Comparing Acceptable and Unacceptable Schools on Teacher Perceptions of Leadership and Administrative Self-Perceptions of Leadership at Hispanic Serving Schools in South Texas

Christopher Daniels, Ed.D.,
Texas A&M University-Kingsville

Marie-Anne Mundy, Ph.D.,
Texas A&M University-Kingsville

Lori Kupczynski, Ed.D.
Texas A&M University-Kingsville

Don Jones, Ed.D.,
Texas A&M University-Kingsville

ABSTRACT

In Texas high schools, low test scores on standardized tests such as the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) may contribute to the high Hispanic dropout rate. A pre-experimental static group comparison was conducted at two high schools that are labeled Academically Acceptable (AA) and Academically Unacceptable (AU) by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The study explored differences in teacher perception of leadership styles and administrator self-perception of leadership styles in the south Texas region to determine if these factors affected the academic acceptability of schools. The schools selected had a socioeconomic status (SES) of at least 65% and a Hispanic-student population of at least 80%. Leadership Practices Inventory—Other (LPI) was utilized to measure the teachers' perceptions of their administrators. Administrators were given the Leadership Practices Inventory—Self (LPI). A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used in analyses. Findings indicated that there was a significant difference between Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable high schools on teacher perceptions of administrative leadership styles. There was no significant difference between Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable schools on administrator self-perceptions of administrative styles.

Keywords: South Texas schools, Hispanic school leadership, school leadership

INTRODUCTION

Historically, an achievement gap has existed between races (Barton & Coley, 2010) though it could be argued that academic progress has been made by minorities and people of color (Gamoran, 2001). For example, in some predominately Hispanic schools, education leaders have reduced the achievement gap between Hispanic and non-Hispanic white students using increased parental involvement and establishing school-community partnerships (Gandara, 2010). Although this method of reducing the achievement gap is promising, it does not guarantee success in all schools. Researchers have documented the presence of an achievement gap that has widened between Hispanic and non-Hispanic white students in recent years (Gamoran, 2001; Barton & Coley, 2010). Educators are still searching for the most effective methods of closing the achievement gap, and there is a significant amount of work needed in the future to continue these efforts.

The United States' population is growing by an estimated 2.9 million people a year (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000), and the nation's population is projected to increase from 301 million in 2000 to 468 million in 2060 (Camarota, 2007). California and Texas have the largest concentrated population in the U.S. with 38 million and 25 million people respectively, and over 52% of all Hispanic students are enrolled in these two states (Fry & Gonzalez, 2008). Demographers believe that the Hispanic population in these states is expected to increase. In 2009, the Hispanic population in the United States was estimated at 48 million. By 2050, the Hispanic population is projected to have 132 million people constituting 30% of the nation's population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010a). It is anticipated that the Hispanic population in Texas will grow from 10.2 million in 2011 to 26 million by 2040 (Potter, 2010; Eschbach, 2009; Murdock, 2009; Murdock et al., 2002; Fix & Capps, 2005; Fix & Passel, 2003; Fry, 2007). In addition to this, public school enrollment trends are expected to change significantly in the next thirty years. Contemporary research predicts that by 2020, one out of four U.S. students will be Hispanic (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b; Fry & Gonzalez, 2008).

Researchers are concerned with the dropout rate and current level of educational attainment of Hispanic students and question the potential outcome of a high percentage of Hispanic students not graduating from high school (Gandara, 2010; Fry, 2007, Murdock, 2009; Camarota, 2007; Capps et al., 2005; Gamoran, 2001; Stamps & Bohon, 2006; Smith, Stern, & Shatrova, 2008). With the projected increase of the Hispanic population, if the educational attainment does not improve, research suggests that this could result in a generation of undereducated students (Garcia & Jensen, 2009).

Advocates who argue for social justice, morality, and equity point at low-socioeconomic status (SES) as a possible reason for underachievement in public schools. In addition, researchers maintain that Hispanic students are undereducated, tend to have low SES, and lack basic resources (Camarota, 2007; Murdock et al., 2002; Murdock, 2009; Garcia & Jensen, 2009). Sanchez and Sanchez (2008) questioned the degree to which teachers accommodate the educational needs of Hispanic students, while other studies have focused on segregation between non-Hispanic white students, Hispanic students, and African American students due to different SES levels (Frankenberg, 2009; Wells, 2009). Moreover, research suggests that the high dropout rate for Hispanic students means that the current educational system has failed to meet their needs (Boden et al., 2009).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Low student scores on standardized tests such as the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) is a major problem in Texas high schools, and is affecting the education system (McNeil et al., 2008). Experts believe that Hispanic students have been underserved in the classroom due to the socioeconomic (SES) inequality between Hispanic students and non-Hispanic white students as well as educational inequality (Gandara, 2010; Sanchez & Sanchez, 2008; & Gamoran, 2001). Most demographers project that there will be an increase of the Hispanic population in years to come (Fry, 2007; Murdock et al., 2006). Unless educators can both solve the high school dropout rate problem and find a way to increase standardized test scores for Hispanic students, a significant percentage of the Texas population will be undereducated. According to Yates's (2008), the future demographic shift suggests that the majority of the population of Texas will be Hispanic American, of low socioeconomic status, undereducated, and have a high dropout rate. This could well impact the state of the economy in Texas in future generations.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this pre experimental static group comparison study was to explore the differences in self-perceptions of administrative styles and teacher perceptions of administrative style between Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable high schools with a large Hispanic student population. The high schools that were selected for this study have a No Child Left Behind (NCLB) academic rating which is based in part on pupil performance of the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) and State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) standardized test scores. TAKS transitioned to a new standardized test called STAAR in 2012 for the purpose of making the test more rigorous. This rating served as the independent variable. The dependent variables included self-perceptions of administrative styles and teacher perceptions of administrative style. The variables helped determine what contributes to effective schools in selected south Texas schools that have a significant Hispanic student population.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Will Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable high schools differ on teacher perceptions of administrative leadership styles as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)?
2. Will Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable high schools differ on administrator self-perceptions of administrative styles as measured by Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)?

