1996

A Comparative Study of Perceptions of Superintendents, High School Principals, and High School Department Chairs on the Role of the High School Academic Department Chair: the Voice of the Administrator

William Anthony Korach
Portland State University

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS, HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, AND HIGH SCHOOL DEPARTMENT CHAIRS ON THE ROLE OF THE HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT CHAIR: THE VOICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

by

William Anthony Korach

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP:
ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

Portland State University
1996

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

The abstract and dissertation of William Anthony Korach for the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision were presented May 9, 1996, and accepted by the dissertation committee and the doctoral program.

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

[redacted]
Ulrich H. Hardt, Chair

[redacted]
Thomas G. Chenoweth

[redacted]
David C. Cox

[redacted]
M. Carrol Tama

[redacted]
Robert C. Holloway
Representative of the Office of Graduate Studies

DOCTORAL PROGRAM APPROVAL:

[redacted]
Robert B. Everhart, Dean
School of Education

****

ACCEPTED FOR PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY BY THE LIBRARY

by [redacted] on 10 June 1996

ABSTRACT

An abstract of the dissertation of William Anthony Korach for the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership: Administration and Supervision presented May 9, 1996.

Title: A Comparative Study of Perceptions of Superintendents, High School Principals, and High School Department Chairs on the Role of the High School Academic Department Chair: The Voice of the Administrator

The purpose of this exploratory descriptive study was to provide a first step in clarifying the role of the high school academic department chair as it is currently practiced in the state of Oregon. The study examined from the administrative perspective the potential for the continued development of the educational leadership role of the department chair as an administrative resource for instructional improvement.

A researcher-constructed questionnaire was used to gather data from 27 Oregon school district superintendents, 34 high school principals, and 118 high school department chairs from English, math, science, and social studies departments in those same high schools.

Congruence of perceptions among these groups of educators regarding 44 activities across five categories of department chair role responsibility were examined for three issues: (a) the time department chairs spend on the activities; (b) the importance of each activity to the role of the high school department chair; and (c) the importance of the chair's continuing to improve in activities in the five categories.

Chi-square testing revealed no statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) in perception between superintendents and principals for any of the 132 items on the questionnaire. Data were then collapsed into one group of administrative responses.

Substantial incongruence of perception for activities in all five categories of department chair responsibility was found between administrators and department chairs.

Results of the study show administrators' expectations for the supervisory role of the department chair to be substantially higher than those of the chairs themselves while department chairs placed higher value on their management role than did administrators.

These findings point to the need for dialogue between administrators and department chairs in order to minimize role conflict for the department chairs resulting from incongruent role expectations. The singular voice of the administrator in organizational decision making could be

informed and modified by the voice of the department chair, a teacher performing in a management and supervisory role.

DEDICATION

To my wife Ricky for her love, caring, and commitment. As the eternal feminine is the source of life itself, so is Ricky the source of my joy and inspiration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Because of the unique nature of the study design, I am especially indebted to many people who saw the potential value of the study and committed themselves to bringing the project to successful completion:

Dr. Ulrich Hardt for his graciousness in accepting the chairmanship of the committee, his guidance and support, and his willingness to share his scholarly expertise.

Dr. M. Carrol Tama for her support and insightful contributions to the design and development of the project.

Dr. Robert Holloway for his wisdom, understanding, advocacy, and unwavering support.

Dr. David Cox for his encouragement, advice, careful critique of the data analysis, and especially for his personal investment in the project.

Dr. John Lind, retired, for his leadership and assistance in conceptualizing the initial project.

Dr. Tom Chenoweth for kindly agreeing to become a member of the committee while on sabbatical and for his strong contribution to the study.

Dr. Robert Everhart for his continued belief in and support of the project.

My appreciation to the 118 high school department chairs and to the 61 administrators who took valuable time from their busy schedules to complete the questionnaire.

A special thank you to Pati Sluys for contributing her expertise in the final editing of the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Reflecting a nationwide trend, the state of Oregon has for the past 10 years been experiencing controversy centered upon a demand for educational reform. Publication of A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) focused national attention on the linkage between a perceived decline in the American educational system and America's increasing inability to compete in a rapidly changing global economy. The nation was at risk; the educational system, which was not producing a work force educated and trained to international standards, was at fault.

Developing a political agenda to stem what A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) had billed as "a rising tide of mediocrity," the U.S. Department of Education under the Reagan administration initiated the selection of Schools of Excellence—models to hold up as examples of what should be happening in America's schools. The effective schools research (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Edmonds, 1979, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1982), which had provided the major

thrust for the national movement for excellence in education during the early 1980s, offered criteria for selection of the schools to be so designated. On that basis, four Oregon high schools (Crater High School, Crater; Lake Oswego High School, Lake Oswego; South Eugene High School, Eugene; and Sunset High School, Beaverton) were among those named Schools of Excellence in the first year of the program.

Following their extensive examination of the effective schools research, Blum and McEady (1984) concluded that one of its most consistent findings had been the significant role of the principal as being the person best positioned to foster school improvement and higher levels of student achievement. Although most of the effective schools studies focused on the elementary principal, they have also been widely applied as a rationale for placing major significance on the high school principal's role as an instructional leader. Some sources (Murphy, 1988; Siskin, 1991) question this practice, however, pointing to fundamental ways in which high schools differ from elementary schools. Siskin (1991) identified "one key anatomical difference [as being] their departmentalized differentiation of specialized teachers" (p. 134). Murphy (1988) denoted "goal structure, administrative organization, student and faculty characteristics, and curricular organization and

delivery" (p. 126) as other factors which are also significantly different in high schools.

Other educational literature raises another objection. While acknowledging that leadership in curriculum and instruction "is essential to the success of our schools, principals are advantageously positioned to provide it, and change is unlikely to happen in schools without principals' support" (Patterson, Purkey, & Parker, 1986, p. 103), many writers emphasize the impracticality, in terms of both time constraints and necessary expertise, of expecting the high school principal to bear the sole responsibility (Duke, 1987; Keefe & Jenkins, 1984; Lucy, 1986; Pitner, 1986). One approach to addressing these concerns has been to look toward the high school department chair as having the potential "to fulfill just such a leadership role" (Lucy, 1986, p. 85). The expectation was that department chairs, possessing both subject matter knowledge and instructional expertise, should assume more responsibility in instructional leadership (DeRoche, Hunsaker, & Kujawa, 1988; Greenfield, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1984; Turner, 1983).

Problem Statement

Historically, the teacher serving as a high school academic department chair has occupied an ambiguous position between the teaching staff and the

administration. In addition to a teaching assignment in the specific department, the chair's job functions, whether explicitly assigned or implicitly expected, have included leadership duties in supervision, curriculum and management—a combination of responsibilities which tends to blur the distinctions generally drawn between line and staff positions in the educational hierarchy, thereby potentially creating both confusion and conflict.

Most often the literature indicates high school department chairs have had no clear, consistent description of exact functions, behaviors, or desirable skills and training which would define their instructional leadership role and assist them to carry it out (Costanza, Tracy, & Holmes, 1987; Hall & Guzman, 1984; Hord & Murphy, 1985; Williams, 1979). Hall and Guzman (1984) concluded "The definition of the job . . . is not well articulated and definitions are not available in the literature" (p. 11). Duke (1987) suggested that department chairs:

> would seem well able to exercise instructional leadership, since they possess subject matter expertise and interact regularly with the same group of teachers, (p. 47)

but also noted that "few studies of how these persons spend their time are available" (p. 47).

The literature indicates similar lack of clarity regarding the extent to which educators value the high school department chair as an instructional leader. Wasley (1991) contended, "No teachers I have interviewed

have seen these positions [department chairs] as ones that enable them to learn and to grow. Nor do they build any kind of shared vision for the school" (p. 5). In contrast, among others (Gorton & Thierbach-Schneider, 1991; Johnson, 1990; Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, & McCleary, 1990), Siskin (1991), makes a strong case for the importance of department chairs. Siskin particularly argues that distinct differences exist from one department to another,

> that effective English and math departments may have demonstrably and justifiably distinct goals, standards, and procedures and that they [teachers in individual departments] may well turn to chairs rather than to principals as appropriate instructional leaders. (p. 156)

In Oregon, the already inherently imprecise character of the instructional leadership role of the high school department chair has become further mired in ambiguity as a result of a "second wave" of educational reform (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Conley & Cooper, 1991; Conway & Jacobson, 1990; Wasley, 1991). Emphasizing restructuring school governance to empower teachers, this second reform movement advocates giving teachers additional responsibilities in decision-making, curriculum and management. It has not been determined how, or if, traditional hierarchical teacher leadership positions such as that of the high school department chair fit within this emerging framework.

Glatthorn (1990) stressed that "Clarity about purpose and role is especially important especially . . . as those issues relate to teacher development" (p. 283). Lack of clarity induces "tensions and ambiguities" caused by "overlapping and contradicting job . . . definitions" (Goldring & Rallis, 1993, p. 8). Studies of the influence of organizational culture on change suggest another caution for those advocating educational reform. Such studies reveal that the intended outcomes of any educational change process, no matter how well-intentioned, will necessarily be dramatically influenced by the beliefs, values, and behavioral norms of the organizational culture into which the change is being introduced (Fullan, 1991; Sarason, 1971; Schein, 1985).

As Oregon educational restructuring efforts go forward, there have been no recent attempts to investigate and to describe educators' perceptions of the nature of the role of the high school department chair as it is currently practiced in Oregon. Nor have explicit attempts been made to discover whether congruent perceptions exist among educators about what is valued in that role. Because of the negative impact, a lack of congruence in values and expectations has been found to have on the effectiveness of role performance (Katz & Kahn, 1978), a clearer understanding of the perceptions of superintendents, high school principals, high school

academic department chairs, and high school academic subject matter teachers is important to making informed decisions about the role of the high school department chair in the emerging instructional leadership structure in Oregon high schools.

To serve as an initial step in bringing clarity to the existing role of the high school department chair in Oregon, this study and its companion study propose to identify, to describe, and to compare the perceptions of superintendents, high school principals, high school department chairs, and high school teachers concerning the nature and the value of the role of the high school department chair as it currently functions in Oregon high schools. Specifically, these two studies attempt to add to the understandings of the current status of the role of the high school academic department chair by examining the congruence of perceptions held by these four groups of educators as they relate to five categories of responsibility comprising the role of the high school department chair:

1. responsibility for human relations,
2. responsibility for management,
3. responsibility for the organization,
4. responsibility for program, and
5. responsibility for supervision.

In addressing that purpose, this study speaks from the administrative perspective of superintendents and principals—those who, filling line positions in the traditional educational hierarchy, have the authority and responsibility for establishing instructional priorities at the district and individual building level. Its companion study, The Voice of the Teacher-Department Chair, an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Rachel Mae Korach, speaks from the perspective of high school department chairs and the teachers in their departments—those who, in what have traditionally been described as staff positions, establish instructional priorities for an academic area in the high school and for their own classrooms.

This study and its companion study are based upon the belief that superintendents, high school principals, high school academic department chairs, and high school teachers all play significant and influential roles in the instructional improvement efforts of their school districts. As a beginning step in establishing the potential value of effective top-down, bottom-up collaborations to instructional improvement, these companion studies, taken together, offer conversations in two voices, that from the administrative perspective and that from the teacher/department chair perspective, on the

role of the high school academic department chair as seen through the perceptions of superintendents, high school principals, high school academic department chairs, and high school teachers from those same departments in a defined group of school districts in Oregon.

Mitchell (1990) contended that "educational leadership requires a leader to assume a being-with-others perspective of everything which occurs in the teaching-learning and leading-following experiences" (p. 211), and advocates a dialogical style of leadership which "asks the leader to put himself or herself in the place of the person who is being led" (p. 211). The dialogical approach between top-down and bottom-up perspectives around which these companion studies were designed corresponds to Mitchell's vision. By examining the instructional leadership role of the high school department chair from the perceptions of four different educator groups, these studies offer the high school principal, the high school department chair, and the high school teacher each an opportunity to put himself or herself in the place of the others to develop a more comprehensive picture of the leadership-followership role of the high school department chair.

