Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

1-1-2003

The Relationship of the Transformational Leadership of the Administrators in America's Middle College High School and Their Feeder Institutions to Selected Indicators of Effectiveness

Christine M. Michael
michael31@tds.net

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

Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, and the Other Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation

Michael, Christine M., "The Relationship of the Transformational Leadership of the Administrators in America's Middle College High School and Their Feeder Institutions to Selected Indicators of Effectiveness" (2003). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones.* Paper 307.

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP
OF THE ADMINISTRATORS
IN AMERICA'S MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOLS
AND THEIR FEEDER INSTITUTIONS
TO SELECTED INDICATORS OF EFFECTIVENESS

by

Christine M. Michael

Dissertation submitted to
The Graduate College
of
Marshall University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Doctor of Education
in
Leadership Studies

Approved by

Dr. Teresa Eagle, Committee Chairperson
Dr. Elaine Gayton
Dr. Barbara Nicholson
Dr. Linda Spatig

Leadership Studies
2003

Keywords: transformational leadership, middle college high school, attendance,
dropout, graduation, college, enrollment, socioeconomic status, women, age.

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP
OF THE ADMINISTRATORS
IN AMERICA'S MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOLS
AND THEIR FEEDER INSTITUTIONS
TO SELECTED INDICATORS OF EFFECTIVENESS

by

Christine M. Michael

Middle college high schools in America identify potential college students who are at-risk in the traditional high school environment. These students are placed on the college campus to take high school and college classes and receive dual credit for the latter. The program is specifically designed to keep these pupils in high school, graduate them, and send them on to higher education. This investigation focused on the leadership style of the administrators of both the middle college high schools and their traditional feeder high schools and its relationship to four indicators of effectiveness: attendance rate, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college going rate.

Thirty-four middle college high schools were identified along with 465 of their feeder institutions. All of the administrators of middle college high schools and 25% of the principals of the traditional high schools were sent the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) along with a *Demographic Survey*. Pearson correlations were produced and t-tests for Equality of Means were applied to the data using an alpha of .05. Ancillary findings were obtained through the same method.

No association was established between the leadership style of the principals and the four indicators of effectiveness. This study did not establish a difference between the leadership styles of the principals of the middle college and traditional high schools, although all of the leadership scored in the top 30th percentile on the LPI, indicating that transformational leadership was popular and in practice. No significant difference was detected between the two types of high schools when examining average daily attendance and dropout rate. However, an important differentiation was demonstrated between graduation and college rates, with the middle college high schools recording much higher success.

Ancillary suggestions included that women and older administrators employ transformational leadership behaviors more frequently than men and younger administrators. School size was inversely related to attendance and graduation rates. Finally, socioeconomic status of the student was positively correlated to dropout rate and inversely correlated with attendance, graduation, and college going rates.

DEDICATION

The author wishes to remember her father, Elias Dowd, who believed that a person could accomplish anything with determination and diligence. He also believed in educating his four daughters in the finest New England colleges, a radical idea at that time.

The writer also wishes to thank her husband, John Michael, for funding doctorates for his wife and two daughters. He also picked up household chores and ate boxed and frozen dinners for five years and never complained.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

Introduction

In 1973, Lieberman had a vision of a collaboration between high school and college faculty and administrations to address potential dropouts who were identified as possible college students (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000; Lieberman, 1975). This innovative model, exemplified by the Middle College High School at LaGuardia Community College in New York, featured a school-college partnership to promote attendance and academic achievement (Lieberman, 1975; Millonzi & Kolker; 1976). Students acquired college and high school credit simultaneously on the college campus (Lieberman, 1975).

Although the nation's middle college high schools differed in grades served and course offerings, they shared common student outcomes (Middle College High School Consortium, 1999). All of these intervention programs strove to develop a seamless curriculum between high school and college where students gained a sense of responsibility for their own education, mastered the content, and raised their self-esteem (Gehring, 2001; Lieberman, 1975, 1998; Williams, 2002). The report from the National Commission on the High School Senior Year (2001) praised this model for addressing the problem of college freshman remediation in English and math and the wasted senior year of high school. These curricula were specially designed in hopes of improving student attendance, increasing grade point averages and graduation results, lowering dropout rates, and increasing the students attending college or being placed in jobs (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000; Gehring, 2001;Williams, 2000).   The goals also included providing students with high standards for the work force and skills for college

preparation (Williams, 2000). By allowing high school students to take college courses, the total time required to graduate was reduced, thus enhancing students' motivation and increasing college-going rate. (Lieberman, 1998).

Cunningham and Wagonlander (2000), current middle college high school administrators, contended that site-based management ensured ownership by all the participants and required a leader with multiple talents who held the key to its success as the team chairperson. They asserted that in addition to preparing a budget and securing funding for staffing, materials, transportation and equipment, this leader hired a caring staff, guided the team in forming the curriculum, and designed a pupil-centered, holistic counseling system. The leader of a middle college high school dealt with parents, recruited new students, allocated space, and built a network of key supporters. "Experience has shown that establishing and sustaining middle college high schools depend on successful collaboration, shared governance, communication, administrative support, and energetic and visionary leadership" (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000, p.50).

Researchers identified the principal as the key factor in determining an effective school and established the connection between the principal's leadership and school climate (Chrispeels, 2002). The atmosphere of a successful school influenced student performance and attitude (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999). The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the aforementioned transformational leadership characteristics of the principals of middle college high schools and of traditional high schools and four student outcomes that pertain specifically to the purpose of the middle

college high school: average daily attendance, drop out rate, graduation rate, and college attendance rate.

Effective Schools

School effectiveness consists of many complex factors including student achievement, school climate, instructional leadership, and regular monitoring of student progress (Johnson & Johnson, 1996; Walberg, Bakalis, Bast, & Baer, 1989). Additional research emphasized collaborative leadership, high student expectations, and staff training (Codianni & Wilburn, 1983; Coyle & Witcher, 1992). Researchers have examined indicators of effective schools. Schools have formed instructional teams to provide constructivist lesson plans, student engagement in project-based learning, strategies incorporating multiple learning styles, and varied performance assessments in an effort to improve attendance and retain students in school (March & Peters, 2002). Many effective schools fortified classroom instruction through aligning their curriculum to state and national standards, especially in response to the pressure to raise standardized test scores and testing requirements for graduation (Chrispeels, 2002). Students were required to employ higher order thinking skills and completion of multifaceted assignments in preparation for college and beyond (Chrispeel, 2002).

School Climate

School climate, which refers to the environment or personality of a school, was another critical factor in determining effective schools (Johnson & Johnson, 1996). Collegiality, high expectations, appreciation and caring, involvement in decision-making, open communication, experimentation, trust and confidence, support, collaboration and humor, and traditions were identified as standards that were used to measure a school's

climate (Purkey & Smith, 1983). Chirichello (1997) established that principals who employed transformational leadership styles fostered schools that were open and engaged, and Rubio (1999) determined that leaders who scored highest in "consideration" were found in schools with the best educational climates.

School climates also influenced student ambitions; students in schools that nurtured self-confidence, mentoring, belonging, and achievement recorded higher student aspirations (Plucker, 1998). Student engagement was also positively influenced by the transformational leadership of the principal (Barker, 1986; Bobbett, 2001; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Olivier, 2001). Students' participation in school activities and feeling that they belonged in the school were predictors of retention rates (Finn, 1989).

Teachers' assessment of the school's professional culture was also related to affective student outcomes encompassing higher self-esteem, commitment to homework and class work, and constructive attitudes towards classmates and teachers (Cheng, 1996). Efficacy beliefs of the teachers were compelling indicators of the school organizational effectiveness and climate, which resulted in positive student outcomes (Barker, 1986; Bobbett, 2001; Olivier, 2001).

Average Daily Attendance

Students who were absent regularly from school fell behind their peers in achievement and self-esteem, and were at risk for dropping out of school and unemployment (DeKalb, 1999). The National Center for Educational Statistics (1996) indicated that eight per cent of high school suburban students and 12% of urban were absent daily from the nation's schools. Among the factors which contributed to truancy were lack of motivation due to a feeling of separation and alienation from school

(Dougherty, 1999). Students cited irrelevant or boring classes, personal family problems, and association with peers who used alcohol or drugs as reasons for nonattendance (Bennett, 2001; Bimler & Kirkland, 2001; Dougherty, 1999; Irving & Parker-Jenkins, 1995).

Schools attempted to address the truancy problem through interventions, the most notable strategy being the implementation of the four block schedule (Khazzaka, 1997). Under this scheduling revision, students had more time to master the content under the teacher's supervision through project-based learning. Teachers had fewer students per day, so that they had the opportunity to form personal relationships with their pupils. In the Khazzaka study (1997), the results were an average increase of 13.5% in daily attendance under the four block schedule. Other schools experimented with alternate curricula, work experience, punitive fines, and reward programs to promote attendance (Dougherty, 1999; Irving & Parker-Jenkins; 1995). Positive climate was a recurring factor throughout the research and relevance of the content material was important (Maynard, 1977).

Dropouts

The foremost predictor for students' dropping out of school was poverty (Drvian & Butler, 2001; Gooding, 2001; Haycock & Huang, 2001). Gooding (2001) observed that students from low income families were less likely to have positive role models or parental influence. Beyond the poverty issue, however, pupils who had low academic skills, lived in single parent homes, or had parents who did not graduate from high school were more likely to drop out of school (Drvian & Butler, 2001). Students with low self-

esteem or who were bored or alienated were also at risk (Collins, 1992; Drvian & Butler, 2001; Fine, 1986; Ryan, 1991).

Wehlage, Rutter, and Tumbaugh (1987) concurred that there were school issues that could be controlled to assist students to continue in school. Wehlage, Rutter, Smith, Lesko, and Fernandez (1989) demonstrated that schools did not respond satisfactorily to the personal and socioeconomic tribulations of at-risk students, thus hostility and antipathy festered toward the school. This group of researchers asserted that students must have felt connection with the values, activities and people of the institution to overcome a history of failure and negative experiences.

School re-engagement was vital for students in danger of dropping out (Hamilton, 1986; Wagonlander, 1987). Wagonlander (1997) insisted that disengaged students would attend school regularly if supported by caring adults. She suggested that educators' attitudes, administrative practices, curriculum, instructional strategies, and class size were all components that can be targeted to promote active learning. Alternative programs, including the middle college high school concept, used low student-teacher ratio, vocational connections to academics, interdisciplinary projects, and individual counseling to foster a social bond between adults and students (Cullen, 1991a; Hamilton, 1986). Engaging seniors in preparation for college was especially challenging, and schools were experimenting with dual enrollment classes, internships, career academies, and applied academics (Conley, 2001).

Graduation

Recent statistics showed that nationally 74% of students graduated from high school at age 18, but the results for different races were stark (Seebach, 2002). Seventy-

eight per cent of white students graduated, while only 56% of black students and 54% of Hispanic students reached that benchmark (Seebach, 2002). Schools have intervened to enhance the graduation rate through articulation of the content material in kindergarten through twelfth grade (Grannis, 1991). Employment of cooperative learning, hands-on activities, and computer-based learning aided in retaining students' interest in learning (Grannis, 1991). Administrators focused on a caring and safe environment in school, and students were allowed to plan three-, four- or five-year programs to complete high school (Janey, 2002). Counselors successfully attempted to help students overcome the influence of a negative home environment and neighborhood in order to graduate from high school (Dyer, 2001; Vartanian & Gleason, 1999; Wilson, 1987).

High stakes testing for graduation created a national impact on students' acquiring basic skills (Jacob, 2001). Although teachers emphasized student weaknesses during remediation, the tests have not increased achievement, but rather narrowed the curriculum and pushed teachers away from best practice pedagogy (Jacob, 2001). Students who failed the exam were at risk for dropping out of school (Jacob, 2001). Increased graduation and math requirements were implemented to strengthen the preparedness of the nation's high school graduates (Lillard & DeCicca as cited in Emanoil, 2000). Hoffer (1997) reported that the additional courses were not sufficiently rigorous to improve achievement, and Lillard and DeCicca (cited in Emanoil, 2000) concurred that the increased requirements only raised the dropout rate, especially among the poor, and blacks and Hispanics.

College Attendance

Many issues swayed a student when deciding upon college, but the most influential predictor of attendance was parental involvement and social interaction in the family (Smith, 1993). Gooding (2001) and Bitner (1981) also found that parental educational level, parental marital status, and socioeconomic levels affected students' academic aspirations. Bitner (1981) confirmed that the earlier in life that students felt pressure to attend college, the more likely they were to attend a higher educational institution. In recognition of these findings, high schools supplied better guidance to students in pre-college course selection and established the expectation of college attendance (Trainor, 1993).

The most reliable predictor of achievement in college was the rigor of high school coursework, which outweighed even standardized college entrance exams (Haycock & Huang, 2001). Haycock and Huang (2001) also stressed that while 75% of high school students went on to college, only about half completed high school core courses necessary for college preparatory skills. As a result, almost half of all college students were compelled to elect remedial classes, contributing to high college dropout rates (Botstein, 1997; Haycock & Huang, 2001; Ornstein, 1992). Haycock and Huang (2001) reported that college deans were obliged to communicate to the high school faculties the knowledge and skills necessary for entering freshmen to ensure their success.

The National Commission on the High School Senior Year (2001) advocated the middle college high school model for some students to aid in the transition from high school to college or the world of work. The location of the middle college high school on the campuses of America influenced a student's incentive and enthusiasm to attend

college, with about 64% transferring from the two-year community colleges to four-year institutions (Cullen, 1991a; Lieberman, 1998).

Leadership in Effective Schools

Hord (1984) and Terry (1988) identified the principal as the key factor in determining an effective school. In their study of effective school principals, Day, Harris, and Hadfield (2001) reported that this group of leaders promoted a climate of collaboration for exploring new strategies. In the Day study, the leaders emphasized learning through personal and professional development of students and staff, and the research concluded that morality, emotion, and social bonds between and among all school members also fueled motivation and commitment (Day et al., 2001).

Effective leadership necessitated the empowerment of leaders and followers (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, and McCleary (1990) proposed that effective principals employed and empowered strong collaborative teams, especially at the secondary level. Researchers also confirmed that successful administrators had supportive staff who had a part in the decision-making process (Shanahan, 1988). Tibaldo (1994) reported that principals of Blue Ribbon Schools practiced democratic, participatory leadership styles more often than their counterparts at non-recognized schools. A strong commitment from the instructional staff was important for serving at-risk students (Drvian & Butler, 2001).

Effective school reform included students, parents, teachers, and principals who were willing to assume leadership roles (Mestinek, 2000). Mestinek (2000) investigated the differences between principals in charter and traditional schools, and confirmed that educational reform necessitated a more transformational leadership style. A leader who

incorporated this style supported a work climate that encouraged creativity, independent thinking, and risk-taking - an environment in which non-traditional students were seen to flourish (Mestinek, 2000). Shared decision-making permitted students, parents, and staff to have input into the daily operations of the program, and this empowerment gave the stakeholders a sense of ownership in their school (Kellmayer, 1995; Raywid, 1983; Spears, 1996; Wehlage, 1983).

Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) first introduced the concept of transformational leadership which, "…occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivations and morality" (p.20). He expressed that transformational leaders ascertained the motives of the followers, fulfilled their needs for self-actualization and incorporated a holistic approach transforming subordinates into leaders themselves. This approach endorsed Maslow's (1970) theory that people seek to realize their potential through self-actualization, esteem, and belonging. A leader in this transformational style was the moral agent who assured that subordinates found purpose, meaning and significance in their work (Sergiovanni, 1990a). Burns (1978) concluded that there were three constructs within transformational leadership. Charismatic or inspirational leadership encompassed vision, mission, confidence, optimism, and enthusiasm to earn respect, loyalty and trust. Leaders who embraced individual consideration attended to personal needs, coached and advised followers, and assisted the latter to ensure success. Finally, intellectual stimulation endorsed intelligence, rationality, problem solving, and divergent thinking (Burns, 1978).

Bass (1985) elaborated on Burns' leadership theory. He posited that leaders motivate others to give extra effort by raising their consciousness about the importance of the results and ways to attain them. Bass also affirmed that leaders persuaded the followers to sublimate their own interests for the sake of the organization. Both authors concurred that successful leadership meant inspiring followers through charisma and ideals, and both agreed on the three constructs, that form the underpinnings of transformational leadership theory, i.e., charisma, consideration of individual needs, and intellectual stimulation (Burns, 1978). However, Burns contended that transactional and transformational leadership were mutually exclusive, whereas Bass concluded that a leader utilized a variety of styles.

Values-driven, visionary leadership was grounded in mutual meaning and purpose (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). In a study of 90 individual leaders, Bennis and Nanus (1985) found that persuasive communication motivated and influenced followers, and leaders established trust through consistency on issues. They argued that high self-esteem pushed the employee to raise his or her own expectations and achievement standards.

Kouzes and Posner (1989) emphasized that workers must feel that their input is important to the organization; both employer and employee received satisfaction knowing that their combined efforts improved the outcomes. Through their research of 550 public and private sector managers, Kouzes and Posner (1989) reported ten behavioral characteristics of transformational leadership which they grouped into five broader categories: challenging the process, inspiring the vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart. These characteristics are discussed in detail in

chapter two. Kouzes and Posner's research formed the basis of the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) instrument for measuring implementation of transformational leadership.

Sergiovanni (1992) expanded the concept to encourage the transformation of schools from organizations to a communities, in which all stakeholders had a duty to shape the school into a reflection of the community's ideals. This premise was the moral foundation for effective school leadership, for it inspired the entire school community toward exceptional allegiance and accomplishment (Sergiovanni, 1990a; 1995). Parents, students, and staff had a vision of what the school could become, and a set of beliefs about what teaching and learning should be (Sergiovanni, 1990a).

A strong transformational principal assisted teachers in finding greater significance in their work and developing their instructional potential (Leithwood, 1992). Faculty development promoted motivation and commitment to the school mission. Leithwood (1992) also contended that if teachers were included in the problem solving process, they would be stimulated to take part in new activities and put forth extra effort which would increase the effectiveness of the school.

At the end of the 20th century, educational institutions began experiencing greater democratization with all stakeholders working together to reach higher levels of excellence (Schlechty, 1990). Transformational theory was reflected in the trend toward site-based management. Schlechty (1990) stated that the transformational approach to leadership fostered personal satisfaction, trust, joint effort, and achievement.

Conclusion

Middle college high schools were established in school districts throughout the nation to address student disengagement (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000). These

smaller, innovative alternatives have been shown to increase high school attendance and graduation rates by offering dual credit for college classes and concentrated counseling services. Researchers affirmed the importance of leadership in effective schools, both traditional and alternative (Hord, 1984; Mestinek, 2000; Terry, 1988). The principal's leadership style affected school climate and student outcomes, including truancy, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college attendance (Haycock & Huang, 2001; Wehlage et. al., 1987). It has not been established if the positive increases in attendance, graduation, and college-going rates in the middle college high school setting are due to the leadership style of the principal.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the transformational leadership characteristics of the nation's middle college high school administrators and those of principals in some of their traditional feeder high schools as they relate to four indicators of effectiveness: average daily attendance, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college attendance rate. The following questions will be answered in this study:

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the middle college and traditional high school principals' scores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and average daily attendance?

2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the middle college and traditional high school principals' scores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and dropout rate?

3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the middle college and

traditional high school principals' scores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and graduation rate?

4. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the middle college and traditional high school principals' scores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and college attendance rate?

5. Is there a statistically significant relationship between the middle college high schools and traditional high schools on the following indicators: *Leadership Practices Inventory,* average daily attendance, drop out rate, graduation rate, and college attendance rate?

Operational Definitions

For the purposes of this study, the following operational definitions are used.

1. Level of implementation of transformational leadership – the respondent's score on the *Leadership Practices Inventory*

2. Organization of the school – the school is a middle college high school or traditional high school as reported by the administrator on the demographic survey

3. Average Daily Attendance – the number reported by the respondents in the demographic survey

4. Dropout Rate – the number reported by the respondents in the demographic survey.

5. Graduation Rate – the number reported by the respondents in the demographic survey

6.   College Going Rate – the number reported by the respondents on the demographic survey

7. Enrollment – the number reported by the respondents on the demographic survey

8. Free and reduced lunch – the number reported by the respondents on the demographic survey

Significance of the Study

Very little research has been completed on middle college high schools, and information on the leadership styles of their administrators is scarce (Boomer, 1993; Kellmayer, 1995; Leithwood, 1992). Gulick and Urwick (1937) asserted that the functions of administrators include planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting; the middle college high school leader does them all. The middle college high school principal plans the development of the original organization and lobbies for funding for the new alternative school. Through analyzing reports, the middle college high school administrator identifies practices that fail, develops innovative structures, and redesigns the model to work (Lieberman, 1998). In many alternative programs, the principal is solely responsible for directing the curricular design and for the hiring of teachers, counselors, and ancillary staff (Collins, 1992). Principals in the middle college high school have a diffused role and are in closer contact with students and teachers than administrators of traditional high schools (Sweeney, 1983). The leader is the central planner, bringing together students, teachers, parents and the community (Kellmayer, 1995; Sweeney, 1983).

Knowledge of the leadership characteristics and assets required to administer an effective school was essential to ensure the survival of alternative programs (Hansen, 1989; Mestinek, 2000). Researchers found that the role of the principal was vital to the success of innovations in successful schools (Floyd, 1999; Hansen,1989), and Wagonlander (1997) asserted that student engagement was positively affected by

administrative practices. A principal committed to restructuring a school had a clear vision, communicated it, and inspired others to collaborate for the achievement of all children (Gild, 2000). From the experience of current principals, establishing and sustaining a new program of this nature depended on successful collaboration, shared governance, communication, administrative support, and energetic and visionary leadership (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000).

Verona (2001) suggested that transformational leadership profiles for principals would enable those hiring principals to identify those candidates with the most potential as administrators with transformational style. Transformational leadership qualities, which were predictors of success in the charter school model, might be incorporated into staff development for future middle college high school administrators (Floyd, 1999; Gild, 2000; Mestinek, 2000). Leithwood (1992) and Verona (2001) argued that skills for the new leadership are teachable and assist in the development of the collaborative school culture. Administrators competent in transformational leadership can lead to improvements for the students. Principals must be trained in the dynamics of a school, organizational structure, and factors that shape leadership practices (Gild, 2000).

Research in the area of middle college high school administration will ultimately help those students who need alternative educational settings in order to benefit from the learning process (Hansen, 1989). Information emanating from this study can aid educators in selecting administrators suited to leading non-traditional, small schools as well as leaders of successful traditional high schools (Hamm, 1999). By identifying leadership style behaviors of successful school principals, current leaders may want to incorporate these behaviors to improve their effectiveness (Tibaldo, 1994).

Limitations of the Study

This descriptive study used a self-reporting questionnaire survey and was subject to the accuracy of the participant's responses; the investigator was unable to check the responses given (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Even though survey information is relatively accurate, it does not penetrate very deeply below the surface (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). The small size of the population of the middle college high school administrators was a limitation, even though the sample was augmented by 25% of the feeder high school principals (Cambell & Stanley, 1963). Thus, findings did not generalize to other high school settings or other types of alternative schools (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Additionally, low response rates from the questionnaire meant that valid generalizations cannot be made (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000).