It should be noted that the two high schools in the study are located in the south Texas region and thus generalizations can only be made to other schools with similar demographics. In addition, it cannot be inferred that Hispanic students in the southern regions of Texas are equally encultured or acculturated.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The singular leadership model has been left in favor of shared leadership model in recent years (Hulpia, Devos, & Rosseel, 2009). Once stakeholders, teachers, administrators, and community members' are committed to a collective collaboration of school success, the principal tends to become a transformational leader of change (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2009). According to Yukl (1994), teachers, staff, and community members are inspired and intrinsically motivated by a transformational leader to excel above and beyond their required duties and responsibilities. Smith and Bell (2011) noted that transformational leaders inspire others to feel optimistic about the vision and goals of the school which increases communication and fosters a safe working environment. Essentially, researchers are stating that transformational leadership empowers teachers to carry out organizational goals through personal commitment and collaboration of colleagues. Once teachers feel they are being empowered by administrators, teachers can change the practice—teachers are entrusted to make decisions to better the students and organization (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2009).

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

Creemers and Reezigt (2005) reported that school effectiveness highlights characteristics that are essential in understanding the areas of effectiveness: student engagement, leadership styles, and professional development. The authors postulated that a school improves if it has sustained measurable growth in the form of standardized test scores. If the aggregate score increases by five percent, a school has made progress. In essence, an effective school shows sustained growth in testable areas and does not regress over a period of time (Brookover & Lezotte, 1979).

Research that was conducted by Back and Monroe (2001) maintained that most schools are classified as effective based on standardized test scores as the singular determinant factor. The importance of students successfully passing standardized tests such as the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) and State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) is important to understanding if students have achieved mastery in the pedagogical domains. Contemporary research concludes that schools that score very high on standardized tests are often viewed publicly by teachers, community members, and the media as effective schools, and consequently, pressure is put on administrators and teachers to achieve high test scores (Fertig, 2000; Sammons & Luyten, 2009). In addition, Griffith (2004) concurred when he postulated that a fundamental definition of an effective school is based on the *number* of students who successfully pass standardized tests. Effective schools can be measured by cross-comparing achievement scores or achievement levels of school districts that are similar in size, demographics, and socioeconomic status (SES) (Bennett & Harris, 1999). In essence, using standardized achievement scores is a strong indicator of school effectiveness. Conversely, low standardized achievement scores suggest that a school has largely been ineffective. Since schools are required to meet achievement score standards every year, school districts set goals in order to stay in compliance with yearly accountability mandates known as Annual Yearly Progress (AYP). AYP is measured in schools based on No Child Left Behind (NCLB) 2001 in three areas: attendance rates, completion rates, and performance on English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics standardized tests. All public schools are held to the standards of AYP (TEA, 2007a).

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND AND SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 brings some clarity to what an effective school is in a contextual sense because of the accountability system that was created in order best serve students. According to the accountability rating of NCLB, an Exemplary rating suggests that a school has met specific guidelines, scores, and has achieved academic success that has been set by the state. An Exemplary school is the highest accountability rating on the NCLB Act scale. A school is rated Exemplary when all students including subgroups achieve mastery of 90% in English, social studies, mathematics, and science portions of the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS). In addition, an Exemplary school has at least 95% of the freshman cohort graduate four years later (TEA, 2008a). The rating below Exemplary is Recognized. In a Recognized school, all students including subgroups achieve mastery of 75% or more in English, social studies, mathematics, and science portions of TAKS. In addition, 85% of the freshmen cohort will graduate in four years (TEA, 2008c). The third rating is an Academically Acceptable (AA) school or campus where all students including subgroups achieve mastery of 70% in English, 65% pass social studies, 50% pass mathematics, and 45% pass science portions of TAKS. The high school campus needs 75% graduation rate to be considered Academically Acceptable (TEA, 2008b). An Academically Unacceptable (AU) school is the lowest accountability rating and schools receiving this ranking have failed to meet the minimum requirements. Schools are also rated on subgroup performance. Subgroups are students who are classified as special education students, English Language Learner (ELL) students, and economically disadvantaged students. NCLB mandates that subgroups perform at the recommended standard, and if schools fail to help these students, the school's accountability rating will be adversely affected.

LEADERSHIP

Schools have always had people who are leaders within the organization. Over the last several years, a significant amount of research has focused on leadership styles and their effects on school organizations. There are many leadership styles including servant leadership, democratic leadership, transformational leadership, autocratic leadership, situational leadership, participative, and laissez-faire leadership. Leadership plays a crucial role in supporting school improvement (Nicolaidou & Ainsow, 2005). Recent research has suggested the importance of a principal's leadership style in increasing education and educational achievement within a school (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Zainal, 2008). Though this is true, the consensus among researchers is that there is not one particular leadership style that will necessarily equal success or failure within a school (Shoupe & Pate, 2010; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2009; Nicolaidou & Ainscow, 2005).

