

# **Explaining Variation in State Implementation of No Child Left Behind**

**Julie Gronquist  
Bemidji State University  
Political Science  
Dr. Patrick Donnay**

### **Abstract**

Perhaps the most sweeping federal education policy of all time, No Child Left Behind has been met with both acclaim and criticism. While many in the education community criticize it as being under-funded and unrealistic, others see it as the answer to the long debated question of how to provide a quality education for all of the nation's students.

Four years after NCLB's enactment, there has been little research on what states need to do to successfully implement the legislation. Using data from a variety of sources, I studied state implementation as it is affected by political culture, federal funding, state expenditures, and other political factors. My findings show mixed results on the importance of funding and other political factors.

### **Introduction**

Since the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) was enacted in 2001 it has received both acclaim and criticism. While many in the education field criticize its testing requirements and one-size-fits-all standards, others praise it for holding schools accountable and offering options to students in failing schools. The accountability measures placed on states by the No Child Left Behind set precedence in federal education policy.

### **Literature Review**

To date, the literature on state implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) is rather sparse and inconclusive. The primary explanation for this is that the act is still in the beginning stages of implementation in many states. Most of the responsibility for implementing NCLB lies with the states. If states do not meet the standards set by the federal government, sanctions are imposed upon failing schools. I will discuss state efforts at implementation over the last three years. I will also consider

how state political culture plays a role in the implementation of the act, while taking into account the history and evolution of education policy.

### **The History of Education Policy**

Federal involvement in public education began in 1965 with the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). As with NCLB, this act was controversial in the beginning, particularly in the area of desegregation. A major goal of the ESEA was to eliminate discrimination and to ensure that all children, regardless of race or economic status, received a quality education. At the time ESEA was passed, the federal government was grossly under-prepared to implement such a major piece of legislation. The three biggest problems faced with implementing the act were a lack of staff, a shortage in funding, and an extraordinary amount of paperwork. Larson (1980) speculates that, "U.S. Office of Education failures were caused by political and administrative pressures." He also states that both administrators and teachers were unsure of the law's exact intent, which led to broad interpretation. Over time administration of the program became more effective and cost-conscious. As administration improved, so did student performance, especially among those students categorized as disadvantaged.

Since the first enactment of the ESEA, accountability measures have increased with each reauthorization. The No Child Left Behind Act is the most comprehensive federal education policy to date, not only calling for still more accountability, but imposing sanctions on schools identified as repeatedly failing.



## **Implementation Literature and NCLB**

In Larson's 1980 study of why government programs fail, he offers reasons for failure. Among these reasons for failure are having vague goals that allow for broad interpretations of the law by those in charge of administering it. He also theorizes that successful implementation is more likely when those making the policy have views similar to those interpreting the policy. Other reasons for failure include poor implementation procedures, an initiative that is too complex, and changes in the economic environment that occur during implementation.

A main criticism with the implementation of No Child Left Behind has been a lack of funding, both at the state and federal level. (Holmes, 2004) The funds needed to carry out certain aspects of the law have proven to be more than school districts can afford in the beginning stages of implementation. Larson states that "the absence of wealth makes program failure more likely." (1980, 7) In a time when both federal and state governments are making across the board cuts, successful implementation of a new policy is less likely to occur.

Historically, educating the nation's youth has been a responsibility left primarily to the individual states. Research by both Dotterweich (2004) and McDermott (2002) concludes that successful implementation is largely dependant on state funding. In Why Government Programs Fail, Larson (1980, 53) states that, "The federal government contributes only 10 percent of the total funding for public schools in the United States." While this book was published over 20 years ago, the percentage of federal aide given to school districts has not changed a great deal. Larson goes on to say that if the small amount of federal aid was withdrawn, it would be enough to cause hardship, even crisis,



in many of our nation's schools. The issue of federal versus state funding has been and continues to be controversial in the area of education policy.

In a January 2004 report by the National Education Association, it is proposed that if the federal government expects schools to meet the aggressive requirements of the NCLB Act, funds for meeting these standards should come entirely from the federal government. This opinion, held by many education interest groups, would set precedence in education funding and would cost the federal government billions of dollars.

