007; Tse, 2006). Many communities have gone through changes in attendance zones before and if plans are created to accommodate student relocations, it is
easier to accept such a proposal (Tse, 2006). If community members can be sold on the fact that change is beneficial, families will agree with that change (Tse, 2006).

Coupled with overcrowded schools, future enrollment projections do not always end up being an accurate forecast of what district officials expect (Chandler, 2006a). According to Chandler (2006a), facilities are being built that will eventually furnish relief, but there are schools that are opening under populated due to projected enrollments not coming to fruition. Even though students are being sent to other locations, eventually schools will meet projected student numbers (Barlow, 2006) However, school officials’ selling point to any change is that change is better for all entities involved, and leadership and instruction should be the primary focus for any transformational change (Barlow, 2006).

Equity Concerns about School Redistricting

In some research, negative concerns have been associated with school redistricting (Bogart & Cromwell, 2000; Clotfelter, 1975; Gill, 1983; Weinstein, 2009). Kane et al. (2006) reported that negative correlations exist between student demographics and its effects on housing markets as well as neighborhoods. According to Baum-Snow & Lutz (2008), school redistricting has created a sense of desegregation in some school districts. Although some research has been performed that focuses on the negative aspects of school redistricting, does a school districts’ inability to address parents’ concerns along with school administrators’ ability to manage change contribute to parents’ perceptions of school redistricting?
According to Dillon (2007), there are major racial concerns that form as a result of school redistricting. If statistics show that race and low socioeconomic status consistently seem to be a concern with school redistricting, how can one argue that redistricting does not raise a concern of race (Dillon, 2007)? Dillon’s (2007) comparison of race and low socio-economic status was opposed by black community members, because community members’ perception was that race is associated with low socio-economic status and low socio-economic status equals low academic success. In most cases, low socioeconomic areas mean that there are probably low-performing schools in that area (Dougherty et al., 2009). Dillon (2007) reports that race is truly the concern when redistricting takes place. Thus, education is progressively going backwards, and separate-but-equal clearly shows that race does not represent equality (Dillon, 2007).

Whenever race is associated to redistricting, careful planning needs to be taken into consideration (Armstrong et al., 1993; Bogart & Cromwell, 2000; Fahey, 2007; Kane et al., 2006; Weinstein, 2009). Parents in Fahey’s study suggested that race is never a concern when it comes to redistricting, so that simple ignorance to address this concern meant the issue was probably not important to those parents. However, the imbalance of race is an essential problem that ought to be addressed, and plans should be made that will accommodate all students in a school system being rezoned (Fahey, 2007). When evaluating the concerns of parents dealing with racial leveling, Fahey (2007) states that this measure is something that school systems do not have to legally address, but as leaders, ethics is the valuable component that should not be overlooked.
Another injustice reported by Chandler (2006b) was the fact non-English speaking community members were excluded from any redistricting discussions because no services were provided to get the information out to non-English speakers. According to Chandler (2006b), some non-English speaking parents hear of proposed redistricting initiatives from their students’ classmates. Chandler’s (2006b) findings stated that all the community members requested balance and equality amongst students in the community.

As a result of school districts rezoning attendance lines, there are few benefits given to families involved in such a move (Hill, 2005). Hill (2005) examined how some school systems are not willing to assist in school choice reforms. According to Hill (2005) several issues have not been addressed that limit participation in school choice: “How to find leaders for large numbers of schools of choice...urban districts have trouble recruiting enough principals...because jobs are so unattractive, districts making more flexible use of the state and local funds available for public school student transportation to help students gain access to schools of choice, and preparing school leaders to run schools of choice” (p.148). Subsequently, in addressing these issues, Hill (2005) suggests that some students are being left behind, but parents that are able to coincide with school choice programs are not impacted by such interfering factors associated with school rezoning. Some parents decide to enroll their students into a school of choice and leave concerns to other neighborhood families. After rezoning has taken place, if lower socio-economic parents cannot afford to opt out of their student attending neighborhood schools, such an education reform cannot be fair to all families (Hill, 2005). According to
Hill (2005), school choice is a disaster, because the reform program has been advertised as a plan that will educate all students, but it has increased segregation.

Neighborhood Concerns with School Redistricting

Neighborhood cohesiveness is directly related to emotional ties that communities have with schools (Black, 1999; O'Brien, 2007). Understanding how emotional school redistricting can be to all stakeholders, O'Brien (2007) reported that keeping neighborhoods intact is very important. In order to keep neighborhoods unified, communication should be generated amongst community leaders, and neighborhood families should be given a forum to speak on any concerns relating to the potential impact school redistricting would have on their neighborhood. In addition to emotional ties connected with neighborhood unity, assumptions cannot be made about neighborhoods' acceptance of change, ability to perform, and ability to overcome any drastic changes in neighborhood schools (Hastings et al., 2005; O'Brien, 2007).

When it comes to neighborhood boundaries, it is important that everyone is a part of the plan. Including everyone is critical because no one area should conclude that its neighborhood is the only area being chosen to be divided (Heavin, 2007a; Silverman, 2007). In a city where issues in the past about redistricting had been resolved, Silverman (2007) explains that intensive studies must take place before another proposal is presented to people of that community concerning another change. Stakeholder involvement is seen as being fair when school districts include representatives from all community groups (Heavin, 2007a).
As school districts rezone attendance lines and establish school choice programs, property values in neighborhoods are being affected by rezoning along with a decrease in academic achievement of students, and parental involvement of students that have been required to move schools decreases (Kane et al., 2006). Researchers have studied the impact of neighborhood segregation, race, and cultural backgrounds, along with performance-based assessment results to determine if property values, neighborhoods, and school choice are affected when students live in certain neighborhoods or attend certain schools (Bogart & Cromwell, 2000; Clapp et al., 2007; Hastings et al., 2005; Kane et al., 2006; Weinstein, 2009). The empirical results of these studies did reveal that property values are impacted heavily by the demographics of a neighborhood, and student performances in neighborhood schools played an important factor in parental choice to move into neighborhoods where students displayed low academic achievement. According to Hastings et al. (2005), “if high income families and parents of high-achieving students focus on academics when choosing schools, while low income families focus on proximity or convenience, then schools may become more stratified under school choice” (p. 1). If school choice does not exist, students are required to attend neighborhood schools, but neighborhoods are populated by parents that have chosen to live in that area for varying reasons. When choosing neighborhoods, parents focus on attributes such as proximity, affordability, and student performances (Hastings et al., 2005). As mentioned, there are several issues concerning districts rezoning attendance lines.
Currently, closeness, convenience, and student achievement is the reason why parents value their students attending neighborhood schools (Hastings et al., 2005). If academic achievement and neighborhood attributes change as a result of school districts rezoning attendance lines, parents will consider moving their children to a school or neighborhood that exhibits high academic achievement (Hastings et al., 2005). According to Sinha et al. (2005), neighborhood schools produce high performing students when those students attend schools with children from their own neighborhoods. Neighborhood schools are defined as schools that are in walking distance from a student’s home, so this proximity produces social engagement and a sense of belonging to that community (Sinha et al., 2005).

Furthermore, debates have taken place on whether or not neighborhoods and student performance bring down the values of homes, but according to Clapp et al. (2007), results indicate a number of outcomes stating there is little impact on property value because of student achievement as a result of redistricting. In actuality, students leaving neighborhood schools to attend schools of choice have not been a negative move in education at all. In fact, according to Hanushek, E., Kain, J., Rivkin, S. & Branch, G. (2005), establishing school choice has enabled parents and students to have an expanded variety of academic choices in relationship to desired areas and fields of study. Above all, school reform has also allowed public schools to become more creative in its processes of establishing new curriculum (Hanushek et al., 2005)

According to Sinha et al. (2005), neighborhood schools produce high performing students when those students attend schools with children from their own neighborhoods.
Meanwhile, parental involvement is increased, and students view community parents as role models, which in turn, inspires students to meet a positive standard that has been set by parents (Sinha, et al., 2005). By and large, social support leads to academic achievement (Sinha et al., 2005), but it is difficult to focus on instruction when redistricting proposals are being presented that will send some students to schools away from their original local neighborhood school zones (Chandler, 2006b). According to Heavin (2007b), if school districts are opening new schools with low student populations, students should be allowed the opportunity to request transfers. Heavin (2007b) discussed the sense of loyalty that families have to one school if students have attended that school for any amount of time. Heavin (2007b) states such request should be allowed for families that have special circumstances in order to appease those families.

According to researchers Clapp et al., (2007), school systems' performance and socioeconomic characteristics drive the reasons why families move to certain areas. However, the real focus of research by Clapp et al., (2007) is whether or not these same issues lower the value of homes. Demographics play a very important role in the real-estate price variances of different neighborhoods (Brasington & Haurin, 2009; Clapp et al., 2007; Reback, 2005). In Connecticut, homes did depreciate due to students being rezoned into neighborhood schools where students performed below average on standardized test (Clapp et al., 2007). Markedly so, parents do not want their students to be rezoned into neighborhood schools that have lower-performing schools, and homebuyers concentrate on student test scores and demographics of the future schools where attendance lines have been redrawn (Clapp et al., 2007). As a result, school choice
becomes more of an option to parents that can afford to send their students elsewhere, but the decisions to relocate are being made for negative reasons (Clapp et al., 2007). Clapp et al. (2007) showed the increase of African American and Hispanic students in a district decreased the property value of homes in that district, and school quality was associated with school demographics. Findings in this study revealed demographics were of higher importance to parents than test scores when focusing on the quality of a neighborhood and its decreased property value (Clapp et al., 2007). As a result of students being reassigned to new schools, the housing market in neighborhoods reacted to those changes in a negative depreciation as well (Brasington & Haurin, 2009; Kane et al., 2006; Reback, 2005). The reason behind the housing market declining was based on the type of people that lived in the newly rezoned area (Kane et al., 2006).

In a large urban public school district in North Carolina students that lived in houses nearly side-by-side in proximity were zoned to different schools as a result of a desegregation plan implemented to create balance in schools. Once again, because of neighborhood demographics, parents were attempting to send their students to other schools, although this desegregation plan was supposed to be the answer to segregated neighborhoods and schools. Consequently, many white families opted out of attending schools that were newly desegregated and chose to use school choice as a means to going to privately funded schools (Kane et al., 2006). Before this school district had school choice, going to magnet schools was the sole answer to students not attending schools they were previously zoned to attend. Parents that could afford to send their students to different schools outside of rezoned areas did so, leaving behind families of lower socio-
economic status to attend lower performing neighborhood schools (Kane et al., 2006). In the final analysis, lower socio-economic parents that are not accustomed to researching data involved with school choice tend to be left behind in the decision making process of sending their students to better schools (Kane et al., 2006).

Strategies for School Redistricting

In order to generate valuable input from the community members that have undergone redistricting initiatives due to overcrowded schools and inadequate facility usage, symposiums must be established that will allow community stakeholders an opportunity to voice their opinion (Diamond, 2007; Silverman, 2007). A large public school district in the Southeastern region of the United States created an effective timeline that allowed for input from their community stakeholders regarding their school redistricting plans (Diamond, 2007). School officials realized its redistricting efforts would affect a large number of schools in the district because of the need to address leveling student enrollment. In addition, this large urban public school district’s officials made every effort possible not to split neighborhoods in hopes that students would be able to remain in their neighborhood school (Diamond, 2007), and district officials understood the importance of including family and community input (Silverman, 2007; Tse, 2006). All in all, school districts owe stakeholders an opportunity to voice their opinions, especially when their revenue is at stake (Diamond, 2007).

If families are involved in redistricting plans, the acceptance of such plans greatly increases (Diamond, 2007; Pasciak, 2007; Silverman, 2007). According to Pasciak (2007), redistricting cannot be a sudden decision. An action of this magnitude requires
time to review all information and all possibilities that may be a result of such a decision (Pasiack, 2007). Although some parents may not agree with decisions made about redistricting, parents appreciate being involved in the planning process (Pasciak, 2007; Silverman, 2007).

As mentioned before by Erzen (2007), redistricting is something that will always occur due to growth, but socioeconomic balancing is a priority, and rezoning plans have to be carefully drawn to pinpoint any discrepancies if feasible. In the event of redistricting, Diamond (2007) notes that it is important to express to communities the reasons why redistricting takes place. Keeping parents informed and allowing community members to express their beliefs or suggestions are ways to get better buy-in. However, Fahey (2007) suggests the likelihood of keeping all stakeholders happy is close to impossible. Whether or not a district is facing racial challenges, income indifferences, or having enough facility space for students, redistricting affects everyone involved (Anyaso, 2006). All in all, the ending result of any redistricting decision must be geared towards student achievement (Erzen, 2007).

As an example, in a small southeastern city bordering North Carolina, it was just a matter of time before its schools became populated to the point that new schools needed to be built (Silverman, 2007). There were community members that wanted tradition to stay intact, but growth requires facilities, and this city’s school board knew that tradition may not have been the best solution to achieve balance (Silverman, 2007). By building new schools and redrawing attendance lines, the city’s school board was able to create balance in many areas amongst its community. As a result of this city’s success at
redrawing attendance lines, school board members were able to develop support from community members, hold public forums, and disaggregate data in a way that did not have any one neighborhood left to perceive that their community was singled out (Silverman, 2007). A mid-western state had a city reform strategy known as the Renaissance 2010 that found “the small school movement has generated hundreds of successful schools, business, and university partnerships in which companies and community institutions have provided internships, resources, and acumen to help make schools successful” (Ayers & Klonsky, 2007, p. 456). With this in mind, Renaissance 2010 was established to relieve overcrowded schools in areas that were going through extreme growth in population, and this reform was perceived in a positive manner amongst community stakeholders (Ayers & Klonsky, 2007).