Effective school leaders demonstrate a passion for education and instruction and demonstrate leadership that inspires and motivates teachers and students to do their very best (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee 1982; Pepper, 2010). Effective leaders create unity in organizations based on trust, respect, and local school policy. In addition, monitoring student progress, conducting classroom walkthroughs, and making decisions based on data is central to quality leadership in effective schools (Hofman, Hofman, & Guldemond; 2001). Researchers maintain that both effective and ineffective schools need leadership where a leader can serve in three different capacities: personal, group, and organization (Nicolaidou & Ainsow, 2004). Schein (1992) added that the purpose of a leader remaining flexible in three capacities is to allow

the leader to reward various types of school behavior and inspire innovation and learning. In essence, a good leader can adapt to all three capacities when necessary in order to foster a culture of learning (Nicolaidou & Ainsow, 2004). An effective leader maintains flexibility, commitment, and possesses the type of leadership where he or she can foster growth and development for individuals, formal and informal groups, and carry on the vision of the school (Kelley, Thornton, & Daugherty, 2005).

Burns (1978) is credited with devising transformational leadership theory although Bass (1985) is recognized with offering a substantial amount of work in the area (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005). According to Bass (1990), transformational leadership occurs when there is a cognitive awareness to accomplish the mission of the group and organization. Research by Leithwood and Poplin (1992) stated that there are three underlining goals of transformational leadership: 1) aid staff in devising a successful school culture; 2) promote teacher development; and 3) solve problems collectively with all stakeholders. An organization that has transformational leadership embraces diversity, allows for planning and goal setting amongst teachers and administrators, encourages professional development that is both meaningful and central to accomplishing the school's mission, and opens communication routes to solve problems (Leithwood & Poplin, 1992). According to Yukl (1994), teachers, staff, and community members are inspired and intrinsically motivated by a transformational leader to excel above and beyond their required duties and responsibilities. Smith and Bell (2011) noted that transformational leaders inspire others to feel optimistic about the vision and goals of the school. Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) explained that this leadership practice provides a paradigm for teacher motivation and a capacity to carry out tasks in work settings allowing for teacher flexibility. In addition, it allows teachers to have direct input in decision making.

METHODOLOGY

A pre-experimental static group comparison was used to compare high schools that were labeled Academically Acceptable (AA) and Academically Unacceptable (AU) on self-perceptions of administrative styles and teacher perceptions of administrative style to determine what contributes to effective schools in South Texas schools that have a significant Hispanic student population. Two high schools were selected from the Texas Education Agency (TEA), Public Education Information System (PEIMS), and the 2010-2011 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) website(s) based on demographic percentage, size of school, accountability rating, and region of the school. AEIS was utilized to analyze which high schools had qualified for the study based on school region, student population, student socioeconomic status (SES), ethnicity, and academic rating. PEIMS was used to sort data by school region, student population, SES, ethnicity, academic rating district name, region, and school size. Pertinent data was entered into an Excel spreadsheet to determine which schools qualified for the study.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

Several high schools were considered for this study but only two high schools were selected and downloaded from the Texas Education Agency (TEA), Public Education Information System (PEIMS), and the 2010-2011 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS). In addition, PEIMS and AEIS were used to aggregate and disaggregate data to determine which schools were selected for this study. Several high schools were eliminated by using

PEIMS and AEIS due to having a demographic percentage, economically disadvantaged percentage, or academic rating that did not correlate with other schools. Selection of schools was based on the following pre-established criteria: high schools that have an accountability rating of Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable and were similar in school population, at least 65% low SES, which is based on free or reduced lunch, at least 80% Hispanic student enrollment, and the schools were located in the south Texas region (TEA, 1998).The PEIMS website was used to filter, sort, and categorize which schools would be eligible for the study.

The primary investigator scheduled a time, date, and location to meet the faculty of each high school to give an in-person introduction, explain the purpose of the study, rights of the participants, directions for the instruments, and answer any questions that participants had in-person at the two high schools. The rationale behind conducting the study in person was to ensure a high response rate amongst participants

Among the 133 teachers in the Academically Acceptable high school, 91 teachers signed consent forms and agreed to participate in the study resulting in a return rate of 69%. Among the 118 teachers in the Academically Unacceptable high school, 78 teachers signed consent forms and agreed to participate in the study resulting in a return rate of 66%.

Among the seven administrators in the Academically Unacceptable high school, four administrators agreed to participate in the study for a response rate of 57%. Among the nine administrators in the Academically Acceptable high school, eight agreed to participate in the study resulting in a return rate of 88%.

INSTRUMENTATION

The Leadership Practices Inventory is a comprehensive survey developed by researchers using triangulation of quantitative and qualitative research methods (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Teachers were given instruments that measured teachers' perceptions of administrative leadership styles, the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)—Observer, while administrators were given an instrument that measured administrators' self-perceptions of leadership (LPI) - Self (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a, 2003b). Both LPI – Self and LPI Observer have thirty questions that are divided into six constructs with five items for each construct that exemplifies leadership qualities. The six constructs are Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Other to Act, and Encouraging the Heart (Table 2). The LPI instruments have a 10-point Likert scale with a numerical value of one indicating the least used leadership behavior exhibited by an administrator (Almost never), and 10, the most frequent leadership behavior exhibited by an administrator (Almost always).

Extensive research led to a consensus among researchers to generate a conceptual framework of five leadership practices for Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practice Inventory (2003). The five leadership practices with reliability scores for LPI Self have been consistently strong: (1) Modeling the Way .77; (2) Inspiring a Shared Vision .87; (3) Challenging the Process .80; (4) Enabling Others to Act .75; and (5) Encouraging the Heart .87. The LPI has been used for data collection by many researchers (The Leadership Challenge, 2007). The five leadership practices with reliability scores for LPI Other are: (1) Modeling the Way .88; (2) Inspiring a Shared Vision .92; (3) Challenging the Process .89; (4) Enabling Others to Act .88; and (5) Encouraging the Heart .92 (The Leadership Challenge, 2007).