Other intervening variables not included in this study may influence the average daily attendance, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college-going rate in the targeted high schools. Thus, a rival hypothesis may exist (Campbell & Stanley, 1963), especially in the area of smaller schools. Small schools have been shown to produce a better environment where students have a sense of belonging (Barker, 1986; Howley, 1996). Students' participation in extra-curricular activities was found to be higher in small schools and attendance increased while dropouts decreased (Galetti, 1999; Howley, 1989). The middle college high school's small size allowed for individualized attention for each student (Millonzi & Kolker, 1976). Finally, small schools showed higher achievement for all students and a highly significant positive difference for low income students (Friedkin & Necochea, 1988; Haycock & Huang, 2001; Howley, 1989).

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Traditional education did not always meet the needs of all students; thus alternatives have emerged (Raywid, 1998). One such effective alternative has been the middle college high school, with its affirming climate measured by increased attendance, lowered dropout rate, and improved graduation and college-going rates (Lieberman, 1998). Furthermore, in studies of effective schools, researchers have identified the administrator's leadership style as one of the crucial indicators of such schools, especially if the administrator employed transformational leadership strategies (Tibaldo, 1994). Finally, other studies determined that successful alternative schools have been characterized by their small size, often serving at-risk students who were economically disadvantaged (Collins, 1992). All the above factors separately, or in combination, have been important in meeting the needs of disadvantaged and non-traditional students.

Effective Schools

The effective schools research emphasized several indicators of success including high expectations that all children can learn, a clear and achievable mission, a safe and orderly environment, and respectful behavior of students and staff (Drvian & Butler, 2001; Dunne & Delisio, 2001). In addition, other factors in the examination of effective schools encompassed achievement of basic skills, strong instructional leadership, and frequent assessment of student progress (Johnson & Johnson, 1996; Walberg, Bakalis, Bast, & Baer; 1989). Finally, additional studies supported a positive school climate that fostered learning, encouraged shared leadership, and encouraged staff development (Barker, 1986; Codianni & Wilburn, 1983; Coyle & Witcher, 1992).

18

Academic emphasis was a strong predictor of effectiveness in schools, followed by continuous school improvement, teamwork, and orderliness (Gaziel, 1997). Separating the schools in his study according to economic differences, Gaziel (1997) observed that in high socioeconomic schools, the emphasis on academic achievement produced a more effective school. However, in disadvantaged schools, where teachers placed the primary emphasis on order, lower academic achievement resulted (Gaziel, 1997).

Chrispeels (2002) noted that many effective schools have strengthened classroom instruction through aligning their curricula to state and national standards. In fact, teams of administrators and teachers have articulated academic performance goals in grades kindergarten through twelve, and have developed curriculum maps for each subject and grade level, including topics, process, skills, and materials (March & Peters, 2002). These instructional teams have provided best practice instruction, incorporating constructivism, student engagement, multiple learning styles, instructional strategies, classroom management and varied assessment (Drivian & Butler, 2001; Dunne & Delisio, 2001; March & Peters, 2002). This focus on effective schools' reform has resulted in improvement in the depth and quality of student learning that required upper level cognitive thinking and completion of complex assignments (Chrispeels, 2002). In addition, frequent monitoring of student advancement and program performance has been essential in the effective schools process (Chrispeels, 2002).

In another study, Barker (1986) learned that many effective schools employed shared decision making, a collaborative communication process where all the stakeholders in school reform consulted one another while working together for the

common goal of improved student performance. Chrispeels, (2002) confirmed that the

principal, teachers, ancillary staff, parents, and students formed a team designed to move

the school toward the effective school objectives. This leadership team defined the

mission of the school and implemented reforms while sharing instructional leadership

and school-based governance (Chrispeels, 2002).   Clearly, schools that focused on

student academic achievement in an atmosphere of shared responsibility were most

successful in researchers' studies.

   School climate. School climate has surfaced as an essential gauge for an effective

school (Johnson & Johnson, 1996). Purkey & Smith (1983) identified several norms

associated with the culture of a school: collegiality; experimentation; high expectations;

trust and confidence; tangible support; appreciation and caring; collaboration and humor;

involvement in decision-making; maintaining traditions; and open communication.

Moreover, Chirichello (1997) asserted that principals who exhibited transformational

leadership styles administered schools whose climates were open and engaged and whose

teachers considered themselves collegial. Additional research determined that a

transformational leader supported a school culture that provided teaching personnel with

opportunities and methods to participate in the decision-making process (Bishop, Tunley

& Berman, 1997). To further support this premise, Rubio (1999) documented that school

leaders who obtained the highest scores for "consideration" served schools in the highest

ratings for climate dimensions.

   Efficacy beliefs were the strongest predictors of school organizational

effectiveness and climate, which, in turn, were echoed in student success (Barker, 1986;

Bobbett, 2001; Olivier, 2001). In addition, teachers' perceptions of the school's

professional culture were also associated with affective student outcomes, including positive attitudes toward classmates and learning (Cheng, 1996). Cheng (1996) also discovered that when teachers exhibited a professional climate, students had higher self-esteem, greater commitment to the school, and a better work ethic.

Plucker (1998) verified that a school climate that cultivated self-confidence, mentoring, belonging, and achievement increased student aspirations. This researcher also ascertained that students who felt they were valuable members of the school community had higher aspiration scores. Interestingly, Leithwood and Jantzi (1999, 2000) discovered a slight, yet statistically significant, relationship between transformational leadership and student engagement, which was reflected in participation in school activities as well as identification with the school and feelings of belonging (Leithwood and Jantzi, 1999). This finding had important implications, for dropping out of school was the final event in a long process of gradual disengagement from school. Thus, student participation and identification predicted schools' retention rates (Finn, 1989).

Attendance rates. Absenteeism was injurious to student achievement, promotion, graduation, self-esteem and potential employment (DeKalb, 1999). Students who did not attend school regularly fell behind their peers and increased the risk of dropping out of school (DeKalb, 1999). The National Center for Educational Statistics (1996) reported that in the 1990-91 school year, eight per cent of high school students in suburban schools were absent in contrast to 12% of urban students. Furthermore, Rood (1989) noted that absenteeism increased through high school and that girls were absent more frequently than boys. He also concluded that minority students were more likely to be

absent than whites, as were students with lower grade point averages. Moreover, Rood (1989) confirmed that students from one-parent families had poorer attendance than those from traditional families and participation in school activities was an indicator of better attendance.

Several factors contributed to truancy. Lack of motivation to attend classes was mirrored in alienation from school; the students reported a feeling of separation and disconnectedness (Dougherty, 1999). This negative viewpoint may have resulted from an uncaring faculty, inability to cope with academic expectations, boredom in irrelevant courses, or suspensions (Bimler & Kirkland, 2001; Dougherty, 1999; Irvin & Parker-Jenkins, 1995). Furthermore, some students experienced personal problems through being a victim of bullying or lack of friends (Bimler & Kirkland, 2001). Family issues were also a cornerstone in chronic student truancy. Overcrowded living conditions, frequent relocations, and permissive or non-caring parents contributed to student absenteeism (Bimler & Kirkland, 2001; Dougherty, 1999). Last, association with delinquent peers who used alcohol or drugs surfaced as an additional factor in nonattendance (Bimler & Kirkland, 2001; Doughtery, 1999).

High school administrators have attempted to address some of the causes of truancy through reorganizing the school day via the block schedule (Khazzaka, 1997). Khazzaka (1997) established that this innovation allowed students extra class time to experience project-based learning, allowing students to see the relevance of the content. Moreover, teachers were responsible for fewer students per day which permitted the instructors to relate personally to their pupils. This researcher also proposed that students

had more time to practice and absorb the material; therefore, academic success resulted.

The study by Khazzaka (1997) yielded these results:

Table 2.1

Average Daily Attendance by Grade Level

Grade Level	7-Period Day	4-Period Day	Difference
9	82%	93%	11%
10	76%	89%	13%
11	72%	87%	2%
12	70%	85%	15%
Average Daily Attendance (n=2890)	75%	88.5%	13.5%

Moreover, researchers have indicated that positive interpersonal relationships were even more effective than a block schedule for addressing truancy (Stirling, 2001). Some schools have established intervention teams to lead weekly counseling sessions to enhance student self-confidence and internal discipline (Robinson, 2000). In addition, administrators have experimented with alternate curricula, work experience, punitive fines, and rewarding steady attendance (Dougherty, 1999; Irving & Parker-Jenkins; 1995). Ultimately, the most successful schools established a positive climate, where students recognized that it was important to be in school every day (Maynard, 1977). Therefore teachers let students know that they were missed and vital learning occurred every day in the classroom (Dougherty, 1999).

Dropouts. Experts in the field of recidivism agreed that approximately 30% of youth dropped out before graduating (Drvian & Butler, 2001); in fact, one out of twenty youngsters drops out each year (Haycock & Huang, 2001).   The strongest indicator for dropping out of school was poverty (Gooding, 2001; Drvian & Butler, 2001; Howley & Huang, 1991). Gooding (2001) concluded that students from low income families were less likely to have positive parental influences and role models. In addition, both Collins (1992) and Fine (1986) noted the number of dropouts increased when a discrepancy existed between the experiences of the middle class teacher and low socioeconomic students.

Drvian and Butler (2001) identified at-risk students as those who have low academic skills, a single parent, or parents who are not high school graduates. Pellerin (2000) also linked parenting style to student outcomes; students from authoritarian or laissez-faire situations were more like to leave the school setting. Furthermore, students who had low self-esteem and negative self-perceptions, or were alienated or bored, were more likely to drop out of school (Collins, 1992; Drvian & Butler, 2001; Fine, 1986; Ryan, 1991). Typically, students in general left education to work outside school, and females abandoned their education to have children or to get married (Fine, 1986).

Wehlage, Rutter, Smith, Lesko, and Fernandez (1989) agreed that schools did not respond adequately to the personal and socioeconomic problems of at-risk students, thus fostering hostility and resentment toward the educational institution.   Specialization in curriculum moved students frequently between teachers who instruct 120 to 180 students per day, hindering the staff member from developing a close, supportive relationship with his or her students (Kane, 1994). Predictably, in studies comparing school structure,

authoritative schools retained the most students, indifferent schools reflected student disengagement, and authoritarian schools had the highest dropout rate (Pellerin, 2000). Authoritarian schools use intimidation and student deprecation to enforce strict and unquestioning obedience to authority. On the other hand, authoritative systems use rules that are reasonable and whose consequences are humane and consistent. School factors that contributed to recidivism comprised lack of consistent discipline, no teacher involvement, lack of attention to individual needs, and lack of engagement in learning (Drvian and Butler, 2001).

Wehlage, Rutter, and Tumbaugh (1987) found at-risk students can be helped through changing certain determinants. These researchers stressed that a successful dropout prevention program should form the intervention to fit the student instead of trying to make the student adapt to school policies. Wehlage and his associates (1989) named the school support system "bonding" or school membership. The student in this study experienced high attachment to the norms, activities, values and people of a particular institution through involvement and thus believed that graduation was attainable (Wehlage et al., 1989). These researchers contended that only through school membership could a student with a history of school failure and a non-supportive family overcome these negative influences (Wehlage et al, 1989).

The investment in programs that retained at-risk students and eventually graduated them yielded a savings of $4.75 for every dollar spent (McCormick, 1989). As expected, school re-engagement was critical for students in danger of leaving the educational setting (Hamilton, 1986; Wagonlander, 1997). Wagonlander (1997) insisted that affective and teacher-related components impacted student commitment to

education; disengaged youth successfully attended school if supported by caring adults. She reported that educators' attitudes, administrative practices, curriculum, instructional strategies, and class size are all factors that can purposefully be implemented to lower the rate of recidivism. She asserted that educators and policy makers have control over these pivotal issues which can foster student reengagement in learning. In addition, Kaplan and Owings (2001) demonstrated that at risk learners showed gains under the block schedule because students spent increased time with one teacher who strengthened interpersonal relationships, developing group cohesion and trust. The longer block-schedule class period allowed pupils to obtain manageable chunks of information, practice under teacher supervision, and receive feedback to increase learning (Kaplan & Owings, 2001). The extended time also permitted practical applications, increasing the relevance of schooling for the learner (Kaplan & Owings, 2001).

Alternative programs utilizing individual counseling, low student-teacher ratio, vocational experiences, and experiential learning provided a solution for students at risk for dropping out of school (Hamilton, 1986). Accordingly, Cullen (1991a) advocated restructuring schools to promote school membership through a social bond with peers and adults. She also supported academic engagement, the psychological investment required to comprehend and master knowledge and skills. At the Middle College High School at LaGuardia Community College, a similar philosophy was implemented when school membership was encouraged by first name relationships between adults and students, the governance structure, daily group counseling, a college campus location, peer counseling, a parent support group, small class size, a student recruitment process, an orientation program, a particular grading system and small class size (Cullen, 1991a).   Cullen

(1991a) confirmed that academic engagement was cultivated through cooperative

learning, team teaching, seventy minute class periods, the house system, collaborative

program planning, interdisciplinary classes, project oriented instruction strategies, college

classes, and the grading system. The result was lowered drop out rates and high

attendance rates (Cullen, 1991a; Heard, 1988). The middle college in Seattle showed

similar progress with an 84% retention rate (Houston, Byers, & Danner, 1992).

Engaging at-risk seniors during their last year of high school was especially

difficult (Conley, 2001). Unfortunately, students failed to make the connection between

high school graduation and future income or life after graduation (Fine, 1986). Various

instructional strategies such as small learning communities, dual enrollment classes,

career academies, internships, block scheduling, and applied academics were successfully

employed to keep seniors attending school regularly (Conley, 2001).

Graduation.   The President's National Education Goals for 2000 set the standard

at 90% for students graduating from high school, and 75% for dropouts who return later

to finish a high school degree or its equivalent (Grannis, 1991). Therefore, schools have

been searching for strategies to retain and graduate students. Articulation of content

material in grades kindergarten through twelve, coupled with hands-on activities,

cooperative learning, computer-based learning, and peer tutoring have aided students in

persisting with their education (Grannis, 1991). In addition, connecting school with

employment and flexible scheduling have allowed more students to remain in school and

graduate (Grannis, 1991). To further accommodate students, administrators have created

a personal and safe environment where counselors responded to students' emotional

needs, teachers fostered higher-order thinking and problems solving skills, and students mastered significant knowledge to prepare for college or employment (Grannis, 1991).

Researchers exploring the influence of the home on graduation have observed that successful seniors possessed a strong support network of teachers, counselors and family (Dyer, 2001). The graduating students did not cite school factors for their persistence, but rather mothers and grandmothers. Those pupils who did not graduate blamed the school, however, mentioning a lack of support from the school as the main reason for their failure (Dyer, 2001). Wilson (1987) asserted that students who live in socially isolated neighborhoods and lack positive adult role models were less likely to graduate from high school. The school in a poor area might have been under-funded, and the negative effects were most severe among young people without family support to overcome the influences of these neighborhoods (Vartanian, 1999).

States attempted to raise the requirements for high school graduation so that students could get better jobs with higher wages or experience success in college. Researchers discovered that by adding 2.5 more courses (one standard deviation), 26,000 to 65,000 students dropped out of school, representing a 3 to 7% upturn in the dropout rate (Lillard & DeCicca as cited in Emanoil, 2000). This policy mostly affected youth who were poor, had many siblings, were black or Hispanic, or whose parents were dropouts themselves (Lillard & DeCicca as cited in Emanoil, 2000). Schools also required additional mathematics electives to raise achievement levels. However, Hoffer (1997) reported that average achievement scores were not higher among students whose schools required three years of mathematics as compared to those institutions that demanded two years of study. Hoffer (1997) stated that the additional courses were not

sufficiently rigorous to improve achievement. He also suggested that schools lower content and mastery standards in exchange for attendance, civil behavior, and passing grades.

States also implemented high-stakes graduation exams to drive achievement and to focus on students' mastering basic skills (Jacob, 2001). Although teachers have identified student weaknesses and provided remediation, the tests did not increase achievement; instead they narrowed the curriculum and pushed teachers away from best practice pedagogy and higher order thinking skills (Jacob, 2001). In addition, students who failed the exam showed increased alienation and anxiety and were at risk for dropping out of school (Jacob, 2001). Jacob (2001) also argued that students in the bottom fifth percentile were 25% more likely to drop out of school than their peers in states that did not employ graduation testing. Furthermore, Verona (2001) confirmed that transformational leadership of principals was related to passing scores in reading, mathematics, writing, and other sections of the New Jersey High School Proficiency Test. Moreover, student attendance rate and socioeconomic status also affected scores, but school size and mobility did not (Verona, 2001).

Some students required more time to graduate from high school and some needed less time, according to academic or developmental causes (Janey, 2002). Experimental programs throughout the country allowed students to plan three, four, or five year programs at the seventh grade level; however, the majority still elected the four-year path (Janey, 2002). The biggest challenge was removing the stigma attached to the five-year option which was overcome through communication and collaborative planning with the student, parents, and school counselors (Janey, 2002). The extra academic support

resulted in students' not requiring remedial classes when they entered their freshman year of college (Janey, 2002).

In an effort to prevent high school dropouts, The National Commission on the High School Senior Year (2001) recommended the middle college high school model for some students as a transition from high school to the world beyond. Middle college high school programs were located on college campuses, significantly impacting a student's motivation to attend college (Cullen, 1991a; Lieberman, 1998). Statistically, middle colleges have graduated about 75% of their students from high school, and about 64% transfer from the two-year institutions to four-year colleges (Lieberman, 1998). Thus, the middle college high school has increased effectiveness in student outcomes in graduation and college going rates over traditional high schools.

College. Several factors influenced a student's choice to attend college. The most powerful predictor of college attendance was parental involvement, including social interaction in the family (Smith, 1993). The parental educational level, parental marital status, and parental socioeconomic levels influenced students academically (Gooding, 2001). Wealth was related to motivation and aspiration, which correlated to effort and academic achievement (Natriello & McDill, 1986). Typically, education money was available and wealthy parents encouraged their child to plan for college (Natriello & McDill, 1986).   Conversely, Natriello and McDill (1986) observed that children from families of little wealth were aware that their parents could not afford to send them to college, negating parental encouragement.

Bitner (1981), in an extensive study on family factors and college attendance, demonstrated that parental income was positively correlated to educational expectations,

and that parental approval of post-secondary plans was of some importance to the students. He discovered that over three-fourths of the college students indicated that their fathers completed some college education. Furthermore, Bitner (1991) reported that the general reputation of the school was the most important characteristic discussed with parents. He noted that the earlier in life a student felt pressure to attend college, the more likely he or she would attend a four-year college. He confirmed that most students do as their parents influenced them to do, and that parents were the deciding factor in college attendance.

Deciding to attend college was a cultural phenomenon where schools and communities could promote college attendance (Oesterreich, 2000; Trainor, 1993). Furthermore, school systems identified and eliminated factors which discouraged students from attending college, while increasing parental involvement, peer support, cultural affirmation, and community involvement encouraged college attendance (Oesterreich, 2000). An added bonus supporting this premise was that small schools promoted social bonds which influenced a student's choice to attend college (Walberg & Walberg, 1994). In fact, Trainor (1993) recommended that schools help students and families overcome the fears associated with college by helping students simulate the college-going experience. Students also needed help with the admissions process, college visits, and applications for financial aid (Oesterreich, 2000).

In contrast to earlier research that suggested schools were lowering standards, Haycock and Huang (2001) asserted that the quality and intensity of high school coursework was a reliable predictor of success in college. Increasing numbers of students have been electing a rigorous or college prep curriculum along with study skills, high

expectations and test preparation in algebra, geometry, calculus, biology, chemistry and physics (Oesterrich, 2000). Haycock and Huang (2001) demonstrated that while three-fourths of high school graduates continue on to college, only about half complete the minimum preparatory curriculum (four English credits, three each in math, science and social studies). They concurred that low-income students were less likely to elect these important courses than their affluent counterparts; in fact, students in the top income quartile were seven times as likely to earn a bachelor's degree as those in the bottom income quartile. These investigators contended that the rigor of high school classes also had a positive effect on learning and test performance, even for those students not anticipating college.

Almost half of all college students were required to take remedial courses, contributing to high college dropout rates (Botstein, 1997; Haycock & Huang, 2001; Ornstein, 1992). Moreover, more than a fourth of freshmen in four-year colleges and almost half of students in two-year colleges did not return for their sophomore year, thus it was incumbent upon higher educators to articulate the knowledge and skills necessary for students entering as college freshmen (Haycock & Huang, 2001). Despite the evidence that students were not prepared for college, high schools were hesitant to change the college preparatory curriculum, fearing that their students would be at a disadvantage when applying to post-secondary institutions (Conley, 2001).

Leadership in Effective Schools

Many research studies identified the principal as the key factor in determining an effective school (Hord, 1984; Terry, 1988). Day, Harris, and Hadfield (2001) studied effective school principals who shared common values with the stakeholders of the

school and fostered a climate of collaboration for developing new strategies. The

effective administrators in the Day inquiry solved problems through a variety of

approaches including personal negotiations. They remained focused on commitment to

learning and the personal and professional development of students and staff alike. In

addition, the principals in the report modeled the core values of respect, fairness,

integrity, and honesty. The study concluded that morale, emotional attachment, and

social bonds among the staff were powerful stimulants to motivation and commitment

(Day et al., 2001)

      Effective leadership necessitated empowerment of leaders and followers (Bennis

& Nanus, 1985). Bennis and Nanus (1985) explained that;

      When individuals feel that they can make a difference and that they

      can improve the society in which they are living through their participation

      in an organization, then it is much more likely that they will bring vigor and

      enthusiasm to their tasks and that the results of their work will be mutually

      reinforcing (p. 91).

      In this situation, the effective administrator used transformational strategies to

motivate the staff through pride of ownership via involvement in the participatory process

(Burns, 1978).   In educational research, Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, and

McCleary (1990) indicated that effective principals developed strong collaborative teams

and empowered them, especially at the secondary level. Researchers also confirmed that

effective principals had supportive staffs who had some part in the decision-making

process (Shanahan, 1988). Furthermore, Tibaldo (1994) observed that principals of

recognized Blue Ribbon Schools practiced democratic, participatory leadership styles

more often than their counterparts at non-recognized schools. He noted that

transformational leadership must be utilized if school staffs hoped to increase

achievement and attain a positive climate.

Mestinek (2000) observed that differences existed between principals in charter

and traditional schools because educational reform required a transformational leadership

style. The principal's efforts to model and reinforce behaviors reflected the school's

vision and shared values, and effective school reform demanded that students, parents,

teachers and principals all take leadership roles (Mestinek, 2000).   Mestinek (2000)

concluded that transformational leaders supported a work environment that encouraged

creativity, independent thinking, and risk-taking essential components for schools to

evolve.

The primary quality of effective programs for at-risk youngsters was a strong

commitment from the instructional staff (Drvian & Butler, 2001). Shared decision-

making allowed students, parents, and staff to have input into the daily operations of the

program (Kellmayer, 1995). This empowerment gave the stakeholders a sense of

ownership in their school and a sense of pride in their success (Raywid, 1983; Wehlage,

1983).

Transformational Leadership

In the last quarter of the twentieth century, transformational leadership based on

teamwork and joint decision making has emerged as a new model for leadership (Spears,

1996). The significance of this theory has rested on its commitment to ethics and the

elevation of leaders and followers to higher levels of needs, motivations and values

(Burns, 1978; Colvin, 2002). Greenleaf began to change attitudes toward leadership in

1977 and was followed in 1985 by Burns. Since then, several authors have posited

theories of transformational leadership including Bass, Bennis, Nanus, Kouzes, and

Posner. Additional theorists examined here are Kinlaw, Pfeiffer, Ballew, Avolio,

Sergiovanni, and Leithwood. Finally, the implications of this style of educational

leadership are explored.

