Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa
ISSN : 2988-6228

Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan
UIN Ar-Raniry- Banda Aceh

Vol. 2 Nomor 2 Desember 2024

Perspectives on the Limitations and Challenges of Standardized Testing in Education

Josephine Obiageli Okafor

Department of French, School of languages, Nwafor Orizu College of Education Nsugbe Anambra State Nigeria.
josephine.obiageli.okafor@nocen.edu.ng

Abstract Standardized testing remains a pivotal tool for assessing educational outcomes, yet it has been subject to widespread critique for its limitations and challenges. The present study presents perspectives on the limitations and challenges of standardized testing in education. A quantitative approach was employed using a survey questionnaire to gather data from 75 educators, including teachers and administrators from tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria. The questionnaire was trial-tested and validated, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.89, ensuring reliability. Data were collected via an online survey using Google Forms, and the responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Findings reveal that educators face multiple challenges, including time constraints, lack of professional development, and pressure from administrators to meet test score targets. Additionally, standardized tests were found to limit innovative teaching methods and fail to adequately assess students' creativity, problem-solving abilities, and long-term learning. These results highlight the significant impact standardized testing has on teaching practices and the educational system as a whole. The study concludes by emphasizing the need for a more holistic approach to student assessment and suggests the adoption of alternative evaluation methods to address these challenges.

Keywords: *standardized testing, educator challenges, teaching methods, student assessment, time constraints, educational limitations*

1. INTRODUCTION

Standardized testing has long been utilized as a mechanism to evaluate student performance and school accountability, but research highlights its numerous limitations and challenges. Standardized testing refers to a uniform method of assessment designed to evaluate the performance of students, educators, or educational systems based on

consistent procedures and scoring criteria (Balogun, 2023). These tests are administered under controlled conditions and use pre-determined questions that measure specific knowledge, skills, or competencies. The primary goal is to ensure comparability across test-takers, often facilitating decisions on student placement, academic achievement, and policy evaluation. One of the foremost criticisms is its tendency to prioritize rote memorization over critical thinking and problem-solving skills. These tests often assess a narrow spectrum of knowledge and skills, sidelining creativity and practical competencies that are vital for real-world success. This narrow focus undermines efforts to promote well-rounded education (Nahar, 2023).

A critical issue with standardized tests is their potential to reinforce systemic inequities in education. Students from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds often face significant challenges due to limited access to resources such as tutoring or test preparation materials. Consequently, standardized tests frequently reflect disparities rather than bridging them, perpetuating cycles of inequality (Amaechi & Onah, 2020). Additionally, cultural bias embedded in test design can marginalize students from minority groups, further skewing results. For instance, test questions may inadvertently favor linguistic or cultural references unfamiliar to non-dominant populations, disadvantaging these students (Au, 2020).

Another limitation lies in the psychological effects of standardized testing on students. Test anxiety is a widespread phenomenon that can negatively impact performance, particularly among younger students. Studies indicate that high-stakes testing environments exacerbate stress levels, often leading to a decline in student well-being and academic motivation (Modrek & Ramirez, 2021). This issue also extends to educators, who may experience pressure to focus disproportionately on test preparation, sidelining innovative teaching methods. This phenomenon, commonly referred to as "teaching to the test," narrows the curriculum and undermines the quality of instruction (Couch-II, 2021).

The reliability and validity of standardized tests have also been questioned. Critics argue that these assessments do not capture the full range of student abilities or account for external factors influencing performance, such as home environments and

access to quality teaching. Furthermore, standardized tests often fail to provide actionable feedback for improving instruction, limiting their utility in driving meaningful educational reform (Nalliah & Reddy, 2022). Ethical concerns about the overuse of standardized testing have also emerged. High-stakes testing can lead to unintended consequences, such as manipulation of scores, narrowing of instructional focus, and even the exclusion of low-performing students from testing pools to inflate institutional performance metrics (Zimkowski, 2024). These practices erode the integrity of education systems and question the validity of test results as indicators of educational quality.