### **State Implementation of NCLB**

Dotterweich's (2004) 'State Compliance and the No Child Left Behind Act' analyzed state compliance in three of the seven categories which states are required to meet to successfully implement the act. The categories focused on were standards and assessments, teacher quality, and school improvement. The researchers examined state implementation as affected by federal and state inducements and constraints. Specifically, they studied how teacher quality, standards and assessments, and school improvement were affected by variables such as legislative professionalism, percentage of state and federal funding, government ideology, and interest groups. The findings of the study showed that, overall, federal inducements and constraints do not have a significant impact on any of the three dependant variables, although it did have a slightly negative impact on teacher quality. A number of state-dependant variables *did* appear to have an impact on implementation, with the state political ecological capacity having the greatest impact. Dotterweich, (2004, 6) in a reference to Goggin's 1990 study on

implementation research, defines state political ecological capacity as “factors such as a state’s wealth and the partisan make-up of the governor’s office and the state legislature.”

Given the findings of the Dotterweich research, one would expect that successful implementation of education policy could be done by states alone if they were willing to commit the time and energy. A study on the Massachusetts Education Reform Act (MERA) of 1993 proved quite the opposite. In her research, Kathryn McDermott (2002, 2) goes so far as to state that the “insufficient state capacity to lead education reform is older and deeper-seated than what can be solved simply by increasing funding and staffing.” Massachusetts warrants such a study because it was one of the first states to pass legislation for standards-based, systematic education reform – the driving philosophy behind the NCLB Act. As a result of the MERA, the state of Massachusetts had to set education standards and hold schools accountable to those standards. The state Department of Education had to analyze tests in new ways, as well as exercise leadership so that all state and local education policies fit together. These three tasks given to the state of Massachusetts in 1993 have now been passed along to the entire country. Much like the No Child Left Behind Act, the MERA has been highly controversial ever since it’s enactment. Implementation of the MERA was rocky to say the least, with teachers and administrators constantly battling policy makers over money and assessments. This study could serve as a predictor of the course No Child Left Behind will take in the next decade.

In his review of No Child Left Behind’s affects on low performing schools, Rotherham (2003, 35) takes a position quite different from most education advocacy groups. He believes that NCLB could be exactly what is needed to close the achievement



gap in America's schools *if* it is implemented right. He explores the role of the state department of education, saying that their traditional role has been mainly giving out money and monitoring compliance. No Child Left Behind forces state departments to "collect data, monitor accountability and performance, and support promising initiatives," all in addition to their traditional duties. He gives five changes that must occur for NCLB to be successful, among them "substantially upgrading the ability of state departments of education to assist low-performing schools as well as enhance the capability of the U.S. Department of Education to deliver assistance and leadership to states, school districts, and schools." His report echoes that of previous research – that successful implementation is the job of the states.

In an article on the challenge of implementation from The Book of the States, Matthews (2004) echoes Rotherham's statements about the need for change in the role of state education agencies, going so far as to say that, "States that now provide only rudimentary levels of support to struggling districts will practically need to start from scratch." (2004, 495) The two main areas that Matthews predicts will be a challenge for states are creating a student record data system and developing a stronger capacity to support "school improvement efforts at the local and district levels." (2004, 495)

### **State Political Culture**

Grant and Erickson's (1993) writings on political culture will provide a backdrop through which to study implementation. In their research they cite Elazar's (1984, 121) categories of political culture, including moralistic, individualistic, and traditionalistic. States with a moralistic political culture view government as a vehicle by which to better

the community. They believe that new programs should be initiated if the public will benefit and be interested in them. They have a positive view of bureaucracy and view political participation as a responsibility of all citizens. Political parties are seen as “vehicles to attain goals believed to be in the public interest.” Elections are viewed as debates between issues and it is believed that representatives seek office to gain the position needed to help others.

Those who hold a traditionalistic political culture believe the primary responsibility of government is to maintain order. Programs are initiated only if they benefit the elite, and bureaucracy is viewed as “depersonalizing government”. Participation in politics is seen as a privilege only extended to those who can afford to participate. Party cohesiveness is thought to be based on family and social ties, and elections are viewed as a competition between the elite within the dominant party.

An individualistic political culture focuses on government as a marketplace where activity is largely economic. People who hold this point of view feel that new programs should not be created unless demanded by the public. They view bureaucracy with ambivalence and feel that politics are dirty. Parties are seen as groups that give out favors, with elections being a mere competition between parties rather than a debate on issues. Representatives are thought to seek office as a way to gain personal rewards.