Hill (2005) reported that financial assistance programs and No Child Left Behind have provided students living in lower-socioeconomic areas and students attending schools that are not performing at high levels several financial incentives to attend charter schools or schools of choice. Hill (2005) states that school choice will raise the bar amongst all schools, and school reform will require public schools to hire more teachers that implement high performing academic programs. In the end, when districts think of rezoning, students’ overall well being and academic achievement are put first (Silverman, 2007). Welner (2006) also indicates that schools with well balanced racial demographics decrease the separation of achievement from one race to another. Furthermore, positive correlations exist with neighborhood children attending schools that are zoned for their neighborhoods (Sinha et al., 2005).
Summary

Chapter two discussed the historical framework of school desegregation, the theoretical and empirical background of quality management, parent satisfaction, and school redistricting. Current issues of school rezoning and school redistricting have highlighted arguments concerning the equality of student resources, facilities, student achievement, and quality of neighborhoods (Kane et al., 2006). Although “Brown v. Board of Education has rightly become one of this nation’s foremost legal doctrines and an attempt to encourage the nation to reach a consensus on how to best achieve integrated public schools” (Crossland, 2004, p. 428), Brown v. Board of Education and the Brown Cases brought more attention to public opinion about fairness and equality for all students (Ansolone & Biafora, 2004). “An explosion of new knowledge, mounting demands for accountability, and proliferation of educational choice put great pressure on the public educational systems. The task before schools is to find methods to improve their effectiveness while serving stakeholders better” (Brown & Cooper, p. 77). In response to school quality, organizations must create feedback systems that will allow organizations to evaluate their own practices (Deming, 1982; Fleming & Asplund, 2007). Parents’ perceptions towards a school and their behaviors can impact how their student learns at school, and can affect school leaders’ ability to lead and teachers’ ability to teach students (Anderson & Minke, 2007). Thus, these data are used to improve organizational practices and performance levels of its employees (Abdulah et al., 2008), and organizational performances are based on its relationship to high quality (Chung, 2009; Deming, 1986). In studying parents’ concerns of schools before and after school
redistricting and implications for school leaders, Chapter two provided a comprehensive review of the related literature in the area of school and organizational leadership.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLGY

Introduction

Chapter three discusses the purpose and importance of this study, clarification of researcher bias, research and interview questions, population, explanatory mixed method research design instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, and ethical considerations. Specifically, this study examined parental concerns of schools before and after school redistricting and directly examined school leaders’ responses to parental concerns data before and after school redistricting. Initially, the researcher collected RBES Perception Survey for Parents data as categorized by nine themes that emerged after performing an exploratory factor analysis of the survey questions. The researcher descriptively analyzed survey data to determine whether or not there were increases or decreases in parental concern as measured by RBES perception themes before and after school redistricting. Second, the researcher interviewed school leaders to determine how they responded to the increases or decreases of parental concerns revealed in the RBES Perception Survey for Parents’ categorized themes before and after their schools were redistricted.

The potential benefit to school districts from evaluating parental concerns as categorized by the theme areas of the RBES Perception Survey for Parents, and evaluating leader responses to parental concerns is that school districts may establish proactive steps to eliminate or reduce negative parent perceptions of redistricting efforts
or sustain positive parent perceptions in school districts before and after redistricting takes place. Additionally, in places where parent perceptions are low or negative, school districts may be able to generate more buy-in that could potentially raise parents’ perceptions. If school districts know where the increases and decreases in parental concerns are prior to and after redistricting taking place, school leaders may be able to implement strategies in changing or sustaining those perceptions.

Clarification of Researcher Bias

As an administrator in this large urban public school district, the researcher of this study experienced two very sensitive redistricting initiatives. The researcher wanted to examine how such practices affected school leaders and how they responded to parental concerns of their school prior to and after school redistricting taking place. In addition, the researcher is a community member that experienced school redistricting as a parent of a middle school student impacted by this redistricting initiative. The researcher believes that all school leaders need to address parental concerns of schools, if any, and should find ways to implement strategies and practices to support school leaders and parents that are involved in school redistricting.

Research Questions

1. Is there a significant decrease in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted?

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant decrease in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted.
2. Is there a significant increase in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted?

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant increase in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted.

3. How have selected school leaders responded to the decrease of parental concerns revealed through RBES perception survey themes after schools were redistricted?

4. How have selected school leaders responded to the increase of parental concerns revealed through RBES perception survey themes after schools were redistricted?

School Leader Interview Questions

Based on an analysis of the RBES Perception Survey of Parents data, a determination was made by the researcher regarding whether or not there was an increase or decrease in parent concerns after redistricting occurs. The researcher then implemented a qualitative approach by interviewing selected school leaders regarding their reactions to either an increase or decrease in parental concerns. Fifteen structured interview questions were created to interview school leaders about their response to parent perception data about their individual schools after redistricting took place. The structured interview questions used to collect school leaders' responses to parental concerns of their individual schools are as follows:

1. Were you aware of the RBES Perception Survey of Parents data results before you became principal of this school?

2. Were you aware of the RBES Perception Survey of Parents data results after you became principal of this school?
3. What factors do you believe contributed to the increase or decrease in parental concerns revealed through the RBES themes before and after school redistricting?

4. When parental concerns decreased, what did you do as principal to sustain decreased parental concerns?

5. When parental concerns increased, what did you do as principal to address increased parental concerns?

6. What changes in RBES parent perception data did you anticipate?

7. For the changes you anticipated, when and how did you address them?

8. For the unanticipated changes, how did you react to them?

9. Were there any changes in perceptions that were a surprise?

10. What steps/actions have you taken since your first year as principal that have influenced these perceptions?

11. From your present vantage point, would you have done anything differently?

12. What do you know now about parent perceptions of your school that you wish you had known before the redistricting?

13. What would you have done to be more proactive had you known what parent perceptions were prior to school redistricting?

14. How did you build communication among parents?

15. What advice would you offer to a principal opening a new school concerning parent perceptions?
Population

The sample of parents used in this study came from large urban public school district located in the southeastern region of the United States. This large urban public school district has nearly 160,000 students and 115 schools, 20 of which are high schools. This study only focuses on the parents of high school students. Of the 20 high schools, five were chosen in this study. It is important to point out that two high schools were not in existence during the time range of this study, two high schools are alternative schools, one high school is a magnet school, and two high schools are vocational schools that were not impacted by redistricting initiatives. Therefore, the researcher chose five out of 13 available high schools to collect RBES Perception Survey for Parents data. All five high schools had an average population of 3,000 students. This placed the sample size of students to be approximately 15,000 out of approximately 45,000 high school students of parents that could have potentially received a perception survey any given year covered in the range of this study. As mentioned in the limitations section, one out of five parents was offered the perception survey, so 20% of the parent population was sampled. Since 20% of parents were given the opportunity to take the RBES Perception Survey for Parents, 3,000 students whose parents were mailed a survey had an opportunity to respond.

Research Sites

The research sites used in this study were five high schools located in a large urban public school district in the Southeast region of the United States. The research
sites were all in the northern region of this school district, and each site had a different set of student demographics.

Selection of Participants

The school district’s Office of Research and Evaluation was needed to provide results from the RBES Perception Survey for Parents. The RBES Perception Survey of Parent data are ex post facto. Twenty percent of the parent population was surveyed as a whole, and that 20% was generated by randomly selecting one of five names from a list of parents produced by the IMD (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). Also, area high school principals of chosen schools that were a part of redistricting processes from 2002-2009 were interviewed in order to perform this study. School leaders were chosen if they were the principal of a redistricted school before or after their schools were split. In two schools, there were different principals before and after the redistricting process. This means that school leaders were interviewed for one school on two separate occasions due to the change of leadership at that particular school.

Gaining Access to Sites and Participants

Access to sites and participants was gained through undergoing this large urban public school district’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the IRB at Mercer University. Certification through the National Institute of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research was obtained in order to gain access as well. Human subjects (school leaders) were interviewed, so gaining NIH Certification ensured that human subjects were protected during any research.
Research Design and Instrumentation

An explanatory mixed method design was used to conduct this study. Quantitative archival data was used first in the sequence of collecting data. After collecting archival parental concerns' data from the Office of Research and Evaluation in this large urban public school district, a paired samples t-test was used as inferential statistics to reveal whether there were increases or decreases in parental concerns revealed through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents. A paired samples t-test reveals data in a "pretest/posttest design" (Warner, 2008, p.1029). In this study, the pretest data were parental concerns before redistricting, and the posttest data were parental concerns after redistricting. The paired samples method of a t-test was appropriate, because data were the result of a "repeated measure" (Warner, 2008, p.1029) to the same sample group. Next in the sequence of this research design, the researcher followed up to gain a better understanding of parental concerns by interviewing high school leaders in how they responded to these data received from the RBES Perception Survey for Parents.

Quantitative Instrument

The Results Based Evaluative System (RBES) is an accountability measure used by this large urban public school district that evaluates schools' performances (Accountability Report, 2008). This accountability system was designed to accurately communicate school district goals, objectives, and expectations (Accountability Report, 2008). In addition, data from the RBES is used to help evaluate, support, increase, and examine the performance level of schools in the district (Accountability Report, 2008). According to Martin (personal communication, November 17, 2009), the RBES is a
“home grown, superintendent driven” evaluative system. The Superintendent of this large urban public school district met with principals during the 1996-1997 school year because he believed there was a need to survey stakeholders in the district (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). As a result of these meetings, the superintendent charged principals with the task of developing, evaluating, and administering survey items to key stakeholders (parents, teachers, and students) in the district (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). With this charge, the RBES Perception Survey of Stakeholders was formed (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009).

Initially, principals in this large urban public school district created a survey that was implemented during the 1997-1998 school year (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). Five years later, principals were reviewing survey items and noticed that several themes were emerging from the results (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). As a result, an exploratory factor analysis was performed and survey questions were grouped together. Nine themes emerged from questions being grouped together and nine official categorical themes were developed (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009): instruction, safety, discipline, leadership, communication, technology, climate, citizenship, and facilities.

For example, two questions pertaining to safety asked parents if the schools their students attend are safe and secure, and is their student’s bus safe and secure. After performing an exploratory factor analysis, these two questions were grouped together and school leaders determined these two questions would fall under safety (C. Martin,
personal communication, November 17, 2009). School leaders examined the remainder of the analyzed data and looked for common terms used throughout each question. Therefore, school leaders in the district categorized the remaining questions according to an exploratory factor analysis and summarized the questions into common themes.

### Table 1

**Parent Perception Theme Trends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Exploratory Factor Analysis Grouping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>(q 5,6,7,10,11,12,24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Theme</td>
<td>(q 22,23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Theme</td>
<td>(q 29,31,32,33,34,35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Theme</td>
<td>(q 13,16,17,30,32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Theme</td>
<td>(q 13,14,15,19,30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Theme</td>
<td>(q 8,9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Theme</td>
<td>(q 16,17,18,24,25,26,27,28,34,42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Theme</td>
<td>(q 29,33,36,37,38,39,40,41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Theme</td>
<td>(q 20,21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RBES Perception Survey of Parents is based on a five-point Likert scale. This Likert Scale measured the level of agreement parents had with each question asked in the survey. The five-points covered in the scale were strongly agree (sa), agree (a), disagree
(d), strongly disagree (sd), and do not know (dk); (sa) represents a four, (a) represents a three, (d) represents a three, (sd) represents a one, and (dk) was not scored. The survey consists of 42 questions with the last question only pertaining to middle and high school stakeholders.

Qualitative Instrument

In order to fully explore all research questions, school leaders (principals) in this large urban public school district where redistricting took place were interviewed about their responses to RBES Perception Survey for Parents data. This qualitative approach took place after RBES Perception Survey for Parents data were examined to determine if parental concerns through categorized themes increased or decreased after school redistricting took place. Accordingly, questions were formulated in order to interview school leaders (principals) on how they responded to parental concerns after school redistricting took place at their individual schools. Questions developed by the researcher for school leader interviews related to concerns in perception survey questions with data awareness, potential causes of concerns, anticipation of parents’ concerns, school leaders’ courses of action, communication, and advice.

Quantitative Return Rate

The return rate of RBES Perception Surveys for Parents was approximately 20% of those surveyed and 10% was the current return rate for Hispanics (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). Twenty of the parent population was surveyed, and that 20% was generated by extracting one of five names from a list of parents produced by the Information Management Division (IMD) through random selection (C.
Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). District officials recognized there was a low return rate due to the RBES Perception Survey for Parents being voluntary, and they recognized that parents who responded to the survey mostly responded because they had strong feelings both positively or negatively towards the schools their students’ attended (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). In response, district officials have made concerted effort to have the RBES Perception Survey for Parents available on-line, during parent conferences, and during early release dates for students (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). All in all, district officials recognized these data results could have been strongly biased opinions of parents that chose to respond to the survey (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009).

Qualitative Return Rate

As a response to the quantitative data, seven school leaders were asked to participate in a face-to-face, one-on-one 15 question structured interview. Seventy-one percent of the school leaders responded and participated in the study. All participants were school principals of individual schools selected in this study during the time of school redistricting. School leader interviews depended on the willingness of school leaders to participate in the study.
Validity

According to Martin (personal communication, November 17, 2009), “The survey has validity to the organization that designed it and uses it because the organization itself believes that it measures parents’ perceptions.” School leaders’ responses to structured interview questions were checked for accuracy by performing member checking. Additionally, the researcher coded responses to interview questions, had another researcher peer review responses, and coded responses again. The researcher repeated these steps until the researcher reached a general consensus of coded themes (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

Reliability

Reliability of the RBES Parent Perception for Parents was demonstrated from great consistency of parent responses from year to year (C. Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). In addition, reliability was measured through Cronbach alpha testing in which Martin (personal communication, November 17, 2009) reported the reliability statistic was .98. The reliability of the structured interview used in this study was examined by checking for the level of consistency in the RBES Perception Survey for Parents data reported by the researcher and the responses to structured interview questions provided by school leaders (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).
Table 2

*Cronbach's alpha for parent survey items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded a</td>
<td>5845</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Total</td>
<td>6743</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.980</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

Emphasis was placed on which data (quantitative or qualitative) were needed in order to sequentially complete this research study (Rauscher & Greenfield, 2009). Thus, following the sequence of steps outlined in an explanatory mixed method design (Rauscher & Greenfield, 2009), survey data took priority over school leader interview responses. In fact, interviews could not take place with school leaders if parental concerns data were not collected and analyzed first. Therefore, data collection began with collecting results from the RBES Perception Survey of Parents. These data were ex post facto data already collected by the district’s Office of Research and Evaluation (C.
Martin, personal communication, November 17, 2009). Next, school leaders were interviewed about their awareness and responses to reported parental concerns data.

The researcher collected quantitative results (RBES Perception Survey for Parents) for this study, however, in order to find out why these data were important to school leaders, the researcher followed up with RBES Perception Survey for Parents data by interviewing school leaders to answer the “so what” in this research study; what are leaders going to do with these data, and why do these data matter? These responses to parental concerns were addressed qualitatively through the 15 structured interview questions outlined in this chapter.