The growing recognition of these limitations has prompted calls for alternative assessment methods that emphasize formative evaluation, portfolio assessments, and competency-based approaches. These alternatives prioritize individual growth, critical thinking, and equitable representation, fostering a more inclusive and effective education system (Bukhari et al, 2024). The need to explore the limitations and challenges of standardized testing in education stems from its continued dominance despite widespread critique. Standardized testing, designed to ensure uniform evaluation, has become synonymous with educational accountability. However, its growing influence has revealed significant gaps that hinder its effectiveness. For instance, while standardized tests measure certain academic skills, they often fail to assess critical thinking, creativity, and practical competencies essential for holistic education (Li et al, 2024).

Furthermore, disparities rooted in socioeconomic status and cultural biases highlight inequities in test outcomes, leaving disadvantaged students at a systemic disadvantage. Research reveals that students from underprivileged backgrounds are disproportionately impacted due to inadequate resources for test preparation (Balogun, 2023). Additionally, the prevalence of test anxiety and its impact on student well-being is underexplored, warranting further investigation (Nahar, 2023). These gaps necessitate a comprehensive understanding of the challenges posed by standardized testing to inform equitable and inclusive educational practices. Exploring alternative assessment methods that better capture student potential and foster meaningful

learning is critical. This study aims to fill these gaps, offering insights into mitigating the limitations of standardized testing while promoting educational equity and effectiveness.

Objectives

1. To investigate the key limitations of standardized testing in accurately assessing student knowledge.
2. To explore the challenges faced by educators in preparing students for standardized tests.
3. To assess how standardized testing influences teaching methods in schools.

Research questions

1. What are the key limitations of standardized testing in accurately assessing student knowledge and skills?
2. What challenges do educators face in preparing students for standardized tests?
3. How does standardized testing influence teaching methods in schools?

2. METHOD

This study adopted a quantitative research approach to explore the limitations and challenges of standardized testing in education. A Survey Questionnaire was employed as the primary data collection tool to capture educators' perspectives on the impact of standardized tests on teaching and learning. The questionnaire was structured with both closed-ended questions and Likert scale items, which allowed for the collection of numerical data related to issues such as time constraints, lack of professional development, and the influence of test scores on teaching methods.

The survey was trial-tested and validated to ensure its reliability, yielding a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.89, indicating excellent internal consistency. The data collection process was conducted entirely online via Google Forms, providing ease of access and convenience for the respondents. The online platform was used to ensure a broad reach and to gather responses from a diverse pool of educators. The survey link was distributed to participants through email and social media, and data collection

spanned two weeks. Participants were reminded periodically to encourage completion of the survey.

The target population for this study comprised 75 educators, including teachers and administrators from tertiary institutions in Anambra State, Nigeria. These respondents were selected using purposive sampling, ensuring that they had relevant experience in standardized test preparation and administration. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Measures such as means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions were computed to quantify the participants' perceptions of the limitations and challenges of standardized testing. Data analysis was performed using SPSS, which helped identify trends and patterns in the responses.

3. RESULTS

Table 1: Distribution of Participants by Age Group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-28 years	19	25.3	25.3	25.3
	29-39 years	20	26.7	26.7	52.0
	40-50 years	13	17.3	17.3	69.3
	51-61 years	17	22.7	22.7	92.0
	62+ years	6	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	

The data in Table 1 shows the age distribution of 75 participants. The largest group is aged 29-39 years, comprising (20) participants, or (26.7%) of the total. This is closely followed by the 18-28 years group, with (19) participants (25.3%). The 51-61 years group includes (17) participants (22.7%), while (13) participants (17.3%) fall within the 40-50 years range. The smallest group is aged 62+, with only (6) participants (8.0%). The cumulative percentages increase progressively, reaching 100% by the final age category.