Whether in favor or against the principles of No Child Left Behind, all research points towards states as the primary implementers of the policy. The aim of my research is to tie together information on political culture and education policy with what states are doing to comply with NCLB regulations. By using data from the Education Commission of the States, I identify those states that are succeeding and compare them with those that



appear to be failing. I then investigate possible causes to this success or failure. As part of this investigation I will perform a series of interviews with local school administrators. Among my theories for success or failure are federal funding, state funding, race, the partisan characteristics of the state, and political culture.

### **Methods and Analysis**

In *No Child Left Behind: The Challenge of Implementation*, author Dewayne Matthews (2004) used data obtained from the Education Commission of the States No Child Left Behind Database to grade each of the 50 states on seven categories of implementation. Each category is comprised of several sub categories, which were averaged to compute an overall score for each category. These scores were then averaged to compute an overall implementation score.

For a grade of 'not on track' to meet a specific standard, a state received a score of 0. For a grade of partially on track, a score of 5 was awarded, while a score of 10 was given to states that are completely on track to meet a given standard.

The first category analyzed was standards and assessments. Included in this category is the establishment of both standards and annual assessments for math, reading, and science. States must provide alternate forms of assessment for students who have limited English proficiency, learning disabilities, or are migrant students.

The second category examined is AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress). Included in this category is accountability for all subgroups (students who are economically disadvantaged, have disabilities, have limited English proficiency, or are members of major racial/ethnic groups). In order to receive a score of 10 in this category, states must

have a single accountability system, teach with a curriculum based primarily on academics (with separate objectives for reading and math), and assess 95% of all students in the four subgroups named above. They must also show continuous progress towards the 100% proficiency level and have a determined annual goal for AYP.

In order to be on track in the area of school improvement, states are required to identify schools needing improvement in a timely manner and provide scientifically based technical assistance to these schools. Some sort of corrective action must be taken against these schools, such as deferring funds, implementing a new curriculum, replacing administration, or closing the school. States must also provide public school choice for students whose school is identified as failing. For schools that are exceeding AYP requirements, a system for recognition is required.

The fourth requirement of states is to provide safe schools by developing criteria for unsafe schools, a transfer policy for students who attend these unsafe schools, and a transfer policy for victims of violent crime.

States are also evaluated on the quality of supplemental services their schools offer. Points for evaluation are whether the state has identified and maintained a list of possible providers for these services, and whether supplemental services currently in place are being effectively implemented and monitored.

States are also required to prepare and distribute a public report card with information including assessment scores, the percentage of schools meeting AYP requirements, high school graduation rates, and data on teacher qualification.

The final requirement of states is that all students are taught by highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals. To be on track to meet this requirement, states must



adopt a definition of highly qualified that falls in line with the guidelines provided by NCLB, develop a system to measure subject-matter competence, test all new elementary school teachers, and be measurably working to increase the percentage of teachers pursuing professional development.

Table One ranks the 50 states according to their average implementation score.

(Table One about here)

The above seven variables were analyzed across the various categories of state political culture. In American Federalism: A View From the States, Daniel Elazar (1984) divides political culture into seven categories: moralistic, moralistic-individualistic, individualistic-moralistic, individualistic, individualistic-traditionalistic, traditionalistic-individualistic, traditionalistic, and traditionalistic-moralistic. Table Two lists states according to Elazar's seven category political culture.

(Table Two about here)

In order to compare state political culture to the seven implementation variables, the mean and range of each category were computed.

When comparing high and low scores within each category, it appears that states with an individualistic political culture are the most successful at NCLB implementation, achieving the highest score in four of the eight categories. States with a moralistic political culture appear to be the worst, earning three out of eight of the lowest scores. This is contrary to what I had expected at the beginning of my research. My hypothesis was that states with a moralistic political culture, who view government as a vehicle used to help others, would devote more time and energy into the implementation of a national

education policy, therefore would have higher implementation scores than individualistic states, who view government primarily as a market place.

(Table Three about here)

In addition to comparing the mean scores, there are differences within the ranges. The ranges between categories of implementation are greater than the ranges within categories. For example, the difference between scores for the various political cultures under the category of safe schools is 1.67, while the difference between the highest and lowest implementation scores for the individualistic-traditionalistic culture is 6.75. This leads to the conclusion that factors other than political culture play a greater role in determining success of implementing No Child Left Behind. Also worth noting is the observation that certain categories appear to be more easily met than others. All political cultures seem to be on track to meet the safe schools requirement, with the *lowest* average score being 8.3, while few are on track to meet the teacher quality requirement, with the *highest* average score being 5.0. A hypothesis for this is that some areas of implementation require more drastic changes to state education systems than others.