In *Servant Leadership*, Greenleaf (1977) defined a servant leader as one who

wants to serve first and then become a leader; i.e., it was the desire to assist others that

lead to a conscious decision to become a leader. Accordingly, the primary motivation

was a deep desire to help others (Spears, 1996). Servant leadership suggested that leaders

and followers moved back and forth between roles, balanced and enhanced their lives,

and thus raised the effectiveness of their institutions. This theory took a holistic approach

to work, promoted a sense of community, and shared decision-making power (Spears,

1996).

The origins of contemporary transformational leadership theory were formulated

in the Pulitzer prize winner *Leadership* by Burns (1978). Burns defined leadership as

"…inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the

motivations—the wants and the needs, the aspirations and expectations—of both leaders

and followers" (p.19). He further distinguished transformational leadership as that which

"…occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and

followers raise one another to higher levels of motivations and morality" (p. 20). He

hypothesized that the leader discovered the motives of the followers, satisfied their needs

for self-actualization, and enlisted the whole person in the process, resulting in a

relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that transformed followers into leaders

and leaders into moral agents. The concept of self-actualization stemmed from Maslow's (1970) theory that people, after satisfying basic survival needs, sought to fulfill their potential through self-actualization, esteem, and belonging. Transformational leadership reflected the human desire for purpose, meaning and significance in what a person does (Sergiovanni, 1990a). At the highest level of moral leadership, participants were guided by the principles of goodness, righteousness, duty, and obligation (Burns, 1978).

Burns (1978) offered three constructs of behavior to explain transformational leadership. Charismatic or inspirational leadership employed vision, displayed a sense of mission and confidence, increased optimism, fostered enthusiasm, and earned respect, loyalty and trust. Second, leaders that employed individual consideration paid attention to personal needs, coached and advised members, and aided each follower in becoming successful. Finally, intellectual stimulation leadership emphasized intelligence, rationality, problem solving, and new approaches.

Bernard Bass (1985) further expanded and refined Burns' leadership theory. The former characterized a leader as, "…one who motivates us to do more than we originally expected to do" (p. 20). He proposed that this could be accomplished by raising the level of awareness about the importance of outcomes and ways to reach them. Leaders also encouraged the follower to transcend his or her own self-interest for the sake of the team or organization. Finally, using Maslow's (1970) hierarchy, subordinates altered or expanded their set of needs and wants. Thus, subordinates and followers became self-directing and self-reinforcing.

Both authors agreed that effective transformational leaders inspired their followers through both charismatic personalities and the purposes the leaders represented (Burns, 1978). Bass concurred with Burns regarding the three constructs that formed the foundation of behavior for transformational leaders: charismatic leadership, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

On the other hand, Bass (1985) differed from Burns (1978) in several distinct areas (Murray, 1988). The former advocated the expansion of the follower's portfolio of needs and wants. Bass also contended that not all transformational leaders had high moral purposes aimed in a positive direction, citing Hitler. Furthermore, Burns maintained that transactional and transformational leadership were mutually exclusive, whereas Bass concluded that a leader employed a variety of styles. In addition, Bass believed that charisma was the most important factor in effective leadership, where the leader focused on the authentic needs of the follower. This leader inspired subordinates through serving as a mentor or coach, and increased their competence through challenging tasks.

Success was also evident when leaders designed situations that empowered employees to satisfy their needs (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). "Leadership is morally purposeful and elevating, which means… that leaders can, through deploying their talents, choose purposes and visions that are based on the key values of the work force …" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p.9). Bennis and Nanus (1985) further asserted that effective leaders lifted followers to higher levels of consciousness including the values of liberty, freedom, justice and self-actualization. After studying ninety individual leaders, these researchers supported a values-driven vision, grounded in shared meaning and

purpose along with persuasive communication, as tools for inspiring and influencing subordinates. Moreover, Bennis and Nanus (1985) observed that the transformational leader established trust by consistency on issues and modeled self-confidence through taking risks. They stressed that self-esteem freed the employee to expect more of himself and to push for higher achievement and self-leadership.

Kouzes and Posner (1989) underscored the importance of making followers feel that their contributions were a vital component to the organization since both the leader and the follower gained psychological gratification through realizing that they had made their organization a better place. Kouzes and Posner (1989) believed that the best leaders shook up the routine of the organization. Furthermore, they affirmed that the greatest leaders maintained a deep respect for the aspirations of others (Kouzes & Posner, 1989).

Kouzes and Posner (1989) surveyed 550 senior and middle managers in the public and private sectors seeking the best practices of leaders. They identified ten behavioral characteristics which they grouped into five broader categories. The first category was "challenging the process," where the leader searched for opportunities to challenge assumptions, and to change, grow, innovate and radically improve the present setting (Kouzes & Posner, 1989). He or she fostered change and took a totally new approach. Thus, the administrator became a change agent, accepting responsibility for his or her actions, and encouraging others to take risks. This individual sought out employees who enjoyed innovation and encouraged open communication, especially listening. In addition, the supervisor analyzed successes and failures and learned from his or her mistakes. Also, the leader was decisive under uncertainty, for vagueness

demanded able leadership. Most important, the administrator helped others during the stress created by change (Kouzes & Posner, 1989).

The second construct was "inspiring a shared vision," which included an uplifting and noble future (Kouzes & Posner, 1989).   Here, the leader discovered a common orientation toward a desired goal, and provided an indication that something better was ahead. This unique ideal promoted pride in the organization and self-esteem among the followers. Each employee had a distinctive purpose, and the supervisor used knowledge and experience to guide his or her vision. In addition the leader enlisted others in the common vision by appealing to their values, interests, dreams and hopes, and then taught them about the mutual goal. He or she used stories, metaphors, and vivid imagery to picture the future. Through personal conviction, the leader illustrated the shared beliefs and values that the group had in common and helped each individual conceive his or her part in the process. The administrator exhibited enthusiasm and energy and genuinely believed in the vision. The managers in the Kouzes and Posner (1989) study claimed that if leaders expected the best from others, they usually got it.

"Enabling others to act" implied that the leader fostered collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust (Kouzes & Posner, 1989). Through team effort, leaders and followers developed goals together and solved problems. The key to achieving the vision was that everyone shared information and resources to insure the success of all. The emphasis was placed on long term goals that aligned with the vision of the institution. The leader was the model of cooperation and reciprocity, integrating solutions and building relationships based on trust through sensitivity to people's needs and interests. The administrator strengthened the power of people by sharing information

and increasing both their discretion and their visibility. Empowering others led to greater

reciprocity of mutual influence and enhanced the follower's ability. The leader

accomplished this by delegating important tasks and giving the subordinate discretion

and autonomy over the latter's area of responsibility. The administrator enlarged the

sphere of the follower's influence by connecting teams members to essential resources

and mentors, and providing recognition for a job well done (Kouzes & Posner, 1989).

In addition, the leader "modeled the way" for others by behaving in ways that

were consistent with his stated values (Kouzes & Posner, 1989). The administrator

practiced the values, for consistency enhanced credibility. By making the vision tangible

to subordinates, the leader's values provided a standard for the organization and

encouraged ethical behavior for interpersonal caring and work habits. Furthermore, in

the culture of the organization, clarity of expectations reduced stress. Employees noticed

how the leader spent time, what questions were asked, how questions were answered,

how the leader reacted to important incidents and how effort was rewarded. The

administrator celebrated small victories that promoted consistent progress toward the

stated aims, thus building commitment and confidence. By dividing tasks into small

chunks, the leader ensured that each employee was not overwhelmed and that a daunting

chore was simplified to its bare essentials (Kouzes & Posner, 1989).

The final construct, "encouraging the heart," recognized individual contributions

to the success of each project (Kouzes & Posner, 1989). After setting high expectations

and treating people in a way that led to achievements, the leader rewarded job effort and

performance. The supervisor provided clear goals, frequent feedback, praise, coaching,

and intrinsic rewards. Through celebrating accomplishments, subordinates bolstered

their hope and courage. Thus the leader served as a cheerleader, honoring people who reinforced key values of the organization. The administrator became personally involved and built relationships with social support networks (Kouzes & Posner, 1989).

A contemporary of Kouzes and Posner, Kinlaw (1989) argued that commitment, the foundation of performance, was characterized by a single-minded desire to surmount all obstacles and a willingness to make personal sacrifices to reach the goal. Coaching was the cornerstone for building and maintaining employee commitment Kinlaw, 1989). A transformational leader established a vision which created expectations and gave meaning and value to achievement. Thus, a good leader stimulated employees to extend their minds and share expertise, and helped others find the courage and strength to overcome obstacles. Leaders also helped people survive failure and disappointment and provided them with new opportunities for success. Finally, leaders served as role models for diligence and integrity, and included the team in their success (Kinlaw, 1989).

During the 1990s moral leadership emerged as the most evolved and sophisticated role for leaders (Pfeiffer & Ballew, 1991). Pfeiffer & Ballew theorized that moral agents encouraged social change, shared power, and fulfilled higher-order needs. They suggested that participation in organizational leadership created an atmosphere of interdependence and innovation. In addition, Avolio (1994) indicated that a leader at a higher phase of moral development would put aside his own personal interest in order to satisfy a follower's needs.

Sergiovanni (1992) gave moral leadership an almost a sacred purpose, "…building a covenant of shared values, one that bonds people in a common cause and transforms a school from an organization into a community" (p.15). He also expanded

41

the concept of servant leadership to the educational setting, stating that "…the most important thing is to serve the values and ideas that help shape the school as a convenantal community…all of the members of the community share the burden of servant leadership" (p.139). Sergiovanni (1992) interpreted this idea to include stewardship, an administrator's personal commitment to conduct life with regard to the rights of other people and the common good. He wrote, "Finally, stewardship involves placing oneself in service to ideas and ideals and to others who are committed to their fulfillment" (p. 139).

This moral leadership was introduced by Sergiovanni (1990b) when he suggested three stages of school leadership. The first stage (building) aroused human potential, satisfied higher needs, and raised expectations to motivate leaders and followers to higher levels of commitment and performance. Next, the significant second phase (bonding) stimulated awareness and consciousness that elevated organizational goals to the level of a shared covenant and joined together leader and followers in a moral commitment. This premise was the moral foundation for effective leadership in schools because it inspired the entire school community toward extraordinary commitment and performance (Sergiovanni, 1990a; 1995). Parents, students, and staff had a vision of what the school could become and a set of beliefs about what teaching and learning should be (Sergiovanni, 1990a). Finally, the third component (banking) focused on turning improvements into routines, ministering to the needs of the school, and guarding the values (Sergiovanni, 1990b).

Continuing to apply transformational theory to school organizations, Leithwood's (1992) theory relied on power that was manifested through other people, not over other

people. He affirmed that a strong transformational principal aided teachers in finding

greater meaning in their work and developing their instructional capabilities. Leithwood

(1992) argued that the transformational leader should help the staff develop and maintain

a collaborative and professional school culture. Secondly, this theorist believed that

administrators who fostered faculty development encouraged motivation, professional

growth, and commitment to the school mission. He proposed that if teachers were

encouraged to solve problems more effectively, they would be stimulated to take part in

new activities and put forth extra effort. This restructuring increased the effectiveness of

the school (Leithwood, 1992).

Educational institutions began experiencing greater democratization through site-

based management in the early 1990s, building relationships with all the stakeholders

encompassing students, staff, parents, and business representatives (Schlechty, 1990).

Schlechty (1990) contended that together, all could reach higher levels of excellence in

an environment that built self-esteem and commitment. He concluded that the

transformational approach fostered personal satisfaction, trust, collaboration, and

achievement. Schlechty (1990) noted that transformational leadership would redefine the

future of education where, "…every leader (is) as teacher and every teacher, a leader"

(p.154).

Recent research concluded that transformational leadership resulted in greater

teacher satisfaction along with the principal's increased leadership and effectiveness

(Philbin, 1997). In addition, this style of leadership created a willingness by teachers to

give extra effort (Philbin, 1997). Other researchers such as Floyd (1999) reported a

positive relationship between the degree of transformational leadership and shared school

mission. Jackson (1999) concurred, stating that transformational leadership produced

extra effort from the staff, increased the perception of effective leadership, and created

higher satisfaction among the faculty. Moreover, he found that transformational

behaviors were appreciably correlated to group involvement when making critical

organizational decisions. Additionally, females tended to be more transformational than

their male counterparts (Boomer, 1993).

Hansen (1989) confirmed that this collaborative environment was especially

significant for effective alternative schools whose administration, faculty and staff had a

sense of ownership through teamwork to carry out the mission of the school (Hansen,

1989). Kellmayer (1995) also reported that successful alternative schools tended to have

a clear mission, shared values, and sense of community and commitment.

School Characteristics

Alternative Schools.   Alternative schools were designed to meet the special needs

and interests of the students enrolled that might not have been addressed in the regular

high school setting. The movement gained momentum in the 1960's in response to high

dropout rates in urban areas and called for innovative education in suburban sites

(Raywid, 1998). Three approaches were reported in the research. One perspective strove

to change the student through punitive or therapeutic measures in a temporary placement.

Conrath (2001) and Greenleaf (1977) observed that students must be taught internal

control as well as academic skills.   However, students in this model often experienced

difficulty when they returned to the traditional venue (Raywid, 1998). The second tactic

involved changing the school and the school experience; schoolmasters in this setting

offered innovative curriculum and instruction with a positive school climate (Raywid,

1998). Kellmayer (1995) also recommended that the site be located on a college campus; the middle college high school concept most closely related to this second strategy. The final plan created a smaller school within a larger school to provide a supportive environment for the student; groups consisting of 200-300 pupils allowed youngsters to develop identity in a smaller sphere of influence (Collins, 1992). Educators agreed that an important component in the alternative school setting was small school size and recommended schools no larger than 200 students (Collins, 1992; McDill, Natriello, & Pallas, 1987; Raywid, 1981; Wehlage & Rutter, 1986; Kellmayer, 1995). McDill et al. (1987) emphasized that small institutions were more personalized and the low student-adult ratios helped control abnormal student behaviors.

Wehlage (1991) studied fourteen effective alternative schools and found that alternative schools must encourage academic engagement and school membership. The former attribute included the student's mental effort to gain the necessary knowledge and skills. School membership implied that the student was attached to, and believed in, the institution (Wehlage, 1991). Kellmayer (1995) asserted that good alternative schools had a clear mission that was shared by the community. The curriculum and instruction reflected these shared values, and the staff worked to create a positive learning climate (Hamm, 1999; Kellmayer, 1995). Wehlage and Rutter (1986) added that the alternative school provided educational experiences to offset the negative alienation and disappointment carried over from previous schooling. These researchers emphasized that programs included not only academic improvements but also personal and social development (Wehlage & Rutter, 1986).

A caring staff that voluntarily participated in the alternative experiment was essential, since this faculty assumed responsibility for the cognitive and affective needs of the students (Hamm, 1999; Kellmayer, 1995; Wehlage & Rutter, 1986). The teachers took on flexible roles as counselors and instructors, creating a supportive, family atmosphere (Collins, 1992; Kellmayer, 1995; Wehlage & Rutter, 1986). Furthermore, Ryan (1991) advocated collaboration between students and teachers to develop mutual trust. For maximum success Raywid (1983) and Kellmayer (1995) emphasized that students choose to attend the alternative school. The faculty was willing to educate the students on non-traditional topics such as health, nutrition, community service, and careers (Collins, 1992; Wehlage & Rutter, 1986). In addition, instruction embraced experiential learning in effective alternative schools along with cooperative learning developed to enhance social skills (Wehlage & Rutter, 1986). A variety of strategies such as guest speakers, multi-age level grouping, field trips, and independent study were also implemented to encompass the differing learning styles of the students (Collins, 1992).

American charter school principals perceived themselves as transformational leaders and scored higher than traditional school principals on three leadership factors: charisma, inspiration, and intellectual stimulation (Mestinek, 2000). In some programs, the principal was responsible for hiring personnel and the success of the school rested solely on him or her (Collins, 1992). Moreover, charter school principals collaborated with the school's stakeholders to achieve the school's vision and mission (Mestinek, 2000). Joint decision-making with the faculty augmented commitment to the stated goals

of the school (Kellmayer, 1995; Wehlage & Rutter, 1986), where high staff morale was essential for a teachers to feel ownership in their school (Raywid, 1981).

Even though most alternative schools contained an at-risk population, they showed a measure of success (Collins, 1992). Students stayed in school, and the dropout rate fell (Raywid, 1983); average daily attendance increased while violence decreased (Collins, 1992). Collins (1992) found that youngsters in alternative school grew personally through higher self-esteem and control over their lives. In addition, he concluded that academic gains included higher grade point averages and scores on scholastic aptitude tests, increased vocational and basic skills, and a greater continuance of education after high school. The purpose of alternative schools differed, so varied measures of their success reflected their stated mission. For example, if the goal of the school was to lower the dropout rate, then recidivism rates were compared (Raywid, 1998). If the goal was to engage students in an innovative education, then the criteria included attitudes toward schooling and post-high school aspirations as the gauge (Raywid, 1998).

Middle College High School. The first middle college high school opened in 1973 at LaGuardia Community College in New York City as a collaborative, alternative high school designed to meet the needs of high risk youth with college potential (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000; Lords, 2000). The goals of the middle college high school were to improve student performance and self-esteem, reduce the dropout rate, and increase graduation and college attendance rates (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000; Heard, 1988; Houston, Byers, & Danner, 1992; Lieberman, 1986). Some middle college high schools included a career component which gave students a successful work-

related opportunity (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000; Lieberman, 1975; 1986). The student emerged with a sense of responsibility his or her own education as well as motivation for higher education (Lieberman, 1986; 1998; Middle College Consortium, 2002). On average, America's middle colleges reported a retention rate of 75%, a senior graduation rate of 75%, and a college entrance rate of 78% of the graduates (Lieberman, 1998).

The special features of the middle college high school enhanced its expressed purpose. Kellmayer (1995) confirmed that the site of an alternative school was paramount to its success; its location on the college campus supplied educationally focused peer role models (Lieberman, 1975; Williams, 2002). The small school size, counseling services, and individual attention provided a nurturing atmosphere, which helped to reconnect alienated students with school (Gehring, 2001; Lieberman, 1975; Millonzi & Kolker, 1976). Administrators strove to maintain a diverse student enrollment that reflected the demographics of the host college (Gehring, 2001). Students were identified by their counselors as at-risk, yet having the potential to attend college (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000; Lieberman, 1986). The emphasis was on the whole student to raise aspirations, reduce fear and anonymity, enrich the setting, replace failure with success, and to provide a sense of the future (Lieberman, 1998).

The collaborative model between high school and college faculty ensured a seamless curriculum with articulation on basic skills necessary for successful completion of college (Lieberman, 1986; Middle College Consortium, 2002; Williams, 2000). As desired, the middle college high school model eased the transition from one educational level to the other (Heard, 1988). Students received dual credit for college classes, and

several simultaneously graduated from high school with an associate college degree (Gehring, 2001; Lieberman, 1986). The teaching strategies also differed from the traditional high school; faculty employed innovative methods and theme instruction to help students connect academics to real world applications (Houston et al., 1992).

Researchers cited different criteria for effective alternative schools (Wehlage, 1983; 1991). Teachers extended their roles to address the whole student, and students felt part of a community of learners and teachers (Cullen, 1991b; Foley, 1983; Raywid, 1983). An individual, experiential curriculum was crucial for marginal students, and teachers employed a variety of instructional strategies to accommodate the students' needs, interests, and strengths (Cullen, 1991b; Wehlage, 1983). Nevertheless, the integrity of the program was maintained because effective alternative schools emphasized academic excellence and a definite accent on work and learning (Wehlage, 1983). Importantly, schools remained small enough to address individual needs yet large enough to provide resources (Foley, 1983; Raywid, 1983).

School Size. In prior decades, policymakers across the country built larger schools to increase cost efficiency and to broaden the course of studies (Howley, 1989). Consolidated schools in rural areas forced students on long bus rides and parents became alienated from schools (Howley, 1989). As schools increased in size, the faculty became more stratified with teachers working as departments rather than as a community (Raywid, 1998). In large schools, students also became isolated into ability groupings; as a result, a disproportionate number of low income students were tracked into a class of reduced expectations, achievement, instructional opportunity and resources (Galetti, 1999; Raywid, 1998).

The recommended number of students for high school was 400 to 800, yet the average school enrollment rose more than five times from 1940 to 1990, overburdening many facilities (Galetti, 1999; p. 15). In addition, the school climate was more favorable in small schools and students had a greater sense of belonging, which lowered students' sense of alienation (Barker, 1986; Galetti, 1999; Howley, 1996). Researchers also found that the caring atmosphere in a small school positively affected confidence, self-esteem and student responsibility, and fewer discipline referrals occurred in small schools (Barker, 1986; Galetti, 1999). Furthermore, students participated in school activities at a higher rate in small schools, experienced leadership opportunities, and attendance was higher with fewer dropouts (Galetti, 1999; Howley, 1989).

Obviously, the smallness of a school enabled the staff to better incorporate the practices of effective schools to meet each individual's needs (Botstein, 1997; Raywid, 1997).   In small schools, teachers were more likely to use cooperative learning, multi-age grouping, and experiential activities; additionally, instructors formed teaching teams and integrated the subject matter content (Galetti, 1999; Raywid, 1997). Also, the staff was able to collaborate on designing a program that suited their setting, and they bonded together as a community taking personal responsibility for the success of their students (Raywid, 1997).

Smallness was also a key element for alternative schools (Kellmayer, 1995; Wehlage, 1983). Raywid (1981) studied 2,500 secondary alternative schools where over two-thirds had fewer than 200 students. Smallness fostered a family atmosphere, individual learning, and participatory decision making (Kellmayer,1995; Raywid, 1981). Foley (1983) noted that alternative schools must be large enough to make resources

available, but small enough to make the students feel that they were part of the group. In fact, the middle college's size was the strongest factor in remediating students; the small size allowed teachers to provide individualized attention to students while the college provided sufficient resources for academic excellence (Millonzi & Kolker, 1976). In fact, the success of the middle college rested on the close student-faculty relationships and the values of individual autonomy and freedom which resulted from its small size (Millonzi & Kolker, 1976).

In addition to greater individual attention, small schools were able to reduce the negative effect of poverty on student achievement (Friedkin & Necochea, 1988; Lee & Smith, 1996). Smaller schools produced higher achievement for students in general along with a substantial positive effect for low income students (Friedkin & Necochea, 1988; Galetti, 1999; Haycock & Huang, 2001; Howley, 1989; Wehlage, Rutter, & Tambaugh, 1987). Recent studies in Georgia demonstrated that small schools reduced the effect of poverty by half in 11th grade (Haycock & Huang, 2001).

Socioeconomic Status.   Research studies affirmed the notion that a student's socioeconomic status (SES) affected school achievement (Gooding, 2001; White, 1982). Socioeconomic status was defined as a combination of parental education, occupational prestige and income (Conrath, 2001; Crane, 1996; McCormick, 1989; Orr, 2000).   White (1982) and Conrath (2001) demonstrated that family income was the strongest predictor of achievement, although parental occupation and education were highly correlated with academic success. Gooding (2001) observed first-time college freshmen at Iowa State University and found that higher level parental educational, stable family

structure/marital status, and an upper level ncome range had a positive effect on student academic potential and performance.

Orr (2000) further differentiated socioeconomic status and wealth or net worth, stating that the latter had an impact on the amount of cultural capital to which the child was exposed, the accessibility of private school, the educational resources available in the home, and the child's self esteem. In fact she found that as a child grew older, the effect of wealth on achievement increased. Additionally, wealthy parents provided books, computers, or tutors which improved the child's achievement (Downey, 1995). If students had academic materials available at home, they spent more time in academic endeavors (Downey, 1995). Furthermore, wealth also influenced a child's self-esteem, especially the popularity of females who could afford to purchase the latest fashions (Orr, 2000).