Selected school leaders received their individual schools’ parent perception data and an official informed consent letter (Appendix C) was sent to school leaders via postal mail, electronic mail, and school leaders were contacted by phone to seek participation in this study. School data sent to school leaders consisted of computed parental concerns data by way of a paired samples *t*-test. Included in the informed consent was an introduction of the study, importance of the study, NIH certification number, and the fifteen interview questions. By including the interview questions, the researcher wanted to ensure participant protection, safety, and not surprise school leaders or place them in a defensive environment with unknown questions. The purpose of the structured interview conducted in this study was to develop an understanding of school leaders’ methods in addressing parental concerns as it related to perception survey data of their individual schools after school redistricting (Golafshani, 2003).
Quantitative Data Analysis

Data for the RBES Perception Survey for Parents was collected and analyzed to determine whether or not there were increases or decreases in parental concerns after school redistricting took place at that given school. The means for each theme from the RBES Perception Survey for Parents were computed by conducting a paired samples t-test using the 17.0 version of SPSS with an inferential statistical analysis of themes after school redistricting took place at that particular school. Archival data for the RBES Perception Survey for Parents was provided to the researcher by way of calculated means for each theme. Therefore, computing the groups of means data in a pre-test, post-test method with redistricting being a form of treatment or intervention to the same group of participants made using a paired samples t-test appropriate for this study (Warner, 2008).
Table 3

Variables, Research Questions, and Items on the RBES Perception Survey and Principal Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Survey and Interview Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable #1:</td>
<td>Research questions 1-4</td>
<td>See Questions 1-42: RBES Perception Survey of Parents and related themes; 1-15 Principal Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Redistricting Process</td>
<td>Descriptive research question #1: Are there parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes that tend to increase before schools are redistricted? #2: After redistricting?</td>
<td>See Questions 1-42: RBES Perception Survey of Parents and related themes trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable #1:</td>
<td>Descriptive research question #3: Are there parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes that tend to decrease before schools are redistricted? #4: After redistricting?</td>
<td>See Questions 1-42: RBES Perception Survey of Parents and related themes trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Perceptions</td>
<td>Qualitative research question #1: How have selected school leaders responded to the increase of parental concern revealed through RBES perception survey themes before schools were redistricted? #2: After redistricting?</td>
<td>See Questions 1-15: Principal Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leaders’ Responses</td>
<td>Qualitative research question #3: How have selected school leaders responded to the decrease of parental concern revealed through RBES perception survey themes before schools were redistricted? #4: After redistricting?</td>
<td>See Questions 1-15: Principal Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Creswell (2003).
Qualitative Data Analysis

As a follow-up to quantitative results, interviews occurred with participating school leaders about their responses to parental concerns through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents data. For this purpose, data was analyzed to evaluate if perception survey data impacted how school leaders responded to parents' parental concerns. This qualitative approach gave the researcher an opportunity to evaluate how school leaders valued parental concerns data and how they responded to such data. Accordingly, all interviews were recorded with a digital audio recording device. Follow-up questions took place during the interview for any responses that needed more clarity, and after transcribing school leaders' responses to interview questions, responses were sent back to school leaders for member checking. Next, the researcher coded responses to interview questions, had another researcher peer review responses, and coded responses again. The researcher repeated these steps until the researcher reached a general consensus of coded themes. Codes were developed to allow the researcher to categorize responses to interview questions (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

Ethical Considerations

Trustworthiness is the most important issue in reporting qualitative data, and all participants in the study were treated with unconditional respect (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). School leaders were not coerced into participating in interviews, school leaders were made aware that responses to the interview conducting by the researcher would be included into a dissertation study, and school leaders were given a clear format as to how this research study was going to take place (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Last, school
leaders’ identity was protected unless permission was given to use their identity in this study.

Summary

This study used a mixed methods design to examine parental concerns of schools before and after school redistricting and directly examined school principals’ responses to perception data before and after school redistricting. The research in this study was driven by four research questions:

1. Are there parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes that tend to decrease after schools are redistricted?
2. Are there parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes that tend to decrease after schools are redistricted?
3. How have selected school leaders responded to the increase of parental concerns revealed through RBES perception survey themes after schools were redistricted?
4. How have selected school leaders responded to the decrease of parental concerns revealed through RBES perception survey themes after schools were redistricted?

The researcher collected quantitative data by way of the RBES Perception Survey for Parents, and collected qualitative data by way of conducting structured interviews of school leaders in the role of principal during the times in which schools in this study were redistricted. A paired samples $t$-test was utilized to analyze perception survey data results using SPSS 17.0 software. School leaders’ responses to structured interview questions were coded and categorized into seven themes. Interview responses were then examined in order to analyze how school leaders responded to parental concerns of their individual
schools, and a report of data and data analysis of the results were provided in Chapter four of this study.
CHAPTER 4

REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

This study examined parental concerns of schools through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents before and after school redistricting, and further examined school principals’ responses to perception data before and after school redistricting. The potential benefit to school districts from evaluating parental concerns as categorized by the theme areas of the RBES Perception Survey for Parents, and evaluating leader responses to parental concerns is that school districts may establish proactive steps to eliminate or reduce negative parent perceptions of redistricting efforts or sustain positive parent perceptions in school districts before and after redistricting takes place. Additionally, in places where parent perceptions are low or negative, school districts may be able to generate more buy-in that could potentially improve parent perceptions. This study may benefit schools because the findings of this study may allow school and district leaders across the country to have a better understanding of parents’ perceptions towards schools in large urban public school districts before and after school redistricting takes place.

According to Caro et al. (2004), when a school district establishes new attendance zones that carelessly divide neighborhoods, such an effort will create problems for the school district, and parents, students, and others impacted by this change will cause a rift. School redistricting is a systematic procedure that has caused many problems with the
equal division of students in communities, socioeconomic balancing, reduction of transportation costs, and the balancing of school populations (desJardins et al., 2007). The process of school redistricting presents technical and political problems for school districts (Caro et al., 2004). Coupled with school redistricting, parents’ perceptions towards a school and their behaviors can impact how their student learns at school, and can affect school leaders’ ability to lead and teachers’ ability to teach students (Anderson & Minke, 2007). As school attendance lines are redrawn, parents concern for their student’s safety and the balancing of test scores can also present problems for school districts (desJardins et al., 2007).

Research Questions

The research questions that guided this study addressed issues raised in the problem statement. Parental concerns are based on parent’s perception of the school their students attend, and may generate from whether or not they have had positive or negative experiences with that particular school (Falbo et al., 2003). A parents’ level of commitment to a school is based on their satisfaction with that school, and their loyalty is similar to that of a consumer as it relates to business (Falbo et al., 2003; Salisbury et al., 1997). When parents are not satisfied with the services a public school has to offer their student, school choice becomes an issue and public education becomes second to private education (Salisbury et al., 1997). A lack of parent support results in a lack of community support. Without the two, the quality of student services becomes an issue (Bhote, 1996; Salisbury et al., 1997). The research questions that guided this study are as follows:
1. Is there a significant decrease in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted?
   
   Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant decrease in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted.

2. Is there a significant increase in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted?
   
   Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant increase in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted.

3. How have selected school leaders responded to the decrease of parental concerns revealed through RBES perception survey themes after schools were redistricted?

4. How have selected school leaders responded to the increase of parental concerns revealed through RBES perception survey themes after schools were redistricted?

   School Leader Interview Questions

   Based on an analysis of the RBES Perception Survey of Parents data, a determination was made by the researcher regarding whether or not there was an increase or decrease in parent concerns after redistricting occurs. The researcher then implemented a qualitative approach by interviewing selected school leaders regarding their reactions to either an increase or decrease in parental concerns. Fifteen structured interview questions were created to interview school leaders about their response to parent perception data about their individual schools after redistricting took place. The structured interview questions used to collect school leaders’ responses to parent perception of their individual schools are as follows:
1. Were you aware of the RBES Perception Survey of Parents data results before you became principal of this school?

2. Were you aware of the RBES Perception Survey of Parents data results after you became principal of this school?

3. What factors do you believe contributed to the increase or decrease in parental concerns revealed through the RBES themes before and after school redistricting?

4. When parental concerns decreased, what did you do as principal to sustain decreased parental concerns?

5. When parental concerns increased, what did you do as principal to address increased parental concerns?

6. What changes in RBES parent perception data did you anticipate?

7. For the changes you anticipated, when and how did you address them?

8. For the unanticipated changes, how did you react to them?

9. Were there any changes in perceptions that were a surprise?

10. What steps/actions have you taken since your first year as principal that have influenced these perceptions?

11. From your present vantage point, would you have done anything differently?

12. What do you know now about parent perceptions of your school that you wish you had known before the redistricting?

13. What would you have done to be more proactive had you known what parent perceptions were prior to school redistricting?
14. How did you build communication among parents?

15. What advice would you offer to a principal opening a new school concerning parent perceptions?

Participants

Participants in this study consisted of parents of students in a large urban public school district and five school leaders. Data collected relating to the RBES Perception Survey for Parents was archival. Participants in the survey from year to year averaged nearly 15,000 students and their parents in a large urban public school district located in the southeast region of the United States. As a response to the quantitative data, seven school leaders were asked to participate in a face-to-face, one-on-one 15 question structured interview. Seventy-one percent of the school leaders responded and participated in the interview. All participants were school principals of individual schools selected in this study during the time of school redistricting.

Quantitative Results

Research Question 1: Is there a significant decrease in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted?

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant decrease in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after school are redistricted.
Table 4

*Instruction RBES Perception Survey for Parents Results*

*Paired Samples t-test for Before Redistricting and After Redistricting (Instruction)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>-.15600</td>
<td>.05273</td>
<td>-6.616</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>-.21600</td>
<td>.05683</td>
<td>-8.498</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>-.03250</td>
<td>.04031</td>
<td>-1.612</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School B</td>
<td>-.26500</td>
<td>.03109</td>
<td>-17.047</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School C</td>
<td>-.16000</td>
<td>.04830</td>
<td>-6.625</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School A</td>
<td>-.19800</td>
<td>.06017</td>
<td>-7.359</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School B</td>
<td>-.24200</td>
<td>.05933</td>
<td>-9.121</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Appendix D for the detailed paired differences table for the paired samples t-test computed through SPSS for schools in theme area of Instruction

A paired samples t-test was calculated to determine the paired differences between parent perceptions of instruction in schools before and after school redistricting. Table 4 shows the means of paired differences, standard deviations, t values, and p values of seven comparisons. School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.15600 (SD=.05). The difference showed a t value of -6.61 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal there was a significant decrease in parental concerns of School A in the theme trend of instruction after schools were redistricted. School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.21600 (SD=.05). The difference showed a t value of -8.49 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns of School B in the theme trend of instruction after schools were redistricted.
School C shows the mean of paired differences was .03250 (SD=.04). The difference showed a t value of -1.61 with a p value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significance difference in parental concerns of School C in the theme trend of instruction.

School D compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.26500 (SD=.031). The difference showed a t value of -17.04 with a p value of <.05. The data results revealed that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School B in the theme trend of climate after schools were redistricted.

School D compared to School C shows the mean of paired differences was -.16000 (SD=.04). The difference showed a t value of -6.62 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School C in the theme trend of climate after schools were redistricted.

School E compared to School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.19800 (SD=.06). The difference showed a t value of -7.35 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concern from School E to School A in the theme area of climate after schools were redistricted.

School E compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.24200 (SD=.05). The difference showed a t value of -9.12 with a p value of <.05. The data results revealed that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of climate after schools were redistricted.
Table 5

Safety RBES Perception Survey for Parents Results
Paired Samples t-test for Before Redistricting and After Redistricting (Safety)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>-.10400</td>
<td>.18447</td>
<td>-1.261</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>-.18000</td>
<td>.16837</td>
<td>-2.390</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>.05250</td>
<td>.10012</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School B</td>
<td>-.28750</td>
<td>.08770</td>
<td>-6.556</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School C</td>
<td>-.21000</td>
<td>.13589</td>
<td>-3.091</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School A</td>
<td>-.18800</td>
<td>.17712</td>
<td>-2.373</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School B</td>
<td>-.23000</td>
<td>.07810</td>
<td>-6.585</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Appendix D for the detailed paired differences table for the paired samples t-test computed through SPSS for schools in theme area of Safety

A paired samples t-test was calculated to determine the paired differences between parent perceptions of safety in schools before and after school redistricting.

Table 5 shows the means of paired differences, standard deviations, t values, and p values of seven comparisons. School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.10400 (SD=.18). The difference showed a t value of -1.26 with a p value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School A in the theme trend of safety after schools were redistricted. School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.18000 (SD=.16). The difference showed a t value of -2.39 with a p value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in perception of School B in the theme trend of safety after schools were redistricted.
School C shows the mean of paired differences was \(0.05250\ (SD=0.10)\). The difference showed a \(t\) value of 1.04 with a \(p\) value of \(>0.05\). The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School C in the theme trend of safety.

School D compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was 
\[-0.28750\ (SD=0.08)\]. The difference showed a \(t\) value of -6.556 with a \(p\) value of \(<0.05\). The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School B in the theme trend of safety after schools were redistricted. School D compared to School C shows the mean of paired differences was -0.21000 \((SD=0.13)\). The difference showed a \(t\) value of -3.09 with a \(p\) value of \(>0.05\). The data results that there was no significant difference in parental concerns from School D to School C in the theme trend of safety after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School A shows the mean of paired differences was -0.18800 \((SD=0.17)\). The difference showed a \(t\) value of -2.37 with a \(p\) value of \(>0.05\). The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of safety after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -0.23000 \((SD=0.07)\). The difference showed a \(t\) value of -6.585 with a \(p\) value of \(<0.05\). The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of safety after schools were redistricted.
Table 6

Discipline RBES Perception Survey for Parents Results
Paired Samples t-test for Before Redistricting and After Redistricting (Discipline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>-.05200</td>
<td>.05718</td>
<td>-2.033</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>-.19000</td>
<td>.09301</td>
<td>-4.568</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>.08000</td>
<td>.11136</td>
<td>.25719</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School B</td>
<td>-.27500</td>
<td>.00577</td>
<td>-95.263</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School C</td>
<td>-.10250</td>
<td>.07228</td>
<td>-2.836</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School A</td>
<td>-.15800</td>
<td>.14325</td>
<td>-2.466</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School B</td>
<td>-.21200</td>
<td>.03899</td>
<td>-12.159</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Appendix D for the detailed paired differences table for the paired samples t-test computed through SPSS for schools in theme area of Discipline

A paired samples t-test was calculated to determine the paired differences between parent perceptions of discipline in schools before and after school redistricting.

Table 6 shows the means of paired differences, standard deviations, t values, and p values of seven comparisons. School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.05200 (SD=.05). The difference showed a t value of -2.03 with a p value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School A in the theme trend of discipline after schools were redistricted. School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.19000 (SD=.09). The difference showed a t value of -4.568 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns of School B in the theme trend of safety after schools were redistricted.
School C shows the mean of paired differences was .08000 ($SD=.11$). The difference showed a $t$ value of .25 with a $p$ value of $>.05$. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the perception of School C in the theme trend of safety.

School D compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.27500 ($SD=.00$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -95.26 with a $p$ value of $<.05$. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School B in the theme trend of discipline after schools were redistricted. School D compared to School C shows the mean of paired differences was -.10250 ($SD=.07$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -2.83 with a $p$ value of $>.05$. The data results reveal that there was a significant difference in parental concerns from School D to School C in the theme trend of discipline after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.15800 ($SD=.14$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -2.46 with a $p$ value of $>.05$. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of discipline after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.21200 ($SD=.03$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -12.15 with a $p$ value of $<.05$. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of discipline after schools were redistricted.
Table 7

*Leadership RBES Perception Survey for Parents Results*

*Paired Samples t-test for Before Redistricting and After Redistricting (Leadership)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>-.04800</td>
<td>.04494</td>
<td>-2.388</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>-.19600</td>
<td>.05320</td>
<td>-8.238</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>-.38500</td>
<td>.47021</td>
<td>-1.638</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School B</td>
<td>-.21000</td>
<td>.06164</td>
<td>-6.813</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School C</td>
<td>-.09500</td>
<td>.08505</td>
<td>-2.234</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School A</td>
<td>-.12000</td>
<td>.12884</td>
<td>-2.083</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School B</td>
<td>-.21400</td>
<td>.05320</td>
<td>-8.995</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Appendix D for the detailed paired differences table for the paired samples t-test computed through SPSS for schools in the theme area of Leadership.