A common criticism about No Child Left Behind is that it is under funded. In Table Four I correlate the average implementation score with various measures of education spending at both the federal and state level. Education spending in many cases is negatively correlated with the implementation of No Child Left Behind. This finding contradicts the position that increased funding is needed for NCLB to be successfully implemented, which leads one to believe that factors other than education funding are responsible for successful implementation, or that states who spend more simply have bigger challenges. Average annual teacher salary correlates positively with the



implementation of NCLB, leading to the conclusion that higher pay attracts more highly qualified teachers.

(Table Four about here)

In addition to education spending, implementation was also analyzed according to various partisan and race variables, which included the percentage of the popular vote obtained in the 2000 Presidential election, the percentage of women in the legislature, and race as found in the 2000 census. None of these variables appeared to have a significant impact on successful implementation.

(Tables Five and Six about here)

### **Interviews**

After analyzing my data in hopes of forming theories as to what predicted success or failure at implementing the No Child Left Behind act, I set out to interview administrators at Independent School District 31 in Bemidji. What I found led me to conclude that implementation not only varies from state to state, but also from district to district.

14 schools in ISD 31 serve 4,837 K-12 students. Both the percentage of students in poverty (44%) and the percentage of students with special needs (15%) exceed the state average of 28% students in poverty and 12% students with special needs. Bemidji also suffers from a high mobility rate, with an average of 37% of students moving at least once during the academic year, more than doubling the statewide average of 15%. On top of these challenges, Bemidji School District faces a declining enrollment. Since 1995 Bemidji has seen a decrease of nearly 600 students, which translates into a loss of over

3.6 million dollars. Pair this with a loss of more than \$300,000 in Title I funds due to a change in the funding formula, and one wonders how the successful implementation of new programs is possible. While many of the challenges facing the Bemidji School District were not caused by No Child Left Behind, I was curious to find out how a struggling district would find the time and resources to implement such demanding legislation.

### **AYP**

At this point in the implementation process Bemidji appear to be doing well. All schools are currently meeting the AYP requirements set by the state. The achievement gap is larger at the secondary level than it is at the elementary level, which has prompted district officials to start alternative programs within the high school that are composed of smaller, shorter classes. So far the district has done a more than adequate job of providing advanced programs for high achieving students.

### **Standards and Assessment**

Kathy Palm<sup>1</sup>, Director of Curriculum, feels that the testing requirements of NCLB can be good for districts if the right kinds of tests are used. ISD 31 currently tests students using both the required state test and an additional test, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP), which is paid for and administered by the school district. The state test is administered in April and districts receive the results in August, while MAP, which is designed aligned with the academic standards adopted by the state of Minnesota, is

---

<sup>1</sup> Interview conducted at Bemidji School District Administrative Offices by Julie Gronquist on Monday, March 21, 2005 at 10 am.



administered in both the fall and spring. The MAP assessment is taken on the computer and results are available immediately after the student is finished with the assessment. Students in the Bemidji school district currently spend 56 out of 172 school days on some type of testing. Not only is classroom time used for test administration, but 26.5 days of staff time are also used in processing the state testing materials.

### **Professional Qualifications**

The final area of the act that has had a significant impact on ISD 31 is the requirement that all teachers be highly qualified. According to Jordan Hickman<sup>2</sup>, Director of Human Resources, this has not been a huge issue for the Bemidji School District due to the fact that Minnesota's teacher licensing requirements were already quite rigorous prior to the enactment of No Child Left Behind. Even so, there are a handful of cases in which veteran teachers were required to return to school to complete additional courses in order remain qualified to teach in their area of experience.

The highly qualified requirement has been more of an issue for paraprofessionals than teachers, though Jordan assures me that 100% of paras will be highly qualified before the year 2014, and that hiring requirements have been changed to meet the definition of 'highly qualified.'