On the other hand, students from low socioeconomic areas attended schools that were under-funded, compared to their middle and upper class counterparts, based on tax based dollars per pupil (Hanuschek, 1989). Haycock et al. (2001) reported that in 42 out of 49 states studied, school children in the poorest districts had less money per pupil to spend than districts with only a few poor pupils. These investigators claimed that the national gap between these two classifications was $1,139 per student. Furthermore, students in high poverty schools were more likely to be taught by underqualified teachers without a major or minor in their fields (Haycock & Huang, 2001; Haycock et al, 2001). In addition, the instructors were more likely to have low college entrance exam test scores (Haycock et al., 2001). Haycock and Huang (2001) demonstrated that the discrepancy in math and science was even worse, where only about half of the instructors

52

met the state minimum requirements. In fact, the educational criteria for weaker teachers in high poverty areas included less experience, lack of appropriate certification, minimal academic preparation, and low performance on licensure tests. Equally important, researchers concluded that teachers expected very little from students in high poverty schools; they assigned almost no homework, and the few assignments that were made were low level ones (Haycock et al., 2001)

Not surprisingly, many investigators confirmed the negative effect of large schools on children in poverty (Friedkin & Nicochea, 1988; Howley, 1996; Lee & Smith, 1996; Raywid, 1998). Whereas high income students flourished in the larger school setting, smaller schools appeared to benefit low SES students, (Friedkin & Necochea, 1988; Howley, 1996; Raywid, 1998). Small schools, in fact, worked to reduce the negative effects of race and poverty to narrow the achievement gap separating the economic classes (Friedkin & Necochea, 1988; Lee & Smith, 1996). Friedkin and Necochea (1988) illustrated that in low SES communities, each standard deviation increase in school size produced about a one-third decrease in student achievement. Conversely, their research confirmed that in affluent areas, every standard deviation in school size corresponded with a one-sixth increase in achievement. Unfortunately, low SES students were more likely to attend a large school (Lee & Smith, 1996).

In addition, students from low SES backgrounds were more likely to drop out of school: in fact, one million at-risk students dropped out each school year (McCormick, 1989). While the detrimental impact of poverty was mitigated by effective school practices, it was difficult to overcome the negative effects of the neighborhood and peers (Baker, Derrer, Davis, Dinklage-Travis, Linder, and Nicholson , 2001). Kellmayer

(1995) suggested that if students from low SES families attended school in a higher SES

site, the cognitive and affective development would be influenced in a positive direction.

Indeed, many middle college high schools are located on community college campuses

which serve low socioeconomic students.

Conclusion

Many studies have examined the leadership style of the principal and its

relationship to school effectiveness, climate, and student outcomes. However, very little

is known about the leadership style of middle college high school principals, compared to

administrators in their traditional feeder schools. In addition, an inquiry into the

relationship of the leadership style to four specific outcomes (average daily attendance,

dropout rate, graduation rate, and college attendance rate) that pertain to the middle

college high school will aid educators in ensuring the success of these alternative schools.

Chapter 3

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the leadership characteristics of administrators in the nation's middle college high schools and in selected traditional high schools, and the impact of this leadership style on four indicators of an effectiveness: average daily attendance, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college attendance rate. Additionally, this research determined if there existed a statistically significant difference between all of the aforementioned factors in their respective schools, i.e., middle college high schools versus traditional high schools. This inquiry was a correlational study using a survey and demographic information (Johnson & Christensen, 2000).

Method

The primary purpose of this survey research was to discover and describe the distribution of certain traits or attributes collected at one point in time (Babbie, 1998). This exploration focused on people, their beliefs, opinions, attitudes, motivations, and behavior (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Although survey information does not penetrate very deeply below the surface, it is relatively accurate (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000).

Population and Sample

The population of this study consisted of the principals of the nation's middle college high schools and of their traditional feeder high schools (N=497) (Appendix A). The nation's middle college high school principals were identified through their consortium, recent magazine articles, and networking on the internet (Appendix B). These institutions were then contacted through fax, e-mail, United States mail, and telephone and asked to identify their feeder high schools and principals. All of the

administrators from the middle college high schools were included in this exploration and 25% of the schoolmasters of their feeder institutions constituted the sample (n=150) for this study. A proportional random sample was used to identify the feeder high schools to be included. The population was divided into mutually exclusive groups; in this case, the lists of feeder schools for each middle college high school (Johnson & Christensen, 2000). The sample was proportional (25%) and a table of random numbers was used until the quota for each grouping was met (Johnson & Christensen, 2000).

Design

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Appendix C) and *Demographic Survey* (Appendix D) were mailed with a cover letter (Appendix E) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope to all of the middle college high school administrators and principals of selected feeder high schools.   Daily tracking of the returns occurred with a cumulative total (Babbie, 1998). Two weeks later, the subjects of this study were contacted through reminder postcards to return the survey. The remaining non-respondents were then faxed a complete set of the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and *Demographic Survey* with an appeal to return the data through fax or mail. Some of the non-respondents were then contacted by telephone for an interview in order to gain the needed additional data. Non-respondents were selected for the telephone appeal in order to reach half of the middle college high schools and at least one of their feeder traditional high schools.

The drawbacks of a questionnaire included the lack of response and the inability to check the responses given (Kerlinger & Lee, 1973). A satisfactory response rate would have been in the 50% range; however, low returns meant that valid generalizations cannot be made (Babbie, 1998; Kerlinger & Lee, 1973).

Instrumentation

Kouzes and Posner (1989) developed the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) through a personal best survey of 1,100 business leaders, inquiring about times when they had accomplished something extraordinary in their organization. The survey consisted of 38 open-ended questions; additionally a shorter form was completed by 780 managers. These two researchers also conducted 42 comprehensive interviews. Through this qualitative study, Kouzes and Posner were able to represent the behavior and strategies employed in extraordinary accomplishment in five distinct categories: challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart. The current form of the LPI contains 30 statements – six statements for measuring each of the five leadership practices. The *Leadership Practices Inventory* was founded upon this conceptual and empirical construct.

The Leadership Practices Inventory was originally tested on 120 M.B.A. students at a small private West Coast University and then refined with 2,100 additional subjects. Reliability and validity of the final version of the LPI were based on the tests of 2,800 additional managers and subordinates. Internal reliabilities on the LPI-Self range from .69 to .85 and test-retest ranged from .93 to.95 as indicated in Table 3.1 (Kouzes & Posner, 1989, p. 315). The LPI was subsequently validated through use in educational studies.

Table 3.1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliability Indices for the Leadership Practices Inventory (N=1,567)

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Internal Reliability LPI N=1567	LPI-self N=423	Test-Retest Reliability N=1144
Challenging the process	22.63	3.85	.78	.73	.93
Inspiring a shared vision	20.08	4.86	.88	.84	.94
Enabling others to act	23.96	3.95	.83	.69	.94
Modeling the way	22.42	3.90	.79	.73	.95
Encouraging the heart	22.23	4.72	.89	.85	.93

(Kouzes & Pozner, 1989, p. 315)

The high numbers in the test-retest reliability inferred strong construct validity among the five subtests. Also, studies of sex differences found two significant differences between men and women; the latter score higher than men on encouraging the heart and modeling the way (Posner & Kouzes, 1992). Also, few important differences were found across cultural and ethnic groups. A study examining the correlation between the LPI and managerial effectiveness supported the construct validity of the Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 1989). The coefficient alpha for the leadership effectiveness scale was .98 and the test-retest reliability on a sample of M.B.A. students was .96 (Kouzes & Posner, 1989, p. 320). A multiple regression of the five component practices predicted the Leadership Effectiveness results (Kouzes & Posner, 1989).

The *Leadership Practices Inventory* uses a ten-point Likert scale; a higher value represented greater use of a particular leadership behavior. The categories were almost never, rarely, seldom, once in a while, occasionally, sometimes, fairly often, usually, very

frequently, almost always.

Data Collection

The first mailing and reminder postcard yielded 11 responses from the middle college high schools and 23 from the traditional high schools. The second attempt through fax generated one additional response from the middle college high schools and four from the traditional schools. Five additional replies from the telephone interviews from the middle college high schools were obtained as well as three from the traditional schools. The total responses were 17 from the middle college high schools and 30 from the traditional feeder schools.

Demographic Information

A *Demographic Questionnaire* (Appendix D) was developed to collect information on the organization of the school (middle college high school or traditional high school), average daily attendance, dropout rate, graduation rate, college attendance rate, school size, and percentage free and reduced lunch. Additional questions concerned the leader of the school, inquiring about official title, sex, age, and highest academic degree.

Data Analysis

The data for the *Leadership Practices Inventory* were entered into the scoring software and tallies were generated for each subtest as well as a total score. All of the statistics for this study were then entered into the SPSS statistical software. Pearson correlations were generated for the independent and dependent variables. Multiple regression analysis to examine the role of intervening variables, i.e., small school size and socioeconomic status was not possible due to the small sample size (Babbie, 1998).

Ancillary correlations were also calculated for LPI and the sex and age of the respondent, enrollment and the four critical indicators, and socioeconomic status and the four crucial indicators.

Chapter 4

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Introduction

This study examined the relationship between transformational leadership in middle college and traditional high schools, and its relationship to average daily attendance, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college attendance rate. No statistical evidence supported a significant relationship in the first four research questions. However, some interesting associations were established among other variables, such as the structure of the high school, enrollment, and socioeconomic status (SES) that were linked to the aforementioned measures of effectiveness. Additionally, scores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* were associationed to sex and age.

Descriptive Data

Principals from 17 middle college high schools and 30 traditional high schools replied to the questionnaire and survey. Twenty-eight men and 16 women comprised the sample; three did not respond to that inquiry. The respondents' ages ranged from 38 to 65 years old, averaging 51.8 years. Three of the respondents held a bachelor's degree, 29 have earned a master's, and 12 possessed a doctorate.

The data from the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) were entered into the LPI scoring software and a total score for the LPI was generated with 300 as a maximum total. Additionally, scores from the five subtests (challenging the process, inspiring the vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart) were also calculated; each subtest had a maximum score of 60. The raw data are summarized in

61

Appendix F. Some of the respondents did not fill out the *Demographic Survey* or they did not fill it out entirely which accounted for the empty cells in the table.

Statistical Analysis of Data

Using the SPSS software, Pearson correlation tests (2-tailed significance) were conducted on the data, with an alpha level of .05. Group statistics were gathered, separating the variables for middle college high schools and traditional high schools. Independent sample tests were run on these data using t-tests for Equality of Means, which is appropriate for small samples, using the same alpha standard. Additionally, ancillary findings were generated using this same statistical method. When using a small sample, the SPSS software tends to be conservative. The program may not find statistically significant relationships in some areas, even though one may exist in the population.

Major findings

Question 1: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the middle college and traditional high school principals' scores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and average daily attendance?

No statistically significant relationship was established between the principals' scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory and average daily attendance using an alpha of .05. Additionally, no significant association was found for any of the subtests and average daily attendance. Table 4.1 indicated that the Pearson correlation numbers (-.114 to .074) confirmed little connection between the two variables; the absolute value of these slopes yielded an almost flat line.

Table 4.1

LPI and Attendance

(N=43)	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-Tailed)
LPI Subscores: Challenging the Process	-.114	.468
Inspiring the Vision	-.016	.917
Enabling Others to Act	-.012	.939
Modeling the Way	.074	.639
Encouraging the Heart	-.061	.699
Total LPI Score	-.018	.909

Question 2: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the middle college and traditional high school principals' scores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and dropout rate?

There was no statistically significant relationship found between the principals' scores or their subscores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (.169-.543) and dropout rate using an alpha of .05 as illustrated in Table 4.2. The subscore "challenging the process" showed a weak positive Pearson correlation association (.219), but all the others were negligible.

Table 4.2

LPI and Dropout Rate
   (N= 41)

	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)
LPI Subscores:		
Challenging the Process	.219	.169
Inspiring the Vision	.135	.399
Enabling Others to Act	.098	.543
Modeling the Way	.099	.540
Encouraging the Heart	.l22	.446
Total LPI score	.187	.241

Question 3: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the middle

college and traditional high school principals' scores on the *Leadership Practices*

Inventory and graduation rate?

No statistically significant relationship was indicated between the principals'

scores of the LPI and the graduation rates of the schools. Additionally, there were no

significant findings using an alpha of .05 between the LPI subscores and graduation rates.

The negative slope values of the Pearson correlations imply very little association

between these variables (-.024 to -.151) as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

LPI and Graduation Rate
         (N=39)

	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)
LPI Subscores:		
Challenging the Process	-.151	.358
Inspiring the Vision	-.024	.883
Enabling Others to Act	-.103	.533
Modeling the Way	-.085	.606
Encouraging the Heart	-.104	.530
Total LPI score	-.074	.654

Question 4: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the middle college and traditional high school principals' scores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and college going rate?

No statistically significant relationship was demonstrated between the principals' scores and subscores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and college attendance rate using the alpha standard of .05 (.611-.818). Table 4.4 substantiated the Pearson correlations in this study were extremely small, representing a flat line slope.

Table 4.4

LPI and College Going Rate
(N = 41)

	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed
Subscores:		
Challenging the Process	-.082	.611
Inspiring the Vision	.064	.689
Enabling Others to Act	.037	.818
Modeling the Way	-.063	.697
Encouraging the Heart	-.046	.777
Total LPI Score	-.048	.764

Question 5: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the middle college high schools and the traditional high schools on the following indicators: LPI, average daily attendance, dropout rate, and college attendance rate?

The comparison of middle college high schools and their traditional feeder high schools on the five target measures yielded some interesting results. The group statistics comparing the two types of schools indicated that there was not a significant difference in the transformational leadership style of the two sets of administrators. In fact, the means and the standard deviations were very close. According to the LPI scoring information found in Table 4.5, both the middle college high school principals and the traditional school leaders scored in the top 70th percentile which constituted a high rating.

Only the subscore "challenging the process" for middle college high school administrators and subscore "inspiring the vision" for traditional high school principals fell slightly below this high standard. The standard deviations for traditional high schools

are generally larger than these measures for middle college high school principals. This difference implied a broader range of transformational behaviors among the traditional high school administrators.

Table 4.5

Group Statistics for Middle College and Traditional High Schools and LPI

	Middle College High Schools (N=17)		Traditional High Schools (N=30)	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
LPI Subscores:				
Challg. the Process	49.94	6.91	50.10	7.57
Inspiring the Vision	50.35	6.50	48.33	9.09
Enabl. Others to Act	52.53	5.72	53.53	5.45
Modeling the Way	51.35	5.67	53.10	6.10
Encourag.the Heart	50.65	6.50	51.10	7.86
Total LPI	254.82	26.86	256.93	33.81

Although the means chart in Table 4.6 shows a slightly higher attendance rate for middle college high schools, no statistically significant difference could be demonstrated to differentiate middle college high schools from traditional high schools using an alpha of .05. Additionally, the middle college high schools reported a somewhat lower dropout rate (3.99 vs. 4.52), but a statistically significant relationship was not exhibited. These results could be attributed to the small sample size.

Table 4.6

Group Statistics for Middle College and Traditional High Schools and Four Indicators

	Middle College High School			Traditional High School		
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Attendance	14	92.18	5.77	29	91.56	5.81
Dropout Rate	14	3.99	5.20	27	4.52	5.16
Graduation Rate	13	97.19	3.05	26	87.38	11.93
College Going Rate	14	87.50	10.43	27	72.93	18.56

The research data confirmed a statistically significant relationship between middle college high schools and graduation rate. The average graduation rates from Table 8 are almost 10% apart, and the significance on the t-test (Table 4.7) was .000. Moreover, similar positive findings were demonstrated relating the middle college high school and college going rate. The means from Table 8 reflected a difference of about 15% more students on average from middle college high schools attending college, and the significance level was .010 on the t-test (Table 4.7).

Table 4.7

Analysis of Variance for Middle College and Traditional High Schools _____

	t-test for Equality of Means	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
LPI Subscores: Challg. the Process	-.071	45	.944	-.16	2.23
Inspiring the Vision	.805	45	.425	2.02	2.51
Enab. Others to Act	-.596	45	.554	-1.00	1.68
Modeling the Way	-.997	45	.339	-1.75	1.81
Encourg. the Heart	-.201	45	.841	-.45	2.25
Total LPI	-.221	45	.826	-.211	9.57
Attendance	.326	41	.746	.615	1.89
Dropout Rate	-.311	39	.758	-.530	1.70
Graduation Rate	3.946	30.87	.000	9.817	2.49
College Going Rate	2.714	39	.010	14.57	5.37

Ancillary Findings

       The research on transformational leadership indicated that women tended to use this style more often than men; the data in this study supported this premise. Using the group statistics, Table 4.8 revealed that women scored higher than men on total LPI scores as well as on all of the subscores. Additionally, the standard deviations for females were much smaller, indicating less variance among the transformational leadership styles of women.

Table 4.8

Comparison of Male and Female Scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory

	Male N=28		Female N=16	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
LPI Subscores:				
Challeng. the Process	48.71	7.89	53.06	5.28
Inspiring the Vision	47.57	8.98	52.44	5.39
Enabl. Others to Act	52.43	6.02	54.81	4.76
Modeling the Way	52.04	6.66	53.38	5.00
Encourag. the Heart	49.29	8.55	53.56	4.26
Total LPI Score	250.86	35.78	267.25	20.05

       The analysis of variance in Table 4.9 reflected the statistical significance of women's scores on the *Leadership Practices Inventory*. The alpha levels on subtests challenging the process (.035), inspiring the vision (.030), and encouraging the heart (.033) showed that women scored higher in these areas of transformational leadership.

Table 4.9

Analysis of Variance for Males and Females and LPI Scores

	t-test for Equality of Means	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
LPI Subscores:					
Challeg. the Process	-2.182	40.790	.035	- 4.35	1.99
Inspiring the Vision	-2.245	41.842	.030	- 4.87	2.17
Enab. Others to Act	-1.357	42	.182	- 2.38	1.76
Modeling the Way	- .698	42	.489	- 1.34	1.92
Encourg. the Heart	-2.210	41.464	.033	- 4.28	1.93
Total LPI	-1.947	41.999	.058	-16.39	8.42

Pearson correlation tests were conducted using the *Leadership Practices Inventory* total scores and subscores in comparison to the age of the respondents. The raw correlation slopes shown in Table 4.10 revealed a moderate (.412) to weak positive relationship (.330-.393). Moreover, using an alpha of .05, a statistically significant association between age and LPI scores was substantiated on the total score and every subscore.

Table 4.10

N= 43	Pearson Correlation	Sig (2-tailed)
LPI Subscores:		
Challenging the Process	.412	.006
Inspiring the Vision	.330	.031
Enabling Others to Act	.365	.016
Modeling the Way	.334	.029
Encouraging the Heart	.393	.009
Total LPI Score	.393	.009

Enrollment was compared to the four selected indicators: average daily attendance, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college going rate. The Pearson correlations confirmed a weak relationship between school size and dropout rate (.149) as well as college going rate (-.058). A moderate negative association was demonstrated in Table 4.11 between enrollment and attendance rate (-.409) and graduation rate (-.544); in other words, larger schools had lower attendance and graduation rates (-.409 and -.544). This inverse relationship between enrollment and attendance and graduation rates was further confirmed by statistically significant results: .007 and .000, respectively.

Table 4.11

Enrollment and Four Indicators of Effectiveness

	N	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)
Average Daily Attendance	43	-.409	.007
Dropout Rate	41	.149	.352
Graduation Rate	39	-.544	.000
College Going Rate	41	-.058	.721

Previous research asserted that low-socioeconomic students were at risk, thus this study evaluated this variable in relationship to the four specified indicators. Using an alpha of .05, a statistically significant link was found in all four groupings, and the Pearson correlation figures also supported a moderate slope between all of the categories. Table 4.12 showed that free and reduced lunch rates were positively connected to dropout rate (.482). Conversely, the lower socioeconomic status students exhibited a lower average daily attendance (-.548), lower graduation rate (-.543), and lower collegegoing rate (-.319).

Table 4.12

Low SES Students and Four Indicators of Effectiveness

	N	Pearson Correlation	Sig.(2-tailed)
Average Daily Attendance	43	-.548	.000
Dropout Rate	41	.482	.001
Graduation Rate	39	-.543	.000
College Going Rate	41	-.319	.042

Finally, no relationship could be established between socio-economic level and type of high school. The t-test for Equality of Means did not yield statistically significant results as demonstrated in Table 4.13. Although many of the colleges associated with middle college high schools were local community colleges with middle and lower socioeconomic students, a link was not found.

Table 4.13

Low SES Students in Middle College and Traditional High Schools

	t-test forEquality Means	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std.Er of Difference
Free-Reduced Lunch Rate	-.695	41	.491	-6.6127	9.5187

Summary

No significant connection was found between the *Leadership Practices Inventory* scores and average daily attendance, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college attendance. No difference was determined between the middle college high schools and

traditional high schools in LPI scores, attendance rates and dropout rates. However,

major findings appeared in graduation and college-going rates in favor of the middle

college high school. Moreover, lower enrollment in both types of schools was linked to

higher attendance and graduation rates. Low socioeconomic status students were

reported to be at risk in all four indicators: school attendance, dropout, graduation, and

college attendance.

Both middle college high school principals and their traditional high school

counterparts reported high implementation of transformational leadership. Although a

difference did not exist between the administrators' LPI scores in the two types of

schools, important variations between men's and women's leadership style was

confirmed. Interestingly, older principals scored higher on the transformational scale.

Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the leadership characteristics of administrators in American's middle college high schools and in feeder traditional high schools, and the influence of this leadership style on four indicators of school effectiveness. This investigation found no statistically significant link between leadership style and four critical factors in measuring the success of high schools: average daily attendance, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college attendance rate.

Additionally, this inquiry explored the possibility of a relationship between the aforementioned four measures of school effectiveness, leadership, and the structure of the high school. While average daily attendance was slightly higher for middle college high schools and dropout rate slightly lower, a statistically significant association was not established. No difference was found in the amount of transformational leadership utilized in both types of high schools. Graduation rate and college going rate for the middle college high schools, however, were appreciably higher.

Procedures

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and *Demographic Survey* were mailed to all the nation's middle college high school principals and to a proportional random sample of the administrators in their traditional feeder high schools. The responses from the LPI were inserted into the LPI scoring software and these results, along with the demographic information, were entered into the SPSS software. Pearson correlations

were produced and t-tests for Equality of Means were applied to the data using an alpha of .05. Ancillary findings were obtained through the same method.

Descriptive Data

Administrators of the nation's middle college high schools and of their traditional feeder high schools comprised the population for this study. The sample included all 34 of the middle college high school principals and 25% of their cohorts in the traditional high schools. Principals for 17 middle college high schools and 30 traditional high schools responded to the questionnaire and survey; almost twice as many men as women replied to the two survey instruments. The average age was 51.8 years and most possessed a masters degree.

Findings

No association was established between the leadership style of the principals and four indicators of school effectiveness: average daily attendance, dropout rate, graduation rate and college attendance rate. This study did not establish a difference between the leadership styles of the principals of the middle college high schools and administrators in their traditional feeder high schools. All of the leaders scored in the top 30th percentile on the *Leadership Practices Inventory*, indicating that transformational leadership style was popular and apparently in practice.