Questions to Be Investigated

These studies are based upon six underlying assumptions: (a) the role of the high school academic department chair is currently an important part of the instructional leadership structure in Oregon high schools; (b) the high school academic department chair will continue to play a valuable role in the developing context of school reform in the state of Oregon; (c) a lack of congruence in perceptions, values, and expectations among key people who influence the role of the department chair could have a negative impact on the chair's role performance; (d) a lack of congruence between the perceptions, values, and expectations of the chairs themselves and those of others who influence the role of the department chair could have a negative impact on the chair's role performance; (e) a measure of the congruence of perceptions, values, and expectations could be determined by surveying superintendents, high school principals, high school academic department chairs, and high school academic subject matter teachers; and (f) for the role of the academic department chair to become most effective will require a combination of top-down, bottom-up collaborations among individuals playing key organizational roles, including superintendents, high

school principals, high school academic department chairs, and high school teachers.

In order to consider the possibilities of an instructional leadership role for the high school department chair which can be effectively performed within the emerging context, these studies undertake to establish two separate voices—a top-down superintendent/ principal administrative voice and a bottom-up teacher/department chair voice—in discovering: (a) the extent to which there is congruence of perceptions within and between these groups regarding the high school academic department chair's carrying out specific instructional leadership roles, and (b) the extent to which there is congruence in their perceptions about the value of that contribution. Thus, these studies take an important first step in identifying what *is*, i.e., what is perceived to be the way department chairs are spending their time, what are perceived to be the most valuable activities included in the department chair role, and what are perceived to be the most important elements to continue to improve in that role—in order to determine the degree of congruence among the perceptions of those four educator groups regarding the role of the high school department chair.

First, from the combined educational experience of the researchers, four key referent groups whose actions influence the nature of instructional improvement in high

schools had been identified. The intent was to investigate the perceptions of those four groups regarding the way the role of the high school academic department chair was currently being performed in Oregon, i.e., what portion of department chair time was perceived to be devoted to performing what activities. While it was understood that, as Murphy (1988) warned, to equate the time devoted to performing a behavior either with its value or its impact on the leadership role would probably not be a valid measure, it was also assumed that incongruent perceptions about the amount of time spent in performing specific department chair activities would be a potential source of conflict in performance of the role. Thus, the first question to be addressed was:

> *What degree of congruence exists among the perceptions of superintendents, high school principals, high school department chairs in English, math, science, and social studies and high school teachers of English, math, science, and social studies about the amount of time spent by the department chair in fulfilling specific department chair activities in five categories of department chair responsibilities: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision?*

Second, both one's own behaviors and the expectations held for others are influenced by one's values and

beliefs. The chair's own perceptions about what was important in his/her role would be significant in determining his/her actions, but what other people in key organizational roles perceived to be important about the role of the high school academic department chair would help define their expectations for the performance of the department chair, in turn impacting the chair's behavior. Incongruence in the different sets of expectations would potentially lead to conflict. Thus, the second question to be addressed was:

> *What degree of congruence exists among the perceptions of superintendents, high school principals, high school department chairs in English, math, science, and social studies and high school teachers of English, social studies, math, and science regarding the importance of specific department chair activities in five categories of department chair responsibilities: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision?*

Third, as Oregon school districts in addressing their reform agendas consider the restructuring of roles and responsibilities, it is important to anticipate possible obstacles to role effectiveness. Determining what congruence there is among the perceptions of interrelated educator groups about what elements of the role of the

high school department chair are most important for the chair to continue to improve would be one step in that effort. Thus, the third question to be addressed was:

> *What degree of congruence exists among the perceptions of superintendents, high school principals, high school department chairs in English, math, science, and social studies and high school teachers of English, social studies, math, and science regarding the importance of the department chair's continuing to improve in performing specific department chair activities in five categories of department chair responsibilities: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision?*

Additionally, these companion studies sought to construct a profile of the typical participant in each of the four educator groups targeted for this study by identifying the following demographic characteristics of the respondents: age, gender, educational background (highest degree achieved and major subjects of study), and educational experience (current position held, number of years of teaching experience, and total number of years in education).

In summary, from the voice of the administrator, this study investigates the congruence of perceptions of superintendents and high school principals in comparison

to the perceptions of high school department chairs regarding: (a) the amount of department chair time high school academic department chairs spend on each activity specified in each of the five defined categories of department chair responsibility; (b) the importance of each activity in each of the five categories to the role of the high school department chair; and (c) the importance of the high school department chair's continuing to improve in each activity in each of the five categories.

Significance of the Studies

This study and its companion study evolved from a strong belief in the need to take a "collective look backward, inward, and ahead" (Deal, 1987, p. 12) in clarifying the value of the instructional leadership role of the high school academic department chair within the evolving context of educational reform in Oregon. As Siskin (1991) cautioned, many of the current educational reform proposals:

> call for "radical surgery" to rescue public schools from their apparent demise [without taking into account that] such radical surgery requires an accurate and intimate knowledge of the patient's anatomy. (p. 136)

Since little information is available about the nature or the perceived value of the instructional leadership role of the high school department chair as it is now practiced

in Oregon high schools, Oregon school districts lack important knowledge about the value of that role as they consider new governance roles and relationships under the "radical surgery" of the school reform effort. As Wasley (1991) stated, "The rhetoric of reform seems ignorant of the current conditions of practice" (p. 4).

Fullan (1991) raised another concern. Because:

> significant change involves a certain amount of ambiguity, ambivalence, and uncertainty for the individual about the meaning of the change, . . . effective implementation is a *process of clarification*. (p. 106)

People who consistently accomplish what matters most to them are people who are continually "clarifying and deepening [their] personal vision" (Senge, 1990, p. 7). Clarifying what has been perceived to be of value in the leadership structures under the current organizational system would assist districts in further defining and developing the instructional leadership role of the high school department chair by anticipating and resolving possible areas of conflict as the district vision of restructuring is carried forward.

The task faced by the Oregon educational community, then, is to develop ways to examine and to reconcile the strengths of the current system with the potential benefits of the innovations being promoted by the reformers (Bacharach & Conley, 1990). Deal (1987) envisioned this undertaking as:

> a process of transformation akin to the one that produces a butterfly from a caterpillar—a cocoon of human experience in which past, present, and future are fused together in an organic process. (p. 12)

Through approaching the investigation of the instructional leadership role of the high school department chair from both the top-down perspective of the administrator and the bottom-up perspective of the teacher/department chair, this study and its companion study offer a unique contribution to the field of educational literature. By surveying four interconnected reference groups in the current educational system—superintendents, high school principals, high school academic department chairs, and high school teachers from defined Oregon school districts—this study and its companion study seek to produce comparative analyses of the perceptions of these four educator groups and thus to determine the areas and degrees of congruence that exist in their perceptions of what has been most highly valued in the role of the high school department chair. This comprehensive examination of the current status of the role of the high school department chair from two different but interrelated perspectives should offer valuable additions to the knowledge base Oregon school districts will need to consider in developing their instructional improvement agendas.

Having gained more understanding of what the nature of the role of the high school department chair is currently perceived to be and what in that role is most valued by differing groups of Oregon educators, school districts charged with educational reform by Oregon legislative mandate should be better able to make decisions about the definition and potential development of the instructional leadership role of the high school academic department chair within this evolving context. Thus, in an image suggested by Deal (1987), these studies offer what has been perceived to be most important in the "old" instructional leadership role of the high school department chair as threads to be woven into the "new" instructional leadership tapestry which is being designed through educational reform in Oregon.

Theoretical Framework

First, the role theory of leadership behavior affirms that "leadership behavior is shaped by the perceptions of how other people want the leader to behave" (Smith & Andrews, 1987, p. 5). In applying role theory specifically to the instructional leadership role of the high school department chair, Sergiovanni (1984) concluded that

> One determiner of the chairperson's leadership effectiveness is the expectations for his or her performance as a leader held by important

> others, such as the principal and teachers. (p. 172)

Based upon the role theory of leadership behavior, then, the realities of a high school department chair role are significantly influenced by the perceptions and expectations of superintendents, high school principals, and high school teachers. Sergiovanni went on to stress the importance of congruence in such perceptions and expectations:

> A further determiner is the extent to which these role expectations agree with each other and with how the leader feels he or she needs to behave. One need not have mirror agreement with superiors and subordinates in regard to role expectations, but reasonable agreement and mutual understanding of areas of agreement seem to be prerequisites for leadership effectiveness. (p. 172)

If conflicting expectations for the role of the high school academic department chair exist among superintendents, high school principals, high school department chairs, and high school teachers, the assumption is that the effectiveness of the department chair will be diminished. While this study is not an attempt to determine effectiveness, *per se*, it does seek to determine possible obstacles to effectiveness by investigating the degree of congruence that exists in the perceptions of these four educator groups about the nature and the value of the role of the department chair as it is currently being practiced in a defined group of Oregon high schools.

Second, Mitchell (1990) posited that educational leadership "is fundamentally a question of the educational values of the leader and the followers" (p. 65). Beare, Caldwell and Millikan (1987) defined values as "weights: the priorities we place on things" (p. 180). As such, values are perceptions of objects, ideas, or other people that guide behavior based upon personal belief systems (Hodgkinson, 1983; Mitchell, 1990). Sergiovanni (1987) believes the meaning of leadership behavior becomes more important than the behaviors themselves: "Leadership reality for all groups is the reality they create for themselves, and thus leadership cannot exist separate from what people find significant and meaningful" (p. 116). From this perspective, determining the importance of the instructional leadership role of the high school department chair requires consideration of the perceptions of both leaders and followers regarding the way that role is defined and what in that role is most valued.

Third, from a general systems theory perspective a *system*, as defined by Kauffman (1980), is "a collection of parts which interact with each other to function as a whole" (p. 1). From a systems viewpoint, it is not the simple aggregate of the parts that is key, but the *interaction* of the parts—the essential nature, the "wholeness," of the organization depends upon its entire structure. In Wimpelberg's (1987) examination of school

effectiveness, he concluded that it "clearly portrays instructional success as an integrated process [involving] each professional position, from teacher to superintendent" (p. 105). Wimpelberg further contended that "interactive decision making in a combination of 'top down' and 'bottom up' collaborations fosters instructional improvement" (p. 105).

Because of the dynamic and ever-changing nature of influence among the members of any organization, leadership and followership must be seen not as static but as evolving roles in which high school teacher, high school department chair, high school principal, and superintendent simultaneously function both as leaders and as followers. This study and its companion study, comprising conversations between two voices—that of the administrator and that of the teacher/department chair—offer a comprehensive "top-down," "bottom-up" perspective on these leadership/followership roles. Grounded in this theoretical framework, these studies offer the necessary first step in defining and clarifying the value of the role of the high school academic department chair in the instructional leadership context being developed by the educational reform efforts in Oregon.

Operational Definitions

Because the researchers undertook these studies with the intent of broadening the knowledge base upon which instructional improvement decisions could be made in their own district, it was determined that a study population most comparable to that of their district would be defined. Thus, for purposes of these studies, the following operational definitions were employed.

1. The independent variable was defined as the current position held (superintendent, high school principal, high school academic department chair, high school teacher).

- *Superintendent*—the chief executive officer from a school district in the state of Oregon with an Average Daily Membership of more than 3,000 but fewer than 12,000 students.
- *Principal*—the primary administrator of an AAAA high school (the Oregon School Activities Association athletic competition designation for schools with populations of at least 650 students in grades 10-12) within one of the defined districts.
- *Department chair*—a faculty member from one of the defined high schools who, in addition to teaching responsibilities in one of four academic disciplines (English, mathematics, science, or

social studies), has responsibility for leadership of that department. [For purposes of this study, the terms *department head* and *department chairperson* are synonymous with the term *department chair*.]

- *Teacher*—a classroom teacher from one of the defined high schools, the majority of whose teaching responsibilities fall within one of the four academic disciplines delineated (English, mathematics, science, or social studies).

2. Dependent variables were defined as the five specific categories of leadership responsibility which had been delineated as comprising the role.

- *Responsibility for Human Relations*—the responsibility for fostering productive, positive, and rewarding working relationships among department members.
- *Responsibility for Management*—the responsibility for coordinating the activities of people and allocating resources to accomplish defined goals.
- *Responsibility for the Organization*—the responsibility for contributing to the improvement of the organization at the department level, the school level, and the district level.