While Bemidji has not had many problems with the implementation of NCLB thus far, many in the district believe that some of the requirements, specifically the expectation of children with special needs to perform at a level equal to that of their

---

<sup>2</sup> Interview conducted at Bemidji School District Administrative Offices by Julie Gronquist at 10 am on Friday, April 8.

peers, are unrealistic and unfair. In the district's 2004 legislative platform, it is argued that, "Schools and districts are being held accountable for physical and mental conditions that prevent these students' achievement at grade level." Given the above average percentage of special needs students served by the district, it is fair to guess that this requirement may be one that haunts the district in the coming years.

### **Conclusion**

This study raised many surprising points in the area of state implementation of No Child Left Behind. Still the battle for funding and more local control of education continues. Utah's House of Representatives recently passed a bill requiring state education officials to prioritize state goals over federal requirements, and to spend as little state money as possible on the implementation of No Child Left Behind. As many as 30 states are considering passing similar legislation. While the school choice option begins to overcrowd schools in New York, North Dakota declares thousands of veteran teachers unqualified. Recently appointed Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings has shown a willingness to work with states on some of the toughest requirements of the act, but criticism for the act remains as an increasing number of states plead for local control of their education system. While the primary criticism of the act is that it is grossly underfunded, my research shows that factors other than federal funding are likely to contribute to successful implementation, namely a state's political culture.

A variable that could explain this difference between political cultures is how states were performing before the implementation of No Child Left Behind. States that had more stringent requirements for teachers and paraprofessionals, had established



testing systems in place, and who set low to moderate AYP goals are more likely to be identified as succeeding early on in the implementation process, while states that did not will be identified as failing. Early implementation scores may have less to do with states' progress on No Child Left Behind and more to do with how states were educating students in the years before the law was passed.

Because the act is still in the early stages of implementation, it is difficult to say which states are truly succeeding and which are not, let alone which factors determine this success. As the demand for accountability continues to increase, the quest for funding and higher test scores will continue with one goal in mind – the education of our nation's children.

## References

- Center for Education Policy. 2003. "From the Capitol to the Classroom." [www.cep-dc.org/pubs/nclb](http://www.cep-dc.org/pubs/nclb)
- Elazar, Daniel J. 1984. *American Federalism: A View From the States*. Harper and Row Publishers: New York.
- Erikson, Robert S., John P. McIver, Gerald C. Wright Jr. 1987. "State Political Culture and Public Opinion." *American Political Science Review*. 3:797-813
- Grant, Daniel R., Lloyd B. Omdahl. 1993. *State and Local Government in America*. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Communications, Inc.
- Holmes, Dwight R. and Paul Wolman. 2004. *No Child Left Behind? The Funding Gap in ESEA and Other Federal Education Programs*. National Education Association: Washington D.C.
- Jones, Charles O. 1984. *An Introduction to the Study of Public Policy*. Brooks/Cole Publishing: Monterey, CA.
- Larson, James S. 1980. *Why Government Programs Fail: Improving Policy Implementation*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Lewis, Joy W. 2003. "District Implementation of No Child Left Behind." Policy Notes. [www.WestEd.org/policy](http://www.WestEd.org/policy)
- Matthews, Dewayne. 2004. "No Child Left Behind: The Challenge of Implementation." *The Book of the States*. ed. The Council of State Governments.
- McDermott, Kathryn A.. 2002. "Can State Education Agencies Lead Reform? Politics, Administration, and the Massachusetts Education Reform Act of 1993". Presented at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.
- McNeal, Ramona, and Lisa Dotterweich. 2004. "State Compliance and the No Child Left Behind Act". Presented at the 2004 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.
- National Education Association. 2004. "No Child Left Behind? The Funding Gap in ESEA and Other Federal Education Programs." [www.nea.org](http://www.nea.org).
- New York Times. 2005. "Utah Bill Mounts Challenge to Federal Education Law." Dillon, Sam. 16 February.



New York Times. 2005. "New U.S. Secretary Showing Flexibility on 'No Child' Act."  
Dillon, Sam. 16 February.

Popham, James W. 2004. America's "Failing" Schools: How Parents and Teachers Can  
Cope With No Child Left Behind. RoutledgeFalmer.

Rotherham, Andrew J. 2003. Hopes and Hazards: No Child Left Behind and Low  
Performing Public Schools. The State Education Standard. National Association  
of State Boards of Education.