Table 2: Distribution of Participants by Role

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Student	11	14.7	14.7	14.7
	Lecturer	43	57.3	57.3	72.0
	Admin staff	21	28.0	28.0	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	

The data in Table 2 reveals the role distribution of 75 participants. The majority are lecturers, with (43) participants, making up (57.3%) of the total. Admin staff follow with (21) participants, accounting for (28.0%), while students comprise the smallest group, with (11) participants (14.7%). The cumulative percentages increase gradually, reaching 100% by the end. This indicates that the sample is predominantly made up of lecturers, with a substantial representation of administrative staff, and a smaller proportion of students.

Table 3: Distribution of Participants by Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	24	32.0	32.0	32.0
	Female	51	68.0	68.0	100.0
	Total	75	100.0	100.0	

The gender distribution of the 75 participants in Table 3 shows that females represent the majority, with (51) participants, or (68.0%) of the total. Males account for (24) participants, or (32.0%). The cumulative percentage reaches 100% at the female category, indicating a higher proportion of female participants in the sample. This suggests that the gender distribution is skewed toward females, with a notable gender imbalance.

Research question 1: What are the key limitations of standardized testing in accurately assessing student knowledge and skills?

Table 4: Statistical Analysis of Key Limitations of Standardized Testing in Assessing Student Knowledge and Skills

		Standardized tests often fail to capture the diversity of student abilities.	Standardized tests cannot measure creativity and problem-solving skills.	These assessments overlook interpersonal skills in students.	The one-size-fits-all nature of standardized testing does not cater adequately.	Standardized tests do not reflect students' growth or long-term learning.
N	Valid	75	75	75	75	75
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.97	2.93	2.96	2.91	3.00
Std. Error of Mean		.119	.110	.110	.119	.115
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		1.026	.949	.951	1.029	1.000
Variance		1.053	.901	.904	1.059	1.000
Skewness		-.870	-.936	-.985	-.726	-.916
Std. Error of Skewness		.277	.277	.277	.277	.277
Kurtosis		-.293	.158	.258	-.542	-.107
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548	.548	.548	.548	.548
Range		3	3	3	3	3
Percentiles	25	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	3.00
	50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
	75	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00

The data in Table 4 presents the perceptions of participants regarding the key limitations of standardized testing. The mean scores across the five statements range from (2.91) to (3.00), indicating a generally moderate agreement with these limitations. The median for all statements is (3.00), suggesting a central tendency towards moderate

agreement. Standard deviations range from (.949) to (1.029), showing moderate variability in responses. Skewness values range from (-.726) to (-.985), indicating that responses lean towards more agreement with the limitations. The kurtosis values are close to zero, showing a distribution near normal. Percentiles indicate that the majority of respondents rated these limitations at or above the midpoint (3.00).

Research question 2: What challenges do educators face in preparing students for standardized tests?

Table 5: Statistical Analysis of Challenges Faced by Educators in Preparing Students for Standardized Tests

		Educators struggle with time constraints when preparing students for tests.	Teachers often face a lack of professional development for test preparation.	The focus on standardized tests limits opportunities for innovative teaching methods.	Pressure from administrators to meet test score targets affects teachers' autonomy.	Educators struggle to address individual learning gaps in test preparation.
N	Valid	75	75	75	75	75
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.96	3.07	2.68	2.77	2.68
Std. Error of Mean		.113	.119	.116	.113	.114
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		.979	1.031	1.002	.981	.989
Variance		.958	1.063	1.004	.961	.977
Skewness		-.896	-.972	-.306	-.585	-.347
Std. Error of Skewness		.277	.277	.277	.277	.277
Kurtosis		-.048	-.151	-.930	-.576	-.856
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548	.548	.548	.548	.548

Range		3	3	3	3	3
Percentiles	25	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
	50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
	75	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00

The data in Table 5 reveals the challenges educators face in preparing students for standardized tests. The mean scores range from (2.68) to (3.07), indicating a moderate agreement with the listed challenges. The highest mean score, (3.07), reflects agreement that teachers face a lack of professional development for test preparation. The lowest mean score, (2.68), suggests some disagreement with the statement about educators struggling to address individual learning gaps. The median is consistently (3.00) for all statements, indicating central alignment with moderate agreement. The standard deviations range from (.979) to (1.031), showing moderate variability in responses. Skewness values range from (-.306) to (-.972), reflecting a tendency towards agreement with these challenges, while kurtosis values suggest a distribution near normal. The percentiles show that a majority of respondents rated these challenges at or above the midpoint (3.00).