- *Responsibility for Program*—the responsibility for the definition, delivery, and monitoring of what is taught by members of the department.
- *Responsibility for Supervision*—the responsibility for overseeing the work of the individuals within the department, focusing on efforts to improve performance, promote professional growth, and accomplish expectations.

3. *Line positions* refer to those positions in the educational hierarchy which include supervisory responsibility with authority to recommend termination of an employee.

4. *Staff positions* refer to primarily advisory positions which are characterized by limited supervisory responsibility and no authority to recommend termination of another employee.

5. *Educational experience* refers to the number of years the respondent had served as a full-time educator in each defined position: high school teacher, high school department chair, high school principal, superintendent. Respondents were also asked to specify academic areas for any experience as a high school teacher and as a high school department chair.

6. *Educational background* refers to the credentials respondents had earned from institutions of higher learning: bachelor's degree, master's degree, doctorate,

administrative certification. Respondents were also asked to specify major courses of study for each credential.

7. *Value* refers to "an enduring belief about the desirability of some means or end" (Raun & Leithwood, 1993, p. 56).

8. *Perception* refers to the interpretation placed on an experience; recognition or identification, especially as a basis for or as verified by action (Reber, 1985).

9. *Top-down* refers to influence by superintendents and high school principals which is exerted on individuals with less formal power and authority in the educational hierarchy.

10. *Bottom-up* refers to influence by high school department chairs and teachers which is exerted on individuals with more formal power and authority in the educational hierarchy.

Limitations of the Studies

The findings and conclusions of these studies were limited in scope, purpose, and methodology; thus the generalizations which can be drawn from the studies are also limited in several respects.

The Population

The studies were limited by the extent to which the defined population is similar to like groups in other areas.

1. Participants were elicited only from within the state of Oregon.

2. The studies sought data only from high schools. No junior high schools nor middle schools were included in the studies.

3. Only those high schools: (a) which were classified as AAAA (based upon populations of at least 650 students in grades 10-12) by the Oregon School Activities Association for purposes of athletic competition, and b) which were located in school districts with Average Daily Memberships of at least 3,000 but not more than 12,000 students were asked to participate.

4. Superintendents, high school principals, high school academic department chairs, and high school teachers were the only school personnel contacted for participation in the studies. No assistant principals, curriculum coordinators, supervisors or persons holding other titles were contacted.

5. Including high school department chairs and teachers from only the disciplines of English, social studies, mathematics, and science further restricted the studies by the extent to which chairs and teachers from these disciplines are representative of those in other departments in the high school organizational structure.

6. These studies also did not address the extent to which the leadership functions delineated in the

questionnaire ought to be performed by the department chair. (It is possible a particular activity could be considered important to be performed within the system, but considered to be the responsibility of someone other than the department chair.)

The Instrument

1. Only those five specific areas of activity identified in the questionnaire were offered in defining the perceived instructional leadership role of the department chair.

2. Only those questionnaire items requesting opinions were used in describing perceived importance.

Assumptions

In addition to the six major assumptions which led to the construction of the research questions, several other assumptions were considered to underlie the design and implementation of these studies. These assumptions were the following:

1. That approaching the studies from both the top-down perspective of the administrator and the bottom-up perspective of the teacher/department chair would take advantage of the researchers' rich background of experience in the full range of educational roles being addressed in the studies: high school teacher, high

school department chair, high school principal, and superintendent.

2. That much meaningful research is collaborative in nature and that each study would be enriched and informed by its companion study viewing the topic from a complementary perspective.

3. That the questionnaire was the appropriate method for gathering data.

4. That the survey instrument as it was constructed was sufficiently valid and reliable to generate adequate meaningful data.

5. That the anonymity of responses would assure that respondents would reply candidly to the survey instrument.

6. That the importance of the topic to high school teachers, high school department chairs, high school principals and superintendents would lead to a high rate of questionnaire returns.

7. That the teacher surveys were distributed as requested and that respondents were therefore representative of the total teacher population defined for the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The administrative voice in this study is spoken from the general systems theory perspective of superintendents and high school principals, who have in common role responsibility for the effectiveness of the entire organization that they administer. From this perspective, the school district and the individual high school together constitute a *system* as defined by Kauffman (1980), "a collection of parts which interact with each other to function as a whole" (p. 1). At the same time, any individual system (such as a high school) may also function as a *subsystem* (one of the parts) of yet a larger system (such as a school district) composed of many subsystems which are, as Owens pointed out, "highly interactive and mutually interdependent" (p. 88).

For high school principals, this means responsibility for the effectiveness of a large, complex, multi-dimensional, highly specialized secondary school system, a system made up of subsystems in which individuals play many different organizational roles. For superintendents, it means responsibility for the effectiveness of a large, complex, multi-dimensional, highly specialized district

school system, a system made up of several thousand people in numerous organizational units, each containing a number of subsystems within which people play many organizational roles.

From this general systems theory administrative perspective, a review of the related literature of the role of the high school department chair is developed in four stages.

First, the evolution of a supervisory role for the high school department chair is reviewed within the context of changes in supervisory philosophy and methodology.

Second, the literature on organizational theory is reviewed to establish the importance to long-term organizational effectiveness of:

- many people successfully performing a variety of leadership roles
- the organization having the ability to utilize competing strengths, and
- the organization having the ability to interpret experience from multiple points of view.

Third, the literature on role theory is reviewed to establish the importance of the influence of other peoples' perceptions and values on the behaviors of the department chair.

Fourth, the literature on instructional leadership is examined from a systems perspective on roles and relationships to establish the importance of looking at the top-down, bottom-up perspective on key roles.

Evolution of the Supervisory Role of the High School Department Chair

From the middle of the 1800s to the early 1900s, the primary goal of supervision in the public high school was to insure a certain level of instructional performance by looking for those deficiencies that would merit the dismissal of teachers (Lucio & McNeil, 1969; Oliva, 1993). Supervision, which was performed by superintendents and principals, was synonymous with inspection.

The role of the high school academic department chair evolved as a support position to the high school principal in parallel with changes in beliefs about employee supervision in the workplace. Frederick Taylor's (1980) scientific management principles for achieving efficiency and productivity became the model in the increasingly complex industrial society of the early 1900s. At the same time, the increased complexities of specialization and a subject-organized curriculum became the model in large urban high schools, making it more difficult for principals to carry out all the responsibilities of their positions. Taylor's formula, focusing on control, accountability, and efficiency within a framework of clear

manager-subordinate relationships, was applied to the reconfigured high school (Oliva, 1993; Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1993).

The emergence of a defined, specialized curriculum and teaching systems with close supervision of teachers in a face-to-face setting increased the need for supervision beyond the resources of the building administration. In response to the problems presented by increased size, complexity, and specialization, high schools institutionalized the departmental structure and the position of department chair (Durkee, 1947; Easterday, 1965; Gorton & Thierbach-Schneider, 1991; Manlove & Buser, 1966; McLaughlin, Talbert, & Bascia, 1990; Siskin, 1991).

By the early 1930s, influenced by social philosophers and psychologists, an emphasis on concern for workers replaced supervision's earlier focus on task and technical skill. This human relations paradigm of supervision, which was to continue as the dominant model into the 1950s, stressed that showing interest in employees as people and providing opportunities for meeting their social needs would increase productivity. Leadership was conceptualized as a type of group dynamics in which supervisory success depended more upon the human relations skills of the supervisor than upon technical expertise (Oliva, 1993; Owens, 1981). Organizations were to be developed around the workers, providing conditions that

enhanced their morale, made them feel important to the organization, and allowed for their personal growth and development. According to Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993), "It was assumed that a satisfied staff would work harder and would be easier to work with, to lead and to control" (p. 13).

In the 1950s, however, the pendulum began to swing as criticism was leveled at the human relations model for focusing too much on people and not enough on the organization. During the next 25 years, the emphasis shifted to a focus on what Owens (1981) referred to as an organizational behavior model, seeking "to describe, understand, and predict human behavior in the environment of formal organizations" (p. 23).

By the early 1980s a perceived decline in the quality of schools had led to renewed emphasis on external control, accountability, efficiency, and highly specified performance standards. Supervisory practices again turned toward closely monitoring teachers' classroom behaviors.

As the paradigms affecting approaches to school district organization and management change over time, strategies also change and purposes are redirected. Placing a high value on quality control in one paradigm can result in a top-down, highly directive supervisory system, while placing a high value on quality control in a different paradigm can produce a more indirect system

emphasizing a collaborative team approach toward problem-solving and supervision. Regardless of the dominant paradigm, what does seem to remain constant at the high school level is the supervisory problem which the role of the academic department chair was designed to address—that posed by the size of the school, complexity of the program, and specialization of the curriculum.

By the 1990s, as Oliva (1993) indicated, "What we are seeing . . . is an amalgamation of practices and attitudes" (p. 9). However, the strongest emphasis has perhaps been placed on the redefinition of the process of supervision called for by Sergiovanni and Starrett (1993), a human resources approach to supervision, one that stresses "successful accomplishment of important and meaningful work" (Glasser, 1994; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993).

While accountability and evaluation cannot be ignored, the focus of such a redefinition of supervision has been to move from the traditional hierarchical model of imposed authority, which Blumberg (1974) described as a type of "cold war" between teachers and their supervisors, to more collaborative supervisory processes which view teachers as active participants in their own growth and view supervisors as active partners in that process of constructing knowledge about teaching and learning (Arredondo, Brody, Zimmerman, & Moffett, 1995; Francis &

Nolan, 1992; Poole, 1994). Just as teaching can be defined as facilitative—behaviors that increase the probability of learning—in a community of learners approach to shared leadership envisioned by Sergiovanni (1994) supervision is similarly defined as facilitative—behaviors that increase the probability of shared goals being accomplished.

Such a perspective on transforming the relationship between supervisors and teachers moves away from what Barth (1988) contended is the dependency encouraged by the top-down, hierarchical relationships which have characterized supervisory models in the past to relationships founded on trust, support, and openness among colleagues that promote joint inquiry into the nature of teaching of learning.

Organizational Theory

An examination of organizational theory offered perspective for this study. Owens (1981) stated that "By definition, an organization exists for the purpose of achieving something: reaching some goal or set of goals. It seeks to do this by accomplishing certain tasks" (p. 88). According to Morphet, Johns, and Reller (1982, p. 64), even for the most simple organizational tasks, the people in the organization must establish structures for

successful organizational decision making and action to occur:

1. A procedure for selecting a leader or leaders.

2. A procedure for determining the roles to be played by each member of the group.

3. A procedure for determining the goals of the group.

4. A procedure for achieving the goals of the group.

In identifying theoretical perspectives on structuring and staffing organizations to accomplish their defined tasks, Owens (1981) summarized two differing viewpoints on the relationships of organizations and the people who make up those organizations.

From one perspective, the structures of the organization are seen as the dominant force in molding people's attitudes and behaviors toward meeting the goals of the organization. This traditional, bureaucratic concept of organizations, attributed to the German sociologist Max Weber, was developed as an administrative structure that complemented Frederick Taylor's scientific management assumptions about behavior (Bolman & Deal, 1991; McPherson, Crowson, & Pitner, 1986; Morphet, Johns, & Reller, 1982; Mouzelis, 1967). McPherson, Crowson, and Pitner depicted:

> Weber's idealized model [as suggesting] that a rational administrative structure includes many interrelated elements of control designed to ensure that employees will perform with maximum

> efficiency in the pursuit of specific goals. (p. 75)

From the second theoretical perspective on organizations, behaviors and interactions of the people within the organization are seen as influential forces shaping the structures of the organization. Hoy and Miskel (1982) referred to "all formal organizations [as being] social systems" (p. 57). According to the Getzels and Guba (1957) social systems model, a social system consists of two basic elements: (a) the institutional roles, with their expectations designed to fulfill the goals of the organization, and (b) the people occupying the roles, who provide the energy to achieve those goals (Hoy & Miskel, 1982; Owens, 1981). Katz and Kahn (1978) applied social psychology to systems theory, noting that systems require "energic sources for their maintenance [and that] for almost all social structures, the most important maintenance source is human effort and motivation" (p. 3).

To survive over time, organizations must have a continuing supply of resources and must develop roles and processes to be able to use them productively. According to Katz and Kahn (1978), use of structures to keep the organization in motion is one type of leadership behavior. As a dynamic, interactive social system, then, a school district develops structures to convert inputs (human and

material resources) into outputs (achievement of its educational goals).