A paired samples t-test was calculated to determine the paired differences between parent perceptions of leadership in schools before and after school redistricting. Table 7 shows the means of paired differences, standard deviations, t values, and p values of seven comparisons. School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.04800 (SD=.04). The difference showed a t value of -2.38 with a p value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School A in the theme trend of leadership after schools were redistricted. School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.19600 (SD=.053). The difference showed a t value of -8.23 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significance decrease in parental concerns of School B in the theme trend of leadership after schools were
redistricted. School C shows the mean of paired differences was .38500 ($SD=.47$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -1.63 with a $p$ value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School C in the theme trend of leadership.

School D compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.21000 ($SD=.06$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -6.81 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School B in the theme trend of leadership after schools were redistricted. School D compared to School C shows the mean of paired differences was -.09500 ($SD=.08$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -2.23 with a $p$ value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in parental concerns from School D to School C in the theme trend of leadership after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.12000 ($SD=.12$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -2.08 with a $p$ value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of leadership after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.21400 ($SD=.05$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -6.92 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of leadership after schools were redistricted.
Table 8

*Communication RBES Perception Survey for Parents Results*
*Paired Samples t-test for Before Redistricting and After Redistricting (Communication)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>-.06000</td>
<td>.0500</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>-.21400</td>
<td>.03507</td>
<td>-13.644</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>-.03000</td>
<td>.07703</td>
<td>-.779</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School B</td>
<td>-.21500</td>
<td>.05802</td>
<td>-7.411</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School C</td>
<td>-.13500</td>
<td>.06455</td>
<td>-4.183</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School A</td>
<td>-.15800</td>
<td>.09576</td>
<td>-3.689</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School B</td>
<td>-.42000</td>
<td>.42302</td>
<td>-2.220</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Appendix D for the detailed paired differences table for the paired samples t-test computed through SPSS for schools in theme area of Communication.

A paired samples t-test was calculated to determine the paired differences between parent perceptions of communication in schools before and after school redistricting. Table 8 shows the means of paired differences, standard deviations, t values, and p values of seven comparisons. School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.06000 (SD=.05). The difference showed a t value of -2.68 with a p value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School A in the theme trend of communication after schools were redistricted. School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.214000 (SD=.03). The difference showed a t value of -13.64 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal there was a significant decrease in parental concerns of School B in the theme trend of communication after
schools were redistricted. School C shows the mean of paired differences was .03000 ($SD=.07$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -13.64 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significance decrease in the parental concerns of School C in the theme trend of citizenship.

School D compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.21500 ($SD=.05$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -7.41 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School B in the theme trend of communication after schools were redistricted. School D compared to School C shows the mean of paired differences was -.13500 ($SD=.06$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -4.18 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School C in the theme trend of communication after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.15800 ($SD=.09$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -3.68 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of communication after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.42000 ($SD=.42$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -2.22 with a $p$ value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of communication after schools were redistricted.
Table 9

Technology RBES Perception Survey for Parents Results
Paired Samples t-test for Before Redistricting and After Redistricting (Technology)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>-.1880</td>
<td>.11389</td>
<td>-3.691</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>-.1860</td>
<td>.06025</td>
<td>-6.903</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>-.0350</td>
<td>.10214</td>
<td>-6.85</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to B</td>
<td>-.41500</td>
<td>.08347</td>
<td>-9.944</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to C</td>
<td>-.25500</td>
<td>.08813</td>
<td>-5.787</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to A</td>
<td>-.35000</td>
<td>.03937</td>
<td>-19.879</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to B</td>
<td>-.39000</td>
<td>.06708</td>
<td>-13.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Appendix D for the detailed paired differences table for the paired samples t-test computed through SPSS for schools in theme area of Technology

A paired samples t-test was calculated to determine the paired differences between parent perceptions of technology in schools before and after school redistricting. Table 9 shows the means of paired differences, standard deviations, t values, and p values of seven comparisons. School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.1880 (SD=.11). The difference showed a t value of -3.69 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in the parental concerns of School A in the theme trend of technology after schools were redistricted. School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.1860 (SD=.06). The difference showed a t value of -6.903 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns of School B in the theme trend of technology after schools were
redistricted. School C shows the mean of paired differences was .03500 ($SD= .10$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -.68 with a $p$ value of $>.05$. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School C in the theme trend of technology.

School D compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.41500 ($SD= .08$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -9.94 with a $p$ value of $<.05$. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School B in the theme trend of technology after schools were redistricted. School D compared to School C shows the mean of paired differences was -.25500 ($SD= .08$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -5.78 with a $p$ value of $<.05$. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School C in the theme trend of technology after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.35000 ($SD= .03$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -19.87 with a $p$ value of $<.05$. The data results revealed that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of technology after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.39000 ($SD= .06$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -19.87 with a $p$ value of $<.05$. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of technology after schools were redistricted.
Table 10

**Climate RBES Perception Survey for Parents Results**

**Paired Samples t-test for Before Redistricting and After Redistricting (Climate)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>-.05600</td>
<td>.07829</td>
<td>-1.599</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>-.20200</td>
<td>.06834</td>
<td>-6.610</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>.05000</td>
<td>.07118</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School B</td>
<td>-.28750</td>
<td>.05852</td>
<td>-10.167</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School C</td>
<td>-.16750</td>
<td>.11730</td>
<td>-2.856</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School A</td>
<td>-.18200</td>
<td>.15304</td>
<td>-2.659</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School B</td>
<td>-.26600</td>
<td>.01673</td>
<td>-35.546</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Appendix D for the detailed paired differences table for the paired samples t-test computed through SPSS for schools in the theme area of Climate.

A paired samples t-test was calculated to determine the paired differences between parent perceptions of school climate in schools before and after school redistricting. Table 10 shows the means of paired differences, standard deviations, t values, and p values of seven comparisons. School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.05600 (SD=.07). The difference showed a t value of -1.59 with a p value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School A in the theme trend of climate after schools were redistricted. School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.20200 (SD=.06). The difference showed a t value of -6.61 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns of School B in the theme trend of climate after schools.
were redistricted. School C shows the mean of paired differences was .00500 \( (SD=.07) \). The difference showed a \( t \) value of 1.40 with a \( p \) value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School C in the theme trend of climate.

School D compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.29750 \( (SD=.02) \). The difference showed a \( t \) value of -10.167 with a \( p \) value of <.05. The data results revealed that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School B in the theme trend of climate after schools were redistricted.

School D compared to School C shows the mean of paired differences was -.16750 \( (SD=.11) \). The difference showed a \( t \) value of -2.85 with a \( p \) value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in parental concerns from School D to School C in the theme trend of climate after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.18200 \( (SD=.15) \). The difference showed a \( t \) value of -2.65 with a \( p \) value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of climate after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.22600 \( (SD=.01) \). The difference showed a \( t \) value of -35.54 with a \( p \) value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of climate after schools were redistricted.
Table 11

Citizenship RBES Perception Survey for Parents Results
Paired Samples t-test for Before Redistricting and After Redistricting (Citizenship)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>-.10600</td>
<td>.20995</td>
<td>-1.129</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>-.19000</td>
<td>.11402</td>
<td>-3.726</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>.00500</td>
<td>.07853</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School B</td>
<td>-.33250</td>
<td>.02754</td>
<td>-24.149</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D to School C</td>
<td>-.12250</td>
<td>.07365</td>
<td>-3.326</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School A</td>
<td>-.13000</td>
<td>.04062</td>
<td>-7.156</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E to School B</td>
<td>-.22600</td>
<td>.07301</td>
<td>-6.922</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Appendix D for the detailed paired differences table for the paired samples t-test computed through SPSS for schools in theme area of Citizenship

A paired samples t-test was calculated to determine the paired differences between parent perceptions of citizenship in schools before and after school redistricting.

Table 11 shows the means of paired differences, standard deviations, t values, and p values of seven comparisons. School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.10600 (SD=.20). The difference showed a t value of -1.12 with a p value of >.05. The data results revealed that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School A in the theme trend of citizenship after schools were redistricted. School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.19000 (SD=.11). The difference showed a t value of -3.72 with a p value of <.05. The data results revealed that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns of School B in the theme trend of citizenship.
after schools were redistricted. School C shows the mean of paired differences was 
.00500(SD=.07). The difference showed a t value of -.12 with a p value of >.05. The data 
results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School C 
in the theme trend of citizenship.

School D compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was 
-.33250(SD=.02). The difference showed a t value of -24.14 with a p value of <.05. The data 
results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School 
D to School B in the theme trend of citizenship after schools were redistricted. School D 
compared to School C shows the mean of paired differences was -.12250(SD=.07). The 
difference showed a t value of -3.32 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal that 
there was a significance decrease in parental concerns from School D to School C in the 
theme trend of citizenship after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School 
A shows the mean of paired differences was -.13000(SD=.04). The difference showed a 
t value of -7.15 with a p value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant 
decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of citizenship 
after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School B shows the mean of paired 
differences was -.2260(SD=.07). The difference showed a t value of -6.92 with a p value 
of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns 
from School E to School A in the theme area of citizenship after schools were 
redistricted.
A paired samples $t$-test was calculated to determine the paired differences between parent perceptions of facilities in schools before and after school redistricting.

Table 12 shows the means of paired differences, standard deviations, $t$ values, and $p$ values of seven comparisons. School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.04800 ($SD=.02$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -3.74 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in the parental concerns of School A in the theme trend of facilities after schools were redistricted. School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.14600 ($SD=.05177$). The difference showed a $t$ value of -6.30 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results show there was a significant decrease in parental concerns of School B in the theme trend of technology after schools were redistricted.
redistricted. School C shows the mean of paired differences was .04500 (SD=.12). The difference showed a $t$ value of -.69 with a $p$ value of >.05. The data results reveal that there was no significant difference in the parental concerns of School C in the theme trend of technology.

School D compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.50000 (SD=.10). The difference showed a $t$ value of -9.77 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School B in the theme trend of technology after schools were redistricted. School D compared to School C shows the mean of paired differences was -.40500 (SD=.10). The difference showed a $t$ value of -8.00 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School D to School C in the theme trend of technology after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School A shows the mean of paired differences was -.32800 (SD=.14). The difference showed a $t$ value of -5.13 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significance decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of technology after schools were redistricted. School E compared to School B shows the mean of paired differences was -.43800 (SD=.12). The difference showed a $t$ value of -7.95 with a $p$ value of <.05. The data results reveal that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns from School E to School A in the theme area of technology after schools were redistricted.

Inferential statistics was applied to determine if there was a significant increase or decrease in parental concerns before and after school redistricting by using a paired
samples $t$-test in SPSS. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis for this research question.

Research Question 2: Is there a significant increase in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted?

Null Hypothesis: There will be no significant increase in parental concerns revealed through RBES perception themes after schools are redistricted.

A paired samples $t$-test was calculated to determine the paired differences between parent perceptions of instruction, safety, discipline, leadership, communication, technology, climate, citizenship, and facilities in schools before and after school redistricting. Tables 4-12 shows the means of paired differences, standard deviations, $t$ values, and $p$ values of seven comparisons. The data results reveal that there was a significance decrease in the parental concerns of School A, School B, School C, School D to School B, School B to School C, School E to School A, and School E to School B in all the theme trends after schools were redistricted. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for this research question.

Qualitative Results

Structured interviews were used to ask school leaders how they responded to the RBES Perception Survey for Parents data for their individual schools. The school leader interview persisted of 15 structured interview questions. School Leaders’ responses were transcribed, returned for member checking and coded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Positively communicates to parents/ community, teachers, and school choice options</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Data</td>
<td>Effectively gathers and disaggregates school data, and evaluates school demographics</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Aware of RBES Perception Data, parent/community perceptions and stakeholder demographics</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Builds and monitors school climate, and maintains or increases school climate</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Develops positive connectedness to Community</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Analysis</td>
<td>Properly handles criticism and develops root cause analysis of perceptions</td>
<td>Purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Builds effective relationships with stakeholders</td>
<td>Gray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3: How have selected school leaders responded to the decrease of parental concerns revealed through RBES perception survey themes after schools were redistricted?
Interview Question 1: Were you aware of the RBES Perception Survey of Parents data results before you became principal of this school?

The four out of five principals interviewed (School Leader B, School Leader C, School Leader D) in this study were unaware of the RBES Perception Survey for Parents data results prior to becoming principal of their particular schools. School Leader E reported that he was aware of these data results due to the sensitivity of his new appointment. According to School Leader B, “I became principal in 1998, so this was an instrument that was being developed at that time. So, we were more of in a development phase of the result-based evaluation system that involved perception survey results taken from students, parents and staff… I became aware once I became principal of the surveys.” According to School Leader C, “I wasn’t aware of the actual RBES Perception data. When the superintendent of this school district hired me as principal in 2002, we did not go over any of the surveys. However, I did know that there was a negative perception from several groups of parents about School C and the previous administration, and that was made very clear to me by the superintendent and a few assistant superintendents in this large urban public school district.”

Interview Question 2: Were you aware of the RBES Perception Survey of Parents data results after you became principal of this school?

All School Leaders responded with being aware of the RBES Perception Survey for Parents data after they became principals of their individual schools. School Leader B responded, “Over the years, these data have become more and more important as we
gauge the level of effectiveness for principals and their leadership in terms of the community, staff, and students.”

Interview Question 3: What factors do you believe contributed to the increase or decrease in parental concerns revealed through RBES themes after school redistricting?

All School Leaders had different perspectives as to why parent perceptions of their individual schools decreased. School Leader B stated, “I think one of the key pieces in the increase of the perception (decreased concern) is the manner in which our district allows people to choose their school even though there is a new school that’s being opened to relieve overcrowding. Students who are currently attending their home school can choose to stay. They can also submit a transfer to go to the new school. So, after redistricting, this choice element allows students and parents to literally go where they want to go. So, if you go where you want to go, whether that’s the school that’s already in existence or the new school, your perception of what is happening at the school is probably a little bit more positive. So, I think that probably contributes to an improvement in this perception data.”

School Leader C’s response highlighted his beliefs towards how any school going through such a change can have increased or decreased parental concerns. School Leader C stated, “I think one of the biggest problems that any school has when they are being split or some of their student body is being redistricted to another school, is there is a perception and attitude by many people, parents, community members, teachers, and students that they are taking away from an existing school and giving to a new school.”
School Leader D reported that a school’s climate can lead to an increase or decrease in parents’ perceptions of their current or new school. School Leader E said the biggest factor that increased parents’ perception and decreased parental concerns of his school was the fact that his school was brand new.

Interview Question 4: When parental concerns decreased, what did you do as principal to sustain decreased parental concerns?