In comparing the middle college and traditional high schools on the four indicators of school effectiveness, mixed results were obtained. No significant difference was detected between the two types of schools when examining average daily attendance and dropout rate. An important differentiation was demonstrated, though, between the two high school styles on the remaining two measures of effectiveness: graduation and

college-going rates. This research did confirm a statistically significant relationship between middle college high schools and graduation rate with almost 10% difference in reported rates between traditional high schools and the alternative model. Furthermore, similar noteworthy results were exhibited in the college going rate of the middle college high school students; 15% more middle college high school students chose to attend college than did those in traditional high schools.

Ancillary findings suggested that women employed transformational leadership behavior more often than men. The females scored higher on the *Leadership Practices Inventory* on total score and on every susbscore. Statistically significant differences appeared on three of the subscores: challenging the process, inspiring the vision, and encouraging the heart. Furthermore, age was shown to be significant in leadership conduct as well. Older administrators utilized transformational strategies more often than younger leaders.

Consistent with the research regarding the benefits of small schools (Galetti, 1999; Howley, 1989), enrollment of the school was shown to be a crucial factor in influencing attendance and graduation rates; the schools with fewer students had higher attendance and graduation rates. No significant relationship could be established between school size and dropout rate or college going rate.

This study also confirmed that the socioeconomic status of the students was central to all four of the effectiveness gauges. As the percentage of students on free and reduced lunch increased, the average daily attendance, graduation rate, and college going rate decreased. Moreover, this investigation reinforced studies which have concluded that low income students were more likely to drop out of school (Gooding, 2001; Drvian

& Butler, 2001). No association existed in this exploration between socioeconomic status and the form of the high school.

Conclusions

Recent researchers have suggested that the principal is the crucial dynamic in determining a successful school (Day, Harris, & Hatfield, 2001; Hord, 1984; Mestinek, 2000; Terry, 1988). Furthermore, administrators who practice transformational leadership are likely to lead in schools with greater effectiveness (Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, & Mccleary, 1990; Philbin, 1997; Shanahan, 1988), and principals using this leadership style also influence a positive school climate (Jackson, 1999; O'Connor, 2001; Rubio, 1999; Tibaldo, 1994). Past investigations also established that student engagement is affected by the by the transformational leadership of the chief administrator (Barker, 1986; Bobbett, 2001; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Olivier, 2001). Additionally, the principal's leadership style contributes to specific school outcomes, especially influencing truancy, dropout rate, graduation rate, and college attendance (Haycock & Huang, 2001; Wehlage et al., 1987). Leithwood and Jantzi (1999) and Wagonalander (1997) reported a relationship between transformational leadership and student engagement, and Finn (1989) tied that engagement to retention in school.

This study, however, could confirm no relationship between participating administrators scores on the LPI and any of the four indicators selected for examination. No statistically significant connection was found in this examination between principals' leadership style and attendance rate, dropout rate, graduation rate and college-going rate. These findings would come as no surprise to those who challenge the aforementioned research claiming to connect school effectiveness with a particular leadership style.

Thomas (2000), for example, concurred with the findings of this study, namely that there is no link between transformational leadership and effectiveness. Hallinger and Heck (1999) concluded as well that school leaders do not necessarily produce effective schools, and Crawford (2002) argued that the notion that a great leader can solve all the problems of a struggling school is far too simplistic a solution for a complex situation Even Bass (1985) indicated that the perception of charisma is related to the interaction of the individual and the situation, and Conger and Kanungo (1998) confirmed that it is during a crisis that the setting is more amenable to leadership and change. Perhaps the importance of the contexts of leadership practice has been underestimated.

Numerous professors of educational administration have addressed perceived gaps between university academic training for leadership and the practical applications of that knowledge (Donmoyer, 1995; Murphy, 1995; Scheurich, 1995). The schism between theory and practice broadened as the sanctioned knowledge base was perceived to be further and further removed from school contexts (Murphy, 1995). Prestine (1995) warned of the danger of students' believing their academic preparation is sufficient to become effective administrators.

Characterizing the practice of administration as an "ill-structured domain," that is, one in which the unpredictable conditions of practice defy the identification of appropriate preparatory knowledge, Prestine (1995) questioned the functionalist assumptions which underlie the standardization of preservice programs. Conceiving of school administration as little more than the mastery of certain functions or concepts makes it simple to design preservice curricula around those areas of concern (e.g. facility management, supervision and evaluation of employees, fiscal stewardship, and certain

conceptual principles such as the various leadership styles thought to be appropriate for school administrators, etc.). Assuming, however, that comprehension of these functions and concepts necessarily translates into an ability to construct an effective practice, is misguided. "Domain knowledge," she argued, "by itself, provides insufficient clues for many students about how to actually use it in solving problems and carrying out tasks in practice" (p. 271).

Schon (1987) agreed, noting that administrative practice is an area of "unfamiliar situations where the problems are not clear and there is no obvious fit between the characteristics of the situation and the available body of [knowledge]" (p. 34). If that is the case, then it is difficult, if not impossible to draw direct lines between principals' mastery of certain conceptual or functional premises and the effectiveness of the schools they lead. The fact that both sets of principals in this study (i.e., those who lead middle college high schools and those who lead traditional schools) not only demonstrated comprehension of the elements of transformational leadership but reported their implementation in their respective schools – to very different ends – suggests that is was less the principals' grasp of the conceptual dimensions of transformational leadership than the context in which it was being practiced which accounts for the differences in their schools' effectiveness.

School contexts. The express purposes of the middle college high school alternative are to improve student attendance, lower drop out rates, and raise the graduation and college going rates for at-risk students (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000; Gehring, 2001; Williams, 2000). America's middle college high schools reported a retention rate of 75%, graduation rate of 75%, and college entrance rate of 78%

(Lieberman, 1998). This inquiry obtained even more positive figures: average daily attendance, 91.2%; dropout rate, 4.06%; graduation rate 94.9%; and college attendance rate, 84.7%. Possibly only the more successful middle college high schools responded to the surveys, which would explain the higher set of figures. Schools that were not as successful would have been reticent in reporting and participating in this study.

The middle college high schools provided a nurturing atmosphere which helped alienated students to reconnect with school (Ghenring, 2001; Lieberman, 1975; Millonzi & Kolker, 1976). Even though they contained an at-risk population, the alternative schools proved that they could attain a degree of success (Collins, 1992). Students stayed in school and the dropout rate fell (Collins, 1992; Raywid, 1983). Stirling (2001) indicated that positive interpersonal relationships were effective in tackling truancy. This inquiry found slightly higher attendance rates for middle college high schools and a somewhat lower dropout rate for that group. However, no statistically significant association could be found in those two categories. That is not to say that one does not exist, merely that the sample size was too small to establish that connection.

Collins (1992) asserted that students in the alternative schools performed better with higher grade point averages and scores on scholastic aptitude tests, and tended to graduate from high school and continue on with education after high school. Specifically, the middle college high school setting provided sufficient resources for academic success (Lieberman, 1998; Millonzi & Kolker, 1976). This model eased the transition from one educational level to the next and ensured a seamless curriculum based on skills necessary for the successful completion of college (Heard, 1988; Lieberman, 1986; Middle College Consortium, 2002; Williams, 2000). This research confirmed a

statistically significant relationship between middle college high schools and graduation rate and similar noteworthy results were exhibited in the college going rate of the middle college high school students. This suggests that students experienced college expectations in a small, nurturing setting and gained confidence that they could succeed at the next educational level.

Additionally, alternative schools are smaller and more personalized (Collins, 1992; McDill, Natriello, & Pallas, 1987; Raywid, 1981; Wehlage & Rutter, 1986). Wagonlander (1997) argued that disengaged students would attend school regularly if class size were small enough to promote active learning. In smaller schools, students have a greater sense of belonging, lowering feelings of alienation and increasing attendance (Barker, 1986; Galetti, 1999; Howley, 1989). The results of this study confirmed a statistically significant relationship between lower enrollment and higher attendance rates in all schools included in this inquiry. Hamilton (1986) and Khazzaka (1997) supported the assertion that low student-teacher ratios provided a solution for students at risk for dropping out of school. Although a weak Pearson relationship was shown between enrollment and dropout rate in this inquiry, there was no conclusive evidence to support this premise.

Moreover, smaller schools have demonstrated higher achievement for students in general (Friedkin & Necochea, 1988; Galetti; 1999; Haycock & Huang, 2001; Howley, 1989; Wehlage, Rutter, & Tanbuagh, 1987). Small schools are more likely to integrate effective schools practices to meet the individual needs of the students (Botstein, 1997; Galetti, 1999; Raywid, 1997). This inquiry supported a significant inverse relationship between enrollment and graduation rate with the larger schools reporting lower

graduation rates. In contrast, a weak negative association between enrollment and

college attendance was found. Essentially, smaller schools performed better than larger

schools on all four indicators of effectiveness as prior research implied.

Socioeconomic issues. White (1982) and Conrath (2001) have argued that family

income is the strongest predictor of achievement, and Bitner (1981) demonstrated that

parental income was positively correlated to educational expectations. Students from low

socioeconomic backgrounds are at risk for absenteeism (Bimler & Kirkland, 2001;

Dougherty, 1999), and they are more likely to drop out of school (Baker, Derrer, Davis,

Dinklage-Travis, Linder, and Nicholson, 2001; McCormick, 1989; Wehlage, Rutter,

Smith, Lesko, & Fernandez, 1989). Students who lived in deprived neighborhoods are

less likely to graduate from high school (Wilson, 1987), and the school itself is likely

underfunded (Vartanian, 1999). Furthermore, Natriello and McDill (1986) supported

previous studies reporting that children from families of little wealth are generally aware

that their parents cannot afford to send them to college. Income range and parental

education have a positive effect on college student academic potential and performance

(Gooding, 2001).

In this study, the socioeconomic status of students was statistically significant in

relationship to all four of the indicators of effectiveness, supporting the aforementioned

research.   Students from low-income families exhibited lower attendance, a higher

dropout rate, lower graduation, and lower college-going rates.

Women and leadership. Past researchers argued women's leadership style is

more transformational that that of their male counterparts (Boomer, 1993; Genge, 2000;

Hines, 1999; Thomas, 2000). Furthermore, women are thought to make a difference in

the areas of vision, support systems, parental roles, sense of humor, and enthusiasm (Genge, 2000). This inquiry demonstrated a statistically significant sex difference on LPI scores and on three of the subscores. Women employed more transformational behaviors according to their responses. Incidently, the older the respondent, the more he or she was to utilize transformational strategies, concurring with the findings of Younger (2002).

Conclusions drawn here may generalize neither to other high schools nor to other types of alternative schools (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Research on the middle college high school concept is rare due to the relatively recent development of this model. This study, however small, adds to the body of knowledge about this new organizational structure.

Implications

In the past 30 year history of the middle college high school concept, the goals of improving student performance and self-esteem, reducing the dropout rate, and increasing graduation and college attendance rates have been realized (Cunningham & Wagonlander, 2000; Heard, 1988; Houston, Byers & Danner, 1992; Lieberman, 1986). Various instructional strategies were incorporated to engage students so that young adults could make the connection between high school graduation and work or college in a seamless curriculum (Conley, 2001; Cullen, 1991a; Fine, 1986; Williams, 2000). Students emerged with a greater sense of responsibility for their own education and motivation for higher learning, and the middle college high school reduced the total time required to graduate from college (Lieberman, 1986, 1998; Middle College Consortium, 2002). The emphasis of this alternative concept was on the whole student in order to elevate aspirations, reduce fear and anonymity, provide positive peer role models on a

college campus, replace failure with success, and impart a hope for the future (Lieberman, 1998; Millonzi & Kolker, 1976). This research supports the continued use of this model and incorporating these positive elements into traditional high schools as well, especially to increase graduation rates and college attendance. The middle college high school construct supports at-risk students so that they will attend school, graduate, and continue on to college (Lieberman, 1998). The results of this exploration confirmed that this alternative school model is successful with young people who otherwise might not have completed high school.

Students from low-income families from all high schools were at risk in all four major indicators in this investigation. Students from the low socioeconomic group were less likely to have positive parental influences and role models and were less likely to graduate (Gooding 2001; Wilson, 1987). Schools in poor areas are often underfunded, and the youngsters do not have the family support to overcome the pressure from their neighborhoods (Vartanian, 1999). District officials must ensure that all students receive adequate educational funding, and individual teachers can become mentors for low income children. Both Collins (1992) and Fine (1986) emphasized that numbers of dropouts increase when a difference existed between the experiences of the middle class teachers and low socioeconomic students. Staff development in schools with high free and reduced lunch rates could help to educate faculty on understanding the effects of poverty.

Haycock and Huang (2001) confirmed that the rigor and quality of high school coursework in all high schools is a reliable predictor of success in college. They suggested that lower income students are less likely to elect these essential courses than

86

their wealthy counterparts. Thus, school officials must encourage all students to select a demanding schedule of classes. Haycock and Huang (2001) also demonstrated that the intensity of high school classes has a positive effect on learning and test performance, even for those students not attending college. Thus, guidance counselors must establish the expectation of college attendance for low-income students especially (Trainor, 1993).

Furthermore, small schools were able to reduce the negative effects of poverty and race to narrow the achievement gap separating the economic classes (Friedkin & Necochea, 1988; Galetti, 1999; Howley, 1996; Lee & Smith, 1996, Raywid, 1998). Students' attendance increased while dropouts decreased in the smaller environment (Galetti, 1999; Howley, 1989). The smaller schools in this exploration illustrated higher attendance and graduation rates. The recent emphasis on larger, consolidated schools to improve economies of scale must be examined in light of the economic status of students. In an effort to keep local schools, alternate instructional delivery could be utilized in small schools with limited course offerings, such as distance learning through television or on-line classes.

Even though it is the American dream for all children to have an equal education regardless of family income, only a few students are aided by schools to advance to a higher social class (Arnstine, 1995). In fact, the higher a child's socioeconomic status, the better education he or she is likely to receive (Arnstine, 1995; Scheurich, 1995). Typically, school rankings match the socioeconomic ranking of the community, thus education serves to reproduce the status quo rather than improve the situation for disadvantaged students (Scheurich, 1995). If educational policymakers truly want to make a difference in students' lives and ensure that none is left behind, they will replace

their emphasis on national standards with a genuine effort to aiding impoverished students using practices proven effective, as those demonstrated in the middle college high schools in this study. Every child deserves a decent education in a safe environment (Giroux, 1996). Nicholson (2003) agrees:

> Expense necessary to provide such an educational experience for every child, however, is difficult, if not impossible to promote in a political environment which prefers no-cost solutions to meaningful reform. Criticizing school administrators for being insufficiently inspirational or teachers for "making excuses" concerning their disadvantaged students' lack of progress is cheap compared to fully funding the kind of reforms we know will work: small schools, small classes, low student-teacher ratios, universal preschool programs…We can pretend that the academic difficulties experienced by low-SES students are the product of the principal's leadership style, but that seriously inflates both the relevance and importance of style. Style won't overcome the kinds of obstacles facing disadvantaged students. Having the will to commit the fiscal resources to provide every child with the kind of supportive environment and personal attention that students in middle college high schools get, however, would ultimately result in what policy makers say they want: a first-class education for every child (B. Nicholson, personal communication, April 25, 2003).

Findings from this study appear to confirm that perspective. The practicing of transformational leadership precepts could not account for differences in attendance, dropout rate, graduation and college-going rate. It is less style than the environment in which it's practiced which influences student outcomes.

Recommendations for Further Study

Much controversy still exists about the assumed body of knowledge for preparing administrators, and whether either preservice curricula or staff development relying on such assumptions improves student outcomes (Hallinger & Heck, 1999). Moreover, questions arise about the ability of any leader to overcome the socioeconomic situation of the students and the school culture to improve student outcomes (Arnstine, 1995). Additional studies are needed in these areas.

The research on the middle college high school as an alternative to traditional high school remains scarce (Boomer, 1993; Kellmayer, 1995; Leithwood, 1992). A qualitative study, investigating perceptions of students and staff concerning the extent to which and in what way the middle college high school is successful for them, would constitute an interesting inquiry. A replication of this project might gain more responses if the inventory and questionnaire were administered at the summer meeting of the consortium of middle college high schools. Additionally, some of the self responses to the *Leadership Practices Inventory* were perfect scores; a comparison with the opinion of the staff concerning the administrator's transformational behavior would be a worthy exploration.

While investigations have reported the connection between women and transformational leadership, the fact remains that women are under-represented in school management (Hines, 1999; Thomas, 2000). Moreover, a tie between transformational style and self-efficacy, androgyny, and self-esteem has been found (Thomas, 2000; Younger, 2002). Thus, the topics relating to female leadership would provide material for an interesting inquiry. Additionally, explorations concerning transformational

89

leadership and age may prove valuable. The preliminary research has indicated that the older administrators were more likely to exhibit transformational strategies (Younger, 2002).

References

Arnstine, D. (1995). *Democracy and the arts of schooling.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Avolio, B. J. (1994). The "natural": Some antecedents to transformational leadership. *International Journal of Public Administration, 17*(9), 1559-1581.

Babbie, E. (1998). *Survey research methods* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Baker, J., Derrer, R., Davis, S., Dinklage-Travis, H., Linder, D., & Nicholson, M. (2001).The flipside of the coin: Understanding the school's contribution to dropout and completion. *School Psychology Quarterly, 16*(4), 406-426. Retrieved January 19, 2002, from EBSCO database.

Barker, B. (1986). *Advantages of small schools* (Clearinghouse No. RC 015607). Las Cruces, NM: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265988)

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: the strategies for taking charge.* New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Bimler, D. & Kirkland, J. (2001). School truants and truancy motivation sorted out with multidimensional scaling. *Journal of Adolescent Research 16*(1), 75-103. Retrieved February 3, 2002, from the EBSCO database.

Bishop, H.L., Tinley, A., & Berman, B.T. (1997, Fall). A contemporary leadership model
to promote teacher leadership. *Action in Teacher Education, 19*(Fall), 77-81.
Retrieved July 19, 2002, from the Wilson Web database.

Bittner, T.R. (1981). The effect of parental influence on post secondary school career or
Educational choices made by secondary school seniors [Abstract]. *Dissertation
Abstracts International, 42* (09), 3880A .

Bobbett, J.J. (2001). School culture, teacher efficacy, and decision-making in
Demonstrably effective and ineffective schools [Abstract}. *Dissertation
Abstracts International, 62* (07), 2293A.

Boomer, K. (1993). The perceived transformational leadership traits of principals of
Restructuring elementary schools in California (Doctoral dissertation, University
of the Pacific, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55,* 427.

Botstein, L. (1997). *Jefferson's children.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Campbell, D.T. & Stanley, J.C.(1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for
research.* Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publishing.

Chen, Y. C. (1996, Jan./Feb.). Relation between teachers' professionalism and job
attitudes, educational outcomes, and organizational factors. *The Journal of
Educational Research, 89*(Jan./Feb.), 163-171. Retrieved July 18, 2002 from the
Wilson Web database.

Chirichello, M.P. (1997). A study of the preferred leadership styles of principals and the
Organizational climates in successful public elementary schools in New Jersey
(Public Schools) [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58*(3), 659.

Chrispeels, J.H. (2002). The California center for effective schools: The Oxnard School

District partnership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(5), 382-387. Retrieved May 14, 2002,

from the EBSCO database.

Codianni, A.V. & Wilburn, G. (1983). *More effective schooling from research to

practice.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Collins, L.L. (1992). Comparative study of alternative high schools in Michigan and the

role of the school administrator in helping to reduce the "dropout" rate (Masters

thesis, Central Michigan University, 1992). *Masters Abstracts International, 31,*

512.

Colvin, R.E. (2002). *Transformational leadership: A prescription for contemporary

Organizations.* Retrieved January 16, 2002, from

http://www.cnu.edu/hrracj/bobpaper.html

Conger, J. & Kanungo, R. (1998) *Charasmatic leadership in organizations.* Thousand

Oaks, CA: Sage.

Conley, D.T. (2001). Rethinking the senior year. *National Association of Secondary

School Principals, 85,* 623. Retrieved January 29, 2002, from

http://www.nassp.org/news/bltn0501.html

Conrath, J. (2001). Changing the odds for young people: Next steps for alternative

education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(8), 585-587. Retrieved February 21, 2002,

from the EBSCO database.

Coyle, L.M. & Witcher, A.E. (1992). Transforming the idea into action. *Urban

Education, 26*(4), 390-401. Retrieved March 15, 2002, from the EBSCO

database.

Crane, J. (1996). Effects of home environment, SES, and maternal tests scores on

mathematics achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research, 89*(5), 305-314.

Retrieved April 14, 2002, from the EBSCO database.

Crawford, M.(2002). The charismatic school leader – potent myth or persuasive effect?

School Leadership & Management, 22(3), 273-287. Retrieved April 28, 2003,

from the EBSCO database.

Cullen, C.L. (1991a). Middle college high school: Its organization and effectiveness

(Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts*

International, 52, 358.

Cullen, C.L. (1991b). Membership and engagement at middle college high school.

Urban Education, 26 (1), 83-93. Retrieved February 15, 2002, from the EBSCO

database.

Cunningham, C.L. & Wagonlander, C.S. (2000, Fall). Establishing and sustaining a

middle college high school. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 111,* 41-51.

Day, C., Harris, A., & Hadfield, M. (2001). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective

school leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 4*(1), 39-56.

DeKalb, J. (1999). *Student truancy* (Report No. EDO-EA-99-1). Eugene, OR:

Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction

Service No. ED429334)

Donmoyer, R. (1995). A knowledge base in school administration: historical footings and

emerging trends. In R. Donmoyer, M.Imber, & J. Scheurich (Eds.), *The*

hnowledge base in educational administration (pp. 75-95). Albany, NY:

State University of New York Press.

Dougherty, J.W. (1999). Attending to attendance. *Phi Delta Kappa Fastbacks, 450,* 7-49. Retrieved May 10, 2002, from the Wilson Web database.

Downey, D. (1995). When bigger is not better: Family size, parental resources, and Children's educational performance. *American Sociological Review, 60,* 746-761.

Drvian, G. & Butler, J. (2001). *Effective schooling practices and at-risk youth: What the research shows.* Retrieved January 18, 2002, from http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/1/topsynl.html

Dunne, D.W. & Delisio, E.R. (2001). *Common elements of effective schools.* Retrieved June 2, 2002, from http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issue

Dyer, S.R. (2001) A comparative analysis of high school experiences of urban African American female at-risk students who remain in high school until graduation and those who leave high school prior to graduation [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62* (04), 1368A.

Emanoil, P. (2000). Economic and social well-being: empty seats. *Human Ecology, 28*(3), 4-8.

Fine, M. (1986). Why urban adolescents drop into and out of public high school. *Teachers College Record, 87*(3), 393-409.

Finn, J.D. (1989). Withdrawing from School. *Review of Educational Research, 59*(2), 117-143.

Floyd, J.E. (1999). An investigation of the leadership style of principals and its relation to Teachers' perceptions of school mission and student achievement [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60* (09), 3212A.

Foley, E. (1983). Alternative schools: New finding. *Social Policy, 13*(3), 44-46.

Friedkin, N. & Necochea, J. (1988). School system size and performance: A contingency Perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10*(3), 237-249.

Galetti, S. (1999, May). School size counts. *Education Digest, 64*(9), 15-18.

Gaziel, H.H. (1997, May/June). Impact of school culture on effectiveness of secondary Schools with disadvantaged students. *Journal of Educational Research, 90*(5), 310-319. Retrieved May 17, 2002, from the EBSCO database.

Gehring, J. (2001, March). High school with a college twist. *Education Week, 20*(26), 36-41.

Genge, M.C. (2000). The development of transformational leaders: the journeys of female and male secondary school principals, alike or different? [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 61 (06A), 2121.