Sashkin and Rosenbach (1998) reported that validity and reliability has been confirmed through a fifteen year period. In addition, the Leadership Practices Inventory has been utilized in many organizational settings and is highly respected in the education arena (Lewis, 1995) and professional settings (Herold, Fields, & Hyatt, 1993). Leong (1995) noted that the LPI has excellent face and psychometric validity and is consistent over time. In addition, Leong maintained that both factor analysis and multiple regressions buttress concurrent and structural validity.

RESULTS

Once all of the data were collected, they were imported into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The survey results were reported using standard deviation, descriptive statistics, percentages, and means. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to analyze both hypothesis 1 and 2 because there was one independent variable and several dependent variables in each.

The descriptive statistics is summarized in Table 3 for self- perceptions of Administrative Leadership (LPI-Self). The data suggests that administrators' self-perceptions of leadership styles in the Academically Unacceptable high school are more favorable than self-perceptions of administrators in the Academically Acceptable high school.

Administrators at the Academically Acceptable high school reported that their self-perceptions of administrative leadership to be high. In addition, they were more likely to ask what they could learn when things did not go as expected, to treat others with respect, to find innovative ways to improve the organization, and to seek challenging opportunities that tested their skills.

Administrators at the Academically Unacceptable high school reported that they challenge faculty and staff to be innovative, ask for feedback, they are more likely to build consensus for a common set of values, find creative ways to celebrate accomplishments, and give teachers lots of support and praise for their overall contributions. Administrators at the Academically Unacceptable high school campus reported that they have develop cooperative relationships with all stakeholders, praise people for a job well done, have confidence in teachers' abilities, appeal to others, have an exciting dream of the future, enlist a common vision, and have a conviction of the meaning of their work. In addition, AU administrators stated that they set a personal example of what was expected from others, build consensus around a common set of values for running a high school organization, set achievable goals, plans, and milestones, give people a great deal of freedom in choosing how to do their work, and actively listen to diverse points of view amongst faculty and staff.

Administrators in the Academically Unacceptable high school reported that they are more likely to talk about future trends that would influence how work gets done. Moreover, administrators stated that they follow through on promises and commitments made, and make sure people were rewarded for contributing to the success of projects. In addition, administrators at the Academically Unacceptable high school were more likely to publicly recognize teachers, faculty and staff, who share a commitment to shared values. These principals were clear about their leadership philosophy, were more likely to experiment/take risks even when there was a chance of failure, and to support decisions that teachers made on their own.

The descriptive statistics is summarized in Table 4 (Appendix) for teacher perceptions of Administrative Leadership (LPI-Other). The data suggests that teachers' perceptions of

leadership styles in the Academically Acceptable (AA) high school are more favorable than teachers' perceptions of administrators in the Academically Unacceptable (AU) high school.

Teacher perceptions of administrative leadership were significantly different when the two high schools were compared. Teachers at the Academically Unacceptable high school reported lower perception of administrative leadership. Conversely, teachers at the Academically Acceptable high school reported that the perceptions of administrative leadership were more positive.

Teachers at the AA high school reported that administrators were more likely to develop cooperative relationships, challenge people to try new and innovative ways of doing their work, to make certain that people adhere to the principles and standards agreed on, to ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills, and made sure administrators had confidence in their abilities—more than the AU high school. Moreover, the data suggests that teachers at the Academically Acceptable high school believed that administrators were more likely to praise teachers for a job well done, to seek out challenging opportunities that test administrative abilities, to set a personal example of what administrators expect from others.

Teachers at the Academically Acceptable high school reported that administrators actively listened to diverse points of view, publicly recognized people who exemplify commitment to shared values, gave members of the team lots of appreciation, enlisted a common vision, shared an exciting dream of the future, found ways to celebrate accomplishments, gave people a great deal of freedom in deciding how to do their work, described a compelling image of the future, and made sure the schools achieve measurable goals that were worked on. Moreover, the data suggests that teachers at the AA high school reported that administrators treat them with dignity respect, talked about future trends describing how work gets done, and made sure people were rewarded for their contributions.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of teacher perceptions of leadership styles (LPI-Other) between an Academically Unacceptable high school and an Academically Acceptable high school. The LPI included Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. The multivariate tests showed a significant difference. Wilkes' $\Delta = .74$, $F(5, 164) = 11.5$, $p < .001$. The multivariate partial η^2 based on Wilkes' Δ was quite strong, .26. Table 5 contains the means and standard deviation on the dependent variables for the two groups.

Analyses of variances (ANOVA) on the dependent variables were conducted as follow up tests to the Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA). Using the Bonferroni method, each ANOVA was tested at the .01 level. The ANOVA was significant for LPI total, $F(1,168) = 35.95$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .18$; the ANOVA was significant for Modeling the Way, $F(1,168) = 30.56$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .15$; the ANOVA was significant for Inspiring a Shared Vision, $F(1,168) = 46.67$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .22$; the ANOVA was significant for Challenging the Process, $F(1,168) = 27.23$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .14$; the ANOVA was significant for Encouraging the Heart, $F(1,168) = 27.24$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .14$. In every case the effect size is considered strong. For each dependent variable, teachers from schools with an Unacceptable Rating scored their administrators lower than teachers from schools with an acceptable school rating.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine if there was a difference between Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable schools on administrator self-perceptions of leadership styles (LPI--Self) There was a significant difference in the multivariate tests Wilkes' $\Delta = .002$, $F(5,6) = .793$, $p = .001$. However, with the Bonferroni