Specifically referring to the school district organization as a social system, Owens (1981) stressed that "Leaders are concerned with facilitating the acceptance, development and allocation of roles that are necessary for the group to function well" (p. 7). Schlechty (1990) contended that "The obligation of system-level policy-makers is to assure the presence of strong leadership" (p. 235) in each organizational unit in order to promote the achievement of organizational goals. Schlechty further maintained that "fostering the emergence of such leadership through the assigning of principals, the training of principals and the training of team leaders (e.g., department chairpersons or lead teachers) is a central responsibility of school superintendents and their staffs" (p. 235).

According to Owens (1981), effectiveness of an organization can be judged by its ability to:

> accomplish three essential core activities over time:
>
> 1. to achieve its goals,
> 2. to maintain itself internally, and
> 3. to adapt to its environment. (p. 248)

Paradoxically, for an organization to maintain itself requires organizational stability, while the capacity for adapting to environmental conditions requires an ability to engage in continuous change. Pascale (1990) maintained

that organizations need to embrace the paradox because stability and adaptability form a dynamic organizational balance, a healthy tension between contending opposites. An organization must be stable enough to be effective, and thus allow individuals in the organization to focus their efforts upon accomplishing the organizational goals. At the same time, an organization must be able to cope with changes in the environment by adapting its systems for achieving its goals as conditions change.

Deal and Peterson (1994) referred to Taoist tradition in stressing the need for balance in bringing about organizational change. The concept of Yin-Yang, which "respresents a seeming duality that in fact expresses an implicit unity" (p. 42), can be applied to all of life, including organizational theory. Effective organizational improvement requires a balance of leadership and management, of challenge and support, of top-down influence and bottom-up influence, of independence and interdependence, of collaborative teaming and individual initiative, of masculine and feminine perspectives. Applying this concept of paradox to an administrative context requires the ability to acknowledge, to accept, and to act in accordance with the need to encourage seemingly oppositional points of view or capacities so that the organization can always draw upon the strengths of both perspectives.

According to Owens (1981), the introduction of changes into the system requires attention to "the dynamic interaction of four subsystems—people, structure, technology and task" (p. 91). The administrative voice from which this study speaks is influenced from general systems theory by awareness of the line administrator's role responsibility for the effectiveness of a whole organization made up of many smaller organizational units or subsystems. As Owens noted: *People*, in order to accomplish *tasks*, create organizational *structure* which establishes a pattern of authority, thus defining *role*.

Role Theory and Role Conflict

Since formal organizations are comprised of individuals interacting in roles, "much organizational behavior can be understood by understanding role relationships" (Schmuck & Runckel, 1988, p. 301). Applying organizational behavior to educational systems, Owens (1981) explained that

> As an institution, the school system establishes roles, and the incumbents of these institutional roles are expected by the organization to exhibit the kind of behavior that will contribute to the goals of the organization. (p. 76)

At the same time, role theory asserts that "leadership behavior is shaped by the perceptions of how other people want the leader to behave" (Smith & Andrews, 1987, p. 5). From this perspective, Katz and Kahn (1978) suggested:

> the idea of role as a set of expected activities associated with the occupancy of a given position assumes substantial agreement among the relevant people as to what those activities are. (p. 200)

Within the context of a formal organization such as a school system, however, an individual occupying a particular leadership role may encounter conflicting expectations for that role from several sources. A written job description may define the role by specific behaviors, but other people with whom the role occupant must interact within the system also act as "role senders" (Yukl, 1981, p. 171) or "constitute a *role set*" (Schmuck & Runckel, 1988, p. 301) for that role. The person's superiors in the authority structure, the person's peers or those who hold comparable positions, and the person's subordinates in the authority structure all contribute expectations for the role (Owens, 1981; Schmuck & Runckel, 1988; Yukl, 1981). The role occupant's own expectations for his/her role are also a factor.

Schmuck and Runckel (1988, p. 301) identified *intrarole* conflict as developing when expectations from different role senders are incongruent or conflicting and the individual in conflict must choose between the expectations characteristic of different role sets. Katz and Kahn (1978, p. 204) defined this type of role conflict "as the simultaneous occurrence of two or more role expectations such that compliance with one would make

compliance with the other more difficult." Owens (1981, p. 69) identified a second type of role conflict as resulting from confusion between *role perception* [the perception the role occupant has of the way another person expects him/her to behave] and *role expectation* [the way the other person actually expects the role occupant to behave]. In yet a third type of role conflict, the role occupant may perceive the role expectations coming from any of these sources to be inconsistent with his/her own personal values or set of ethical norms (Yukl, 1981).

In discussing empirical research findings regarding the impact of role conflict on role occupants in several occupational categories, including education, Katz and Kahn (1978, p. 204) reported that "such conflicts were associated with negative psychological responses on the part of the focal person." While acknowledging that research has not substantiated the impact of such "role conflict on members of the role set," Katz and Kahn "predicted strain and hostility there as well" (204).

In her book on restructuring organizations to compete in the global marketplace, Kanter (1989, p. 67) advised building productive synergies among employees while striving to remove the most serious threat to any organization: "hostile, internal competition." Understanding the potential impact of role conflict in the school system is important from an administrative

perspective, because administrators are responsible for the success of the organizations they manage. Organizational success is contingent upon the ability of people to work effectively and interdependently in a variety of role relationships.

Knowing that role conflict is a common cause of school-wide conflict (Schmuck & Runckel, 1988), administrators need to attend to working relationships and to minimize conflicts which decrease employee effectiveness. For example, the role expectations of district or building administrators for a department chair may conflict with the role expectations of high school teachers within an academic department which the high school department chair is to supervise. One could assume that the resulting conflicts in determining priorities, in allocating time, and in meeting multiple expectations would reduce the department chair's effectiveness while increasing the chair's dissatisfaction with his/her role performance.

Another conflict described by Schmuck and Runckel (1988, p. 302) arises when role expectations conflict with personal values. Raun and Leithwood (1993) studied the problem solving and decision making of superintendents to discover what direct influence values had on actions. Raun and Leithwood cited Hambrick and Brandon, stressing

that values influence perception such that executives "see and hear what they want to see and hear" (p. 55).

Values, therefore, do influence perceptions; perceptions influence what people choose to notice, and what is noticed is more likely to be acted upon. Bolman and Deal (1991) stated that

> Leaders' thinking defines and frames reality for themselves and often for their constituents. How they frame problems or dilemmas has a decisive impact on what their organization notices, what it does, and what it eventually becomes. (p. 21)

In general, the more discretion instructional leaders have, the greater the probable effect their values will be in influencing their decisions (Raun & Leithwood, 1993). Assuming that the high school department chair has more discretion than the teacher, and the high school principal has more discretion than the department chair, and the superintendent has more discretion than the principal, then all of those positions need to be considered in determining how what they value influences decisions which influence teachers. Thus, in this study there is a need to look carefully at what those three reference groups value about the role of the department chair.

Top-down, Bottom-up Perspectives on Instructional Leadership

The instructional leadership literature most directly influencing the current role expectations of the high

school academic department chair began with the 1980s effective schools vision of the building principal. The effective schools perception of the nature of principal leadership was that a strong, committed, diligent individual could isolate and influence the school conditions affecting student performance. The context could be controlled and shaped to produce better results in student achievement if certain key correlates (Edmonds, 1979) were addressed. Relying on strong administrative leadership, the principal could be successful by defining clear goals, creating safe and positive environments, raising expectations, and emphasizing basic skills and regular assessment.

Burlingame (1987) contended that this one-dimensional, top-down view of leadership most often attributed to effective schools studies focuses on *only one* of "three very different and incompatible images of what constitutes leadership" (p. 4) that a close reading of the effective schools literature would support. It ignores the impact of the cultural context of the school community—the influence of the norms, beliefs, and values of the people within the culture—on the would-be leader, which is the defining aspect of what Burlingame (1987, p. 6) referred to as "Leadership Two." Hoy and Miskel (1982) emphasized that

> As a social system, the school is characterized by an interdependence of parts, a clearly

> defined population, differentiation from its environment, a complex network of social relationships, and its own unique culture. (p. 51)

Schein (1990) defined culture as

> (a) a pattern of basic assumptions, (b) invented, discovered, or developed by a given group, (c) as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, (d) that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore (e) is to be taught to new members as the (f) correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 111)

From this perspective, then, effective school reform could not be realized solely by imposing a rational, principal-directed, top-down model, but would have to take into account the unique expectations of the school culture. In fact, Fullan (1991) insisted that restructuring efforts are really "about changes in the culture of schools, not the implementation of particular reforms" (p. 204). Hargreaves (Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992) pointed to the

> *cultures of teaching* . . . beliefs, values, habits and assumed ways of doing things among communities of teachers who have had to deal with similar demands and constraints over many years [as one aspect of school culture which helps explain] much about the dynamics of educational change or its absence. (p. 217)

The impact of teacher culture on change efforts would seem to be recognized by the third image of leadership Burlingame (1987, p. 6) delineated from the effective schools literature—one which implies a strong bottom-up influence in that the leader's effectiveness is seen as being subject to the degree of consensus created by the

group of followers. Goldring and Rallis (1993), in studying principals as agents of change, confirmed the impact of teachers: "The most immediate force affecting the principal-in-charge may be the teachers. . . . Teachers are the agents of change—without them, change will not occur" (p. 6).

Another perspective on bottom-up influence was expressed by Badaracco and Ellsworth (1989). What they termed "values-driven" leadership allows a leader to depend "on bottom-up decision making, with the knowledge that shared norms and values will help shape the decisions" (p. 128). They further characterized "genuine bottom-up influence [as] evidence of mutual trust and respect, both of which are central to the personal values and organizational aims that underlie leadership" (p. 129).

As reported by Crowson and Glass (1991), it is ironic that in the midst of a major reform movement which seeks to transform power "downward" to teachers, another trend is emerging toward looking "upward" to the leadership role of the superintendent. Many researchers (Crowson & Glass, 1991; Fullan, 1991; Joyce, Wolf, & Calhoun, 1993; McLaughlin, Talbert, & Bascia, 1990; Wimpelberg, 1987) are now advocating for a balanced system of centralized and decentralized control. This understanding of organizational effectiveness is becoming more accepted

simultaneously with an emerging interest in the role of leadership at the top of the organizational hierarchy's linkages with teacher effectiveness. Crowson and Glass (1991) in their paper on the changing role of the superintendent noted that superintendents of more effective districts have been found to be more in touch with curriculum and instruction than superintendents in less effective districts have been found to be.

While the need to consider the school district as a dynamic system in which many individuals perform leadership roles, each influencing the others, has been established, little emphasis has been given to the interplay of top-down and bottom-up influences on instructional leadership. In school systems, superintendents—positioned at the top of the formal power structure—perform influential roles spanning the entire scope of the organization. These roles are depicted by three dominant themes according to Cuban (1988, p. 131): instructional (teacher of teachers); management (chief executive); and political (negotiator/statesman). Wimpelberg (1987, p. 104) found Cuban's theme of superintendent as "teacher-scholar" or "teacher leader" to be an exception in the literature on the superintendency. Cuban, who analyzed the superintendent literature and profiles several exemplary superintendents, agreed that the managerial and political roles dominate most

superintendent behavior. Some notable individuals, however, make instructional leadership the central focus of their work, employing their political and managerial skills to support improvements in curriculum and instruction. Cuban made a strong case for looking at the role and influence of some superintendents as master teachers who create the conditions for instructional success:

> Through shaping the mission of the district, establishing a direct climate that signals a seriousness of purpose, designing rituals and structures that infuse life in both the mission and climate through communication skills and personal example, superintendents create a unique and personal curriculum from which they teach. In brief, the school board, the district organization, and the community become a classroom. Intentions and strategies become lesson plans. At this level a superintendent who teaches is one who not only persuades children and adults, professionals and lay people, parents and nonparents to see schooling differently but also bends their efforts toward new goals through actively creating new organizational mechanisms or knitting together weakly connected structures. (p. 133)

Fullan (1991) proclaimed the district administrator to be "the single most important individual for setting the expectations and tone of the pattern for change within the local district" (p. 191). He noted as well the critical responsibility of top management in overseeing school improvement when, as is often the case, the greatest obstacle is the "fragmentation, overload, and incoherence resulting from unfocused and uncoordinated efforts" (p. 197). Other researchers (Goodlad, 1983;

Little, 1981) are in agreement with Wimpelberg (1987) who stated that

> . . . disconnectedness or 'loose coupling' . . . [meaning] lack of coordination or control between activities of the organization . . . is precisely the condition that hurts instructional quality and school improvement the most. (p. 105)

Anderson (1967) explained that systems tend to centralize authority in positions at the top of the hierarchy as a result of the organization's need to coordinate activities and guarantee responsible actions. According to Fullan, the key for upper management is to insure that the "right choices are made, the change effort is taken seriously, and that specific pressure and support are provided during implementation" (p. 191).