Gild, L.S. (2000). Transformational leadership practices of secondary principals in selected alternative schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61,* 2122.

Giroux, H. (1996). Doing cultural studies: youth and the challenge of pedagogy. In P. Leistyna, A. Woodrum, & S. Sherblom (Eds.), *Breaking Free* (pp. 83-108), Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Gooding, Y. (2001). The relationship between parental education level and academic success of college (Doctoral Dissertation, Iowa State University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62,* 484.

Grannis, J.C. (1991). *Meeting the goals of school completion* (Report No. EDO-UD-91-9). New York, NY: Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED334309)

Greeleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness.* New York, NY: Paulist Press.

Gulick, L. & Urwick, L. (1937). *Papers on the science of administration.* New York, NY: Institute of Public Administration.

Hallinger, P. & Heck R. (1999). Can leadership enhance school effectiveness? In T. Bush, L. Bell, R. Bolam, R. Glatter, & R. Ribbins (Eds.), *Educational management: redefining theory policy and practice*, London: Paul Chapman.

Hamilton, S.F. (1986, Spring). Raising standards and reducing the dropout rate. *Teachers College Record, 86,*(Spring), 410-429.

Hamm, S.C. (1999). Alternative schools: Meeting the needs of nontraditional students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60* (10), 3581A. (UMI No. 9948277)

Hansen, J.N. (1989). Leadership behavior in selected alternative schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 50* (08), 2325A. (UMI No. 14900)

Hanuschek, M. (1989). The impact of differential expenditures on students performance. *Educational Researcher, 18*(4), 45-51.

Haycock, K. & Huang, S. (2001). Youth at the crossroads. *Thinking K-16, 5*(11), 3-22. Retrieved April 11, 2002, from http://www.edtrust.org/main/documents/k16_winter01.pdf

Haycock, K., Jerald, C., & Huang, S. (2001). Closing the gap: Done in a decade. *Thinking K-16, 5*(2), 3-23. Retrieved April 11, 2001, from http://www.edtrust.org/main/documents/k16_spring01.pdf

Heard, F.B. (1988). *An assessment of Tennessee statewide school-college collaborative for educational excellence: The middle college high school* (Clearinghouse no. JC880250). Los Angeles, CA: Center for Research on the Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED294637)

Hines, J.A. (1999). A case study of women superintendents in the state of Ohio in their roles as transformational leaders in creating school district climate [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 60 (11A), 3855.

Hoffer, T.B. (1997). High school graduation requirements: Effects on dropping out and student achievement. *Teachers College Record, 98*(4), 584-608. Retrieved January 30, 2002, from the EBSCO database.

Hord, S.M. (1984). *The effects of principal styles on school improvement* (Clearinghouse No. EA017382). Austin, TX: Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED251971)

Houston, A. V., Byers, S.M., & Danner, D. (1992). A successful alternative to traditional education: Seattle middle college high school at Seattle Central Community College. *Journal of Negro Education, 61*(4), 463-470.

Howley, C.B. (1989, Fall). Synthesis of the effects of school and district size: What research says about achievement in small schools and school districts. *Journal of Rural and Small Schools, 4,* 2-12.

Howley, C. (1996). Compounding disadvantage: The effects of school and district size on student achievement in West Virginia. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 12*(1), 25-32.

Howley, C. & Huang, G. (1991). *School completion 2000: Dropout rates and their implications for meeting the national goal* (Report No. EDO-RC-91-5). Charleston, WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED335177)

Irving, B.A. & Parker-Jenkins, M. (1995). Tacking truancy: An examination of persistent non-attendance amongst disaffected school pupils and positive support strategies. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 25*(2), 225-235. Retrieved March 29, 2002, from the EBSCO database.

Jackson, R.L. (1999). Transformational and transactional leadership in division administration at three institutions of higher education: An application of the Bass and Avolio Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60,* 2308.

Jacob, B.A. (2001). Getting tough? The impact of high school graduation exams. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 23*(2), 99-121. Retrieved June 5, 2002, from the Wilson Web database.

Janey, C.B. (2002). Must high school last four years? *Educational Leadership, 59*(7), 64-67. Retrieved April 4, 2002, from the EBSCO database.

Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2000) *Educational research.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Johnson, W.L. & Johnson, A.M. (1996). Assessing school climate priorities: A Texas study. *Clearing House, 70*(2), 64-66. Retrieved March 14, 2002, from the Wilson Web database.

Kane, C.M. (1994). *What we know and what we need to know: Report of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning* (Report No. ISBN-0-16-045231-7). Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED378685).

Kaplan, L.S. & Owings, W.A. (2001). Personalizing learning to prevent failure. *Principal Leadership, 1*(6), 42-47. Retrieved February 18, 2002, from the Wilson Web database.

Kellmayer, J. (1995) *How to establish an alternative school.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kerlinger, F. & Lee, H. (2000) *Foundations of behavioral research.* (4th Ed.) Orlando, FL: Harcourt College Publishers.

Khazzaka, J. (1997). Comparing the merits of a seven period school day to those of a four period school day. *High School Journal, 81*(2), 87-98. Retrieved May 26, 2002, from the EBSCO database.

Kinlaw, D.C. (1989). *Coaching for commitment: Managerial strategies for obtaining superior performance.* San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (1989). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, V.E. & Smith, J.B. (1996). *High school size: which works best and for whom?* (Clearinghouse No. RCO 20640). New York, NY: American Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED396888)

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (1999). The relative effects of principal and teachers sources

    of leadership on student engagement with school. *Educational Administration*

    Quarterly, 35(4), 679-707. Retrieved July 18, 2002, from the EBSCO database.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (2000). Effects of transformational leadership on

    Organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of*

    Educational Administration, 38(2), 112-129.

Leithwood, L.A. (1992,Feb.). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational*

    Leadership, 49(5), 8-12.

Lieberman, J. (1975, May 14). *The middle college high school: A new model for*

    remediation. New York, NY: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the

    International Reading Association.

Lieberman, J. (1986, May) *Middle college: A ten year study* (Clearinghouse No. JC

    860362). Los Angeles, CA: Center for Community Colleges. (ERIC Document

    Reproduction Service No. ED271153)

Lieberman, J. (1998, Fall). Creating structural change: Best practices. *New Directions for*

    Community Colleges, 103, 13-19. Retrieved on March 24, 2002, from the

    Wilson Web database.

Lords, E. (2000). New efforts at community colleges focus on underachieving teens.

    Chronicle of Higher Education, 46(43), 45-47.

March, J.K. & Peters, K.H. (2002). Curriculum development and instructional design in

    effective schools process. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(5), 379-381. Retrieved June 13,

    2002, from the Wilson Web database.

Maslow, A.H. (1970). *Motivation and personality (2nd ed.).* New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Maynard, W. (1977, March). Working with disruptive youth. *Educational Leadership, 51,* 417-421.

McCormick, K. (1989) *An equal chance: Educating at risk children to succeed* (Clearinghouse No. UDO26782).Alexandria, VA: National School Board Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED307359)

McDill, E.L., Natriello, G., & Pallas, A.M. (1987). A population at risk: Potential consequences of tougher school standards for student dropouts. *American Journal of Education, 94*(2), 135-181.

Mestinek, R. M. (2000). A comparative study of leadership characteristics of principals in charter schools and traditional schools. (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61,* 489.

Middle College Consortium (2002). *Shared beliefs.* Retrieved March 27, 2002, from http://www.mcconsortium.org/sharedbeliefs.html

Millonzi, J. & Kolker, A.(1976). *Factors in remedial education: The case study of an alternative school* (Clearinghouse No. JC770154). Los Angeles, CA: Center for Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED135425)

Murphy, J. (1995). The knowledge base in school administration: historical footings and emerging trends. In R. Donmoyer, M. Imber, J. Scheurich (Eds.), *The knowledge base in educational administration* (pp. 62-83). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Murphy, J. (2003). Speech at the AASA National Conference on Education, New

Orleans, LA. Retrieved April 30, 2003, from http://www.aasa.org.

Murray, M.F. (1988) A study of transformational leadership, organizational effectiveness,

and demographics in selected small college settings (Doctoral dissertation, Kent

State University, 1988). *Dissertation Abstracts International 50,* 1880.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1996). *Student absenteeism and tardiness:*

Indicator of the month (Report No. NCES-96-798). Washington, DC: United

States Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.

ED396461

National Commission on the High School Senior Year. (2001). *The lost opportunity of a*

senior year: Finding a better way. Retrieved January 24, 2002, from

http://www.commissiononthesenioryear.org/report/commissionsummary2.pdf

Natriello, G. & McDill, E. (1986). Performance standards: Student effort on homework

and academic achievement. *Sociology of Education, 59,* 18-31.

O'Connor, G.J. (2001). A study of leadership styles and school climate [Abstract].

Dissertation Abstracts International, 62 (11A), 3647.

Olivier, D.F. (2001). Teacher personal and school culture characteristics in effective

Schools: toward a model of a professional learning community [Abstract].

Dissertation Abstracts International, 62 (06), 2001A.

Ornstein, A.C. (1992). The national reform of education: Overview and outlook. *NAASP*

Bulletin, 76(541), 89-101.

Orr, A.J.(2000) Racial differences in academic achievement: The effects of wealth.

*Dissertation Abstracts International, 61 (*05), 2053A. (UMI No.9971358)

Oesterreich, H .(2000). *Characteristics of effective urban college preparation programs* (Report No. EDO-UD-00-8). New York, NY: Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED448244)

Pellerin, LA. (2000). High schools, parenting styles, and student disengagement [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61* (11), 4567A.

Pellicer, L.O., Anderson, L.W., Keefe, J.W., Kelley, E.A. & McCleary, L.E. (1990). *High school leaders and their schools: Profiles of effectivness (vol. 2).* Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Pfeiffer, J.W. & Ballew, A.C. (1991). *Theories and models in applied behavioral science.* San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer and Company.

Philbin, L.P III (1997). Transformational leadership and the secondary school principal [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International 58*(09), 3386A.

Plucker, J.A. (1998, Mar./Apr.). The relationship between school climate conditions and student aspirations. *The Journal of Educational Research, 91*(Mar/Apr), 240-246. Retrieved July 18, 2002, from the Wilson Web database.

Posner, B.B. & Kouzes, J.M. (1992). *Psychometric properties of the leadership practices inventory.* San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer and Company.

Prestine, N. (1995). A constructivist view of the knowledge base in educational administration. In R. Donmoyer, M. Imber, & J. Scheurich (Eds.), *The knowledge base in educational administration* (pp. 269-286). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Purkey, S. & Smith, M (1983, March). Effective schools: A review. *Elementary School Journal, 83*(March), 426-452.

Raywid, M.A. (1997, Dec/Jan). Small schools: A reform that works. *Educational*
Leadership, 55, 34-39. Retrieved March 22, 2002, from the Wilson Web
database.

Raywid, M.A. (1998). The journey of the alternative schools movement: Where it's been
and where it's going. *High School Magazine, 6*(2), 10-14.

Raywid, M,.A. (1981). The first decade of public school alternatives. *Phi Delta Kappan,*
63(8), 551-553.

Raywid, M.A. (1983). Schools of choice: Their current nature and prospects. *Phi Delta*
Kappan, 64(10), 684-688.

Robinson, Loretta. (2001) African American males students from single parent homes
have high rate of truancy [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International 61* (12),
4683.

Rood, R. (1989). Advise for administrators: Writing the attendance policy. *NAASP*
*Bulletin, 76(*516), 21-25.

Rubio, J.J. (1999). A descriptive study of principal leadership style and social system
variables of school climate through the perceptions of elementary school teachers
[Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International 60* (1), 39.

Ryan, M.E. (1991, Nov.). An alternative scheduling format; Intensive learning: An
answer to the dropout crisis. *NAASP Bulletin,* 25-29.

Scheurich, J. (1995). The knowledge base in educational administration: postpositivist
reflections. In R. Donmoyer, M. Imber, & J. Scheurich (Eds.) *The knowledge*
base in educational administration (pp.17-31), Albany, NY: State University of
New York Press.

Schlechty, P.C. (1990). *Schools for the twenty-first century.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-

    Bass.

Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner toward a new design for teaching*

    and learning for the professions. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Seeback, L. (2002, Feb. 16). Bad news about high school graduation rates. *Naples (FL)*

    Daily News. Retrieved June 15, 2002, from

    http://www.naplesnews.com/02/02perspective/d

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990a). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results.

    Educational leadership, 47(8), 23-27.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1990b). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary*

    Performance in schools. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and Janovich.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1992). *Moral leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1995). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective.* Boston,

    MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Shanahan, M.T. (1988). A study of the perceptions of Oklahoma school principals

    regarding their use of participative management [Abstract]. *Dissertation*

    Abstracts International 48 (10), 2508A.

Smith, M.H. (1993). Family characteristics, social capital, and college attendance

    [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International 55* (10), 3326A.

Spears, L. (1996). Reflections on Robert K. Greenleaf and servant leadership.

    Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 17(7), 33-35.

Stirling, N.A. (2001). Block-scheduling policy: Its effect on African American high

School students' truancy and attitudes toward school [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62*(78), 2309.

Sweeny, M. (1983). An exploratory structural-functional analysis of American urban

Traditional and alternative secondary public schools (Doctoral dissertation, Portland State University, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 45,* 486.

Terry, K.W. (1988). Secondary school teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership

behaviors in selected effective and regular secondary schools (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern State University of Louisiana, 1988). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 49,* 1340.

Thomas, R.K. (2000). Women in leadership: an examination of transformational

Leadership, gender role orientation and leadership effectiveness [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 61 (06A), 2489.

Tibaldo, L.J. (1994). The relationship of leadership style behaviors of principals to the

existence of effective schools (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International 55,* 3710.

Trainer, J. F. (1993). An analysis of college going decisions as social reproduction

phenomena: Comparative case studies in rural Pennsylvania (Doctoral dissertation, Penn State University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54,* 1701.

Vartanian, T.P. & Gleason, P.M. (1999). Do neighborhood conditions affect high school

dropout and college graduation rates? *Journal of Socio-Economics, 28*(1), 21-42. Retrieved June 2, 2002, from the EBSCO database.

Verona, G.S. (2001). The influence of principal transformational leadership style on high school proficiency test results in New Jersey comprehensive and vocational-technical high schools [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International 62,* (03), 874A.

Wagonlander, C.S. (1997). An investigation into critical school factors that foster positive re-engagement for at-risk youth (Doctoral dissertation, Eastern Michigan University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58,* 3849.

Walberg, H., Bakalis, M., Bast, J., & Baer, S. (1989, June). Reconstructing the nation's worst schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70*(June), 802-805.

Walberg, H.J. & Walberg, H.J. III (1994, June/July). Losing local control. *Educational Researcher, 23,* 19-26.

Wehlage, G. (1983). *Effective programs for the marginal high school students.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Wehlage, G. (1991). School reform for at risk students. *Equity and Excellence, 25*(1), 15-24.

Wehlage, G. & Rutter, R.A. (1986). Dropping out: How much do schools contribute to the problem? *Teachers College Record, 3,* 374-392.

Wehlage, G., Rutter, R., Smith, G., Lesko, N. & Fernandez, R. (1989). *Reducing the risk: Schools as communities of support.* Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Wehlage, G., Rutter, R., & Tumbaugh, A. (1987, March). A program model for at risk high school students. *Educational Leadership 45,* 70-73.

Weis, L, Farrar, E., & Petrie, H.G. (Eds.) (1989). *Dropouts from school: Issues, dilemmas, and solutions.* Albany, NY: University of New York Press.

White, K.R. (1982). The relation between socioeconomic status and academic

Achievement. *Psychological Bulletin 91*(3)*,* 461-481.

Williams, J. (2000, April). Close quarters. *Techniques: Connecting education and*

Careers, 75(4), 22-26. Retrieved April 12, 2002, from the Wilson Web database.

Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago

Press.

Younger, B.L. (2002). A study of women and the relationships among self-esteem, self-

efficacy, androgyny, and transformational leadership behavior [Abstract].

Dissertation Abstracts International, 63 (05B), 2628.

APPENDIX A

ACADEMY OF THE CANYONS	26455 Rockwell Campus Rd.	Santa Clarita	CA	91355
Hart High School	24825 North Newhall Ave.	Newhall	CA	91321
Saugus High School	21900 Centurion Way	Saugus	CA	91350
Valencia High School	27801 Dickason Dr.	Valencia	CA	91355
Canyon High School	19300 Nadal St.	Canyon Country	CA	91351
THE ACADEMY AT ILLINOIS CENTRAL COLLEGE	1 College Dr.	East Peoria	IL	61635
Brimfield High School	Box 307	Brimfield	IL	61517
Deer Creek-Mackinaw	401 E 5th St.	mackinaw	IL	61755
Delavan High School	907 Locust St.	Delavan	IL	61734
Dunlap High School	5220 W. Legion Hall Rd.	Dunlap	IL	61525
East Peoria High School	1402 E. Washington	East Peoria	IL	61611
Elmwood High School	301 W. Butternut	Elmwood	IL	61529
El Paso High School	600 N.Elm	El Paso	IL	61738
Eureka High School	200 W. Crugar	Eureka	IL	61530
Fieldcrest Community High School	One Dornbush Dr.	Minonk	IL	61760
Henry-Senachwine HighSchool	1023 college St. & Rt. 29	Henry	IL	61537
Illini Bluffs High School	212 N. Saylor St.	Glasford	IL	61533
Illinois Valley Central High School	1300 West Sycamore	Chillicothe	IL	61523
Limestone High School	4201 S. Airport Rd.	Bartonville	IL	61523
Lowpoint-Washburn High School	508 E. Walnut	Washburn	IL	61570
Metamora TWP High School	101 West Madison	Metamora	IL	61548
Midland High School	RR 1 Box 170	Varna	IL	61375
Midwest Central High School	910 s. Washington	Manito	IL	61546
Morton High School	350 N. Illinois	Morton	IL	61550
Pekin High School	1903 Court St.	Pekin	IL	61554
Peoria Heights High School	508 E.Glen	Peoria Heights	IL	61614
Peoria High School	1615 N. North	Peoria Heights	IL	61604
Peoria-Manual High School	811 S. Griswold	Peoria Heights	IL	61605
Peoria-Richwoods High School	6301 N. University	Peoria Heights	IL	61614
Peoria-Woodruff High School	1800 NE Perry	Peoria Heights	IL	61603

Princeville High School	302 Cordis St.	Princeville	IL	61559
Roanoke-Benson High School	208 W. High St.	Roanoke	IL	61561
Tremont High School	400 W. Pearl	Tremont	IL	61568
Washington Community High School	115 Bondurant St.	Washington	IL	61571
Farmington High School	568 e. Vernon	Farmington	IL	61531
BOYCE CAMPUS MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL	595 Beally Rd.	Monroeville	PA	15146
Gateway Senior High School	3000 Gateway Campus Blvd	Monroeville	PA	15146
Penn Hills Senior High School	12200 Garland Dr.	Pittsburgh	PA	15235
Plum Sr. High School	900 Elicker Rd.	Plum	PA	15239
Woodland Hills Senior High School	2550 Greensburg Pike	Pittsburgh	PA	15221
BROOKLYN COLLEGE ACADEMY @ BROOKLYN COLLEGE	2900 Bedford Ave.	Brooklyn	NY	11210
HOSTOS LINCOLN ACADEMY OF SCIENCE	475 Grand Concourse	Bronx	NY	10451
INTERNATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL @ LAGUARDIA CC	31-10 Thomson Ave	Long Island City	NY	11101
MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL @ LAGUARDIA CC	31-10 Thomson Ave	Long Island City	NY	11101
RF WAGNER SCHOOL FOR ART AND TECHNOLOGY	47-07 30th Place	Long Island City	NY	11101
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL	West 181st St. & University Ave	Bronx	NY	10453
MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL @ MEDGAR EVER	1186 Carroll St.	Brooklyn	NY	11225
Morris High School	166 St. & Boston Rd.	Bronx	NY	10456
Herbert H. Lehman High School	3000 East Tremont Ave	Bronx	NY	10461
Columbus High School	925 Astor Ave	Bronx	NY	10469
Evander Childs High School	800 East Gun Hill Rd.	Bronx	NY	10467
Walton High School	2780 Reservoirt Ave.	Bronx	NY	10468
Bronx High School of Science	75 West 205 St	Bronx	NY	10468
Stevenson High School	1980 Lafayette Ave	Bronx	NY	10473

Truman High School	750 Baychester Ave	Bronx	NY	10475
South Bronx High School	701St. Anne's Ave	Bronx	NY	10455
Kennedy High School	99 Terrace View Ave.	Bronx	NY	10463
Banana Kelly High School	991 Longwood Ave	Bronx	NY	10459
Alfred Smith High School	333 East 151 st	Bronx	NY	10451
Jane Addams High School	900 Tinton Ave	Bronx	NY	10456
Gompers High School	455 Southern Boulevard	Bronx	NY	10455
Dodge High School	2474 Crotona Ave.	Bronx	NY	10458
Bronx Guild High School	1980 Lafayette Ave	Bronx	NY	10473
Lane High School	999 Jamaica Ave	Brooklyn	NY	11208
August Martin High School	156-10 Baisley Blvd	Jamaica	NY	11434
Beach Channel High School	100-00 Beach Channel Dr.	Rockaway Park	NY	11694
Cardozo High School	5700 223 St.	Bayside	NY	11364
Springfield Gardens High School	143-10 Springfield Blvd	Springfield Gardens	NY	11413
John Bowne HighSchool	63-25 Main St.	Flushing	NY	11367
Francis Lewis High School	58-20 Utopia Parkway	Fresh Meadows	NY	11365
Martin Van Buren High School	Hillside Ave. & 232 St.	Queens Village	NY	11427
Forest Hills High School	67-01 110 St.	Forest Hills	NY	11372
Bryant High School	48-10 31 Ave.	Long Island City	NY	11103
Long Island City High School	14-30 Broadway	Long Island City	NY	11106
Newtown High School	48-01 90 St.	Elmhurst	NY	11373
Flushing High School	35-01 Union St.	Flushing	NY	11354
Far Rockaway High School	821 Bay 25 St.	Far Rockaway	NY	11691
Jamaica High School	167-01 Gothic Dr.	Jamaica	NY	11432
Richmond High School	89-30 114 St.	Richmond Hill	NY	11418
John Adams High School	101-02 Rockaway Blvd	Ozone Park	NY	11417
Grover Cleveland High School	2127 Himrod St.	Ridgewood	NY	11385
Bayside High School	208 St. & 32 Ave.	Bayside	NY	11361
Hillcrest High School	160-05 Highland Ave.	Jamaica	NY	11432
Townsend Harris High School	149-11 Melbourne Ave.	Flushing	NY	11367