Research question 3: How does standardized testing influence teaching methods in schools?

Table 6: Statistical Analysis of How Standardized Testing Influences Teaching Methods in Schools

		Teachers may emphasize rote memorization rather than critical thinking skills development.	Test preparation often leads to narrowing the curriculum to test topics.	Teachers may adopt a more rigid, teacher-centered approach to instruction.	Test scores may prompt teachers to focus on remedial instruction.	Teachers may spend more time on test-related practice and drills.
N	Valid	75	75	75	75	75
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.72	2.81	2.84	2.99	2.85
Std. Error of Mean		.107	.109	.109	.115	.110
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Std. Deviation		.924	.940	.945	.993	.954
Variance		.853	.884	.893	.986	.911
Skewness		-.781	-.717	-.756	-.993	-.753
Std. Error of Skewness		.277	.277	.277	.277	.277
Kurtosis		-.201	-.231	-.178	.086	-.216
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.548	.548	.548	.548	.548
Range		3	3	3	3	3
Percentiles	25	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
	50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
	75	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00

The data in Table 6 reflects how standardized testing impacts teaching methods. The mean scores range from (2.72) to (2.99), showing a moderate tendency toward

agreement with the influence of standardized testing on teaching approaches. The highest mean, (2.99), indicates that test scores prompt teachers to focus on remedial instruction. The lowest mean, (2.72), suggests a slight disagreement with the notion that teachers emphasize rote memorization. The median for all statements is (3.00), suggesting a central tendency of moderate agreement. Standard deviations range from (.924) to (.993), demonstrating some variability. Skewness values, between (-.717) and (-.993), suggest that responses lean toward agreement, and kurtosis values show near-normal distributions. Percentiles indicate that most respondents rated these influences at or above the midpoint (3.00).

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There are no key limitations of standardized testing in accurately assessing student knowledge and skills.

Table 7: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Limitations of Standardized Testing in Assessing Student Knowledge and Skill

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	464.377[a]	22	21.108	1.021	.457
Intercept	8524.504	1	8524.504	412.436	.000
Age	54.999	4	13.750	.665	.619
Role	15.988	2	7.994	.387	.681
Gender	2.469	1	2.469	.119	.731
Age * Role	55.751	8	6.969	.337	.947
Age * Gender	81.524	3	27.175	1.315	.280
Role * Gender	1.666	2	.833	.040	.961
Age * Role * Gender	34.002	2	17.001	.823	.445
Error	1074.770	52	20.669		
Total	17908.000	75			
Corrected Total	1539.147	74			

The analysis of the "limitations of standardized testing" in Table 7 shows no significant effects from the variables age, role, or gender, as the p-values are greater than the significance level (0.05). Specifically, the p-values for age (0.619), role (0.681), gender (0.731), and their interactions (e.g., age*role, age*gender) are all above 0.05. This suggests that these factors do not significantly affect perceptions of the limitations of standardized testing. Therefore, Hypothesis 1, stating there are no key limitations, is accepted.

Hypothesis 2: Educators do not face any significant challenges in preparing students for standardized tests.