At the building level, principals are directly responsible for overall management of the building and for leading the building's improvement efforts. According to Fullan (1991), instructional leadership, including "facilitating change, helping teachers work together, and furthering school improvement" (p. 145), is now an almost universal expectation of the building principal. Characteristics of effective management (such as planning, organizing, monitoring, troubleshooting) and traditional elements of leadership (such as developing shared vision, setting direction, and inspiring engagement) are both essential to instructional leadership (Louis & Miles, 1990). Either the principal must possess all of the

skills and characteristics required of instructional leadership or he/she must be capable of working with many others who together can create the conditions for instructional improvement. Rosenholtz (1989) concluded from her work on collaborative schools that

> Great principals do not pluck their acumen and resourcefulness straight out of the air. In our data, successful schools weren't led by philosopher kings with supreme character and unerring method, but by a steady accumulation of common wisdom and hope distilled from vibrant, shared experience both with teacher leaders in schools and colleagues district wide. (p. 219)

As Goodlad (1984) suggested,

> It is naive and arrogant to assume that principals, who may or may not have been effective teachers, can acquire and maintain a higher level of teaching expertise than teachers engaged in teaching at a full-time occupation. The concept becomes particularly absurd at the secondary level . . . (p. 303)

At the same time, in Murphy's (1988) review of what he perceived to be methodological or conceptual problems with many studies of instructional leadership, he noted that "the district context in which principals work is a . . . major environmental condition that has been largely ignored in studies of instructional leadership" (p. 125).

Ackoff (1981) stated, "The essential properties of a system taken as a whole derive from the interactions of its parts, not their actions taken separately" (p. 16). The dual nature of the role of the high school academic department chair is intriguing from the point of view of an organization's need to develop multiple and apparently

contending capacities. The department chair would seemingly be able to understand and to advocate for both teachers and administrators, developing a capacity to "walk the talk" as both supervisor and teacher.

Superintendents and principals have always faced the problem posed by Getzels and Guba (1957) to "integrate the demands of the institution and the demands of individuals in a way that is organizationally productive and individually fulfilling" (p. 430). The department chair probably comes closest of any role player in the traditional high school system of being able to meet both these demands because the chair literally experiences both on a daily basis. High school department chairs are responsible for teaching (interacting with students), at the same time that they are responsible for a subsystem (the subject matter department) and are part of a building management team which is responsible for the whole.

The department chair has a unique perspective to bring to the task of school renewal. From one point of view, the high school academic department chair may be one of the most effective role players in the organization because the person in that role is constantly performing at both ends of the continuum: a teacher who is supervised and a supervisor of teachers.

Summary

The central focus of this study is the role of the academic department chair in Oregon high schools as perceived by superintendents and high school principals in comparison to the perceptions of high school academic department chairs. The underlying purpose of the study is to establish sound perspective from which to base organizational decisions regarding the human and structural dimensions of establishing a combination of top-down and bottom-up collaborations as a means of fostering instructional improvement. The academic high school department is a subsystem of the high school, and the high school is a subsystem of the school district, each with key role players—department chairs, principals, and superintendents—who perform interactive and interconnected organizational roles, all presumably working to improve teaching and learning.

Both Fullan (1991) and Wimpelberg (1987) advocated a combination of top-down and bottom-up collaborations as the most effective means of fostering instructional improvement. For this synthesis to occur successfully, however, requires a kind of organizational cohesiveness in which the activities of individuals in a variety of roles contribute toward accomplishing the purpose of the organization. This prescription for successful educational improvement also requires a kind of shared

leadership wherein roles and expectations for people from superintendents to classroom teachers are negotiated, shaped, and reshaped as all participants in the improvement process seek to create the conditions for the organization's success.

To establish sound perspective for understanding the role of the high school academic department chair requires multiple historical and theoretical perspectives from the related literature. First, the literature on the development of the role of department chair in large, complex, multi-dimensional, highly specialized high schools was reviewed, demonstrating that the fundamental structural conditions and program conditions which the role was designed to address still exist today. Demands which shape the role of the high school principal continue to include responsibility for both the effectiveness of the instructional program and the total operations of the high school. The role of the department chair was found to be unique in that it spans responsibilities for both the delivery and the supervision of the instructional program and the operations in a department or subsystem within the organization of the high school.

Second, literature on organizational theory was reviewed, confirming that effective organizations require many individuals working successfully within the structure of the organization in a variety of roles. Effective

organizations must accomplish their goals and maintain appropriate stability while adapting to change in their environment. Effective organizations value contending capacities, such as stability and adaptability and collegiality and individuality.

Next, a discussion of the literature on role theory demonstrated that the behavior of people in organizations is shaped by the expectations of colleagues. Conflicting role expectations tend to reduce role effectiveness, while hostile internal role conflict within organizations reduces organizational effectiveness. Line administrators have organizational responsibility for creating the conditions for both productive and fulfilling roles.

The fourth section examined the school district as a dynamic system in which individuals at all levels of the organizational hierarchy perform interactive roles within the cultural context. From this perspective, neither a top-down nor a bottom-up leadership bias is going to be effective over time. What is required for effective instructional improvement is a combination of top-down and bottom-up collaborations in which a number of individuals play key leadership roles.

The literature review thus provides a framework from which to investigate the perceptions of superintendents and high school principals in comparison to the perceptions of high school department chairs in

determining what has been most valued in the role of the high school academic department chair in the state of Oregon—critical information from which to make decisions about the future of that role within the context of the current restructuring efforts.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Overview

This study, in concert with its companion study, sought to offer a beginning step in establishing possibilities for the instructional leadership role of the high school academic department chair as a viable component of a restructured system of governance envisioned under school reform in Oregon. Consistent with that purpose, this study investigated the perceptions about the role of the high school department chair held by superintendents and high school principals in comparison to perceptions held by high school academic department chairs from the top-down administrative perspective of a school district superintendent. The intent of the study was to determine the congruence of perceptions among these educator groups regarding: (a) the amount of department chair time spent on each activity specified in each category of department chair responsibility; (b) the importance of each activity in each category to the role of the department chair; and (c) the importance of the department chair's continuing to improve in each activity

in each category. Additionally, the study sought develop a profile of the typical respondent in each role category who responded to the survey instrument. Respondents were asked to respond to questions that would provide demographic characteristics: gender, age, educational background, and educational experience.

The narrative of this chapter, divided into six sections, provides a description of the methodology of the study. The first section identifies the general study hypotheses which the study investigated. The second section provides an overview of the study population. The third section details the development of the survey instrument that was utilized in the study. The fourth section describes the procedures followed for field testing the survey instrument. The fifth section explains the procedures followed in distributing, collecting, and monitoring returns of the survey instrument. The sixth section outlines processes followed in the analysis, interpretation, and descriptive reporting of the data as detailed in Chapter IV.

Statement of the Problem

In examining the potential for the high school academic department chair to act as an administrative resource for instructional leadership in the emerging context of educational reform in Oregon, this study

investigates the degree of congruence that exists in the perceptions of superintendents and principals in comparison to the perceptions of high school academic department chairs regarding five areas of responsibility defined for this study as comprising the role of the high school department chair:

1. responsibility for human relations,
2. responsibility for management,
3. responsibility for the organization,
4. responsibility for program, and
5. responsibility for supervision?

In examining these department chair responsibilities, this investigation focuses on three issues:

1. the amount of time devoted to carrying out the responsibilities,
2. the importance of the responsibilities to the role of the department chair, and
3. the importance of the department chair's continuing to improve the performance of the responsibilities.

Additionally, the study investigates congruence of opinions among those same three educator groups about assumptions associated with effectiveness as a department chair.

Study Hypotheses

General hypotheses developed to guide the statistical analysis portion of this study and stated in the null form for testing purposes were as follows:

Hypothesis 1. There will be no differences in perceptions between administrators in the role of superintendent and administrators in the role of high school principal regarding activities in five categories of responsibility of the high school academic department chair in relation to the amount of department chair time devoted to each activity, the importance of each activity to the department chair role, and the importance for the department chair to continue to improve in each activity.

Hypothesis 2. There will be no differences in the rank ordering by administrators in the role of superintendent and administrators in the role of principal for the five categories of department chair responsibility delineated for this study in regard to their importance to the role of the department chair.

Hypothesis 3. There will be no difference between perceptions of administrators in the role of superintendent and principal and the perceptions of high school department chairs regarding the amount of department chair time spent in performing activities defined for this study as comprising five categories of

role responsibility of the high school academic department chair.

Hypothesis 4. There will be no differences between administrators and high school department chairs in their perceptions of the relative importance to the role of department chair of specific activities defined for this study as comprising five categories of role responsibility of the high school academic department chair.

Hypothesis 5. There will be no differences between administrators and high school department chairs in their perceptions regarding the importance of department chairs continuing to improve in the performance of those activities defined for this study as comprising five categories of role responsibility of the high school academic department chair.

Hypothesis 6. There will be no differences between administrators and high school department chairs in their rank ordering of the importance of the five categories of department chair responsibility delineated for this study.

Hypothesis 7. There will be no differences between perceptions of administrators in the role of superintendent and administrators in the role of principal regarding the potential for the high school academic department chair to act as an administrative resource for educational leadership.

Hypothesis 8. There will be no differences between perceptions of administrators and perceptions of high school department chairs regarding the potential for the high school academic department chair to act as an administrative resource for educational leadership.

The Study Population

For purposes of this study and its companion study, Oregon school districts with total student populations of more than 3,000 but fewer than 12,000 students and with high schools designated as AAAA (at least 650 students in grades 10-12) by the Oregon School Activities Association were targeted. There were 31 school districts, which included 38 high schools, that were found to meet the defined criteria. Since the identified study population consisted of relatively few school districts, it was determined that all districts should be included.

After the researchers had received permission from the superintendents of each of the targeted districts for their districts to participate in the study, surveys were mailed to the superintendents of all 31 districts and to the principals and department chairs in the academic areas of English, math, science and social studies of the 38 high schools within those same districts. These four departments were selected because of the consistency with which they make up the academic core in the current high

school organizational structure in Oregon and because they comprise the majority of the high school teaching staff.

Stratified random sampling was used to identify a 10% sample to be surveyed from the total population of 1446 teachers with the majority of their teaching assignments in these four academic departments in the 38 high schools. Questionnaires were then sent to 145 teachers, who proportionally represented the total defined teaching population.

When one principal returned the questionnaire indicating that department chairs were not part of the organizational structure in his building, all personnel from that school and its corresponding district were dropped, reducing the population for these companion studies to its final level (N = 293): superintendents (N = 30); high school principals (N = 37); high school department chairs (N = 148); and high school teachers (N = 141), a 10% stratified random sample from the study population (N = 1407).

Development of the Instrument

To facilitate the descriptive purposes of this study and its companion study, the questionnaire was chosen as the method for gathering pertinent data for testing the hypotheses. The decision to use the survey format was

prompted by several considerations, primarily those delineated by Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1985, p. 344).

1. It is a less time-consuming and less expensive method for obtaining desired information than the person-to-person interview would be.

2. The confidentiality of responses offered by the questionnaire format may encourage more truthful responses than the interview would elicit.

3. Each respondent receives the same questions in the same format without the possibly intrusive presence of the interviewer's appearance, attitude, or behaviors.

4. The conscribed format of the questionnaire makes it easily adapted to computerized scoring, thus reducing the task of summarizing and comparing responses.

Construction of the survey instrument to be used in these companion studies was accomplished in several steps.

First, a literature search utilizing the Educational Resources Information Center yielded more than 650 resources to be examined for relevance, most of which were journal articles and books located either in the Portland State University library or in the researchers' personal libraries. A search of Dissertation Abstracts was also conducted, with a total of six pertinent dissertations then being ordered from University Microfilms.