set at .01, no significant differences were found for LPI total, $F(1,10) = 1.89$, $p = .20$, partial $\eta^2 = .16$; Modeling the Way, $F(1,10) = .85$, $p = .38$, partial $\eta^2 = .08$; Inspiring a Shared Vision, $F(1,10) = .30$, $p = .60$, partial $\eta^2 = .03$; Challenging the Process, $F(1,10) = .37$, $p = .56$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$; Enabling Others to Act, $F(1,10) = 4.43$, $p = .06$, partial $\eta^2 = .31$; and Encouraging the Heart, $F(1,10) = 2.83$, $p = .12$, partial $\eta^2 = .22$ and we failed to reject the null hypothesis. The effect sizes range from weak to strong. The group of administrators from the Academically Acceptable high school viewed their leadership styles similar to the group of administrators from the Academically Unacceptable high school (Table 6).

CONCLUSIONS

The demographic composition of the United States is continuing to change. For the purposes of this study, 80% Hispanic student enrollment and at least 65% low socioeconomic status were selected as control variables. Yates's research (2008) added that the future demographic shift suggests that the majority of the population of Texas will be Hispanic American, low SES, undereducated, and the dropout rate may remain at a high level. Educators who are employed in areas of Texas or other regions of the United States with low percentages of SES students and people of color need to be cognizant that the demographics of their school and community could soon change.

Having said that, this study illuminated what two high schools did to convey how a school is effective with leadership styles. There is a potential problem that this study makes readily known: administrators at the Academically Unacceptable high school viewed their own leadership style as above average, with a mean score of nine on a scale of one to ten. While it is certainly acceptable for administrators to view their leadership in a positive light there appears to be a problem when the teachers at that particular high school strongly disagree with that assertion. At times, administrators think of themselves as doing a wonderful job performing school tasks and administrative functions, but often fail to take into account what teachers think about the administrative leadership in their school.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LITERATURE

The findings of this study supported the continued argument that administrative leadership is imperative in leading a school to effectiveness. Leadership plays a crucial role in supporting school improvement (Nicolaidou & Ainsow, 2004), but one leader does not necessarily mean that the school will be successful, and it does not mean the school will fail. Effective schools and ineffective schools do not have necessarily, one type of leadership style that will lead a school to effectiveness (Shoupe & Pate, 2010; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Nicolaidou & Ainscow, 2005). In addition, according to findings of the study, the way administrators perceive their abilities to communicate with others and carry out tasks is imperative to how effective a school will be.

According to the findings in this study, there was a significant difference in how administrators at the Academically Unacceptable high school rated themselves (as doing an outstanding job) and the way teachers rated those administrators (not doing a very good job) at that high school campus. However, the underlying theme is that administrators at both high schools perceived themselves as *good* administrators. A salient question needs to be asked: how many administrators in other schools that are Academically Unacceptable (or Academically

Acceptable) perceive themselves as *good* administrators, while similar to this study, teachers disagree.

The findings in this study indicated a non-significant relationship between self-perceptions of leadership styles at the Academically Unacceptable high school and self-perceptions of leadership styles at the Academically Acceptable high school. Administrators at both high schools perceived themselves as good administrators, and as a result, were not significantly different.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are Recommendations for further studies:

- Additional research is needed to analyze *school effectiveness research* and determine what constitutes an effective school from an ineffective school
- Additional research is needed to determine how to meet the sociological and educational needs of minorities and people of color.
- Additional research is needed to determine if Exemplary and Recognized schools on the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability rating could participate in future studies.
- Additional research is needed to determine how this study could affect large, medium, small, and very small schools if they agreed to participate in future studies.
- Additional research on a comparison study at schools where comprehensive school climate surveys are taken.

SUMMARY

The United States' demographics are changing, especially in Texas. To meet the diverse needs of students, educators must prepare to help all students, especially minorities and people of color. Though educators have sought various ways to help these groups by closing the achievement gap, an achievement gap still persists. With an expectation of a demographical shift, experts believe that the gap will widen further (Myers, 2007) Educators must find a way to close the achievement gap so more students can receive a quality education.

From this study, administrators may find the information beneficial in many ways. First, an administrator's leadership style may affect how a school organization is operated, and it could have an effect on school culture, climate, morale, teacher satisfaction, and teacher perceptions of administrative leadership. Cheng (1999) noted that effective schools have a principal who exhibits a democratic leadership style and a strong commitment from staff members to accomplish and exceed the goals of the organization. Discovering the causes of effectiveness that increase educational attainment is the overall significance of the study, so educators may meet the needs of Hispanic students.

Similar to administrators, teachers could also have an effect on school culture, school climate, morale, teacher satisfaction, and teacher perceptions of administrative leadership. Data and subsequent information from this study may be useful for future studies.

REFERENCES

Back, J., & Monroe, E. (1985). The effective schools concept: an effective way to make a difference? *Education*, *105*, 232-235. Retrieved from http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/4731860/effective-schools-concept-effective-way-help-schools-make-difference

Barton, P. E., & Coley, R. J. (2010). *The black and white achievement gap: When progress stopped*. *Policy information report*. Educational Testing Services. Retrieved from www.ets.org/research/pic

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational Dynamics, 18(3), 19-31.