Newcomers High School	28-01 41 Ave.	Long Island City	NY	11101
Edison High School	165-65 84 Ave.	Jamaica	NY	11432
Robert F. Kennedy Community High School	75-40 Parsons Blvd.	Flushing	NY	11366
Frank Sinatra High School	29-10 Thompson Ave.	Long Island City	NY	11101
Louis Armstrong High School	32-02 Junction Blvd	East Elmhurst	NY	11369
Midwood High School	2839 Bedford Ave	Brooklyn	NY	11210
Tilden High School	5800 Tilden	Brooklyn	NY	11203
Madison High School	3787 Bedford Ave.	Brooklyn	NY	11229
Jefferson High School	400 Pennsylvania Ave.	Brooklyn	NY	11207
Prospect Heights High School	883 Classon Ave.	Brooklyn	NY	11225
New Utrecht High School	1601 80St.	Brooklyn	NY	11214
Wingate High School	600 Kingston Ave	Brooklyn	NY	11203
Brunswick High School	400 Irving Ave.	Brooklyn	NY	11237
Sheepshead Bay High School	3000 Avenue X	Brooklyn	NY	11204
Canarsie High School	1600 Rockaway Parkway	Brooklyn	NY	11236
Roosevelt High School	5800 20 Ave.	Brooklyn	NY	11204
South Shore High School	6565 Flatlands Ave.	Brooklyn	NY	11236
Edward R. Murrow High School	1600 Avenue L	Brooklyn	NY	11230
Dewey High School	50 Ave. X	Brooklyn	NY	11223
Clara Barton High School	901 Classon Ave.	Brooklyn	NY	11225
Paul Rebeson High School	150 Albany Ave.	Brooklyn	NY	11213
Maxwell High School	145 Pennsylvania Ave.	Brooklyn	NY	11207
Bard High School	424 Leonard St. 4th floor	Brooklyn	NY	11222
Seward Park High School	350 Grand St.	New York	NY	10002
University Neighborhood High School	200 Monroe St.	New York	NY	10002
Washington Irving High School	40 Irvin Place	New York	NY	10003
Brandeis High School	145 West 84 St.	New York	NY	10024
Stuyvesant High School	345 Chamberst St.	New York	NY	10282
LaGuardia HighSchool	100 Amsterdam Ave.	New York	NY	10023
ML King High School	122 Amsterdam Ave	New York	NY	10023
Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis High School	120 West 46 St.	New York	NY	10036

Park West High School	525 West 50 St.	New York	NY	10019
A. Philip Randolph Campus High School	135 St. & Convent Ave.	New York	NY	10031
High School of Teaching	421 East 88 St.	New York	NY	10128
Norman Thomas High School	111 East 33 St.	New York	NY	10016
The Heritage School	1680 Lexington Ave.	New York	NY	10029
Manhattan Comprehensive Night and Day High School	240 Second Ave.	New York	NY	10003
Chelsea High School	131 Avenue of the Americas	New York	NY	10013
East Side Community High School	60 420 East 12 St.	New York	NY	10009
CANADA MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL	4200 Farm Hill Blvd	Redwood City	CA	94061
Carlmont High School	1400 Alameda de las Pugas	Belmont	CA	94002
Sequoia High School	1201 Brewster	Redwood City	CA	94062
Menlo-Atherton High School	555 Middlefield Rd.	Atherton	CA	94027
Woodside High School	199 Churchill Ave.	Woodside	CA	94062
Redwood High School	1968 Old County Rd.	Redwood City	CA	94063
COMMUNITY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL OF SO.NEVADA	3200 East Cheyenne Ave.	North Las Vegas	NV	89030
Basic High School	400 Palo Verde	Henderson	NV	89015
Bonanza High School	6665 W. Del Rey	Las Vegas	NV	89146
Boulder City High School	1101 Fifth Ave.	Boulder City	NV	89005
Centennial High School	10200 Centennial Pkwy.	Las Vegas	NV	89128
Chaparral High School	3850 Annie Oakley	Las Vegas	NV	89121
Cheyenne High School	3200 W. Alexander Rd.	N. Las Vegas	NV	89032
Cimarron-Memorial High School	2301 N. Tenaya Way	Las Vegas	NV	89128
Clark High School	4291 W. Pennwood Ave.	Las Vegas	NV	89102
Coronado High School	1001 Coronado Center Dr.	Henderson	NV	89052
Desert Pines High School	3800 Harris Ave	Las Vegas	NV	89110
Durango High School	7100 W. Dewey Dr.	Las Vegas	NV	89113
Eldorado High School	1139 N. Linn Ln.	Las Vegas	NV	89110
Foothill High School	800 College Dr.	Henderson	NV	89015
Green Valley High School	460 Arroyo Grande	Henderson	NV	89074

Indian Springs High School	400 Sky Road	Indian Springs	NV	89018
Las Vegas High School	6500 E. Sahara Ave.	Las Vegas	NV	89142
Las Vegas Academy	315 s. 7th St.	Las Vegas	NV	89101
Laughlin High School	1900 Cougar Dr.	Laughlin	NV	89029
Moapa Valley High School	PO Box 278	Overton	NV	89040
Mojave High School	5302 Goldfield St.	N Las Vegas	NV	89031
Palo Verde High School	333 Pavilion Court Dr.	Las Vegas	NV	89144
Rancho High School	1900 E. Owens	North Las Vegas	NV	89030
Sierra Vista High School	8100 W. Robindale Rd.	Las Vegas	NV	89113
Silverado High School	1650 Silver Hawlk Ave.	Las Vegas	NV	89123
Valley High School	2930 S. Burnham	Las Vegas	NV	89109
Virgin Valley High School	820 Valley View Dr.	Mesquite	NV	89027
Western High School	4601 w. Bonanza Rd.	Las Vegas	NV	89107
MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL @ CONTRA COSTA COL	2600 Mission Bell Dr.	San Pablo	CA	94803
Acalanes High School	1200 Pleasant Hill Rd.	Lafayette	CA	94549
Campolindo High School	300 Moraga Way	Moraga	CA	94556
Del Oro High School	1969 Tice Valley Rd.	Walnut Creek	CA	94595
Las Lomas High School	1460 S. Main St.	Walnut Creek	CA	94546
Miramonte High School	750 Moraga Way	Orinda	CA	94563
Antioch High School	700 W. 18 th St.	Antioch	CA	94509
John Swett High School	1098 Pomona St.	Crockett	CA	94525
La Paloma High School	6651 Lone Tree Way	Brentwood	CA	94513
Liberty High School	850 2nd St.	Brentwood	CA	94513
Alhambra Senior High School	150 E. St.	Martinez	CA	94553
Adelante High School	2450 Grant St	Concord	CA	94520
Clayton Valley High School	1101 Alberta Way	Concord	CA	94521
College Park High School	201 Viking Dr.	Pleasant Hill	CA	94523
Concord High School	4200 Concord Blvd	Concord	CA	94521
Crossroads High School	1266 San Carlos Ave.	Concord	CA	94518
Gateway High School	205 Pacific Ave	Pittsburg	CA	94565

Mt. Diablo High School	2455 Grant St.	Concord	CA	94520
Northgate High School	425 Castle Rock Rd.	Walnut Creek	CA	94598
Nueva Vista High School	1101 Alberta Way	Concord	CA	94521
Prospect High School	802 W. 2nd St.	Pleasant Hill	CA	94523
Summit High School	4200 Concord Blvd	Concord	CA	94521
Ygnacio Valley High School	755 Oak Grove Rd.	Concord	CA	94518
Riverside High School	809 Black Diamond St.	Pittsburg	CA	94565
California High School	9870 Broadmoor Dr.	San Ramon	CA	94583
Del Amigo High School	189 Del Amigo Rd.	Danville	CA	94526
Monte Vista High School	3131 Stone Valley Rd.	Danville	CA	94526
San Ramon Valley High School	140 Love Lane	Danvile	CA	94526
De Anza Senior High School	5000 Valley View Rd.	Richmond Hill	CA	94803
El Cerrito Senior High School	540 Ashbury Ave	El Cerrito	CA	94530
Kennedy High School	4300 Cutting Blvd	Richmond	CA	98404
Pinole Valley High School	2900 Pinole Valley Rd.	Pinole	CA	94564
Richmond High School	1250 23rd St	Richmond	CA	94804
Deer Valley High School	4700 Lone Tree Way	Antioch	CA	94531
Pittsburg High School	250 School St.	Pittsburg	CA	94565
Live Oak High School	1708 F St.	Antioch	CA	94509
Freedom High School	1050 Neroly Rd.	Oakley	CA	94561
DE ANZA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	210100 Finch Ave.	Cupertino	CA	95014
Cupertino High School	10100 Finch Ave.`	Cupertino	CA	95014
Homestead High School	21370 Homestead Rd.	Cupertino	CA	95014
Monta Vista High School	21840 McClelland Rd.	Cupertino	CA	95014
Fremont High School	1279 Sunnyvale-Saratoga Rd	Sunnyvale	CA	94087
Lynbrook High School	1280 Johnson Ave.	San Jose	CA	95129
MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL AT EL CENTRO COLLEGE	801 Main St.	Dallas	TX	75006
Adams High School	2101 Milmar Dr.	Dallas	TX	75228
Adamson High School	201 E Ninth	Dallas	TX	75203
Carter High School	1819 W.Wheatland	Dallas	TX	75232

Hillcrest High School	9924 Hillcrest Rd.	Dallas	TX	75230
Jefferson High School	4001 Walnut Hill Lane	Dallas	TX	75229
Kimball High School	3606 s. Westmoreland Rd	Dallas	TX	75233
Madison High School	3000 Martin L. King Blvd	Dallas	TX	75215
Manns High School	912 S. Ervay	Dallas	TX	75201
Metropolitan Educational Center	1403 Corinth	Dallas	TX	75215
Molina High School	2355 Duncanville Rd.	Dallas	TX	75211
North Dallas High School	3120 N. Haskell Ave	Dallas	Tx	75204
Pinkston High School	2200 Dennison St.	Dallas	TX	75212
Roosevelt High School	525 Bonnie View Rd	Dallas	TX	75203
Samuel High School	8928 Palisade Dr.	Dallas	TX	75217
Seagoville High School	15920 Seagoville Rd.	Dallas	TX	75253
Skyline High School	7777 Forney Rd.	Dallas	TX	75227
A. Maceo Smith High School	3030 Stag Rd	Dallas	TX	75241
South Oak Cliff High School	3601 S. Marsalis Ave.	Dallas	TX	75216
Spruce High School	9733 Old Segoville Rd.	Dallas	TX	75217
Sunset High School	2120 W. Jefferson	Dallas	TX	75208
WT White High School	4505 Ridgeside Dr.	Dallas	TX	75244
Woodrow Wilson High School	100 South Glasglow Dr.	Dallas	TX	75214
GARFIELD HIGH SCHOOL AT CITY COLLEGE	1255 16th St.	San Diego	CA	92101
Claremont High School	4150 Ute Dr.	San Diego	CA	92117
Crawford High School	4191 Colts Way	San Diego	CA	92115
Henry High School	6702 Wandermere D.	San Diego	CA	92120
Hoover High School	4474 El Cajon Blvd.	San Diego	CA	92115
Kearny High School	7651 Wellington St.	San Diego	CA	92111
La Jolla High School	750 Nautilus St.	La Jolla	CA	92037
Lincoln High School	150 So. 49th St.	San Diego	CA	92113
Madison High School	4833 Doliva Dr	San Diego	CA	92117
Morse High School	6905 Skyline Dr.	San Diego	CA	92114
Point Loma High School	2335 Chatsworth Dr.	San Diego	CA	92106
San Diego High School	1405 Park Blvd	San Diego	CA	92101

School	Address	City	State	ZIP
Scripps Ranch High School	10410 Treena St.	San Diego	CA	92131
Sorra High School	5156 Santo Rd.	San Diego	CA	92124
University City High School	6949 Genessee Ave.	San Diego	CA	92122
Twain Jr-Sr High School	6402 Linda Vista Rd.	San Diego	CA	92111
GREENVILLE TECHNICAL COLLEGE	PO Box 5616	Greenville	SC	29606
Berea High School	515 Berea Dr/	Greenville	SC	29617
Eastside High School	1300 Brushy Creek Rd.	Taylors	SC	29687
Hillcrest High School	3665 s. Industrial Dr.	Simpsonville	SC	29681
Riverside High School	1300 Suber Rd.	Greer	SC	29650
Wade Hampton High School	100 Pine Knoll Dr.	Greenville	SC	29609
Blue Ridge High School	2151 Few Chapel Rd.	Greer	SC	29641
Southside High School	100 Blassingame Rd.	Greenville	SC	29605
Greer High School	3000 E. Gap Creek Rd.	Greer	SC	29651
Mauldin High School	701 E. Butler Rd.	Mauldin	SC	29662
Travelers Rest High School	115 Wilhelm Winter St.	Travelers Rest	SC	29690
Woodmont High School	150 WoodmontSchool Rd.	Piedmont	SC	29673
HANEY TECHNICAL CENTER	3016 Highway 77	Panama City	FL	32405
AC Mosley High School	501 Mosley Dr.	Lynn Haven	FL	32444
AD Harris High School	819 East 11th St.	Panama City	FL	32401
Bay High School	1200 Harrison Ave	Panama City	FL	32401
Rutherford High School	1000 School Ave.	Springfield	FL	32401
HOUSTON MIDDLE COLLEGE FOR TECHNICAL CAREERS	PO Box 1932	Houston	TX	77004
Austin High School	1700 Dumble	Houston	TX	77023
Bellaire high School	5100 Maple	Bellaire	TX	77401
Chavez High School	8501 Howard	Houston	TX	77017
Davis High School	1101 Quitman	Houston	TX	77009
Furr High School	520 Mercury	Houston	TX	77013
Sam Houston High School	9400 Irvington	Houston	TX	77076
Jones High School	7414 St. Lo	Houston	TX	77033
Kashmere High School	6900 Wileyvale	Houston	TX	77028

Lamar High School	3325 Westheimer	Houston	TX	77098
Lee High School	6529 Beverly Hill	Houston	TX	77057
Madison High School	13719 Whiteheather	Houston	TX	77045
Milby High School	1601 Broadway	Houston	TX	77012
Reagan High School	413 East 13th	Houston	TX	77008
Scarborough High School	4141 Costa Rica	Houston	TX	77092
Sharpstown High School	7504 Bissonnet	Houston	TX	77074
Sterling High School	11625 Martindale	Houston	TX	77048
Waltrip High School	1900 West 34th	Houston	TX	77018
Washington High School	119 East 39th	Houston	TX	77018
Westbury High School	11911 Chimney Rock	Houston	TX	77035
Westside High School	14201 Briar Forest	Houston	TX	77077
Wheatley High School	4900 Market	Houston	TX	77020
Worthing High School	9215 Scott	Houston	TX	77051
Yates High School	3703 Sampson	Houston	TX	77004
MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL OF KANAWHA COUNTY	200 Elizabeth St.	Charleston	WV	25311
Capital High School	1500 Greenbrier St.	Charleston	WV	25311
George Washington High School	1522 Tennis Club Rd.	Charleston	WV	25314
Herbert Hoover High School	275 Elk River Rd. S.	Clendenin	WV	25045
Nitro High School	1301 Park Ave.	Nitro	WV	25143
Riverside High School	1 Warrior Way	Belle	WV	25015
St. Albans High School	Kanawha Terrace and Hudson St.	St.Aalbans	WV	25177
Sissonville High School	6100 Sissonville Dr.	Charleston	WV	25312
So. Charleston High School	One Eagle Way	So. Charleston	WV	25309
MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL-LODI UNIFIED SCHOOLS	5151 Pacific Avenue	Stockton	CA	95207
Bear Creek High School	10555 Thorton Rd.	Stockton	CA	95209
Liberty High School	660 West Walnut St.	Lodi	CA	95240
Lodi High School	3 So Pacific Ave.	Lodi	CA	95242

School	Address	City	State	ZIP
Plaza Robles High School	9434 Thorton Rd.	Stockton	CA	95209
Tokay High School	1111 Century Blvd.	Lodi	CA	95240
MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL @ LOS ANGELS SW COL	1600 Imperial Highway	Los Angeles	CA	90047
Belmont Senior High School	1575 W 2nd St.	Los Angeles	CA	90026
Crenshaw Senior High School	5010 11th Ave.	Los Angeles	CA	90043
Dorsey Senior High School	3537 Farmdale Ave.	Los Angeles	CA	90016
Eagle Rock Jr-Sr. High School	1750 Yosemite Dr.	Los Angeles	CA	90041
Fairfax Senior High School	7850 Melrose Ave.	Los Angeles	CA	90046
Benjamin Franklin Senior High	820 N. Avenue 54	Los Angeles	CA	90042
John Fremont Senior High School	7676 S. San Pedro St.	Los Angeles	CA	90003
Garfield Senior High School	5101 E 6th St.	Los Angeles	CA	90022
Hamilton Senior High School	2955 Robertson Blvd	Los Angeles	CA	90034
Hollywood Senior High	1521 N. Highland Ave.	Los Angeles	CA	90028
Jefferson Senior High School	1319 41st St.	Los Angeles	CA	90011
DS Jordan High School	2265 E 103rd St.	Los Angeles	CA	90002
Lincoln High School	3501 N. Broadway	Los Angeles	CA	90031
AL Locke Senior High School	325 E 111th St.	Los Angeles	CA	90061
Los Angeles Senior High School	4650 W. Olympic Blvd	Los Angeles	CA	90019
John Marshall Senior High School	3939 Tracy St.	Los Angeles	CA	90027
Roosevelt High School	456 S. Mattews St.	Los Angeles	CA	90033
University Senior High School	11800 Texas Ave	Los Angeles	CA	90025
Venice Senior High School	13000 Venice Blvd	Los Angeles	CA	90066
Westchester Senior High School	7400 W. Manchester Ave.	Los Angeles	CA	90045
Wilson Senior High School	4500 Multnomah St.	Los Angeles	Ca	90032
LOWELL MIDDLESEX CHARTER SCHOOL @ MIDDLESEX CC	67 Middle St.	Lowell	MA	1852
Lowell High School	50 Fr. Morrissette Blvd	Lowell	MA	1852
MOTT MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL @ MOTT CC	1401 E Court St. MMBI 123	Flint	MI	48503
Linder High School	7201 Silver Lake Rd.	Linden	MI	48451

Flushing High School	5039 Deland Rd.	Flushing	MI	48433
Genessee High School	7347 No. Genessee Rd.	Genessee	MI	48437
Atherton High School	3354 S. Genessee Rd.	Burton	MI	48519
Bently High School	1150 N. Belsay Rd.	Burton	MI	48509
Davison High School	1250 N. Oak Rd.	Davison	MI	48423
Grand Blanc High School	11920 S. Saginaw St.	Grand Blanc	MI	48439
Mt. Morris High School	12356 Walter St.	Mt. Morris	MI	48458
Lakeville High School	12455 Wilson Rd.	Otisville	MI	48463
Fenton High School	3200 W. Shiavassee	Fenton	MI	48430
Flint Northern High School	G-3284 Mackin Rd.	Flint	MI	48504
Lake Fenton High School	11425 Torrey Rd.	Fenton	MI	48430
Beecher High School	1020 W. Coldwater Rd.	Flint	MI	48505
Carman-Ainsworth High School	1300 No. Linden Rd.	Flint	MI	48532
Bendle Senior High School	2294 East Bristol Rd.	Burton	MI	48529
Cleo High School	1 Mustang Dr.	Clio	MI	48420
Kearsley High School	4302 Underhill Dr.	Flint	MI	48506
Goodrich High School	8029 So. Gale Rd.	Goodrich	MI	48438
Swartz Creek High School	1 Dragon Dr.	Swartz Creek	MI	48473
Hill-Clay High School	301 Nanita Dr.	Montrose	MI	48457
Hamady Middle/High School	384 N Jennings Rd.	Flint	MI	48504
MIDDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL @ MIDDLE COAST COL	2701 Fairview Rd - PO Box 5005	Costa Mesa	CA	92628
Corona del Mar High School	2101 Eastbluff Dr.	Newport Beach	CA	92660
Costa Mesa High School	2650 Fairview Rd.	Costa Mesa	CA	92626
Estancia High School	2323 Placentia Ave.	Costa Mesa	CA	92627
Newport Harbor High School	600 Irvine Ave.	Newport Beach	CA	92627
MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL @ SANTA ANNA COLLEG	1530 West 17th St.	Santa Anna	CA	92706
Century High School	1401 South Grand	Santa Anna	CA	92705
Saddleback High School	2802 So. Flower	Santa Anna	CA	92707
Santa Anna High School	520 W. Walnut	Santa Anna	CA	92701

Santa Anna Valley High School	1801 S. Greenville	Santa Anna	CA	92704
SAN MATEO MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL	1700 West Hillsdale Blvd	San Mateo	CA	94402
Aragon High School	900 Alameda de las Pulgas	San Mateo	CA	94402
Burlingame High School	400 Carolan Ave.	Burlingame	CA	94010
Capuchino High School	1501 Magnolia Ave.	San Bruno	CA	94066
Hillsdale High School	3115 Del Monte St.	San Mateo	CA	94403
Mills High School	400 Murchison Dr.	Millbrae	CA	94030
Peninsula High School	300 Piedmont	San Bruno	CA	94401
San Mateo High School	506 North Delaware St.	San Mateo	CA	94401
MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL @ SW TENNESSEE CC	737 Union Ave. E 102	Memphis	TN	38174
Central High School	306 So. Bellevue Blvd	Memphis	TN	38104
Craymont High School	3333 Covington Pike	Memphis	TN	38128
East High School	3206 Poplar Ave.	Memphis	TN	38111
Fairley High School	4950 Fairley Rd.	Memphis	TN	38109
Hamilton High School	1363 Person Ave.	Memphis	TN	38106
Kingsbury High School	1270 No. Graham	Memphis	TN	38122
Kirby High School	4080 Kirby Pkwy.	Memphis	TN	38115
Manassas High School	781 Firestone Blvd.	Memphis	TN	38107
Melrose High School	2870 Deadrick Ave.	Memphis	TN	38114
Raleigh Egypt High School	3970 Voltaire	Memphis	TN	38128
Ridgeway High School	2009 Ridgeway Rd.	Memphis	TN	38119
Sheffield High School	4315 Sheffield Rd.	Memphis	TN	38118
Treadwell High School	920 No. Highland St.	Memphis	TN	38122
Trezevant High School	3350 Trezevant St.	Memphis	TN	38127
BT Washington High School	715 S. Lauderdale St.	Memphis	TN	38126
Wooddale High School	5151Scottsdale Ave.	Memphis	TN	38118
Westside High School	3389 Dawn Dr.	Memphis	TN	38127
Westwood High School	4480 Westwood Rd.	Memphis	TN	38109
White Station High School	514 So. Perkins Rd.	Memphis	TN	38117
Whitehaven High School	4851 Elvis Presley Rd.	Memphis	TN	38116

Barlett High School	5688 Woodlawn Ave.	Bartlett	TN	38134
Bolton High School	7323 Brunswick Rd.	Arlington	TN	38002
Collierville High School	1101 N. Byhalea Rd.	Collierville	TN	38017
Cordova High School	1800 Berryhill Rd.	Cordova	TN	38018
Germantown High School	7653 Old Poplar Pike	Germantown	TN	38138
Houston High School	9755 Wolf River Blvd	Germantown	TN	38139
Millington High School	8057 Wilkinsville Rd.	Millington	TN	38053
MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL	401 NE Northgate Way	Seattle	WA	98125
Ballard High School	1418 NW 65th St.	Seattle	WA	98117
Cleveland High School	5511 15th Ave. S	Seattle	WA	98108
Franklin High School	3013 S. Mt. Baker Blvd	Seattle	WA	98144
Garfield High School	400 23rd Ave.	Seattle	WA	98122
Nathan Hale High School	10750 30th Ave. NE	Seattle	WA	98125
Ingraham High School	1819 N 135th St.	Seattle	WA	98133
John Marshall High School	520 NE Ravenna Blvd.	Seattle	WA	98115
Nova High School	2410 E. Cherry St.	Seattle	WA	98122
Rainier Beach High School	8815 Seward Park Ave. S	Seattle	WA	98118
Roosevelt High School	1410 NE 66th St.	Seattle	WA	98115
Sealth High School	2600 SW Thistle St.	Seattle	WA	98126
South Lake High School	8825 Rainier Ave. S	Seattle	WA	98118
West Seattle High School	5950 Delridge Way SW	Seattle	WA	98106
TRUCKEE MEADOWS COMMUNITY COLLEGE HIGH SCHO	7000 Dandini Blvd	Reno	NV	89512
Galena High School	3600 Butch Cassidy Way	Reno	NV	89511
Glenn Hare Center	350 Hunter Lake	Reno	NV	89509
Hug High School	2880 Sutro St.	Reno	NV	89512
Incline High School	PO Box 6860	Incline Village	NV	89452
McQueen High School	6055 Lancer St.	Reno	NV	89523
North Valleys High School	1470 East Golden Valley Rd.	Reno	NV	89506
Opportunity School	350 Hunter Lake	Reno	NV	89509
Reed High School	1350 Baring Blvd	Sparks	NV	89434