**Table One**  
**States Ranked By Average Implementation Score**

State	Average Score	Rank
CT	9.41	1
MD	8.97	2
OH	8.91	3
IL	8.86	4
VA	8.77	5
NV	8.74	6
FL	8.73	7
PA	8.6	8
IA	8.5	9
CA	8.49	10
IN	8.46	11
MS	8.46	12
DE	8.43	13
NY	8.41	14
NC	8.41	15
OK	8.37	16
AR	8.33	17
GA	8.26	18
MI	8.21	19
SD	8.15	20
TN	8.13	21
SC	7.99	22
TX	7.99	23
NJ	7.94	24
MA	7.93	25
WI	7.87	26
LA	7.83	27
AK	7.76	28
MO	7.67	29
WA	7.67	30
AZ	7.64	31
CO	7.64	32
ID	7.3	33
KS	7.3	34
KY	7.21	35
NM	7.01	36
WV	6.92	37
ND	6.86	38
MN	6.83	39
AL	6.69	40
RI	6.57	41
HI	6.46	42
NH	6.4	43
OR	6.27	44
UT	6.2	45
MT	6.06	46
VT	5.86	47
NE	5.52	48
WY	5.47	49
ME	5.39	50



**Table Two**  
**States Listed by Political Culture**

<b>Political Culture</b>	<b>States</b>
<p><b>Moralistic</b></p> <p><i>Government is viewed as a way to better the community and that new programs should be initiated if the public will benefit and be interested in them. Have a positive view of bureaucracy and view political participation as a responsibility. Parties are seen as "vehicles to attain goals believed to be in the public interest." (pg. 121) Elections are seen as debates between issues and it is believed that representatives seek office to gain the position needed to help others.</i></p>	<p>Colorado, Oregon, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin</p>
<p><b>Moralistic-Individualistic</b></p>	<p>California, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Washington</p>
<p><b>Individualistic-Moralistic</b></p>	<p>Connecticut, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New York, Rhode Island, Wyoming</p>
<p><b>Individualistic</b></p> <p><i>View government as a marketplace where activity is largely economic. Feel that new programs should not be created unless demanded by the public. View bureaucracy with ambivalence, feel that politics are dirty, and view parties as groups that give out favors. View elections as being a competition between parties, not over stances on issues, and believe that people seek office as a way to gain personal rewards.</i></p>	<p>Alaska, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania</p>
<p><b>Individualistic-Traditionalistic</b></p>	<p>Hawaii, Missouri</p>
<p><b>Traditionalistic-Individualistic</b></p>	<p>Florida, Kentucky, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, West Virginia</p>
<p><b>Traditionalistic</b></p> <p><i>Government is seen as a way to maintain order. Programs are initiated if they benefit the elite. Bureaucracy is viewed as "depersonalizing government" and participation in politics is seen as a privilege. Party cohesiveness is thought to be based on family and social ties, and elections are viewed as a competition between the elite in the dominant party and the reason for seeking office is "dependent on the political values of the elite." (pg. 121)</i></p>	<p>Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia</p>
<p><b>Traditionalistic-Moralistic</b></p>	<p>Arizona, North Carolina</p>

Information obtained from Elazar, Daniel J. 1984. American Federalism: A View From the States. Harper and Row Publishers: New York.



**Table Three**  
**Average NCLB Implementation Scores by Political Culture Category with High and Low Averages Highlighted**