All School Leaders reported they needed to continue constant communication with parents and community members. School Leader C responded that his “personal philosophy was simply that we had to communicate with our parents. We had to highlight all the great things that were going on at School C academically, in the area of fine arts, and athletics.” According to School Leader D, “I continued what we were already doing but tried to continue to improve all theme areas, not just sustain.” School Leader E increased his school’s community outreach efforts. He reported, “One of our Local School Plan for Improvement focuses is to maintain and grow a sense of community and awareness. One of our strategic plans is to increase our community stakeholder awareness annually, and we have several tangible ways in how we do that. We conduct four stakeholder informational or focus groups during the course of the year, every year. We also have upgraded our outreach efforts in terms of the quality of product that we have seen in the community.”

Interview Question 5: When parental concerns increased, what did you do as principal to address increased parental concerns?
According to the inferential statistical results from this study, none of the schools had an increase in parental concerns after schools were redistricted. See Tables 4-12. However, all school leaders said they would perform a self evaluation of their schools to see where they could have improved parent perceptions. School Leader C reported, “Obviously, any time perceptions decreased (increased concern), even though it wasn’t a significant decrease (increase in concern), it raised a little red flag, and once again we would ask ourselves why parent perceptions went down in a particular area? We also asked our parents through school counsel, through PTSA, and through meetings, what do you really think about School C? We would ask our parents, what can we do to make School C better?” School Leader D’s response was similar to School Leader C. He replied, “I asked questions of parents and staff to determine specific areas for growth. Then, I targeted those areas for the next school year where appropriate.” All in all, school leaders in this study reported they would develop a root-cause-analysis as to why parental concerns increased in their individual schools after schools were redistricted.

Interview Question 6: What changes in RBES parent perception data did you anticipate?

There were a couple of theme trends that consistently surfaced concerning school leaders’ anticipation of data results. Safety and Facilities were the most anticipated themes that emerged from coding school leaders’ responses. School Leader B mentioned, “The safety theme where there was really no change is not a surprise, because safety is not typically a concern due to the consistent and effective manner in which school discipline is applied and enforced, and in the way it’s communicated. The students who
attend schools in this large urban public school district overall believe their schools are safe. So, whether they are going to a new school or they are staying at their current school, safety is pretty consistent.” Coincidentally, School Leader E had similar anticipation. He stated, “Two years ago, we had a widely publicized fight that was put up on YouTube, you may have seen, I don’t know, but it really did significant harm to our perception survey with regard to safety.”

In the theme trend area of Facilities, School Leader C responded that this was a perception that he anticipated. However, his anticipation was not a positive perception. Many community members were upset, because according to School Leader C, “When a new school is opened up, they have got all the new amenities and the new paint.” Parents in School Leader C’s community wanted the same perks that the new School D received. In response to negative perceptions, the county came in about a year or two after the split, and painted the entire school. In addition, “We had that brand new beautiful four storey building. We already had a new gym that was completed my second year of being principal in 2003. So, we had a brand new gym and that was nice, but when they saw those new academic classrooms, they went real wild about the four stories. When they saw the new academic classrooms, what we call the 'cat walk' from the gym to the four storey building, the fact that it was almost the entire front of the atrium or the lobby area was glassed encased, parents really thought we had very nice facilities. I mean, it really is an impressive building. I think when that building was completed, the parents looked at that this and this became a show place” (School Leader C). All in all, School Leader C stated, “I think facilities were the biggest thing we saw as an increase in parent
perceptions.” School Leader D summed all responses by stating that he “anticipated continued increases in perceptions after there was a slight decline in the survey theme areas.”

Interview Question 7: For the changes you anticipated, when and how did you address them?

After coding School Leaders’ response to anticipated data, theme trends that emerged were Communication, Awareness, Outreach, and Problem Analysis. As mentioned by School Leader B, not only did the local schools address parent concerns, but “the system responded to public outcry” as well. School Leader D noted, “I addressed anticipated changes in the next years’ surveys, PTA and local school council meetings as well as other community groups.” School Leader E anticipated there would be a concern with safety on his campus due to a few students getting involved in a widely publicized fight. His response was to this anticipation was cautioned by county officials, but as a leader, he felt the incident needed to be addressed immediately. “I interrupted first period and I said that before the school ended I was going to do a video presentation to the school, which I did. I brought the director of school intervention out to the school, and I brought Sandy Joe out to the school who was at that time the chief of staff to the Superintendent, and we talked about the incident and potential parent perceptions that may come about as a result of this fight. I told them what I intended to do. One of the two cautioned me about being too outspoken and to literal in my comments. He actually reminded me about perceptions and what it could look like in the community” (School Leader E).
However School Leader E told students, “At School E if you are going to be a thug, act like a thug, and commit crimes like a thug, then we are going to treat you like a thug, and that we would not tolerate that kind of behavior.” He commented that there were mixed emotions from the community about his addressing students in this manner, but “there was an element of our parent community that thought those words were praiseworthy and that they supported us a 100%... some felt that I exacerbated the problem, and some felt that I made the problem go away. What it did was create awareness in the parent community, and I was trying to send a message to the thugs as well that you don’t act that way here” (School Leader E).

With Problem Analysis, School Leader C stated, “We looked at whether the anticipated change was good or bad. We looked at what we would do if it was positive or negative. If we had a greater number from one year to the next, we looked at why was that, and we tried to not only emulate what we were doing in the year before, but we tried to improve on it.” Throughout all interviews conducted, all school leaders looked within their current practices to evaluate what the anticipated perception was, and as a leadership team, they reflected upon what steps to take next to improve or sustain anticipated perceptions.

Interview Question 8: For the unanticipated changes, how did you react to them?

According to the school leaders interviewed in this study, there were not many unanticipated changes or concerns that came about from the RBES Perception Survey for Parents. Seemingly, all school leaders had a general grasp on anticipated themes and their school climate, so unanticipated themes were not a concern for these leaders. In fact,
School Leader C responded by stating, “Truthfully, without sounding arrogant, we were right on with what we thought that our parent community was.”

Interview Question 9: Were there any changes in perceptions that were a surprise?

The general consensus amongst school leaders revealed there were no general surprises, but a few did mention a couple of areas that were somewhat of a surprise. As mentioned in the responses to Interview Question eight, all school leaders in this study had a general grasp on the climate of their schools and were aware of parent perceptions of their individual schools. However, School Leader B did mention that Communication was a surprise; I think the communication theme with a significant increase I think is somewhat of surprise for me. I did cannot recall any particular initiative that we were engaged in that would have done that, so communication is kind of a surprise.”

Interview questions in this study were a direct reflection on school leadership, and School Leader C made a profound statement with his response to this question. He stated, “I think to be a principal, there is a lot of ego involved. I mean, when you become a principal it’s somewhat of an ego trip, and the one thing that I always looked at on these parent perception survey was leadership. I looked at that, and obviously you would want it to be up as high as it can be. On some years, I was like man, what can me and my team do, because it just wasn’t about me, it was about the leadership team in the school which included the teachers. So, leadership was one of the first things that I always looked at, because in my opinion and my philosophy, if you have a strong leadership team, you are going to have a pretty effective school.” In regards to his statement, School Leader C mentioned that not a lot of principals would respond they were unaware of the
perceptions of their schools, and surprise is something that would reflect being unaware of community perceptions. Therefore, with the exception of a couple of theme trend areas, all school leaders responded that there were few surprises in their school’s survey data.

Interview Question 10: What steps/actions have you taken since your first year as principal that have influenced these perceptions?

In evaluating school leaders’ responses to this interview question, all had similar approaches in addressing the step/actions they have taken to influence parent perceptions of their individual schools. In coding responses, the theme trends that emerged were Communication, Relationships, Problem Analysis, and Outreach. School Leader B said, “Schools that were opening to relieve overcrowd schools gave us opportunities to affect our staff in ways where we were going through some pretty significant changes.”

Specifically, School Leader B stated, “We eliminated what was then called the "Technical track" as far as course offerings for the kids, and now this is adopted state wide, but we were the first school to do this. Years ago, this type of change was met with a lot of resistance internally and externally. We also at the same time expanded our advanced placement offerings and had the expectation that it would be an access culture zone. In other words, it was more effort based. Any student who wanted to participate in an advanced placement course, the door was open. Then, to support this, we also had some significant improvements in our intervention programs especially during the school day. We had a culture where a few students were allowed to participate in the highest level courses. We didn’t have very many offerings for advanced placement, and the
teachers had more of a gifted elite type mindset, and there was a true belief that students of poverty, students of color, and students of different orientation to the community would struggle in these higher level courses.”

“We removed the departmental concept as far as the high school design, and what I mean by that is we became focused on grade level content areas. Not all of these changes happened at the same time, but over a course of about three years, these changes took place. So, if you are moving from elite to complete access, if you are moving from high expectations for a few to high expectations for all, and if you are moving from a teacher of record in isolation to a team of teachers that are focused on improvements for the whole groups of students they serve, you have now changed where some teachers didn’t feel comfortable in the environment. They saw these new schools as opportunities for them to take the traditional teaching approach to those new schools, so that gave us a staff who truly believed in these changes and they communicated effectively to the kids and to the parents. These significant changes and these initiatives probably wouldn’t have gone as well and as quickly without the redistricting that took place. We had a chance to grow fast, so we hired a lot of people who had some of the same mindset” (School Leader B).

Furthermore, School Leader C noted, “I think once again I have to go back to building relationships with parents. I cannot emphasize this enough that when I took over School C, it was a very good academic school. However there was a perception that it was going to hell in a hand basket. There were several parent groups that would meet on a regular basis to discuss what they could do, number one; to change the school or
number two; to move their kids out of the school. Obviously that did not go unnoticed by the county office people. So, there was a real effort on not only my part, but on my leadership team’s part and we communicated this to the teachers that we had to do a better job of communicating with parents. I met with parent groups that whole first year, I informed them, I told them about my philosophy, I told him about what I expected them to do, what I expected our teachers to do, what I expected the students to do, and it was met with very good results. In these regards, and within a year, every parent group that had been created to discuss whatever issue, every one of those groups had disbanded within a year. So I felt that it was that my team had to go out and communicate with parents about our specific goals, vision, and our directions that we were going to take the school. ”

Continuing, School Leader D said, “I continued to work on leadership within the school and the greater community.” School Leader E reported, “In year one, we had a planned strategy to improving facilities, and we borrowed a million and a half dollars in year one to build a stadium, some additional storage, a facility for the baseball program, softball program, and a state of the art indoor practice facility. We paid that off in two and half years. We were able to do that and increase our parking capacity about 500 parking spots to get kids on campus. Today, kids would die before they would ride the yellow bus. So, as we approached 4000 students, we only had 687 parking places on our campus and 400 for teachers. Consequently, there were 287 spots there for kids and it just didn’t work out that way, so we increased it up to 1000 parking spaces for students. We did that on money that we raised ourselves, and parents appreciated this because a lot
of them were tired driving the kids due to them not wanting them on the bus. As far as technology, we have upgraded technology with white board technology throughout the building in our math and science classes, and our goal is to have a white board or some form of the interactive technology in every classroom in this building by the end of the school year in 2012. Most importantly, our parents have noted that as well.”

All in all, in response to school redistricting, School Leader B stated, “Something that that we can all learn in the future and it’s not just to assess numbers, but to assess the culture that’s in place, the problems that are in place, and to have a plan on how to effectively transition those teachers to a newer environment in a positive way so that they are not running from something, but that they are actually going to something. I think in this most recent redistricting effort, this is being done effectively, and it’s a much different climate. So, I think those are important pieces to note, and I do think they have had a significant impact on some of the increased perceptions in particular areas”.

Interview Question 11: From your present vantage point, would you have done anything differently?

School leaders’ responses ranged from doing nothing differently to addressing several areas of the perception data of their individual schools. Coded themes that emerged from principals’ responses were Awareness, Demographics, Communication, and School Data. School Leader B noted, “I think the best way to say this is really kind of twofold; in the current state of development in our perception process and the way in which we are communicating these results from a district level to the local level. We are much further along in our appreciation of this data, so knowing what I know now, if I had
to go back, I probably would have had more of an awareness approach for the parents in terms of these themes. So, I think that when they are responding that is a large document with an extensive number of questions, I think that the themes can get lost. But, if we talked to the parents in a way where we communicate things we see as very important and we would really like to know their thoughts, we could increase positive perceptions of our schools. I think I would have made sure that we reached a broader audience not just a sampling, and I would have been a little bit more direct with all the parents. To be honest, we do this more extensively now in selecting a school principal. We go through a process that's pretty intense with the community input and the characteristics that they want to see in the principal. So, I think that I would have done a little bit more outreach looking back on it.”

Furthermore, School Leader C reported, “I would have involved more of my minority parents, more Hispanics, African American, and Asian parents. I should have gone out to them more. I should have met them where they are, because particularly the Hispanic parents, many of my Hispanic parents, and I don’t know this for a fact, but I got the impression that many of them were undocumented. I wish I would have done more of that for my African American community and for my Asian community. Now my Asian community, it was like they really weren’t a part of the school. They sent their kids to school, and for the most part those kids did very well, but when we had orchestra or band concerts or honors night at the school or whatever, very few Asian parents showed up. Now, it could have been that they were working, or maybe it’s a cultural thing, I don’t know, but I really wish I and my administrative team would have done more outreach to
our African American, Hispanic, and Asian communities. I should have done more outreach, and that would be one thing if I went back to School C or any school of that nature, that would be one of my first goals to do more outreach, go to their churches, go to their social clubs, and go to their places of business. Actually go meet and talk with them and introduce myself, invite them to come into the school. I am not talking about have an international night or anything like this, but just have something where if they didn’t come to school, the school was going to come to them. You know, if the mountain doesn’t come to Mohammad, Mohammad has got to go to the mountain. So I really should have done a better job of going and doing outreach to particularly my minority communities.”

In addition, School Leader D responded, “I would have networked as much as possible in the community, but School Leader E stated, “I don’t think so, but I have been a principal for 18 years. Either I am pretty good with what I do, or I am so bad that I can’t do anything else.”

Interview Question 12: What do you know now about parent perceptions of your school that you wish you had known before the redistricting?

All school leaders had a grasp of what parents’ perceptions were of their individual schools prior to and after redistricting occurred. School Leader A validated this statement by saying, “I think that it (data results) just backed up what we thought was going to happen.” Further, School Leader B said, “I think that I probably didn’t have this understanding of the choice elements that I have now from a communication standpoint and from a value based component of our district.”
Interview Question 13: What would you have done to be more proactive had you known what parent perceptions were prior to school redistricting?

This was an area in which all school leaders responded with something different in terms of how they would have been more proactive relating to parent perceptions prior to redistricting. Responses ranged from doing nothing to studying the demographics of their community. School Leader A said, “Looking back on it, I am not sure that there was anything thing else we could have done. We did our leg work ahead of time.” From a different perspective, School Leader B stated, “I probably would have worked a little more in how the parents were feeling.” School Leader C stated, I really wish I would have done is begun right from day one tallying all the great things about School C, because there were some issues that had to be addressed at School C, and so I failed in prioritizing those issues. Those issues had to be dealt with first before we dealt with perception and particularly the redistricting.” School Leader D said, “I would have increased networking amongst all stakeholders in the community,” and School Leader E said, “I wished that I had studied the demographics in this community a little tighter, so that I may have developed a little better understanding of this community. I went into this position a bit naïve. I thought that my natural work and affinity for getting along with folks would be enough to carry me.”