This extensive review of the literature and studies related to the role of the high school department chair

established that no existing instrument would suffice to gather the required information to accomplish the purposes of these companion studies. While some similarities in topic and design were noted in previous studies (Kirkland, 1978; Ritter, 1979; Price, 1969; Orfinger, 1980), their differences in focus made those questionnaires unusable for purposes of these studies. Thus, as the second step in developing an effective and relevant questionnaire, a careful examination of several existing questionnaires and self-inventories categorizing and defining functions of the role of the high school academic department chair (Anderson, 1987; Costanza et al., 1987; DeRoche, Hunsaker, & Kujawa, 1987; Duke, 1987; Glatthorn, 1990; Hatfield, Blackman, Claypool, & Master, 1986; Sergiovanni, 1984; Weaver & Gordon, 1979; Weber, 1987; Williams, 1979) preceded the construction of tentative items.

Third, informed by this information base as well as by the two researchers' combined 55 years of experience in education (as high school English teachers, English department chairs and high school principal and superintendent), five categories of responsibility for the role of the high school academic department chair were identified and tentative descriptors for activities which would comprise each category were constructed.

Fourth, more exact and careful definition of the specific activities was accomplished through discussions

with other administrators, high school department chairs, and high school teachers, none of whom would be part of the population to be studied.

The fifth step was to structure the questionnaire into five sections.

Part I requested demographic information: gender, age, educational background (highest degree earned, major areas of study) and educational experience (teaching experience, teaching area, administrative experience—principal and/or superintendent).

Part II categorized 44 department chair activities under the five areas of department chair responsibility identified earlier (responsibilities for human relations, for management, for the organization, for program, and for supervision). Participants were asked to respond to each item on a five-point Likert-type scale from three separate perspectives: (a) the amount of time they perceived the department chair spent in performing each activity; (b) their perception of the importance of each specified function; and (c) their perception of the importance of the department chair's continuing to improve in each area.

Part III requested respondents to place the five categories of department chair responsibilities listed in Section II into rank order from 1 (*most important*) to 5 (*least important*) according to the respondents' perceptions of the importance of each of the areas of

responsibility to the role of high school academic department chair.

Part IV consisted of 12 statements of opinion regarding expectations for the instructional leadership role of the high school department chair. Respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point Likert-type scale the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement: 1 (*strongly disagree*); 2 (*disagree*); 3 (*neutral*); 4 (*agree*); or 5 (*strongly agree*).

Part V was an open-ended question inviting participants to provide additional information, to make comments, and/or to clarify or expand upon any of their previous responses.

To help establish content validity and to solicit suggestions for improvement, the researchers submitted the instrument to a panel of four individuals knowledgeable in the field: two current high school academic department chairs, an English teacher, and a central office instructional supervisor, none of whom were to be included in the ensuing study. They were each asked to consider whether items were clearly understandable, whether each item was clearly related to the category of department chair activity into which it had been placed, and whether or not each item would elicit valid information. They were also asked to suggest any modifications and/or

deletions as well as to indicate the amount of time required to complete the questionnaire.

Items which were considered vague or difficult for the respondent to answer were then modified for greater clarity. One activity in the second section was moved from the Responsibilities for the Organization category to the Responsibilities for Human Relations category and one activity was added to the Responsibilities for Supervision category. One set of directions was also clarified and two opinion statements were more exactly worded.

Field Test

In order to continue to establish the reliability and validity of the instrument, a field test was conducted. Survey questionnaires were distributed to high school teachers, high school academic department chairs, high school principals, and central office administrators in a neighboring school district (again, none of whom were members of the targeted study group). Each was asked to provide feedback on the clarity of the instructions for completion and the clarity, adequacy and appropriateness of the selected role responsibilities in defining the department chair position. The 32 responses indicated that the directions were clear and that respondents agreed the defined responsibilities were appropriate in

describing the position. The printed questionnaire required 20 to 25 minutes to complete.

Thus, content validity of the survey instrument was addressed through: (a) careful examination of survey instrument items for direct relation to the categories of instructional leadership behaviors being defined, (b) alteration or modification of word choice to eliminate ambiguity, and (c) refinement of syntax to improve clarity. In view of these steps taken to improve the survey instrument, and affirmation received from the consulting practitioners and from the field test that it measured what it purported to measure, it was considered reasonable to assume that conditions for content validity and reliability of the survey instrument were met. The instrument was then forwarded to the Human Subjects Research Review Committee at Portland State University for review. A copy of the completed questionnaire may be found in Appendix A.

Procedures for Data Collection

Names of superintendents and high school principals and addresses for individual districts and high schools were taken from the Oregon School Directory (Oregon Department of Education, 1990). After permission to conduct the study had been obtained from the Central Office of each targeted school district, questionnaire

packets were mailed to each of the superintendents (N = 30) and to the principals and the four academic area department chairs of each of the high schools N = 37). Individual cover letters explained the importance and significance of the study, solicited the cooperation of the recipients in completing the questionnaire and offered to share the results of the study if requested. The letters also assured the anonymity of the responses. Stamped, self-addressed envelopes were enclosed to encourage participants to respond quickly and to facilitate a greater number of responses. Copies of the cover letters are included in Appendix B.

Stratified sampling was used to select teachers in each of the four academic departments from the individual high schools whose participation in the study would be requested. Telephone calls to each of the high schools ascertained the total population of teachers with the majority of their assigned classroom responsibilities in the targeted departments: English (N = 431); mathematics (N = 323); science (N = 286); social studies (N = 367). All teachers were assigned numbers in sequence by specific departments by first listing the schools in alphabetical order and then noting the total number of teachers in each of the targeted departments in each school. A random number table was used to select the 10% sample from the total number of teachers in each of the targeted

departments from all 37 schools. Packets were sent to the head secretary in each high school with the request that, using an alphabetical listing of teachers in each department, the secretary distribute the packets to the designated teachers who had been randomly selected (e.g., math teacher #3 on the alphabetical listing).

In order to facilitate the sending of follow-up letters as necessary, each return envelope was coded to the list of participants. Returned responses were checked off on the master list and the envelopes were then discarded, the identity of the respondents and their responses to the questionnaire remaining confidential.

Three weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up letter was mailed to targeted participants who had not yet responded. Each letter included a second copy of the questionnaire, another request for participation, and a stamped, addressed return envelope.

The anticipated rate of return of the survey instrument was set at 70% so as to give credibility to this study and its companion study. Of the 352 survey instruments distributed, 304 responses were received, an overall response rate of 86%. Department chairs from four high schools reported that the disciplines of science and mathematics were combined into one department in their buildings. Since each chair had filled out two separate questionnaires, the population was reduced by two (n = 35)

for both mathematics and science department chairs, thereby reducing the overall study population of department chairs by four (N = 144). Each chair's responses were counted in the discipline in which the survey instrument indicated the majority of the chair's classes were taught. Rates and percentages of returns as well as usable responses are reported by educator group in Table 1.

Table 1

Questionnaire Returns by Educator Group

Educator Group	Number Surveyed	Number Responding	% Responding	Number of Usable Responses
Superintendents	30	27	90	27
Principals	37	34	92	34
Department Chairs	144	122	85	118
Teachers	141	121	86	114
TOTALS	352	304	86%	293

Treatment of the Data

After data collection was complete, information from the returned questionnaires was entered into the SYSTAT (Wilkinson, Hill, & Vang, 1992) for the Macintosh, Version 5.2 on a Macintosh 6100 for analysis of the data, with findings being reported in primarily descriptive form. Demographic data were reported both in tabular and in narrative form to construct a profile of the study population. To facilitate analysis of the descriptive

questionnaire data, frequency distributions were computed so that the demographic data and the perceptions concerning the high school department chair position could be compared among educator groups. Means, percentages, and standard deviations were reported for the total population and for groups differentiated by demographic characteristics.

A probabilities matrix of all responses provided a global perspective of areas with possible significant difference. When only one question elicited the possibility of significant difference between the responses of the superintendents and the principals, the responses for these two groups were collapsed into one administrative category. Collapsing the administrative data for statistical purposes increased the size of N for this reporting category, thereby lessening the differences in total numbers between the administrator and the department chair respondents and strengthening the confidence level for subsequent statistical tests.

Chi-square analysis was used to compare the frequencies of responses given by superintendents, principals, and department chairs to all items on the survey instrument. These computer-generated chi-square values were then used to test the null hypotheses. Results of the data analysis are reported in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Overview

This chapter presents an analysis of the questionnaire data. SYSTAT (Wilkinson, Hill, & Vang, 1992) for the Macintosh, Version 5.2 was used on a Macintosh 6100 for the analysis. Frequency distributions and percentages were run for all questionnaire responses. Percentages of responses given by superintendents and principals are shown in Appendix C, Charts 1C through 10C. Means and standard deviations were calculated for all responses from each group of administrators according to current role. A complete listing may be found in tabular form in Appendix D.

This chapter is organized in three sections: demographics, descriptive analysis, and testing of the hypotheses. The first section consists of a descriptive overview of demographic information provided by superintendents and principals who participated in the study. Section two establishes the administrative voice of superintendents and principals through a description of their perceptions in response to each of the survey

questions. The third section discusses the findings relative to the eight hypotheses of this study.

Demographics

One purpose of this research was to create a profile of the typical superintendent and the typical high school principal who comprised the study population. To that end, respondents were asked to complete questions that provided demographic information in the following areas: gender, age, educational background (highest degree earned and major areas of study), educational experience (teaching experience and teaching area), and experience as an administrator (principal and/or superintendent), total years of experience in education, and previous experience as a high school department chair. This section describes the demographic characteristics of the participants in this study.

Personal Information

Study participants were asked to provide two items of personal information: their gender and their age. Table 2 reports their responses.

In education, administrative roles have traditionally been male-dominated. As might be expected, therefore, the majority of respondents in each group of administrators in this study was found to be male. Age of respondents varied, but was skewed toward older respondents. No

superintendent was found to be under 40 years of age, and the largest number (n = 19, 70%) fell into the over 50-year-old range. The largest number of principal respondents was in the 40-49-year-old range.

Table 2

Personal Data

Characteristic	Superintendents (N = 27) n	%	Principals (N = 34) n	%	Department Chairs (N = 118) n	%
Gender:						
Male	27	100.00	31	91.18	91	77.12
Female	0	0	3	8.82	27	22.88
Age:						
29 or under	0	0	0	0	1	0.85
30-39	0	0	4	11.76	18	15.25
40-49	8	29.63	16	47.06	65	55.08
50 or over	19	70.37	14	41.18	34	28.81

Educational Background

Questionnaire items regarding educational background of respondents are reported in Table 3.

A master's degree was the highest degree achieved by the greatest number of principals (n = 33, 97%), while slightly more than one-half of the superintendents (n = 14, 52%) had earned a doctorate. The majority (59%) of both superintendents and principals had done their major academic preparation in one of the four disciplines under consideration for this study.

Table 3

Educational Background of Study Participants

Characteristic	Superintendents (N = 27) n	%	Principals (N = 34) n	%	Department Chairs (N = 118) n	%
Highest Degree Earned:						
Bachelor's	0	0	0	0	19	16.10
Master's	13	48.15	33	97.06	96	81.36
Doctorate	14	51.85	1	2.9	43	2.54
Academic Area:						
English	6	22.22	2	5.88	32	27.12
Math	1	3.70	3	8.82	29	24.58
Science	4	14.81	9	26.46	27	22.88
Social Studies	5	18.52	11	32.35	30	25.42
Other	11	40.73	14	41.18	0	0

Educational Experience

Table 4 reports the distribution of responses of the study population to questions regarding educational experience.

The majority of department chairs in this study had a good deal more teaching experience than their administrators, most of whom (n = 45, 74%) had been in the classroom for fewer than 10 years before entering administration. Whereas the largest number of principals (n = 13, 38%) had been in their current position for only two to four years, the largest number of department chairs (n = 39, 33%) had been in their current positions for 10 years or more.