Reno High School	395 Booth St.	Reno	NV	89509
Spanish Springs High School	1065 Eagle Canyon Dr.	Sparks	NV	89436
Sparks High School	820 15th St.	Sparks	NV	89431
Washoe High School	777 W. 2nd St.	Reno	NV	89509
Wooster High School	1331 East Plumb Lane	Reno	NV	89502
WILLIAMSON COUNTY MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL	20 White Bridge Rd.	Nashville	TN	37209
Brentwood High School	5304 Murray Lane	Brentwood	TN	37027
Centennial High School	5050 Mallory Lane	Franklin	TN	37067
Fairview High School	2595 Fairview Blvd	Fairview	TN	37062
Franklin High School	810 Hillsboro Rd.	Franklin	TN	37064
Page High School	6281 Arno Road	Franklin	TN	37064
Ravenwood High School	1724 Wilson Pike	Brentwood	TN	37027
MIDDLE COLLEGE HGH SCHOOL AT WASHTENAW CC	4800 E. Huron River - PO Box D-1	Ann Arbor	MI	48106
Pioneer High School	601 West Stadium Blvd	Ann Arbor	MI	48103
Huron High School	2727 Fuller Rd.	Ann Arbor	MI	48105
Ipsilanti High School	2095 Packard	Ipsilanti	MI	48197
Willow Run High School	235 Spencer Lane	Ipsilanti	MI	48198
Lincoln High School	7425 Willis Rd.	Ipsilanti	MI	48197
OLIVE HARVEY MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL	10001 South Woodlawn Ave.	Chicago	IL	60628
TRUMAN MIDDLE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL	145 West Wilson	Chicago	IL	60640
Amundsen High School	5110 N. Damon Ave.	Chicago	IL	60625
Austin High School	231 No. Pine Ave.	Chicago	IL	60644
Best Practices High School	2040 W. Adams St.	Chicago	IL	60612
Bowen High School	2710 E 89th St.	Chicago	IL	60617
Calumet Academy	8131 South May St.	Chicago	IL	60620
Carver High School	13100 South Duty West Ave.	Chicago	IL	60827
Clemente Academy	1147 North Western Ave.	Chicago	IL	60622
Collins High School	1313 South Sacramento Dr.	Chicago	IL	60623
Corliss High School	821 E. 103rd St.	Chicago	IL	60628

Curie Metro High School	4959 South Archer Ave.	Chicago	IL	60632
Dunbar High School	3000 South King Dr.	Chicago	IL	60616
DuSable High School	4934 South Wabash Ave.	Chicago	IL	60615
Englewood Academy	6201 South Steward Ave.	Chicago	IL	60621
Fenger Academy	11220 South Wallace St.	Chicago	IL	60628
Flower High School	3545 West Fulton Blvd.	Chicago	IL	60624
Foreman High School	3235 No. LeClaire Ave.	Chicago	IL	60641
Gage Park High School	5630 South Rockwell St.	Chicago	IL	60629
Hancock High School	4350 West 79th St.	Chicago	IL	60652
Harlan Academy High School	9652 South Michigan Ave.	Chicago	IL	60628
Harper High School	6520 Wouth Wood St.	Chicago	IL	60636
Hirsch High School	7740 South Ingleside Ave	Chicago	IL	60619
Hubbard High School	6200 South Hamlin Ave.	Chicago	IL	60629
Jones Metro High School	606 South State St.	Chicago	IL	60605
Juarez High School	2150 South Laflin St.	Chicago	IL	60608
Julian High School	10330 South Elizabeth ST.	Chicago	IL	60643
Kelly High School	4136 South California Ave.	Chicago	IL	60632
Kelvyn Park High School	4343 West Wrightwood Ave.	Chicago	IL	60639
Kennedy High School	6325 West 56th St.	Chicago	IL	60638
Kenwood Academy	5015 South Blackstone Ave.	Chicago	IL	60615
King High School	4445 South Drexel Blvd.	Chicago	IL	60653
Lakeview High School	4015 No. Ashland Ave.	Chicago	IL	60613
Las Casas HighSchool	8401 South Saginaw Ave.	Chicago	IL	60617
Lincoln Park High School	2001 North Orchard St.	Chicago	IL	60614
Lindblom High School	6130 South Wolcott Ave.	Chicago	IL	60636
Manley Academy	2935 West Polk St.	Chicago	IL	60612
Marshall High School	3250 West Adams St.	Chicago	IL	60624
Mather High School	5835 North Lincoln Ave.	Chicago	IL	60659
Morgan Park High School	1744 W. Pryor Ave.	Chicago	IL	60643
Near North High School	1450 North Larabee St.	Chicago	IL	60610
Orr High School	730 North Pulaski Rd.	Chicago	IL	60624

Phillips High School	244 East Pershing Rd.	Chicago	IL	60653
Prosser High School	2148 North Long Ave.	Chicago	IL	60639
Richards High School	5009 South Laflin St.	Chicago	IL	60609
Robeson High School	6835 South Normal Blvd	Chicago	IL	60621
Roosevelt High School	3436 West Wilson Ave.	Chicago	Il	60625
Schurz High School	3601 No. Milwaukee Ave.	Chicago	IL	60641
Senn Academy	5900 North Glenwood Ave.	Chicago	IL	60660
Simeon High School	8235 So Vincennes Ave.	Chicago	IL	60620
Simpson High School	1321 So. Paulina St.	Chicago	IL	60608
South Shore Academy	7529 South Constance Ave.	Chicago	IL	60649
Southside Academy	7342 South Hoyne Ave.	Chicago	IL	60636
Spalding High School	1628 West Washington Blvd	Chicago	IL	60612
Steinmetz High School	3030 North Mobile Ave.	Chicago	IL	60634
Sullivan High School	6631 North Bosworth Ave.	Chicago	IL	60626
Taft High School	6545 W. Hurlbut St.	Chicago	IL	60631
Tilden Academy	4747 South Union Ave.	Chicago	IL	60609
Vaughn High School	4355 No. Linder Ave.	Chicago	IL	60641
Washington High School	3535 East 114th St.	Chicago	IL	60617
Wells Academy	936 North Ashland Ave.	Chicago	IL	60622
Westinghouse High School	3301 West Franklin Blvd.	Chicago	IL	60624

APPENDIX B
List of Middle College High Schools

Academy @ Illinois Central College
1 College Dr.
East Peoria IL 61635
309-694-5578
FAX: 309 694-5524
Jimmie Moore
Jmoore@ICC.CC.Il.US

Academy of the Canyons
26455 Rockwell Campus Rd.
Santa Clarita, CA 91355
661-259-7800 x 3056
FAX 661-255-2954
David LeBarron
DNL@hartdistrict.org

Boyce Campus Middle College High School
595 Beally Rd.
Monroeville, PA 15146
724-325-6609
724-325-6826
FAX: 724-325-6826
Carolyn Hassall
Chassal@ccac.edu

Brooklyn College Academy @Brooklyn College
2900 Bedford Ave.
Brooklyn, NY 11210-2889
718-951-5941
FAX: 718-951-4441
Julianna Rogers
JulsRogers@aol.com

Canada Middle College High School Suzanna Munzell
4200 Farm Hill Blvd.   480 James Ave.
Redwood City, CA 94061   Redwood City CA 94062-1098
650-306-3120
FAX: 650-306-3128

Community College High School of Southern Nevada
3200 East Cheyenne Ave.   Pat Merselis
North Las Vegas, NV 89030
702-651-5030   FAX 702-651-4627

DeAnza Community College
210100 Finch Ave.
Cupertino, CA 95014
408-864-8634
408-522-2235
FAX: 408-749-8022
Polly Bove

Garfield High School at City College
1255 16th St.
San Diego, CA 92101
Tina Tomaschke
X1112
FAX: 619-525-2063

Greenville Technical College
PO Box 5616
Greenville , SC 29606-5616
864-250-8844
FAX: 864-250-8846
Dr. David Church

Haney Technical Center
3016 Highway 77
Panama City, FL 32405
850- 747-5500
FAX 850-747-5555
Sandra Davis

Hostos Lincoln Academy of Science
475 Grand Concourse
Bronx, NY 10451
718-518-4332
FAX: 718-518-4321
Michelle Cataldi

Houston Middle College for Technical Careers
3100 Clevurne at TSU
PO Box 1932
Houston, TX 77004
713-523-9202
FAX 713-523-9097
Roy Morgan
rmorgan@houstonisd.org

International High School @LaGuardia Community College
31-10 Thomson Ave.
Long Island City, NY 11101
718-482-5456 482-5659
FAX 718-392-6904
Burt Rosenburg

Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter School @ Middlesex Community College
67 Middle St.
Lowell Ma 01852
978-656-
FAX 978-459-0456
Lisa Bryant
bryant@middlesex.cc.ma.us

Middle College High School @ Contra Costa College
2600 Mission Bell Dr.
San Pablo, CA 94806   94803
510-235-7800 X4410
FAX 510-215-7927
Gary Carlone   Ted Abreu
Fcarlone27@aol.com

Middle College High School @ El Centro College
801 Main St.
Dallas, TX 75006
214-860-2356
FAX 214-860-2359
Richard Davis

Middle College High School @ LaGuardia Community College
31-10 Thomson Ave.
Long Island City, NY 11101
718-349-4000
FAX 349-4003
Cecelia L. Cunningham and Aaron Listhaus
cecunnin@aol.com

Middle College High School @ Los Angeles SW College
1600 Imperial Highway
Los Angeles, CA 90047
213-241-1000   323-755-6429
FAX 323- 756-1919
Natalie Battesbee
Natjenk@aol.com

Middle College High School @ Medgar Ever
1186 Carroll St.
Brooklyn, NY 11255
718-703-5400
718-703=5600

Middle College High School at Orange Coast College
2701 Fairview Rd.
PO Box 5005
Costa Mesa, CA 92628-5005
714-432-5732 X 26613   432-0202
FAX 714-432-5064
Joe Fox
Jfox@NMISD.k12.CA.US

Middle College High School @ Santa Anna College
1530 West 17th St.
Santa Anna, CA 92706
714-953-3900   564-6136
FAX 714-953-3999 564-6133
Jean B.Williams
Williams_JeanB@RSCCD.org

Middle College High School @ Southwest Tennessee Community College
737 Union Ave. E102   Shelby State Community College
Memphis TN 38174
901-333-5360
FAX – 901-333-5368
Joyce Mitchell
Joycolbert@aol.com

Middle College High School of Kanawha County (WV)
133 Riggleman Hall
Charleston, WV 25304
304-348-6135
FAX 304-348-7703
Sandy Boggs

Middle College High School of Lodi Unified School District
San Joaquin Delta College
5151 Pacific Avenue
Stockton, CA 95207
209-954-5151
FAX 209 – 954-5875
Jeff Thompson
jthompson@sjdccd.cc.ca.us

Middle College High School of Seattle
401 NE Northgate Way
Seattle, WA 98125
206-587-2026
John German
Dogc356@uswest.net

Mott Middle College High School @ Mott Community College
1401 East Court St. MMBI 123
Flint, MI 48503
810-232-8531
FAX 810 – 232-8660
Chery Wagonlander
cwagonla@mostt.gisd.k12.mi.us

Olive Harvey Middle College High School @ Olive Harvey Community College
10001 South Woodlawn Ave.
Chicago, IL 60628
773-291-6517
FAX 773-291-6538
Helen Hawkins
hhawkins@ccc.edu

Robert F. Wagner Jr. Secondary School for Art and Technology @ LaGuardia CC
47-07 30th Place
Long Island City, NY 11101
718-472-5671
FAX 718-472-9117
Terry Born
Tborn39396@aol.com

San Mateo Middle College High School
College of San Mateo
1700 West Hillsdale Blvd.
San Mateo, CA 94402-3784
650-574-6101
FAX: 650-574-6227
Greg Quigley
gquigley@smuhsd.k12.ca.us

Truckee Meadows Community College High School
7000 Dandini Blvd.
Reno, NV 89512-3999
775-674-7660   FAX 775-674-7931
Greer Gladstone   Gglad12650@aol.com/Tcates@tamcc.edu

Truman Middle College High School
145 West Wilson
Chicago, IL 60640
773-907-4840
FAX 773-907-4844
Tom O'Hale

University Heights High School
West 181 St. & University Ave.
Bldg. Tech 2
Bronx, NY 10453
718-289-5302
Debra Harris

Washtenaw Community College
4800 E. Huron River Dr.
PO Box D-1
Ann Arbor, MI 48106
734-973-3410
FAX 734-973-3464
Lee Schliecher

Williamson County Middle College High School
20 White Bridge Rd.
Nashville, TN 37209
615-353-3687
FAX 353-3244
Harold Ford
HaroldF@NCS.edu

JAM ES M. KOUZES/BARRY Z. POSNER

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

SELF

INSTRUCTIONS

Write your name in the blank above. On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each carefully Then look at the rating scale and decide *how frequently you engage in the behavior* described.
    Here's the rating scale that you'll be using:

1 =Almost Never	6 = Sometimes
2 =Rarely	7 = Fairly Often
3 = Seldom	8 = Usually
4 = Once in a While	9 = Very Frequently
5 = Occasionally	10 = Almost Always

In selecting each response, please be realistic about the extent to which you *actually* engage in the behavior. Do *not* answer in terms of how you would like to see yourself or in terms of what you should be doing. Answer in terms of how you *typically* behave—on most days, on most projects, and with most people.
    For each statement, decide on a rating and record **it** in the blank to the left of the statement. *Do not leave any blank incomplete.* Please remember that all statements are applicable. If you feel that any statement does not apply to you, in all likelihood it is because you do not frequently engage in the behavior. In this case, assign a rating of 3 or lower. When you have responded to all thirty statements, turn to the response sheet on page *4. Make sure that you write your name on the response sheet in the blank marked "Your Name."* Transfer your responses and return the response sheet according to the instructions provided.
    For future reference, keep the portion of your LPI-Self form that lists the thirty statements.

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

SELF

To what extent do you typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the number that best applies to each statement and *record* it *in the blank to the left of the statement.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Usually	Very Frequently	Almost Always

1. I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.

2. I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.

3. I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.

4. I set a personal example of what I expect from others.

5. I praise people for a job well done.

6. I challenge people to try out new and innovative approaches to their work.

7. I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.

8. I actively listen to diverse points of view

9. I spend time and energy on making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards that we have agreed on.

10. I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities.

11. I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.

12. I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.

13. I treat others with dignity and respect.

14. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.

15. I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.

2

I	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Almost Never	Rarely	Seldom	Once in a While	Occasionally	Sometimes	Fairly	Usually Often	Very Frequently	Almost Always

16 .I ask "What can we learn?" when things do not go as expected.

17 .I show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.

18. I support the decisions that people make on their own.

19. I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.

20. 1 publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.

21. I experiment and take risks even when there is a chance of failure.

22. I am contagiously enthusiastic and positive about future possibilities.

23. I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.

24. I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.

25. I find ways to celebrate accomplishments.

26. I take the initiative to overcome obstacles even when outcomes are uncertain.

27. I speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.

28.1 ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.

29. I make progress toward goals one step at a time.

30. I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

Now turn to the response sheet and follow the instructions for transferring you responses.

3

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY [LPI]

SELF

RESPONSE SHEET

Instructions: Write your name in the blank above. Separate this response sheet from the rest of the LPI by tearing along the perforated line. Transfer the ratings for the statements to the blanks provided *on this sheet.* Remember to assign a rating of 3 or less for any statement you feel you do not have enough information to adequately assess. Please notice that the numbers of the statements on this sheet are listed from *left to right.*

After you have transferred all ratings, return the form according to the "Important Further Instructions" below.

1._____   2._____   3._____   4._____   5._____

6._____   7._____   8._____   9._____   10._____

11._____   12._____   13._____   14._____   15._____

16._____   17._____   18._____   19._____   20._____

21._____   22._____   23._____   24._____   25._____

26._____   27._____   28._____   29._____   30._____

Important Further Instructions
After completing this response sheet, return it to: Christine Michael
17 Tyree Circle
Elkview, WV 25071

4

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Please indicate the demographics of the school principal and the school.

<u>School Leader</u>

1. Official title_____

2. Sex   □ male □ female

3. Age_____

4. Highest degree_____

<u>School</u>

1. The official title of the person filling out this form is _____.

2. The enrollment for the 2001-2002 school year was _____.

3. The average daily attendance for the 2001-2002 school year was _____.

4. The dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year was _____.

5. The graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year was _____.

6. The college-going rate for the 2001-2002 school year was _____.

7. The per cent of students on free and reduced lunch for the 2001-2002 school

    year was _____.

APPENDIX E

Cover Letter to Participants

<div align="center">
17 Tyree Circle
Elkview, West Virginia 25071
September 20, 2002
</div>

Attn: Principal

Dear Sir or Madam,

You have been selected to participate in a nationwide survey of administrators of middle college high schools and selected high schools. I am focusing my doctoral dissertation on leadership style and four student outcomes.

Your participation in my study would be greatly appreciated. Please fill out the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and the *Demographic Questionnaire* and return in the self-addressed stamped envelope within the next week. Your responses and anonymous and confidential. You do not need to answer each question and your involvement is voluntary.

Thank you for aiding me in my doctoral studies.

<div align="center">
Sincerely,

Christine Michael
</div>

APPENDIX F   Raw Data

type of hs 1=mchs 2=tradition	total LPI (300)	challenge process (60)	Inspiring the vision (60)	enabling others act (60)	modeling the way (60)	encourage the heart (60)	sex 1=M 2=F
1	207	37	35	46	44	45	1
1	268	55	53	54	49	57	2
1	223	47	39	50	49	38	1
1	267	54	54	55	51	53	2
1	191	34	43	38	41	35	1
1	237	53	52	46	41	45	2
1	248	41	47	57	49	54	1
1	268	54	51	54	57	52	1
1	261	51	52	52	53	53	1
1	282	57	50	59	57	59	2
1	274	50	57	58	55	54	2
1	278	54	54	58	60	52	2
1	289	60	60	60	58	51	1
1	272	53	57	54	53	55	2
1	247	49	51	47	49	51	1
1	265	52	54	53	56	50	
1	255	48	47	52	51	57	
2	285	57	56	58	58	56	1
2	289	59	58	59	58	55	1
2	250	50	42	53	53	52	2
2	284	56	57	56	57	58	2
2	223	39	37	55	48	44	1
2	270	57	57	53	50	53	2
2	272	57	54	58	56	47	2
2	268	52	54	56	55	51	1
2	259	51	53	54	53	48	1
2	164	36	27	40	34	27	1
2	208	35	38	42	46	47	2
2	258	50	44	52	55	57	1
2	189	35	30	45	46	33	1
2	249	46	49	52	52	50	1
2	281	54	53	59	60	55	1
2	271	56	51	56	54	54	2
2	191	36	34	47	38	36	1
2	256	48	46	50	55	57	1
2	300	51	52	57	57	53	1
2	260	49	51	55	57	48	1
2	248	53	49	49	52	45	1
2	258	54	54	45	52	53	1
2	267	53	51	54	51	58	1
2	289	57	57	59	59	57	1
2	284	55	56	57	57	59	2
2	300	60	60	60	60	60	1
2	280	53	52	59	59	57	2
2	279	54	55	59	56	55	2
2	256	51	39	58	57	58	1
2	220	39	34	49	48	50	

age	degree 1=MA 2=doctor 3= BA	Enrollment	Average Daily Attend.	dropout rate	graduation rate	going rate	Free and Reduced Lunch
43	1	320	96.2	2.5	97.5	90	0
53	1	1844					
38	1	159	97	0	98	97	0
58	2	238	86	4.1	98	96	47
40	3	54	92	5	95	96	0
54	1	440	78	5		85	37
55	1	450	92	2	92	94	78
47	1	245	98	1	100	100	21
58	2	540	87	11	91	67	65
56	1	161	88	19	98	71	16
54	1	30	96.4	0	100	90	0
51	1	210	92.1	3	99	89	70
61	1	160	92.8	2.3	95	75	0
47	1	536	97	0	100	80	0
40	1	55	98	1	100	95	0
59	1	1140	94.3	5.4	82.4	74.7	27
45	2	1900	97.3	2	98	80	48
	2	1425	96.55	0.004	96.9	87.4	0.024
51	2	2800	79.9		75	90	73.5
52	1	633	94.9	3.1	88.2	91	6
54	2	528	93				1
57	1	208	99	2.4	94	94	0
59	1	4400	81.5	7.2	83	90	78.9
49	2	2850	95.7	0.5	99.7	88	8
52	1	879	92	7	93	60	7
49	1	384	95.5	1.6	94	65	28.3
52	1	970	98.7	2.4	93	65	14
52	1	705	90.3	3.7	85.1	68	13.7
43	2	757	93.9	3.9	96	81	22
57	1	1225	93.5	3		55	40
54	3	3550	81.6	6.2	54.9	57	44
40	3	75	91	0			84
59	2	1986	90.2	1.97	96.75	69	10.2
50	1	1250	93	12	99	55	34
57	1	3268	92	4.4	76.3	83	15
55	1	850	81	17	68	12	78
55	2	2050	97.9	0.03	98	89	7
65	2	2700	84	12	70	65	80
45	1	300	97	1	98	69	12
58	1	865	93.6	2.2	82	43	53
54	2	2500	91	20	75	80	79
48	1	2975	90	1	98	88	0
49	1	1740	96	1	98	95	10

Curriculum Vitae

CHRISTINE MICHAEL

email: chmichae@access.k12.wv.us
awesomom2@aol.com

Education:

♦ Ed.D. Marshall University; Huntington, WV, in Leadership Studies
♦ Ed.S. Marshall University; Huntington, WV, in Curriculum
♦ M. A. Marshall University; Huntington, WV, in Leadership Studies
♦ M.A. Tufts University; Medford, MA, in Mathematics Education
♦ B.A. Wellesley College; Wellesley, MA, in Mathematics

Employment:

♦ 2002 – present   George Washington High School – assistant principal
(curriculum)
♦ 2001 – 2002   Riverside High School – assistant principal (discipline)
♦ 1993 – 2001   John Adams Jr. High School – mathematics teacher
  ▪ Department Head, Faculty Senate President
  ▪ Chairman, Finance Committee 1997-2001
  ▪ Math Counts State Champions 1994, 95, 96, 99, 2000
  ▪ GWHS Tennis Coach
    State Champions Boys: 1998, 99; Girls: 1999
♦ 1988-93   Roosevelt Junior High School – mathematics teacher
♦ 1987-88   Charleston Catholic High School – mathematics teacher
♦ 1985-87   George Washington High School – contracted teacher
♦ 1973-75   George Washington High School- mathematics teacher
  ▪ committee originating Math Field Day
♦ 1972-73   Shrewsbury (MA) High School – mathematics teacher