Table 8: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Challenges in Preparing Students for Standardized Tests

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	349.351[a]	22	15.880	.804	.707
Intercept	8072.290	1	8072.290	408.831	.000
Age	56.987	4	14.247	.722	.581
Role	33.821	2	16.911	.856	.431
Gender	15.328	1	15.328	.776	.382
Age * Role	76.591	8	9.574	.485	.861
Age * Gender	39.214	3	13.071	.662	.579
Role * Gender	3.061	2	1.531	.078	.926
Age * Role * Gender	30.456	2	15.228	.771	.468
Error	1026.729	52	19.745		
Total	16414.000	75			
Corrected Total	1376.080	74			

The analysis of challenges faced by educators in preparing students for standardized tests in Table 8 reveals no significant effects from age, role, or gender, with p-values exceeding 0.05 (e.g., age (0.581), role (0.431), gender (0.382)). The

"Corrected Model" is also not significant (p = 0.707). Therefore, Hypothesis 2, which states that educators do not face significant challenges in preparing students for standardized tests, is **accepted** since the factors examined do not significantly influence the challenges.

Hypothesis 3: Standardized testing does not influence teaching methods in schools.

Table 9: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Influence on Teaching Methods

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	437.194[a]	22	19.872	1.162	.320
Intercept	8039.787	1	8039.787	470.061	.000
Age	52.872	4	13.218	.773	.548
Role	33.003	2	16.501	.965	.388
Gender	11.457	1	11.457	.670	.417
Age * Role	40.907	8	5.113	.299	.963
Age * Gender	96.144	3	32.048	1.874	.145
Role * Gender	6.341	2	3.170	.185	.831
Age * Role * Gender	24.899	2	12.450	.728	.488
Error	889.392	52	17.104		
Total	16478.000	75			
Corrected Total	1326.587	74			

The analysis examining the influence of standardized testing on teaching methods in Table 9 indicates no significant effects from age, role, or gender, with p-values exceeding the 0.05 threshold (e.g., age (0.548), role (0.388), gender (0.417)). The "Corrected Model" is also not significant (p = 0.320). Therefore, there is no significant influence of these factors on teaching methods, suggesting that factors such as age, role, and gender do not significantly alter the impact of standardized testing on teaching practices.

The key limitations of standardized testing in accurately assessing student knowledge and skills were highlighted in the study. Firstly, standardized tests were found to fail in capturing the diversity of student abilities, with a mean of 2.97. They also do not measure creativity or problem-solving skills (mean of 2.93). Additionally, these assessments overlook interpersonal skills (mean of 2.96) and have a one-size-fits-all nature that inadequately caters to individual learning needs (mean of 2.91). Finally, standardized tests do not reflect long-term growth or learning (mean of 3.00). A study by Bukhari et al, (2024) similarly found that standardized tests are unable to account for diverse learning abilities and talents. This finding agreed with the current study's conclusion that such assessments miss key cognitive and emotional skills. In a related study by Zimkowski (2024), it was highlighted that standardized testing fails to measure critical thinking, a limitation also identified in the current research. However, while the study by Li et al, (2024) argued that standardized tests were useful for evaluating academic achievement, they too acknowledged the inherent limitation in assessing skills such as creativity and collaboration. This contrast emphasizes the need for alternative assessment methods.

The study found several challenges educators face in preparing students for standardized tests. Educators struggle with time constraints when preparing students (mean of 2.96), and many face a lack of professional development for effective test preparation (mean of 3.07). The focus on standardized tests limits opportunities for innovative teaching methods (mean of 2.68). Additionally, pressure from administrators to meet test score targets reduces teachers' autonomy (mean of 2.77), and addressing individual learning gaps in test preparation remains a significant challenge (mean of 2.68). A study by Balogun (2023) found that while time constraints are a key issue, teachers in their study were more likely to receive adequate professional development for test preparation, highlighting a difference in educational support structures. This finding agreed with the current study's result on the struggle with professional development. In a related study, Nahar (2023) noted that a focus on standardized testing stifled teachers' creativity, a limitation also highlighted in this research. However, unlike the present study, their findings showed less pressure from administrators to

meet score targets. This contrast suggests the varying levels of administrative pressure educators face in different educational systems. Lastly, a study by Amaechi and Onah (2020) revealed that addressing individual learning gaps was the most critical issue for educators, corroborating the findings of this research.