Table 4

Educational Experience of Study Participants

Characteristic	Superintendents (N = 27) n	%	Principals (N = 34) n	%	Department Chairs (N = 118) n	%
Total Teaching Experience:						
fewer than 5 years	9	33.33	4	11.76	8	6.78
5-9 years	12	44.44	20	58.82	15	12.71
10-19 years	4	14.81	10	29.41	64	54.24
20-29 years	2	7.41	0	0	29	24.58
30 or more years	0	0	0	0	2	1.69
Total Years in Current Position:						
first year	3	11.11	7	20.59	22	18.64
2-4 years	8	29.63	13	38.24	24	20.34
5-9 years	9	33.33	8	23.53	33	27.97
10 or more years	7	25.93	6	17.65	39	33.05
Total Years in Education:						
fewer than 10 years	0	0	3	8.82	6	5.09
10-19 years	3	11.11	15	44.02	34	28.81
20-29 years	13	48.15	14	41.18	57	48.31
30 or more years	11	40.74	2	5.88	21	20.80

As a frame of reference for the educational experience of the study population, 20 or more years of experience in education were reported by 88% of the superintendents, 47% of the high school principals, and 69% of the high school academic department chairs. In other words, more of the superintendents are more experienced educators than are the department chairs, and more of the department chairs are more experienced educators than are the principals.

Prior Experience as a High School Department Chair

Since this study focused on the perceptions of superintendents and high school principals about the role of the high school academic department chair, their own previous high school department chair experience was requested and reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Administrators' Experience as High School Department Chairs

Experience as a Department Chair	Superintendents (N = 27) n	%	Principals (N = 34) n	%
In English, math, science, or social studies	1	3.70	11	32.35
In another high school department	3	11.11	5	14.71
In no high school department	23	85.19	18	52.94

More principals (n = 11, 32%) than superintendents (n = 1, 3%) reported previous experience as a high school academic department chair as defined by this study. In fact, the majority of superintendents (n = 23, 85%) reported no previous experience as a department chair. Just over 50% (n = 18, 52.94%) of the principals also reported no prior experience as a department chair.

Demographic Profiles

The demographic information provided by the respondents was used to develop the following profiles:

1. A typical principal respondent was a male between the ages of 40 and 50 who had earned an undergraduate degree in either social studies or science. He had taught for fewer than 10 years and had not served as a high school academic department chair. He held a master's degree in education or administration, and had been in his current position for fewer than five years.

2. Of the 34 principals responding to the survey,

- 31 principals were male; 3 principals were female
- 30 principals were over the age of 40; 4 were under 40
- over one-half of the principals (n = 18) had not served as high school academic department chairs, while nearly one-third (n = 11) indicated experience as a department chair in English, math, science or social studies
- the highest degree earned by 33 of the principals was a master's degree.

3. The typical superintendent was a male over the age of 50 whose academic preparation had been in English, social studies, or science. He had taught for fewer than 10 years and had not served as a high school academic department chair. His advanced degree (either a master's

or a doctorate) was in educational administration, and he had been in his superintendent position for fewer than 10 years.

4. Of the 27 superintendents responding to the survey,

- all superintendents were male
- all superintendents were over the age of 40
- only one superintendent had previous experience as the chair of a high school academic department
- more than one-half of the superintendents (n = 14) had earned a doctorate
- the major area of study for superintendents was English (n = 6), followed by social studies (n = 5), and science (n = 4).

The Voice of Superintendents and High School Principals

As a first step in examining the potential value of effective top-down, bottom-up collaborations to instructional improvement, this study seeks to define an administrative voice on the role of the high school academic department chair. Administrative voice is spoken from the perspective of superintendents and high school principals, who have in common role responsibility for the effectiveness of the complex, multi-dimensional organization that they administer. To begin to establish that administrative voice, this section describes the

perceptions of superintendents and high school principals regarding five categories of responsibility comprising the role of the high school academic department chair: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision. Complete frequency distribution data for superintendent and principal responses to the survey questions in each of the five categories of department chair responsibility are reported in tabular form in Appendix C.

Responsibility for Human Relations

As defined for this study, the department chair Responsibility for Human Relations category encompasses the following nine activities:

HR-1. Build and maintain a supportive department team

HR-2. Encourage open communication among department members

HR-3. Facilitate effective conflict resolution

HR-4. Foster cooperative problem solving

HR-5. Encourage trust, caring, and respect among department members

HR-6. Maintain regular, open communication with department members

HR-7. Practice collaborative, participative decision-making processes

HR-8. Promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement

HR-9. Encourage department members to share in leadership roles.

For each activity, study participants were asked to address three separate issues:

- Time--The amount of department chair time spent on the activity
- Role--The importance of the activity to the role of the department chair
- Improve--The importance for the department chair to continue to improve in performance of the activity.

Charts C1 and C2, located in Appendix C, report frequencies of responses in this category for superintendents and principals, respectively.

Superintendents' responses: Time. Superintendents perceive human relations activities as consuming a considerable amount of department chair time. The human relations activity receiving the highest rating from the most superintendents was encourage open communication among department members (HR2), with 37% of the superintendents rating it as consuming *a great deal* of department chair time. Four additional human relations activities were rated by 22% of the superintendents as consuming *a great deal* of department chair time: build

and maintain a supportive department team (HR1); foster cooperative problem solving (HR4); maintain regular, open communication with department members (HR6); and promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement (HR8).

Superintendents' responses: Importance to the role. In the category of human relations, superintendents rated activities typically associated with organizational effectiveness very highly. The human relations activity rated by superintendents as of highest importance to the role of the department chair was promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement (HR8), with 62% of the responding superintendents rating it as *extremely important* and an additional 33% of the superintendents rating it *very important*.

Activities HR2 and HR6, both related to open and regular communication, another cornerstone of organizational effectiveness, were also rated very highly by 88.89% of the superintendents

Superintendents' responses: Importance to continue to improve. Promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement (HR8) was also rated by superintendents as higher than any other human relations activity in its importance to improve, with 67% rating it *extremely important* to improve and 26% rating it *very important* to improve.

Principals' responses: Time. The human relations activity given the highest rating by the most principals (29%) for consuming *a great deal* of department chair time was maintain regular and open communication (HR6). The human relations activity rated highest by the most principals (47%) for consuming *a good deal* of department chair time was encourage trust, caring, and respect among department members (HR5).

Principals' responses: Importance to the role. The human relations activity rated by principals as of the highest importance to the role of the department chair was also maintain regular, open communication with department members (HR6), with 76% of the principals rating it as *extremely important* and 17.65% of the principals rating it as *very important*. The second highest rating given by the principals to the importance of the academic department chair's activities within the area of human relations was promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement (HR8), with 68% of the principals rating it as *extremely important* and 21% rating it as *very important*.

Principals' responses: Importance to continue to improve. Consistent with their high ratings for the importance of human relations to the role of the department chair, the principals also rated importance for the department chair to continue to improve in the area of human relations very highly. The two activities receiving

the highest rating by principals as *extremely important* to improve were maintain regular, open communication with department members (HR6) and promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement (HR8), each with 71% of the principals rating it as *extremely important* to improve.

Responsibility for Management

Eight activities comprise the Responsibility for Management category:

MG-1. Develop department teaching schedule and assignments

MG-2. Participate in the selection of department instructional personnel

MG-3. Develop and administer the department budget

MG-4. Disseminate information to department staff

MG-5. Allocate and maintain equipment, instructional materials, and facilities

MG-6. Interpret and apply district policy and building standards

MG-7. Plan and organize relevant department meetings

MG-8. Serve as liaison between department members and the administration.

For each activity, study participants were asked to address three separate issues:

- Time--The amount of department chair time spent on the activity

- Role--The importance of the activity to the role of the department chair
- Improve--The importance for the department chair to continue to improve in performance of the activity.

Appendix C, Charts C3 and C4, reports frequencies of responses in the management category for superintendents and principals, respectively.

Superintendents' responses: Time. The management activity rated by the greatest percentage of superintendents (30%) as consuming *a great deal* of department chair time was serve as liaison between department members and the administration (MG8).

Superintendents' responses: Importance to the role. In the category of management, 48% of superintendents rated most highly the department chair's responsibility to plan and organize relevant meetings (MG7) for the department, or the organizational subsystem. And 37% rated serve as liaison between department members and the administration (MG8) most highly.

Superintendents' responses: Importance to continue to improve. Plan and organize relevant department meetings (MG7) was rated highly by superintendents as important for the department chair to continue to improve, with 56% of superintendents rating it as *extremely important* and 26% as *very important*.

Principals' responses: Time. Principals rated management activities as consuming a considerable amount of department chair time, with 18% rating develop and administer the budget (MG3), disseminate information to department staff (MG4), and serve as liaison between department members and the administration (MG8) all as consuming *a great deal* of department chair time.

Principals' responses: Importance to the role. The principals continue to stress the importance of communication in their responses to the Responsibility for Management category of the role of the department chair. The management activity seen by principals as of highest importance was serve as a liaison between department members and the administration (MG8), rated by 59% as *extremely important*, and 32% as *very important*. Ratings of extremely important were also given by 44% to plan and organize relevant department meetings (MG7) and to develop and administer the department budget (MG3).

Principals' responses: Importance to continue to improve. Serve as a liaison between department members and the administration (MG8) was rated by 50% of the principals as *extremely important* to improve, making it the activity rated of most importance to principals' management improvement agendas for department chairs. The activity rated by the principals as next most important to improve in management was plan and organize relevant

department meetings (MG7), with 44% marking it as *extremely important* to improve.

Responsibility for the Organization

Responsibility for the Organization focuses on the department chair's role in integrating, organizing, and coordinating the improvement effort of the academic department, as a subsystem within the organization of the larger system of the school. For this study, eight activities were identified in the category of department chair Responsibility for the Organization:

OR-1. Engage department members in an organized department growth and improvement effort

OR-2. Represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort

OR-3. Serve as department spokesperson at community meetings, board meetings

OR-4. Prepare requested information on department topics for principal, central office, school board

OR-5. Act as advocate for the protection of classroom instructional time

OR-6. Support teachers' professional needs and concerns

OR-7. Work with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program

OR-8. Participate in curricular planning and decision making at the district level.

Study participants were asked to address three separate issues in relation to each of these eight activities:

- Time--The amount of department chair time spent on the activity
- Role--The importance of the activity to the role of the department chair
- Improve--The importance for the department chair to continue to improve in the activity.

Charts C5 and C6, located in Appendix C, report frequencies of responses for the management category given by superintendents and principals, respectively.

Superintendents' responses: Time. Most superintendents did not perceive department chairs to be expending *a great deal* of department chair time in the area of Responsibility for the Organization. Only three activities—prepare requested information on department topics for principal, central office, school board (OR4), act as an advocate for the protection of classroom instructional time (OR5), and support teachers' professional needs and concerns(OR6)—were each rated by 15% of the superintendents as consuming *a great deal* of time.

Superintendents' responses: Importance to the role. The largest number of superintendents (48%) rated work

with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program (OR7) as *extremely important* to the role. Two other activities—engage department members in an organized department growth and improvement effort (OR1) and represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort (OR2)—were also rated as *extremely important* to the role by 41% of the superintendents.

Superintendents' responses: Importance to continue to improve. For this issue, *extremely important* ratings were given by 56% of the superintendents to engage department members in an organized department growth and improvement effort (OR2), by 52% to work with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program (OR7), and by 48% to represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort (OR2).

Principals' responses: Time. No activity was rated by more than four principals as consuming *a great deal* of department chair time. The activity rated by the most principals, (38%), to consume *a good deal* of time was participate in curricular planning and decision making at the district level (OR8). One activity, work with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program, was rated by 21% as consuming *no time* (OR7).

Principals' responses: Importance to the role. Principals rated engage department members in an organized department improvement effort (OR1) highly, with 41% rating it as *extremely important* to the role and 47% rating it as *very important* to the role. Principals also rated represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort (OR2) very highly, with 44% of the principals rating it as *extremely important* and 47% rating it as *very important*.

Principals' responses: Importance to continue to improve. The organizational area rated by principals as of highest importance to improve was (OR1) engage department members in an organized growth and improvement effort, with 56% of the principals marking it *extremely important* to improve. The activity receiving the second highest ranking in importance to improve was work with other department chairs to develop an integrated instructional program (OR7), with 50% of the principals marking it as *extremely important*. Consistent with its ranking by principals in the area of importance to the role, represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort (OR2) also received a high rating in its importance to improve, with 47% of the principals marking it as *extremely important*.