Interview Question 14: How did you build communication among parents?

All school leaders’ responses were directly tied into the coded themes of Communication and Outreach. School Leader A said, “I believe we were trying to just be as open as possible about what was going on with School A.” School Leader B stated,
“We did this in all our communications. We did speak to the choice issue, and we talked about if you have already established your enrollment in the school, you could stay if you are able to provide your own transportation, and we had parents who took advantage of that option.” School Leader C, School Leader D, and School Leader E shared the same beliefs. Specifically, School Leader C responded by saying, I am really big on having all different kinds of communication. We improved our website, and I attended every booster club meeting, and every parent meeting in the first couple of years that I was principal. I was at those meetings if it was a way possible.”

Interview Question 15: What advice would you offer to a principal opening a new school concerning parent perceptions?

All principals' responses were aligned with the coded themes of Authenticity, Awareness, and Outreach. According to School Leader A, “You have to understand that people are going to have different ideas and thoughts about what is really going on other than what you or I know about what is going on in our school. You have to pay attention to it, and you have to be as open as you can to the community.” “Be aware of the perceptions that the parents have coming in, and if you are already established, I think that it's also something that as you go through the process, you don’t want to see any of your perception items decrease. You want to at least sustain or increase your parent perceptions. It's hard to do that unless you know them, so I think knowing these perceptions is really important. Whether you are going through redistricting or not, to know your leadership perceptions, instructional perceptions, and operational perceptions, gives you a real indication of your effectiveness. You should monitor perceptions
continually, especially when you go through redistricting, because you have a new staff and essentially there is going to be a different dynamic than what you have been working with. So, you got to pay attention to the whole creation of the new team” (School Leader B).

Next, “The biggest thing is you need to bring the parents in. For those parents that don’t come in, you need to have some kind of outreach program for these parents. You have to have consistent guidelines, and you have to have consistent communication. If you have that, I think you are going to have an opportunity to bring more parents into the fold. When parents feel comfortable with you, and their kids feel comfortable with you, they feel more comfortable towards your school. Another important piece to know as a principal is that parents can influence how their kids feel about school” (School Leader C). “Know your community quickly and get to know who may have a large influence on the community” (School Leader D).

Last, “Perception is about 90% of what you see or hear, so be firm, tell the truth, and don’t keep any big time secrets. Next, demonstrate a willingness to listen; be a deep listener. Don’t hear what they have to say and the whole time they are saying it you are thinking you of your response. That’s not deep listening. Deep listening is really truly listening to them and trying to fit it into the grander scheme of things. Third, and this is important, you have to indicate a willingness and openness to be available and flexible enough to meet the needs of their schedule. Last, and most important, your school has got to be for kids. They’re what it’s all about! That’s so important to know that we are in the kid business” (School Leader E). In conclusion, “These are emotional times for parents
and students, and sometimes we forget just how important it is in picking their school for
their kids. We need to support and aide their decisions, but we don’t need to advice them
for our own personal benefits, and that’s a difficult thing sometimes” (School Leader B).

Research Question 4: How have selected school leaders responded to the increase
of parental concerns revealed through RBES perception survey themes after schools were
redistricted?

A paired samples $t$-test was calculated to determine the paired differences
between parental concerns of instruction, safety, discipline, leadership, communication,
technology, climate, citizenship, and facilities in schools before and after school
redistricting. Tables 4-12 show the means of paired differences, standard deviations, $t$
values, and $p$ values of seven comparisons. The data results show there were no
significant increases in the parental concerns of School A, School B, School C, School D
to School B, School B to School C, School E to School A, and School E to School B in
all the theme trends after schools were redistricted. School Leaders did not have
significant increases in parental concerns of their individual schools, but all school
leaders reported that if there were any significant increases, they would use problem
analysis, communication, outreach, and school data to address these concerns as
categorized in coded interview responses. Specifically, School Leader C said,
“Obviously, any time perceptions decreased (increased concern), even though it wasn’t a
significant decrease, it raised a little red flag, and once again we would ask ourselves why
do we think that the parent perception went down in a particular area? We also asked our
parents through school counsel, through PTSA, and through meetings, what do you really
think about School C? We would ask our parents, what can we do to make School C better?”

Summary

Chapter four was organized into Research Questions, Interview Questions, Mixed Methods Design Research, Findings (Quantitative then Qualitative), and a Chapter Summary. The RBES Perception Survey for Parents data were used as measurable statistical data to descriptively illustrate an increase or decrease in parental concerns of schools after redistricting occurred. These results were archival data received from the large urban public school district used in this study. Seven school leaders (principals) were contacted for participation in a 15 question structured interview used to evaluate school leaders’ responses to these data perception data concerning their individual schools after their schools were redistricted. Five out of seven (71%) school leaders agreed to participate in the structured interview. All school leaders chosen were the current principals in leadership when their individual schools were redistricted; two of the five agreed participants opened brand new schools as a result of this large urban public school districts redistricting effort. A paired samples t-test was used to describe if there was an increase or decrease in parental concerns of schools after redistricting took place. Further, school leaders were interviewed as to how they responded to these descriptive data results of their individual schools. Interview responses were coded then recoded (Test-Retest Method) and peer reviewed for reliability of responses. Seven themes emerged from principals’ responses; Communication, School Data, Awareness, Climate, Problem Analysis, Outreach, and Relationships. When needed, follow-up questions were
asked of school leaders for clarity and member checking was used for school leaders to validate their responses.

According to the RBES Perception Survey for Parents results computed using a paired samples $t$-test, there were no significant increases in parental concerns of schools after redistricting. All schools’ data revealed a significant decrease in parental concerns or no significant difference (increase or decrease) in parental concerns of schools after school were redistricted. Inferential statistics was applied to determine if there was a significant increase or decrease in parental concerns before and after school redistricting by using a paired samples $t$-test in SPSS. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis for the first research question and failed to reject the null hypothesis for the second research question. As mentioned, after coding school leaders’ interview responses, seven themes emerged from their responses. School responses varied in many ways based on their leadership styles, but all school leaders specifically stressed the importance of community outreach as schools undergo redistricting efforts. Community outreach was the core theme that served as the vehicle for driving other themes and how school leaders communicated to parents and other community members. All in all, school leaders responded that their ability or failed ability to communicate their vision, mission, and expectations for students to all stakeholders (parents, students, and teachers) determined the increase or decrease in parental perceptions of their individual schools after redistricting occurred, because “A parent's perception is their reality” (School Leader A).
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter five provides an analysis of parents’ concerns of schools through the lenses of the RBES Perception Survey for Parents after school redistricting, and further examines school leaders’ responses to parental concerns after school redistricting. This research study used a mix methods design with a collection of archival data in the RBES Perception Survey for Parents (quantitative) and structured interview responses from school leaders in response to parental concerns of their individual schools (qualitative). Parents chosen to participate in the RBES Perception Survey for Parents were randomly selected, and school leaders selected to participate in a structured interview were sitting principals during the time of school redistricting; all located and residing in a large urban public school district in the southeast region of the United States. RBES Perception Survey for Parents data and school leaders structured interview responses drives the discussion, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for this study.

Summary of the Study

To many Americans today, the current issues of school rezoning and school redistricting have highlighted arguments concerning the equality of student resources, facilities, student achievement, and quality of neighborhoods (Kane et al., 2005). Organizations must create feedback systems that will allow organizations to evaluate their own practices (Deming, 1982; Fleming & Asplund, 2007), because parents’
perception towards a school and their behaviors can impact how their student learns at school, and can affect school leaders' ability to lead and teachers' ability to teach students (Anderson & Minke, 2007). This study examined parental concerns of schools through the lenses of the RBES Perception Survey for Parents after school redistricting, and further examined school principals’ responses to perception survey data after school redistricting. According to Caro et al. (2004), when a school district establishes new attendance zones that carelessly divide neighborhoods, such an effort will create problems for the school district, and parents, students, and others impacted by this change will cause a rift. As school attendance lines are redrawn, parents concern for their student’s safety and the balancing of test scores can also present problems for school districts (desJardins et al., 2007).

The purpose for performing this study was to provide an empirical study to the body of literature that explores redistricting initiatives, examines school leaders’ responses to parental concerns of their schools after redistricting occurs, and potentially establish proactive steps to eliminate or reduce negative parent perceptions or sustain positive parent perceptions of schools after redistricting takes place. Upon conducting a paired samples t-test of parental concerns revealed through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents, data results revealed there were no significant increases in parent concerns of schools after schools were redistricted. Upon coding school leaders’ structured interview responses, seven themes emerged; Communication, School data, Awareness, Climate, Outreach, Problem Analysis, and Relationships.
Discussion of the Major Findings

School choice and educational accountability have raised the stakes for public school districts, and school districts need to examine different approaches on how to best serve the students, teachers, and parents of their individual school districts (Brown & Cooper, 2000). Alongside school quality, organizations must create feedback systems that will allow organizations to evaluate their own practices (Deming, 1982; Fleming & Asplund, 2007). Quality Management theorists state that organizations must create feedback systems in order to monitor the progress and perceptions of its organizations (Deming, 1982). As a result, this large urban public school district implemented the RBES Perception Survey for Parents that examines parents’ concerns of schools in this district. Upon performing a paired samples $t$-test of perception results from 2000-2009, results revealed that there were no significant increases in parental concerns of schools in the nine RBES Perception Survey theme areas after school redistricting took place in this large urban public school district. Perception data were evaluated on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). School leader interviews were coded and categorized into seven theme areas; communication, school data, awareness, climate, outreach, problem analysis, and relationships. These themes were revealed throughout school leaders’ responses to the RBES Perception Survey for Parents data of their individual school.

In the RBES Perception Survey theme area of instruction, the majority of schools had a significant decrease in parental concerns after schools were redistricted. These data revealed that the majority of parents surveyed had no major concerns about the quality of
instruction their child was receiving after redistricting occurred in their school attendance zone. School Leader (B) attributed results to the fact that this large urban public school district allows for parents and students to choose which school they will attend when schools are redistricted. Therefore, granting parents and students the option as to whether or not they wanted to remain at their current school increased the perceptions of that particular school and decreased the level of concern parents had about instruction, because their students were attending schools they wanted to attend and neighborhoods were not being split. In fact, School Leader (B) said, “We did speak to the choice issue, and we talked about if you have already established your enrollment in the school, you could stay if you are able to provide your own transportation, and we had parents who took advantage of that option.” If academic achievement and neighborhood attributes change as a result of school districts rezoning attendance lines, parents will consider moving their children to a school or neighborhood that exhibits high academic achievement (Hastings et al., 2005). According to Sinha et al., (2005), neighborhood schools produce high performing students when those students attend schools with children from their own neighborhoods. Results revealed that parents have a working knowledge of the curriculum provided in this school district, believe their student is learning what is expect of them to learn, believes assignments issued to students are appropriate, and they believe that the overall quality of education in their local neighborhood school is high. According to Deming (1986), quality is achieved when a customer’s satisfaction needs are met, and the expectation level of an organization exceeds that of the customer. Crosby (1979) notes that quality is built around the
standards of an organization, deviation from standards are unacceptable, and that organizations’ standards must be clear and understandable to all stakeholders (Crosby, 1979). Last, Juran (1951) suggests that quality is quite simple; quality is achieved when a customer is satisfied.

According to data results revealed through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents and School Leader interviews in the areas of safety, discipline, and citizenship, there were either no significant differences (increase or decrease) in parental concerns or there were significant decreases in parental concerns. In the theme area of safety, data results revealed the majority of schools identified in this study had no significant difference in parental concerns after school were redistricted. Although three comparisons of parental concerns revealed there was a significant decrease in parental concerns after schools were redistricted. The safety theme remained constant in the 3 (agree) range throughout redistricting efforts in this large urban public school district. Parents agreed that that the schools their students’ attend are safe schools, and they agreed that this large urban public school district provides safe transportation for their students. Parents concern for their student’s safety can present problems for school districts (desJardins et al., 2007), but data results revealed that there were no significant increase or decrease in parental concern. All data revealed that parents agreed their students’ schools were safe.

In relationship to the RBES Perception Survey theme areas of safety and discipline and school leaders’ interview responses to those data, “Safety is not typically a concern due to the consistent and effective manner in which school discipline is applied
and enforced, and in the way it’s communicated. The students who attend schools in this large urban public school district overall believe their schools are safe. So, whether they are going to a new school or they are staying at their current school, safety is pretty consistent” (School Leader B). Discipline results revealed that the majority of schools in this study had no significant difference in parental concerns due to policies and procedures put into place for students. Parents agreed that students demonstrate positive behaviors that are conducive for learning, school leaders worked collaboratively to generate positive student behaviors, and administrators are fair in dealing with discipline issues at their particular schools. Three school comparisons data revealed that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns of schools in relationship to discipline.

RBES Perception Survey for Parents citizenship theme results revealed that the majority of schools in this study had a significant decrease in parental concerns. Two schools’ data results revealed there was no significant difference in parental concerns. In school leader interview responses to those data, “Citizenship goes directly back to choice again. Parents feel good about being in their school of choice, and they make assumptions that it’s just a better environment for their kids to develop the citizenship component” (School Leader B). Once again, parents agreed that students demonstrate positive behaviors that are conducive for learning, students are taught and practice a respect for self and other stakeholders in their school, and students are taught and practice positive citizenship traits in their schools. According to Sinha et al. (2005), neighborhood schools produce high performing students when those students attend schools with children from their own neighborhoods, which in turn, inspires students to meet a
positive standard that has been set by parents and school leaders in the building (Sinha et al., 2005).

According to data results revealed through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents and School Leader interviews in response to those data in the areas of facilities, technology, and communication there were significant decreases or no significant differences in parental concerns. With facilities, parents had a decrease in concerns of the schools their students attend. Only one school’s data revealed that there was no significant difference in parental concerns of facilities. According to Chandler (2006a), facilities are being built that eventually furnishes relief to overcrowded schools, and parents are satisfied with new facilities. According to school leaders interviewed in this study, technology correlated to facility concerns. Parents wanted the same technology opportunities for their students that new schools were offering to their students. The same as in the RBES Perception Survey theme area of facilities, parents’ data revealed that there was a significant decrease in concerns of technology being offered at their students’ school. However, School Leader C pointed out that parents feel “when a new school is opened up, they have got all the new amenities and the new paint. One of the biggest problems that any school has when they are being split or some of their student body is being redistricted to another school, is there is a perception and attitude by many parents, community members, teachers, and students that they are taking away from an existing school and giving to a new school.” The decrease in concerns attributed to the retrofits in current schools that occur in this large urban public school district any time a new school is opened. In addition, the county responded with upgrading technology in local schools
and provided schools with state-of-the-art facilities or improved the current technology of local schools that were not new. School Leader E said the biggest factor that increased decreased parental concerns of his school was the fact that it was something that was brand new.