Political Culture	Moralistic (9)	Moralistic-Individualistic (8)	Individualistic-Moralistic (6)	Individualistic (9)	Individualistic-Traditionalistic (2)	Traditionalistic-Individualistic (6)	Traditionalistic (8)	Traditionalistic-Moralistic (2)
Average Score	6.79 (5.39-8.21)	7.48 (6.06-8.50)	7.22 (5.47-9.41)	8.52 (7.76-8.97)	7.06 (6.46-7.67)	7.71 (6.92-8.73)	8.06 (6.69-8.77)	8.03 (7.64-8.41)
Standards and Assessment	9.04 (7.00-10.00)	8.91 (6.00-10.00)	7.45 (6.00-9.00)	9.29 (7.00-10.00)	9.90 (9.90-9.90)	9.38 (8.00-10.00)	9.49 (8.00-10.00)	9.10 (8.00-10.00)
Adequate Yearly Progress	6.60 (3.90-10.00)	7.63 (0.00-10.00)	8.78 (3.30-10.00)	9.57 (8.30-10.00)	7.50 (5.60-9.40)	8.23 (5.00-10.00)	8.73 (4.40-10.00)	9.15 (8.30-10.00)
School Improvement	4.74 (2.20-9.30)	7.23 (2.9-10.00)	6.80 (2.90-9.30)	8.66 (5.00-10.00)	7.70 (7.50-7.90)	9.18 (8.60-10.00)	8.66 (7.10-10.00)	7.15 (5.70-8.60)
Safe Schools	10.00 (10.00-10.00)	9.06 (5.00-10.00)	10.00 (10.00-10.00)	10.00 (10.00-10.00)	8.75 (8.00-10.00)	8.33 (5.00-10.00)	10.00 (10.00-10.00)	10.00 (10.00-10.00)
Supplemental Services	8.11 (4.00-10.00)	8.75 (6.00-10.00)	7.50 (2.00-10.00)	9.56 (8.00-10.00)	8.50 (8.00-9.00)	8.00 (4.00-10.00)	8.75 (6.00-10.00)	7.15 (9.00-10.00)
Report Card	5.28 (2.50-10.00)	5.94 (2.5-10.00)	6.67 (5.00-10.00)	8.06 (5.00-10.00)	5.00 (5.00-5.00)	5.79 (2.30-10.00)	6.25 (2.50-10.00)	7.50 (7.50-7.50)
Teacher Quality	3.78 (1.30-6.30)	4.87 (2.5-6.3)	3.34 (0-7.50)	4.51 (2.50-6.70)	3.15 (2.50-3.80)	5.02 (3.80-6.30)	4.51 (1.30-7.50)	3.80 (3.80-3.80)

**Dark Grey** – Low Scores

**Light Grey** – High Score

Score range shown in parentheses.



**Table Four**  
**Implementation Scores Correlated with Education Spending**

	Education Spending Per Capita	Expenditure Per Pupil	Higher Ed Spending Per Capita	K-12 Spending Per Capita	Average Annual Teacher's Salary
Average Score	-.208	.113	-.347(*)	-.064	.296(*)
Standards and Assessment	-.248	-.359(*)	.128	-.332(*)	-.392(**)
Adequate Yearly Progress	.094	.270	-.197	.196	.319(*)
School Improvement	-.323(*)	.000	-.396(**)	-.174	.209
Safe Schools	.105	.158	-.181	.201	.139
Supplemental Services	-.073	-.016	-.095	-.035	.209
Report Card	-.125	.072	-.127	-.076	.245
Teacher Quality	-.232	.164	-.328(**)	-.087	.116

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

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Table Five**  
**Average Implementation Score Correlated with Political Variables**

	<b>% of Women in the Legislature in '96</b>	<b>Republican Percent of Popular Vote in '00</b>	<b>Democrat Percent of the Popular Vote in '00</b>	<b>Other Candidate Percent of Popular Vote in '00</b>
<b>Average Score</b>	.076	-.181	.269	-.370(**)
<b>Standards and Assessment</b>	-.120	.260	-.146	-.419 (**)
<b>Adequate Yearly Progress</b>	.097	-.230	.245	-.239
<b>School Improvement</b>	-.110	-.143	.194	-.237
<b>Safe Schools</b>	.080	-.121	.126	.069
<b>Supplemental Services</b>	-.041	-.075	.108	-.043
<b>Report Card</b>	.187	-.086	.157	-.280(*)
<b>Teacher Quality</b>	.159	-.139	.204	-.257

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

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).



**Table Six**  
**Average Implementation Score Correlated with Race**

	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Pacific Islander	Other	Two or More Races
<b>Average Score</b>	.173	-.177	-.038	-.063	-.049	.060	-.066
<b>Standards and Assessment</b>							
<b>AYP</b>	.046	-.145	-.092	.095	.151	.060	.062
<b>Teacher Quality</b>	.203	-.106	-.156	-.081	-.010	-.095	-.078
<b>Report Card</b>	.311	-.271	.066	-.139	-.118	-.071	-.127
<b>Supplemental Services</b>	-.009	.082	.098	-.141	-.230	.089	-.103
<b>Safe Schools</b>	.122	.031	.134	-.254	-.678	.030	-.203
<b>School Improvement</b>	-.056	-.091	-.111	.152	.169	.143	.113

Data obtained from the 2000 census.

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

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).