Bennett, N., & Harris, A. (1999). Hearing truth from power? Organisational theory, school effectiveness and school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10*(4), 533-550. doi: 10.1076/sesi.10.4.533.3492

Boden, C. J., Allen, C. S., Usry, Y., & Cellitti, A. (2009). A promising model: The Arriba Program for Latino immigrant students. *The International Journal of Learning. 15*(12), 187-198. Retrieved from ijl.cgpublisher.com/product/pub.30/prod.1972

Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly,18*, 34-64. doi: 10.1177/0013161X82018003004

Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. W. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement*. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

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

Camarota, S. A. (2007). Immigrants in the United States, 2007: A profile of America's foreign-born population. *Center for Immigrant Studies.* Retrieved from graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/.../CIS1128ImmigStats.pdf

Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J. S., & Herwantoro, S. (2005). The new demography of America's schools: immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act. *Urban Institute*. Retrieved from www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/311230_new_demography.pdf

Creemers, B., & Reezigt, G. J. (2005). Linking school effectiveness and school improvement: the background and outline of the project. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 16*(4), 359-371. doi: 10.1080/0924/3450500234484

Eschbach, K. (2009). *Current demographic trends and the future of Texas*. Retrieved from www.georgetownchamber.org/SummitDemographer.ppt

Fertig, M. (2000). Old wine in new bottles? Researching effective schools in developed countries. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *11*(3), 385-403. doi: 3453(200009)11:3;1-G;FT385

Fix, M., & Capps, R. (2005). Immigrant children, urban schools, and the No Child Left Behind Act. *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved from www.migrationinformation.org/usfocus/print.cfm?ID=347

Fix, M., & Passel, J. S. (2003, January). *U.S. immigration—trends and implications for*

schools. National Association for Bilingual Education NCLB Implementation. New Orleans, Louisiana. The Urban Institute. Retrieved from www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/410654_NABEPresentation.pdf

Frankenberg, E. (2009). The demographic context of urban schools and districts. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *42*(3), 255-271. doi: 10.1080/10665680903032294

Fry, R. (2007). *The changing racial and ethnic composition of U.S. public schools*. Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from www.pewhispanic.org/files/reports/79.pdf

Fry, R., & Gonzales, F. (2008). *One-in-five and growing fast: A profile of Hispanic public school students*. Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from www.pewhispanic.org/.../one-in-five-and-growing-fast-a-profile-of-h.

Gamoran, A. (2001). American schooling and educational inequality: a forecast for the 21st century. *Sociology of Education*, *74*(4), 135-153. Retrieved from www.yorku.ca/pathways/literature/Access/gamoran%2001.pdf

Gandara, P. (2010). Overcoming Triple Segregation. *Education Leadership, 68*(3), 60-64 Retrieved from www.ascd.org/publications/educational.../EL_Study_Guide.aspx

Garcia, E., & Jensen, B. (2009). Early educational opportunities for children of Hispanic origins. *Social Policy Report, 23*(2), 3-19. Retrieved from www.srcd.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc

Griffith, J. (2004). Ineffective Schools as Organizational Reactions to Stress: Social Psychology of Education, 7, 257-287.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*(2), 157-191. doi: 10.1080/0924345980090203

Herold, D. M., Fields, D. L., & Hyatt, C. W. (1993, August). *Using leadership instruments in a management development context: what are we measuring?* Paper presented at the academy of management annual meetings (Atlanta). Abstract retrieved from connection.ebscohost.com/.../using-leadership-instruments-management.

Hofman, R. H., Hofman, W. H. A., & Guldemond, H. (2001). *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 4*(2), 115-135. doi: 10.1080/136031200110034834

Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Rosseel, Y. (2009). The relationship between the perceptions of distributed leadership in secondary schools and teachers' and teacher leaders' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 20*(3), 291-317. doi: 10.1080/09243450902909840

Kelley, R. C., Thornton, B., Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education, 126*(1), 17-25. Retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=EJ725153

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003a). *The Leadership Practices Inventory*—Observer (3rd ed). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003b). *The Leadership Practices Inventory*—Self (3rd ed). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 202-227.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2009) Transformational leadership. In B. Davies (ed.), *The Essentials of School Leadership*, (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Leithwood, K. & Poplin, M. (1992). The Move Toward Transformational Leadership: Educational Leadership; Feb 1992; 49, 5; Research Library.

Leong, F. T. (1995). Review of the Leadership Practices Inventory. In J.C. Conoley & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *The Twelfth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Lewis, M. A. (1995). Review of the Leadership Practices Inventory. In J.C. Conoley & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *The Twelfth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

McNeil, L. M., Coppola, E., Radigan, J., & Vasquez Heilig, J. (2008). Avoidable losses: High-stakes accountability and the dropout crisis. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 16*(3). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v16n3/

Murdock, S. H. (2009, February). *Historical population patterns and future trends affecting school enrollment and the labor force: Implication for Texas and the United States.* Rice University, Houston, TX: A paper presented at the Superintendent's Conference. Abstract retrieved from www.reg8.net/docs/12-The_Population_of_Texas.ppt

Murdock, S. H., White, S., Hoque, M., Pecotte, B., You, X., & Balkan, J. (2002). *A summary of the Texas challenge in the twenty-first century: Implications of population change for the future of Texas.* Texas A&M University, TX: Center for Demographic and Socioeconomic Research and Education. Retrieved from txsdc.utsa.edu/reports/2002/texaschallange/TxChall2002.pdf

Myers, K., (1996). School Improvement in Practice: The Schools Make a Difference Project. London: Falmer.