According to parental concerns revealed in the RBES Perception Survey for Parents theme area of communication, the majority of parents agreed that schools clearly outline parent and student expectations, the manner in which school leaders respond to parental concerns are feasible, and school leaders use multiple resources to communicate to parents. In order to generate valuable input from the community members that have undergone redistricting initiatives due to overcrowded schools and inadequate facility usage, symposiums must be established that will allow community stakeholders an opportunity to voice their opinion (Diamond, 2007; Silverman, 2007). In response, data results revealed that there was a significant decrease in parental concerns in the theme area of communication. If families are involved in redistricting plans, the acceptance of such plans greatly increases (Diamond, 2007; Pasciak, 2007; Silverman, 2007). Although some parents may not agree with decisions made about redistricting, parents appreciate being involved in the planning process (Pasciak, 2007; Silverman, 2007). All school leaders interviewed in their responses to school data in this study stated that they had to build and maintain constant communication with parents. Specifically, School Leader E stated, “One of our strategic plans is to increase our community stakeholder awareness annually, conduct focus groups, and upgraded our outreach in the community.”
According to parental concerns revealed in the RBES Perception Survey for Parents theme area of climate, data results revealed parents agreed that their local schools' approach to conflict resolution is sufficient, parental involvement is encouraged, students are recognized for positive behaviors and performances, parental concerns are revealed in leadership decisions, and relationships amongst students and school leaders are highly encouraged. The majority of data revealed that there were no significant differences in parental concerns in the area of climate after schools were redistricted. All schools were in the 3 (agree) range of the Likert scale survey used in this study.

Literature review involving communication directly tied into the literature review for school climate. However, in school leader interviews conducted in this study, all school leaders attributed community outreach to the decrease or sustainment of parental concerns. As mentioned by School Leader B, school choice attributes to a decrease in concerns, because, “If you go where you want to go, whether that’s the school that’s already in existence or the new school, your perception of what is happening at the school is probably a little bit more positive.” The increase or decrease in parental concerns of schools depends on the school climate of that individual school (School Leader D).

One particular point made by all school leaders if they had the opportunity to do anything differently would be to perform more community outreach to minority families. According to Dillon (2007), there are major racial concerns that form as a result of school redistricting. Specifically, School Leader C said, “I would have involved more of my minority parents, more Hispanics, African American, and Asian parents. I should have gone out to them more. I should have met them where they are, because particularly, and
I don’t know this for a fact, but I got the impression that many of my Hispanic parents were undocumented. I wish I would have done more of that for my African American community and for my Asian community.” When evaluating the concerns of parents dealing with racial leveling, Fahey (2007) states that this measure is something that school systems do not have to legally address, but as leaders, ethics is the valuable component that should not be overlooked. Another injustice reported by Chandler (2006b) was the fact non-English speaking community members were excluded from any redistricting discussions because no services were provided to get the information out to non-English speakers. As a result, School Leader E stated, “I wished that I had studied the demographics in this community a little tighter, so that I may have developed a little better understanding of this community.”

Last, according to parental concerns revealed in the RBES Perception Survey for Parents theme area of leadership, data results revealed that parents agreed their local schools’ approach to conflict resolution was sufficient and timely, parental involvement was encouraged, and school leaders collaborated to encourage good behaviors amongst students. The majority of data revealed that there were no significant differences in parental concerns in the area of leadership after schools were redistricted. All schools were in the 3 (agree) range of the Likert scale survey used in this study. All school leaders interviewed in this study mentioned that they must continuously monitor school-wide perceptions and management of their individual schools. Accordingly, Deming (1986) and other researchers (Crosby, 1979; Juran, 1951) quality management derived from three different areas of study. First, quality management is based on how much a
quality leader contributes to the organization. Second, quality management derived from empirical measurement studies developed to improve organizational performances. Last, quality management derived from assessment models used to evaluate organizational performances (Abdulah et al., 2008; Crosby, 1979; Deming, 1986; Juran, 1951). All school leaders responded that their ability or failed ability to communicate their vision, mission, and expectations for students to all stakeholders determined the increase or decrease in parental perceptions of their individual schools after redistricting occurred, because “A parent's perception is their reality” (School Leader A).

All in all, there were a few important leadership tips that school leaders interviewed in this study provided for principals opening new schools. First, “Whether you are going through redistricting or not, to know your leadership perceptions, instructional perceptions, and operational perceptions, gives you a real indication of your effectiveness. You should monitor perceptions continually, especially when you go through redistricting” (School Leader B). Second, “The biggest thing is you need to bring the parents in. For those parents that don’t come in, you need to have some kind of outreach program for these parents. You have to have consistent guidelines, and you have to have consistent communication. If you have that, I think you are going to have an opportunity to bring more parents into the fold” (School Leader C). A parents’ perceptions towards a school and their behaviors can impact how their student learns at school, and can affect school leaders’ ability to lead and teachers’ ability to teach students (Anderson & Minke, 2007), but “when parents feel comfortable with you, and their kids feel comfortable with you, they feel more comfortable towards your school”
Last, school leaders must recognize that “your school has got to be for kids. They’re what it’s all about! That’s so important to know that we are in the kid business” (School Leader E). “These are emotional times for parents and students, and sometimes we forget just how important it is in picking their school for their kids. We need to support and aide their decisions” (School Leader B).

Conclusions

This study examined parental concerns of schools through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents before and after school redistricting, and further examined school leaders’ responses to perception data before and after school redistricting of their individual school. Nine theme areas were categorized the RBES Perception Survey for Parents; instruction, safety, discipline, leadership, communication, technology, climate, citizenship, and facilities. School leaders that agreed to participate in this study were interviewed, and all responses were coded and categorized into seven themes; communication, school data, awareness, climate, outreach, problem analysis, and relationships. School leaders’ responses, supported the findings in this study. As mentioned, purpose for performing this study was to add an empirical study to the body of literature that explores redistricting initiatives, examines school leaders’ responses to parental concerns of their schools after redistricting occurs, and potentially establish proactive steps to eliminate or reduce negative parent perceptions or sustain positive parent perceptions of schools after redistricting takes place. Overall, results from this study revealed that there were no significant increases in parental concerns of schools after schools were redistricted.
All data results revealed a significant decrease in parental concerns or there were no significant differences in parental concerns of schools after redistricting occurred. Every result that revealed no significant difference showed a response rate in the 3 (agree) range of the Likert scale survey used in this study. According to data results revealed in the study, parents maintained or increased a positive perception of schools that were redistricted in this large urban public school district. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis for research question one and failed to reject the null hypothesis for research question two.

Data results in the RBES Perception Survey theme area of instruction revealed there were no significant decreases in parental concerns. School leaders’ responses fell in the categorized coded theme of communication, school data, and climate. This large urban public school district affords parents the opportunity to choose which school their students will attend if they are currently attending a school that is to be redistricted. According to school leaders, school choice benefits redistricting efforts, because parents may already feel strongly about the level of instruction being offered at a given school, and they are given the opportunity to keep their students at that given school. School leaders continued to disaggregate school data to community members, and their students were allowed to stay in their neighborhood school. Research supported data results revealed in this study, because neighborhood schools produce high performing students when those students attend schools with children from their own neighborhoods (Sinha et al., 2005).
According to data results in the RBES Perception Survey theme area of safety, discipline, and citizenship revealed there were either no significant differences (increase or decrease) in parental concerns or there were significant decreases in parental concerns. School leaders' responses fell in the categorized coded theme of communication, problem analysis, relationships, and climate. Parents believed that the schools their students attend were safe. School leaders reported that the decrease in parental concerns for school discipline was attributed to the manner in which school leaders handled discipline issues. Parents agreed that school leaders were fair and school leaders believed that there was a high level of consistency in how discipline interventions were implemented in schools. School leaders believed that citizenship was directly related to school choice, because students were able to remain in an environment where they felt comfortable, or students who were perceived as being negative had an opportunity to develop fresh perceptions of their behaviors at a new school. Research supported the findings in this study by suggesting that students are inspired to meet positive standards set by parents and school leaders in the building when allowed to remain in neighborhood schools (Sinha et al., 2005).

Data results in the theme area of climate and communication revealed there were no significant differences and significant decreases respectively in parental concerns. School leaders' responses fell in the categorized coded theme of communication, outreach, relationships, and climate. Parents agreed that school leaders listened to their concerns, communicated options for school choice, and kept them aware of events that were taking place in their local schools. School leaders increased community
involvement and specifically increased their outreach to all stakeholders. Researchers supported the findings by stating that some parents may not agree with decisions made about redistricting, but parents appreciate being involved in the planning process (Pasciak, 2007; Silverman, 2007).

Data results in the theme area of facilities and technology revealed there were significant decreases in parental concerns. School leaders’ responses fell in the categorized coded theme of communication and problem analysis. Parents had a positive perception about the facilities and technology of their current and new schools. Parents’ beliefs were attributed to the fact that schools were new, and they knew that new schools would have advanced technology. School leaders believed the decreased concerns of current schools attributed to the county responding to the outcry of parents wanting improvements made to their current schools. In response, this large urban public school district performed retrofits with technology and renovated older facilities in current schools after redistricting took place. Research suggested that parents knew that new schools had to be built to relieve overcrowded schools and they were satisfied with newer facilities (Chandler, 2006a).

Data results in the theme area of leadership revealed there were no significant differences in parental concerns. School leaders’ responses fell into all of the categorized coded themes. Parents believed in the school leaders appointed to the position of principal. Parents agreed that the mission, vision, and expectations of their local school were effectively communicated, and they felt that school leaders invited parental concerns of their local school. School leaders were consistent, fair, and demonstrated the
ability to keep parents well informed. School leaders' ability to manage the quality and perceptions of their schools attributed to the increase or decrease in parental concerns. Research suggested that school leaders improved organizational performances (Deming, 1986).

Implications

The data results and responses to school leader structured interview questions have revealed several implications for this study. The results of this study will provide school districts an opportunity to better understand parent perceptions of schools before and after school redistricting, and the results will allow for school districts to understand how school leaders are forced to respond to parent concerns of their individual schools prior to and after school redistricting. School districts undergoing school redistricting may expand additional knowledge into improving practices for preparing school leaders how to respond to parental concerns of schools prior to and after school redistricting, and school districts may be able to put into place more effective ways in going about redistricting initiatives.

Current issues of school rezoning and school redistricting have highlighted arguments concerning the equality of student resources, facilities, student achievement, and quality of neighborhoods (Kane et al., 2005). Understanding that parents' perceptions towards a school and their behaviors can impact how their student learns at school, and can affect school leaders' ability to lead and teachers' ability to teach students (Anderson & Minke, 2007), evaluating parental concerns of schools before and after redistricting are greatly beneficial to school district officials in charge of making such decisions that
would bring about a change school attendance zones. As mentioned by the majority of schools leaders interviewed in this study, they were unaware of parent perceptions and concerns of their schools prior to becoming principal.

According to School Leader B in this study, “Over the years, these data have become more and more important as we gauge the level of effectiveness for principals and their leadership in terms of the community, staff, and students,” so having an informed understanding of the perceptions and concerns of their communities would be a tremendous benefit to school leaders undergoing redistricting efforts. School districts would be better served by informing school leaders of such parental concerns before they become principals of schools. Although data results revealed there were no significant increases in parental concerns of schools after redistricting occurred, school districts can resolve potential parental concerns by implementing processes that allow for schools leaders to create leadership goals in addressing parental concerns as a part of the hiring process in selecting school principals. According to school leader responses, the majority of them had to be reactive to parental concerns instead of being proactive in designing ways to improve or sustain parental concerns.

Furthermore, having knowledge of parents’ parental concerns of schools would benefit school officials by examining advantageous increases or negative decreases in parental concerns that can be avoided or continued by forming redistricting focus groups, community outreach groups, and change parent perceptions of public education in their area. According to Martin (2009), school leaders need to understand parent perceptions as it relates to their particular school. With these findings, it would benefit school leaders in
improving efforts towards eliminating any barriers in parental concerns that would prevent students from being successful and school leaders from establishing positive learning environments in new schools or original schools impacted by redistricting initiatives.

Recommendations for Future Research

Upon conducting this study, a few recommendations for future study surfaced as the researcher examined other potential causes of parental concerns when involving school redistricting initiatives.

1. Although, “Brown v. Board of Education has rightly become one of this nation’s foremost legal doctrines and an attempt to encourage the nation to reach a consensus on how to best achieve integrated public schools” (Crossland, 2004, p. 428), Brown v. Board of Education brought more attention to public opinion as to what is fair and equal for all students as this case relates to education (Ansolone & Biafora, 2004). A recommendation for future study would be to examine societal perceptions towards school redistricting as it relates to segregation and desegregation. This study would examine if past negative experiences throughout history involving Civil Rights attributes to negative perceptions of current school redistricting practices. This study would look deeper into determining whether or not people perceive redistricting as just another way to gerrymander attendance lines regardless of how the majority of redistricting initiatives are used to improve school quality.
2. This study examines the RBES Perception Survey for Parents. In actuality, the entire RBES Perception Survey involves students and teachers as well. A recommendation for future study would be to conduct this study utilizing perception survey data from students and teachers. This study would involve gathering literature based on students’ and teachers’ perceptions of schools. However, the same literature involving school redistricting can be used. This study would examine how students and teachers perceive the schools in which they attend or work. This study could benefit school leaders involved in planning redistricting, because the students and teachers are the ones that have to attend or work in these schools, and their perceptions are not examined in the current study. Having an understanding of students’ and teachers’ perceptions could impact how redistricting occurs in a given school district.

3. Currently, in relationship to closeness, convenience, and student achievement, parents value their students attending neighborhood schools, but if academic achievement and neighborhood attributes change as a result of school districts rezoning attendance lines, parents will consider moving their children to a school or neighborhood that exhibits high academic achievement (Hastings et al., 2006). According to the findings of the current study, parents were provided an opportunity of school choice when redistricting occurred. A recommendation for future study would be to examine the perception of parents and students that were forced to rezone without the option of school choice. In essence, they were forced to attend schools that may not have been of their choosing. This study would
further examine if parental concerns increased when their students are forced to attend schools they do not want to attend.

Summary

According to Caro et al. (2004), when a school district establishes new attendance zones that carelessly divide neighborhoods, such an effort will create problems for the school district, and parents, students, and others impacted by this change will cause a rift. Current issues of school rezoning and school redistricting have highlighted arguments concerning the equality of student resources, facilities, student achievement, and quality of neighborhoods (Kane et al., 2005). This study examined parental concerns of schools through the RBES Perception Survey for Parents before and after school redistricting, and further examined school leaders' responses to perception data before and after school redistricting. The RBES Perception Survey for Parents data were used as measurable statistical data to descriptively illustrate an increase or decrease in parental concerns of schools before and after redistricting occurred, and structured interviews were used to qualitatively examine school leaders' responses to perception data of their individual school before and after redistricting.