The study revealed that standardized testing influences teaching methods in several ways. Teachers may emphasize rote memorization rather than fostering critical thinking skills (mean of 2.72), and test preparation often results in a narrowed curriculum focused primarily on test topics (mean of 2.81). Furthermore, teachers may adopt a more rigid, teacher-centered approach to instruction (mean of 2.84). Test scores can prompt teachers to focus on remedial instruction (mean of 2.99), and teachers may spend excessive time on test-related practice and drills (mean of 2.85). This finding agreed with the study by Au (2020), which highlighted that rote memorization dominates teaching methods due to the pressure of preparing students for standardized tests. In contrast, Modrek and Ramirez (2021) argued that while there is a narrowing of curriculum, some teachers integrate critical thinking within test preparation, thus balancing both demands. A related study by Nalliah and Reddy (2022) found that teachers often shift to a more teacher-centered approach as a direct response to test pressures, aligning with the results of this study. However, in contrast to our findings, their study suggested that teachers were also using more interactive strategies to alleviate the rigidity.

4. CONCLUSION

The findings from this study reveal that standardized tests often fail to accurately assess the full range of student abilities, including creativity, problem-solving, and interpersonal skills. Additionally, the one-size-fits-all approach does not adequately reflect students' individual learning trajectories. Educators face significant challenges in preparing students for these assessments, including time constraints, lack of professional development, and pressure to meet performance targets. This, in turn, influences teaching methods, with a tendency to focus on rote memorization and narrow curriculum content at the expense of critical thinking and creativity. These results underscore the need for a more holistic and inclusive approach to student

assessment, one that recognizes the diverse skills and growth of learners. Moving forward, it is essential to explore alternative assessment models that provide a more accurate and comprehensive picture of student learning, while also supporting educators in their professional development and autonomy. This study contributes to the ongoing dialogue on how standardized testing impacts education and advocates for meaningful reforms that better align assessment practices with the dynamic needs of students and educators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amaechi, C. E., & Onah, F. E. (2020). Detection of uniform and non-uniform gender differential item functioning in economics multiple choice standardized test in Nigeria. *Journal Of The Nigerian Academy Of Education*, *15*(2).

Au, W. (2020). Testing for whiteness? How high-stakes, standardized tests promote racism, undercut diversity, and undermine multicultural education. In *Visioning multicultural education* (pp. 99-113). Routledge.

Balogun, J. A. (2023). *Reimagining Nigeria's Educational System: Improving Academic Performance Through High Stakes Standardized Testing*. Taylor & Francis.

Bukhari, S.U.P., Rafique, M., Khaliq, N., Hatesh, H., Umer, N., Ahmed, S., Khan, D.A. and Nadeem, S.V., 2024. Academic Performance Indicators To Improve Learning Outcomes Of Students In Educational Institutes: Beyond Standardized Tests. *Migration Letters*, *21*(S11), pp.1428-140.

Couch II, M., Frost, M., Santiago, J., & Hilton, A. (2021). Rethinking standardized testing from an access, equity and achievement perspective: Has anything changed for African American students?. *Journal of Research Initiatives*, *5*(3), 6.

Li, L., Srivastava, N., Rong, J., Pianta, G., Varanasi, R., Gašević, D., & Chen, G. (2024, March). Unveiling Goods and Bads: A Critical Analysis of Machine Learning Predictions of Standardized Test Performance in Early Childhood Education. In *Proceedings of the 14th Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference* (pp. 608-619).

Modrek, A. S., & Ramirez, G. (2021). Cognitive regulation outdoes behavior regulation in predicting state standardized test scores over time. *Metacognition and Learning*, *16*(1), 113-134.

Nahar, L. (2023). The effects of standardized tests on incorporating 21st century skills in science classrooms. *Integrated Science Education Journal*, *4*(2), 36-42.

Nalliah, R. P., & Reddy, M. (2022). When standardized testing is not standardized. *Journal of Dental Education*, *86*(7), 823-829.

Zimkowski, W. A. (2024). *A Quantitative Causal Comparison of State Standardized Test Scores* (Doctoral dissertation, American College of Education).