Nicolaidou, M., & Ainscow, M. (2004). Understanding Failing Schools: Perspective from the Inside: School Effectiveness & School Improvement, Sep 2005, Vol. 16 Issue 3, p 229-248,DOI:10.1080/09243450500113647

Nicolaidou, M., & Ainscow, M. (2005). Understanding failing schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 16*(3), 229-248. doi: 10.1080/09243450500113647

Pepper, K. (2010). Effective principals skillfully balance leadership styles to facilitate student success: a focus for the reauthorization of ESEA. *Planning and Changing, 41*(½), 42-56. Retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=EJ952358

Potter, L. (2010, May). *Demographic characteristics and trends of Texas and central Texas counties*. Central Texas Economic Outlook Conference. Office of the State Demographer. Abstract retrieved from txsdc.utsa.edu/.../2010_05_12_Central_Tx_Economic_Outlook_Con

Sammons, P., & Luyten, H. (2009). Editorial article for special issue on alternative methods for assessing school effects and schooling effects. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 20*(2), 133-143. doi:10.1080/09243450902879753

Sanchez, H. T., & Sanchez, M. A. (2008). The Politics of illegal immigration, bilingual education and the commodity of the post-technological society. *The Educational Forum*, *72*(4), 329-338. Retrieved from www.docstoc.com/docs/99430426/Sanchez-and-Sanchez-_2008_

Sashkin, M., & Rosenbach, W. (1998). *A new vision of leadership* in Taylor, R. (Ed.) *Contemporary Issues of Leadership*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Shouppe, G., & Pate, J. L. (2010). Teachers' perceptions of school climate, principal leadership style and teacher behaviors on student academic achievement. *National Teacher Education Journal, 2*(3), 87-98. Retrieved from vtext.valdosta.edu:8080/jspui/handle/10428/455

Smith, J., Stern, K., & Shatrova, Z. (2008). Factors inhabiting hispanic parents' school involvement. *The Rural Educator*, *29*(2), 8-13. Retrieved from www.ruraleducator.net/archive/29-2/29-2_Smith.pdf

Smith, P., & Bell, L. (2011). Transactional and transformational leadership in schools in challenging circumstances: a policy paradox. *Management in Education, 25*(2). doi: 10.1177/0892020611399608

Stamps, K., & Bohon, S., A. (2006). Educational attainment in new and established Latino metropolitan destinations. *Social Science Quarterly, 87*(5), 1225-1240. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6237.2006.00425

Texas Education Agency (2007a) Adequate Yearly Progress Guide. Retrieved from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ayp/2007/guide.pdf

Texas Education Agency (2008a). *Academic Excellence Indicator System.* Retrieved from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2008/glossary.html

Texas Education Agency (2008b). *Accountability Manual 2008.* Retrieved from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/2008/manual/manual.pdf

Texas Education Agency (2008c). *Technical digest 2007-2008.* Retrieved from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index3. aspx?id=4326&menu_id3=793

U.S. Census Bureau (2000). *The Hispanic Population: Census 2000 Brief.* Retrieved from http:www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbro1-3.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau (2010a). *Current population survey*. Retrieved from www.census.gov/poplation/www/socdemo/school.html

U.S. Census Bureau (2010b). Overview of race and Hispanic origin. Retrieved from *www.census.gov/prod/.../c2010br-02.pdf*

Wells, R. (2009). Segregation and immigration: An examination of school composition for children of immigrants. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 42*(2), 130-151. doi: 10.1080/10665680902779853

Yates, J. (2008). Demographic imperatives for educational reform for culturally and linguistically diverse students. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners*, *11*(1), 4-12. Retrieved from mv.ddel.metapress.com/index/18563187154M7077.pdf

Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zainal, K. (2008). Educational leadership and management: Teachers expectation towards school principal. *The International Journal of Learning*, *15*(5), 211-217. Retrieved from ijl.cgpublisher.com/product/pub.30/prod.1740

APPENDIX:
Table 1

The Demographics Characteristics of Participating High Schools

Accountability Rating	School Enrollment	Hispanic Student Enrollment	Economically Disadvantaged
Academically	1,450	90%	65%
Unacceptable Academically Acceptable	1,936	97%	80%

Note. Data was obtained by Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) 2010-2011.

Table 2

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) Constructs

1. Modeling the Way	(items 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 16, 21, 26)
2. Inspiring a Shared Vision	(items 12, 17, 22, 27)
3. Challenging the Process	(items 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28)
4. Enabling Others to Act	(items 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29)
5. Encouraging the Heart	(items 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30)

(The Leadership Challenge, 2007)

Table 3

Administrator Descriptive Statistics (LPI)—Self

	Acceptable			Unacceptable		
Question	Md	M	SD	Md	M	SD
1. I set a personal example of what I expect of others.	8.50	8.50	.577	9.50	9.25	.866
2. I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.	9.00	9.00	.816	8.50	8.00	1.69
3. I seek out challenging opportunities that test his/her skills and abilities.	9.00	8.75	.500	9.00	9.13	.641
4. Develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.	9.00	9.25	.500	10.00	9.88	.354
5. I praise people for a job well done.	9.00	9.00	.816	10.00	9.63	.518
6. Spend time and energy making certain that people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.	9.50	9.50	.577	10.00	9.25	.707
7. Describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.	8.50	8.75	1.89	8.50	8.75	.886

8. Challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.	8.50	8.50	1.29	9.00	9.00	.926
9. Actively listens to diverse points of view.	8.50	8.50	.577	10.00	9.38	.916
10. Makes it a point to let people know that I have confidence in their abilities.	9.00	9.00	.816	10.00	9.63	.518
11. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.	9.00	8.75	1.26	10.00	9.75	.463
12. Appeal to others to share and exciting dream of the future.	9.00	8.75	1.26	9.00	8.13	1.72
13. Searches outside the formal boundaries of an organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.	9.00	8.75	.500	9.00	9.25	.463
14. I treat others with dignity and respect.	9.50	9.25	.957	10.00	9.63	.518
15. I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.	8.00	7.75	1.50	9.00	8.75	1.58
16. I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people's performance.	7.00	7.50	1.73	8.50	7.88	1.64
17. I show others how their long term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.	7.50	7.75	.957	8.50	8.38	.744
18. I ask "what can we learn" when things don't go as expected.	8.50	8.25	1.71	8.50	8.50	.926
19. I support the decisions that people make on their own.	8.00	8.00	.816	9.50	9.13	.991
20. I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.	8.00	8.50	1.00	10.00	9.50	.756
21. I build consensus around a common set of values for running our Organization.	8.50	8.50	1.29	9.00	9.25	.707
22. I paint the "big picture" of what we aspire to accomplish.	9.00	9.00	.816	9.00	9.38	.518
23. I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs we work on.	8.25	8.25	1.50	9.00	9.00	.535
24. I give people a great deal of freedom of choice in deciding how to do their work.	8.50	8.50	1.29	9.50	9.25	.886
25. I find ways to celebrate accomplishments	8.50	8.25	1.71	9.00	8.63	1.69
26. I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.	8.50	8.75	.957	10.00	9.75	.463
27. I speak with a genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.	9.50	9.00	1.41	10.00	9.63	.518
28. I experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.	9.00	9.00	.816	8.00	7.88	1.36
29. I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.	9.00	8.75	1.26	9.00	8.75	.886
30. I give members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contribution.	9.00	9.00	.816	10.00	9.38	1.06

Table 4

Teacher Descriptive Statistics (LPI)—Other

	Acceptable			Unacceptable		
Question	Md	M	SD	Md	M	SD
1. Administrators set a personal example of what I expect	8.00	7.59	1.86	6.00	6.15	2.01

of others.						
2. Administrators talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.	8.00	7.82	1.75	6.00	6.05	2.11
3. Administrators seek out challenging opportunities that test his/her own skills and abilities.	7.00	7.02	2.05	6.00	5.64	2.01
4. Administrators develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.	8.00	7.43	1.94	6.00	6.21	2.10
5. My administrator(s) praise people for a job well done	8.00	7.74	2.19	6.00	6.44	2.17
6. Administrators spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.	8.00	7.27	2.08	6.00	6.01	2.13
7. Administrators describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.	8.00	7.34	2.00	6.00	5.64	2.17
8. Administrators challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.	8.00	7.16	2.24	6.00	5.92	2.23
9. Administrators actively listen to diverse points of view.	7.00	6.97	2.19	5.00	5.37	2.38
10. Administrators make it a point to let people know they have confidence in the abilities of others.	7.00	6.67	2.60	5.50	5.44	2.35
11. Administrators follow through on the promises and commitments made.	8.00	7.28	2.05	6.00	5.58	2.23
12. Administrators appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.	7.50	7.16	2.01	6.00	5.49	2.39
13. Administrators search outside the formal boundaries of an organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.	8.00	7.14	2.12	6.00	5.60	2.37
14. Administrators treat others with dignity and respect.	8.00	7.88	2.01	6.00	6.13	2.14
15. Administrators make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.	8.00	7.02	2.19	5.00	5.14	2.31
16. Administrators ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people's performance.	6.00	6.17	2.58	5.00	4.60	2.30
17. Administrators show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.	7.00	6.92	2.20	5.50	5.28	2.27
18. Administrators ask "what can we learn?" when things don't go as expected.	7.00	6.60	2.20	5.00	5.03	2.25
19. Administrators support the decisions that people make on their own.	7.00	6.84	2.32	5.00	5.05	2.31
20. Administrators publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.	8.00	7.38	2.17	6.00	5.76	2.13
21. Administrators build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.	8.00	7.42	2.03	5.00	5.23	2.23
22. Administrators paint the "big picture" of what we aspire to accomplish.	8.00	7.82	1.82	6.00	5.85	2.18
23. Administrators set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.	8.00	7.47	2.09	6.00	5.77	2.27
24. Administrators give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.	8.00	7.02	2.17	5.00	5.31	2.20
25. Administrators find ways to celebrate accomplishments.	8.00	7.24	2.29	6.00	5.58	2.10
26. Administrators are clear about their philosophy of leadership.	8.00	7.40	2.27	5.50	5.42	2.36
27. Administrators speak with a genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.	8.00	7.78	1.97	6.00	5.69	2.24

28. Administrators experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.	7.00	6.67	2.30	5.00	5.08	2.41
29. Administrators ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.	8.00	7.17	2.09	6.00	5.91	2.25
30. Administrators give members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contribution.	8.00	7.16	2.24	6.00	5.53	2.32

Table 5

Teacher LPI Means

	Unacceptable		Acceptable	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
LPI Total	168	5	217	51
Modeling the Way	33	11	42	11
Inspiring a Shared Vision	28	9	37	8
Challenging the Process	33	11	42	11
Encouraging the Heart	34	12	43	12

Table 6

Administrator LPI Means

	Unacceptable		Acceptable	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
LPI Total	9	.283	8.6	.801
Modeling the Way	9	.368	8.6	.897
Inspiring a Shared Vision	9	.582	8.6	1.030
Challenging the Process	9	.434	8.6	.775
Enable	9	.427	8.7	.599
Encouraging the Heart	9	.496	8.5	.907