Overall, there were no significant increases in parental concerns of schools after redistricting occurred. Data results revealed that parents maintained or increase a positive perception of schools that were redistricted in this large urban public school district. Parents indicated that school leaders provided a high level of instructional quality, were consistent and fair with student services, and demonstrated the ability to keep parents well informed of school activities, school choice, and redistricting efforts. School leaders’
believed their ability to manage school quality and perceptions of their schools attributed to the decrease in parental concerns. The results of this study suggests that school districts will be provided an additional to the body of literature that will assist school leaders in having a better understanding of parental concerns of schools before and after school redistricting. In addition, it would be beneficial for school district leaders to understand how school leaders are forced to respond to parental concerns of their individual schools relating to parent perception data prior to and after school redistricting. School districts undergoing school redistricting may expand additional knowledge into improving practices for preparing school leaders how to respond to parental concerns of schools prior to and after school redistricting, and school districts may be able to put into place more effective ways in going about redistricting initiatives. Recommendations for future study include examining the impact that desegregation and segregation may have on society’s perceptions of redistricting, conducting a continuation of this study from the perspective of students and teachers, and examining the perception of parents and students that have gone through redistricting without being offered the opportunity of school choice.
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My name is Reuben Jovon Gresham, and I am currently a doctoral candidate at Mercer University, and my dissertation topic is a study of parent perceptions of schools before and after redistricting and implications for school leaders. My study has been approved by GCPS Office of Research and Evaluation under the following limitations:

• "This study could be useful for principals of existing and new schools, and may therefore be of value for the numerous redistricting events anticipated in the near future for GCPS.
• Examining trends in parent perceptions of schools experiencing redistricting in the past may provide additional context for the findings of the current investigation. They may also offer some level of reassurance to families who are experiencing redistricting for the first time.
• Quantitative and qualitative data should complement each other in the design of this mixed-methods study.
• While it may be difficult to attribute differences in parent perceptions to the redistricting of the school, any differences observed should help to focus future research on the same topic" (GCPS Office of Research and Evaluation, 2009).

I order to complete the qualitative process of my mixed methods study, I am requesting your permission to participate in a 15 question interview that will take approximately 45-60 minutes. Based on an analysis of the RBES Perception Survey of Parents data, I will determine if there is an increase or decrease in concerns emerging from parents’ responses. With this, I am interviewing school leaders about their awareness and responses to parent perception data.

Upon completion of the interview, responses will be transcribed, and you will receive a copy of your responses to confirm the information being reported (member checking). In generating the final report, all of your responses will be confidential, and there are no risks involved in participating in this study. Please know you are not obligated to participate. This interview is voluntary.

Interviews will take place during the months of January and February, and interview times will strictly be based on your availability. Member checking process will be completed by the end of
February and you will be sent a final copy of the transcribed interview. Please see the following attachments: GCPS Research and Evaluation research approval letter (File ID 2010-23) and National Institute of Health Certificate of Completion (Certification Number: 53168).

If you have any questions pertaining to this study, please contact me at 770-362-9176.

Thank you very much,

Reuben Jovon Gresham
Assistant Principal,
Doctoral Candidate, Mercer University
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DETAILED RBES PERCEPTION SURVEY FOR PARENTS PAIRED SAMPLES T-

TEST RESULTS FOR ALL SCHOOLS
RBES PERCEPTION SURVEY FOR PARENTS PAIRED SAMPLES *T-TEST*
RESULTS FOR SCHOOL A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Instruction Theme Before - Instruction Theme After</td>
<td>-15.600</td>
<td>.05273</td>
<td>.02358</td>
<td>-2.2147</td>
<td>-.0953</td>
<td>-6.016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Safety Theme Before - Safety Theme After</td>
<td>-10.400</td>
<td>.18447</td>
<td>.08250</td>
<td>-3.3305</td>
<td>.12505</td>
<td>-1.281</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 Discipline Theme Before - Discipline Theme After</td>
<td>-5.200</td>
<td>.05718</td>
<td>.02557</td>
<td>-1.2300</td>
<td>.01900</td>
<td>-2.033</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4 Leadership Theme Before - Leadership Theme After</td>
<td>-4.800</td>
<td>.04494</td>
<td>.02010</td>
<td>-1.0381</td>
<td>.00781</td>
<td>-2.388</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5 Communication Theme Before - Communication Theme After</td>
<td>-6.000</td>
<td>.06000</td>
<td>.02236</td>
<td>-1.2208</td>
<td>.00208</td>
<td>-2.893</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6 Technology Theme Before - Technology Theme After</td>
<td>-18.800</td>
<td>.11389</td>
<td>.05093</td>
<td>-3.2941</td>
<td>-.0459</td>
<td>-6.091</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7 Climate Theme Before - Climate Theme After</td>
<td>-5.600</td>
<td>.07839</td>
<td>.03501</td>
<td>-1.5322</td>
<td>.04122</td>
<td>-1.599</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8 Citizenship Theme Before - Citizenship Theme After</td>
<td>-10.600</td>
<td>.20985</td>
<td>.09369</td>
<td>-3.6669</td>
<td>.15469</td>
<td>-1.129</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9 Facilities Theme Before - Facilities Theme After</td>
<td>-4.800</td>
<td>.02854</td>
<td>.01281</td>
<td>-0.8356</td>
<td>-.01244</td>
<td>-3.748</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Paired Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Theme Before</th>
<th>Theme After</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Instruction Theme</td>
<td>Instruction Theme</td>
<td>-.21600</td>
<td>.05883</td>
<td>.02542</td>
<td>-2.857</td>
<td>-.14543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Safety Theme</td>
<td>Safety Theme</td>
<td>-.18000</td>
<td>.09837</td>
<td>.07930</td>
<td>-2.906</td>
<td>.02906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>Discipline Theme</td>
<td>Discipline Theme</td>
<td>-.19000</td>
<td>.09301</td>
<td>.04158</td>
<td>-3.054</td>
<td>-.07452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>Leadership Theme</td>
<td>Leadership Theme</td>
<td>-.19600</td>
<td>.05320</td>
<td>.22379</td>
<td>-2.620</td>
<td>-1.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>Communication Theme</td>
<td>Communication Theme</td>
<td>-.24000</td>
<td>.05507</td>
<td>.15886</td>
<td>-2.575</td>
<td>-.17045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>Technology Theme</td>
<td>Technology Theme</td>
<td>-.18600</td>
<td>.06025</td>
<td>.02894</td>
<td>-2.608</td>
<td>-1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7</td>
<td>Climate Theme</td>
<td>Climate Theme</td>
<td>-.20200</td>
<td>.06834</td>
<td>.03056</td>
<td>-2.889</td>
<td>-.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>Citizenship Theme</td>
<td>Citizenship Theme</td>
<td>-.19000</td>
<td>.11402</td>
<td>.05098</td>
<td>-3.315</td>
<td>-.04843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9</td>
<td>Facilities Theme</td>
<td>Facilities Theme</td>
<td>-.14600</td>
<td>.05177</td>
<td>.02315</td>
<td>-2.102</td>
<td>-.08172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired Samples Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paired Differences</strong></td>
<td><strong>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Instruction Theme Before - Instruction Theme After</td>
<td>-.03250</td>
<td>.04031</td>
<td>.02016</td>
<td>-.09664</td>
<td>.03164</td>
<td>-1.812</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Safety Theme Before - Safety Theme After</td>
<td>.05250</td>
<td>.10012</td>
<td>.05006</td>
<td>-.10862</td>
<td>2.1182</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 Discipline Theme Before - Discipline Theme After</td>
<td>.08000</td>
<td>.11136</td>
<td>.05668</td>
<td>-.09719</td>
<td>.25719</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4 Leadership Theme Before - Leadership Theme After</td>
<td>-.38500</td>
<td>.47221</td>
<td>.23511</td>
<td>-1.13321</td>
<td>.36321</td>
<td>-1.838</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5 Communication Theme Before - Communication Theme After</td>
<td>-.03000</td>
<td>.07703</td>
<td>.03851</td>
<td>-.15257</td>
<td>.09257</td>
<td>-.779</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6 Technology Theme Before - Technology Theme After</td>
<td>-.03500</td>
<td>.10214</td>
<td>.05107</td>
<td>-.19753</td>
<td>.12153</td>
<td>-.655</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7 Climate Theme Before - Climate Theme After</td>
<td>.05000</td>
<td>.07118</td>
<td>.03559</td>
<td>-.08326</td>
<td>.16326</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8 Citizenship Theme Before - Citizenship Theme After</td>
<td>.00500</td>
<td>.07853</td>
<td>.03926</td>
<td>-.11996</td>
<td>.12996</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9 Facilities Theme Before - Facilities Theme After</td>
<td>-.04500</td>
<td>.12897</td>
<td>.06449</td>
<td>-.16022</td>
<td>.25022</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Instruction Theme Before</th>
<th>Instruction Theme After</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>0.3109</td>
<td>0.31555</td>
<td>-0.26500</td>
<td>0.03109</td>
<td>0.01555</td>
<td>-0.31447</td>
<td>-0.21533</td>
<td>-17.047</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>0.08770</td>
<td>0.04386</td>
<td>-0.28750</td>
<td>0.08770</td>
<td>0.04386</td>
<td>-0.42705</td>
<td>-0.14795</td>
<td>-6.556</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>0.00577</td>
<td>0.02086</td>
<td>-0.27500</td>
<td>0.00577</td>
<td>0.01038</td>
<td>-0.28419</td>
<td>-0.26581</td>
<td>-9.563</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4</td>
<td>0.06164</td>
<td>0.03082</td>
<td>-0.21000</td>
<td>0.06164</td>
<td>0.03082</td>
<td>-0.30609</td>
<td>-0.11191</td>
<td>-6.813</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5</td>
<td>0.05902</td>
<td>0.02901</td>
<td>-0.21500</td>
<td>0.05902</td>
<td>0.02901</td>
<td>-0.30733</td>
<td>-0.12287</td>
<td>-7.411</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6</td>
<td>0.08347</td>
<td>0.04781</td>
<td>-0.41500</td>
<td>0.08347</td>
<td>0.04173</td>
<td>-0.54781</td>
<td>-0.28219</td>
<td>-9.944</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7</td>
<td>0.05052</td>
<td>0.02926</td>
<td>-0.29750</td>
<td>0.05052</td>
<td>0.02926</td>
<td>-0.39062</td>
<td>-0.20428</td>
<td>-10.167</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8</td>
<td>0.02754</td>
<td>0.01777</td>
<td>-0.33250</td>
<td>0.02754</td>
<td>0.01377</td>
<td>-0.37632</td>
<td>-0.28868</td>
<td>-24.149</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9</td>
<td>0.10231</td>
<td>0.05115</td>
<td>-0.50000</td>
<td>0.10231</td>
<td>0.05115</td>
<td>-0.65279</td>
<td>-0.33721</td>
<td>-9.775</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RBES PERCEPTION SURVEY FOR PARENTS PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST
RESULTS FOR SCHOOL D TO SCHOOL C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Instruction Theme Before - Instruction Theme After</td>
<td>-1.0000</td>
<td>.04030</td>
<td>.02415</td>
<td>-2.3696</td>
<td>-2.0831</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Safety Theme Before - Safety Theme After</td>
<td>-2.1000</td>
<td>.13589</td>
<td>.06795</td>
<td>-4.2623</td>
<td>.06233</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 Discipline Theme Before - Discipline Theme After</td>
<td>-1.0250</td>
<td>.07228</td>
<td>.03614</td>
<td>-2.1752</td>
<td>.01252</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4 Leadership Theme Before - Leadership Theme After</td>
<td>-1.0580</td>
<td>.09505</td>
<td>.04252</td>
<td>-2.3033</td>
<td>.04033</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5 Communication Theme Before - Communication Theme After</td>
<td>-1.2500</td>
<td>.04455</td>
<td>.02277</td>
<td>-2.3371</td>
<td>-.02299</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6 Technology Theme Before - Technology Theme After</td>
<td>-2.5500</td>
<td>.08813</td>
<td>.04408</td>
<td>-3.9523</td>
<td>-.11477</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7 Climate Theme Before - Climate Theme After</td>
<td>-1.6750</td>
<td>.11730</td>
<td>.05865</td>
<td>-3.5414</td>
<td>.01914</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8 Citizenship Theme Before - Citizenship Theme After</td>
<td>-1.2750</td>
<td>.07365</td>
<td>.03683</td>
<td>-2.3970</td>
<td>-.06530</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9 Facilities Theme Before - Facilities Theme After</td>
<td>-4.0500</td>
<td>.10116</td>
<td>.05058</td>
<td>-5.6589</td>
<td>-2.4483</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RBES PERCEPTION SURVEY FOR PARENTS PAIRED SAMPLES *T-TEST*
RESULTS FOR SCHOOL E TO SCHOOL A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Instruction Theme Before</td>
<td>-1.9800</td>
<td>.06171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Instruction Theme After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Safety Theme Before</td>
<td>-1.8600</td>
<td>.17712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Safety Theme After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 Discipline Theme Before</td>
<td>-1.5600</td>
<td>.14325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Discipline Theme After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4 Leadership Theme</td>
<td>-1.2000</td>
<td>.12384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before - Leadership Theme After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5 Communication Theme Before</td>
<td>-1.5600</td>
<td>.09576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communication Theme After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6 Technology Theme Before</td>
<td>-3.5000</td>
<td>.03937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technology Theme After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7 Climate Theme Before</td>
<td>-1.8200</td>
<td>.15304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Climate Theme After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 8 Citizenship Theme Before</td>
<td>-1.3000</td>
<td>.04682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Citizenship Theme After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 9 Facilities Theme Before</td>
<td>-3.2800</td>
<td>.14272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilities Theme After</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RBES PERCEPTION SURVEY FOR PARENTS PAIRED SAMPLES T-TEST**

**RESULTS FOR SCHOOL E TO SCHOOL B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Theme Before - Theme After</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instruction Theme Before - Instruction Theme After</td>
<td>-24200</td>
<td>.09933</td>
<td>.02653</td>
<td>-31567</td>
<td>-18833</td>
<td>-9.121</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Safety Theme Before - Safety Theme After</td>
<td>-23000</td>
<td>.07810</td>
<td>.03483</td>
<td>-32498</td>
<td>-13002</td>
<td>-6.585</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Discipline Theme Before - Discipline Theme After</td>
<td>-21200</td>
<td>.03899</td>
<td>.01744</td>
<td>-26041</td>
<td>-16359</td>
<td>-12.159</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leadership Theme Before - Leadership Theme After</td>
<td>-21400</td>
<td>.06120</td>
<td>.02379</td>
<td>-28005</td>
<td>-14795</td>
<td>-8.955</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communication Theme Before - Communication Theme After</td>
<td>-42000</td>
<td>.42302</td>
<td>.18918</td>
<td>-94525</td>
<td>10525</td>
<td>2.220</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Technology Theme Before - Technology Theme After</td>
<td>-39000</td>
<td>.06708</td>
<td>.03000</td>
<td>-47329</td>
<td>-30871</td>
<td>-13.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Climate Theme Before - Climate Theme After</td>
<td>-26600</td>
<td>.01673</td>
<td>.00748</td>
<td>-28678</td>
<td>-24522</td>
<td>-35.548</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Facilities Theme Before - Facilities Theme After</td>
<td>-43800</td>
<td>.12317</td>
<td>.05508</td>
<td>-59093</td>
<td>-28507</td>
<td>-7.952</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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