Responsibility for Program

For this study, the category of department chair Responsibility for Program is defined by eight activities:

PG-1. Facilitate development of curriculum (philosophy, goals, objectives)

PG-2. Supervise the implementation of curriculum

PG-3. Monitor the continued maintenance of curriculum

PG-4. Devise and implement process for program evaluation

PG-5. Provide leadership in the selection and development of instructional materials

PG-6. Coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials

PG-7. Assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses

PG-8. Establish goals for program improvement.

Study participants were asked to address three separate issues in relation to each of these eight activities:

- Time--The amount of department chair time spent on the activity
- Role--The importance of the activity to the role of the department chair
- Improve--The importance for the department chair to continue to improve in the activity.

Charts C7 and C8, located in Appendix C, report frequencies of responses for the program category given by superintendents and principals, respectively.

Superintendents' responses: Time. None of the activities in this category were seen to require a great deal of time. In response to coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials (PG6), 52% rated it as consuming *a good deal* of time. Provide leadership in the selection and development of instructional materials (PG5) was rated by 44% of the superintendents as consuming *a good deal* of department chair time.

Superintendents' responses: Importance to the role. Four program activities were rated by more than 40% of the superintendents to be *extremely important* to the role of the department chair: supervise the implementation of curriculum (PG2), 41%; devise and implement processes for program evaluation (PG4), 41%; assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses (PG7), 44%; and establish goals for program improvement (PG8), 41%.

Superintendents' responses: Importance to continue to improve. Consistent with their high ratings for importance to the role, Responsibility for Program activities were also rated very highly by superintendents in regard to their importance for the department chair to continue to improve. Assess learning outcomes to identify

program strengths and weaknesses (PG7) was rated by 59% of the superintendents as *extremely important* to improve. Over one-half of the superintendents (52%) also rated supervise the implementation of curriculum (PG2) as *extremely important* to improve. Several additional activities were also rated as *very important* to improve by more than 40% of the superintendents: devise and implement process for program evaluation (PG4), 44%; provide leadership in the selection and development of instructional materials (PG5), 48%; coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials (PG6), 41%; and establish goals for program improvement (PG8), 48%.

Principals' responses: Time. Coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental material (PG5) was perceived by 15% of the principals as consuming the greatest amount of department chair time within the category of Responsibility for Program.

Principals' responses: Importance to the role. In the category of Responsibility for Program, principals gave strong ratings for the importance of several department chair activities. A high rating was given to facilitate the development of curriculum (PG1), with 56% of the principals rating it *extremely important*. Activity PG2, supervise the implementation of curriculum, was also rated highly, with 50% of the principals rating it as

extremely important to the department chair role. Another activity receiving a high rating from principals was assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses (PG7), with 41% of the principals rating it *extremely important* to the role.

Principals' responses: Importance to continue to improve. The program area rated by principals as of highest importance to improve was facilitate the development of curriculum (PG1), with 62% of the principals rating it as *extremely important* to improve. In addition, two other activities were rated by over 50% of the principals as *extremely important* to improve: supervise the implementation of curriculum (PG2), 53% and assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses (PG7), 56%.

Responsibility for Supervision

The category of Responsibility for Supervision is directly related to the department chair's role in supervising the instruction of other teachers. For this study, 11 different activities were considered to make up the category of department chair Responsibility for Supervision:

SP-1. Model a variety of instructional strategies

SP-2. Assist teachers in developing professional growth plans

SP-3. Encourage experimentation and innovation among teachers

SP-4. Coordinate instruction among department members

SP-5. Observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback

SP-6. Monitor teacher lesson plans

SP-7. Practice clinical supervision (pre-conference, data collection, post conference)

SP-8. Communicate high expectations for teacher performance

SP-9. Assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction

SP-10. Organize plan for teacher sharing, peer coaching (e.g., videotaped lessons, classroom visitations)

SP-11. Evaluate teacher performance.

Study participants were asked to address three separate issues for each activity:

- Time--The amount of department chair time spent on the activity
- Role--The importance of the activity to the role of the department chair
- Improve--The importance for the department chair to continue to improve in the activity.

In Appendix C, Charts C9 and C10 report frequency distributions of responses for the supervision category given by superintendents and principals, respectively.

Superintendents' responses: Time. Most superintendents did not rate supervisory responsibilities as consuming *a good deal* of department chair time. Communicate high expectations for teacher performance (SP8) was rated as consuming *a great deal* of department chair time by 18.52% of the superintendents. The next highest rating for taking *a great deal* of time was given by 15% of the superintendents to assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction (SP9).

Superintendents' responses: Importance to the role. In the category of supervision, superintendents rated areas associated with expectations for teacher performance and the improvement of teacher instruction very highly. The supervision activity rated by superintendents to be of the highest importance to the role of the department chair was communicate high expectations for teacher performance (SP8), with 59% of the responding superintendents rating it as *extremely important*. Superintendents also rated assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction (SP9) very highly, with 56% rating it *extremely important*.

Superintendents' responses: Importance to continue to improve. The two academic department chair activities superintendents rated most important to improve were again

communicate high expectations for teacher performance (SP8) and assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction (SP9). Both activities had 63% of the superintendents rating them *extremely important* to improve.

Principals' responses: Time. Very few principals rated any of the supervision activities as consuming *a great deal* of department chair time. Two principals (5%) gave a rating of *a great deal* of time for observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback (SP5) and practice clinical supervision (SP7).

Principals' responses: Importance to the role. In the category of Responsibility for Supervision, principals stressed the need for department chairs to communicate high expectations for teacher performance (SP8), with 44% of the principals ranking it *extremely important* to the role. The two other activities rated next highest by principals relate directly to the importance of teachers working to improve their instruction. Assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction (SP9) was rated by 38% of the principals as *extremely important* to the department chair role, and model a variety of instructional strategies (SP1) was rated by 35% of the principals as *extremely important* to the role.

Principals' responses: Importance to continue to improve. Forty percent of the principals rated a total of

five activities in the category of the department chair's Responsibility for Supervision as *extremely important* to improve. The five other highest improvement ratings went to model a variety of instructional strategies (SP1), 41%, encourage experimentation and innovation among teachers (SP3), 44%, observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback (SP5), 41%, communicate high expectations for teacher performance (SP8), 44%, and assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction (SP9), 41%.

Summary

A major purpose of this study was to use the perceptions of superintendents and high school principals to establish an administrative voice regarding the role of the high school academic department chair in Oregon. To characterize this administrative voice, this section summarizes the perceptions of superintendents and principals regarding five categories of responsibility comprising the role of the high school academic department chair: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision. Each of the five categories was divided into specific questionnaire items representing activities performed by high school department chairs. Participants responded in relation to the amount of time spent on the item, the importance of the item to the department chair role, and the importance for the department chair to continue to improve on the activity.

1. Responsibility for Human Relations. For seven of the nine human relations activities, more superintendents than principals perceived department chairs to spend *a great deal of time* in carrying out those responsibilities. More principals, who work in closer proximity to department chairs than do superintendents, rated seven of the nine activities as *extremely important* to the department chair role and eight of the nine activities as *extremely important* for the department chair to continue to improve.

Predictably, in the category of Responsibility for Human Relations good communications were found to be considered a cornerstone. Both for importance to the role and importance to continue to improve, principals and superintendents rated most highly the department chair's ability to work well with people by maintaining regular, open communication and by promoting an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement. Fullan's (1991) framework for effective school improvement—the necessity of "top-down," "bottom-up" collaborations, which was a motivating force behind this study and its companion study—recognizes open and regular communication as essential to an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement.

In addition, principals demonstrated considerable respect for the importance of people working well together

if school effectiveness is to be realized. As Goldring and Rallis (1993) suggested, "Teachers are the agents of change—without them, change will not occur . . . [and] teachers are the most immediate force affecting the principal" (p. 6). Consistent with this assumption about the importance of good working relationships among teachers and administrators, principals gave their highest ratings on the entire questionnaire to the importance of department chair activities in the area of Human Relations Responsibility.

2. Responsibility for Management. In the category of Management, principals continued to stress the importance of effective communication. The management activity given the highest ratings by principals both for importance to the role and importance to continue to improve was (MG8) serve as liaison between department members and the administration. Principals clearly place high value on the communications role of the high school academic department chair.

Superintendents, however, gave their highest ratings both for importance to the role and importance to improve in the Responsibility for Management category (MG7) to plan and organize relevant department meetings. This high rating by superintendents for the importance of planning and organizing within the individual department seems to confirm the superintendents' valuing of the effective

functioning of subsystems within the larger organization. It would also seem to suggest an awareness consistent with Wimpelberg's (1987) observation that "the condition that hurts instructional quality and school improvement the most is lack of coordination and control between activities of the organization" (p. 105).

3. Responsibility for the Organization. In the category of Responsibility for the Organization, both superintendents and high school principals placed high value upon the department chair's role in bringing about focused, coordinated school improvement efforts. Both principals and superintendents stressed the importance of department chairs' engaging teachers in the department's organized improvement efforts, being actively involved in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement plan, and working with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program.

Superintendents and high school principals clearly affirm the importance of the role of the high school department chair in bringing about organized and coordinated improvement of the instructional program within their individual departments and across disciplines within the entire school. This depiction of the department chair supports the common view from the literature of the department chair role as one having multiple and far-reaching expectations.

4. Responsibility for Program. In the category of Responsibility for Program, both superintendents and high school principals rated several department chair activities as important to the role of the high school department chair as well as important for the department chair to continue to improve. These high ratings for so many activities in the program category confirm the high value placed upon the department chair's role as a program and curriculum specialist. Administrators apparently still hold to the turn-of-the-century belief that the complex, highly specialized, extensive nature of the high school curriculum requires experts who are very knowledgeable about the curriculum of the individual disciplines. This view of the role of the high school department chair includes traditional expectations for curriculum expertise in addition to the leadership expectations in human relations and management.

Superintendents and high school principals strongly reconfirm the high value placed upon the traditional role expectation of the high school department chair as a program expert. Administrators gave very high ratings to the importance to the department chair role of supervising and developing curriculum, implementing program evaluation, assessing learning outcomes, and establishing goals for program improvement. These traditional role expectations for department chairs also received extremely

high ratings from superintendents and high school principals on the issue of importance for the department chair to continue to improve.

5. Responsibility for Supervision. In the category of Responsibility for Supervision, both superintendents and high school principals rated activities associated with high expectations for teacher performance and the improvement of teacher instruction very highly. This response pattern is consistent with administrative responses in other categories. Administrators seem to value creating the conditions for success, such as setting high expectations and creating an atmosphere which promotes continuous improvement, in addition to focusing on specific areas for improvement, such as effective communication, or in the case of supervision, the direct assistance of teachers to improve their instruction.

On the issue of importance for the department chair to continue to improve, administrators also gave very high marks to several activities in the supervision category. Both superintendents and high school principals placed very high value on department chairs improving their work in the direct supervision of teachers. Principals rated the importance of improvement extremely highly for five activities in the supervision category: modeling instructional strategies, encouraging innovation, observing teachers and providing feedback, communicating

high expectations for teacher performance, and assisting teachers with the improvement of their instruction. Superintendents gave a similar response, with over 60% responding that it was *extremely important* for department chairs to improve in the activities of communicating high expectations for teacher performance and assisting teachers with the improvement of their instruction. The response by superintendents to the importance of communicating high performance expectations to teachers and to assisting teachers with the improvement of their instruction seems to support Fullan's (1991) assertion that the top of the administrative hierarchy is of singular importance to "setting the expectations and tone of the pattern for change within the local district" (p. 191). These responses seem to indicate that superintendents clearly value change in the form of improvement of instruction.

Testing of the Hypotheses

Preliminary chi-square analysis produced multiple instances of unacceptably small cell size. Since expected cell sizes of at least five are required to conduct a valid chi-square test, it was determined that it would be useful to collapse some of the data for statistical examination. When investigator examination of the frequency of responses for levels 1 (*no time; no*

importance) and 2 (*little time; little importance*) on the rating scales disclosed no meaningful discrimination for purposes of this study, these two categories were collapsed into one for chi-square analysis of each of the null hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis was that perceptions of superintendents and those of high school principals would not differ significantly regarding activities comprising five categories of responsibility of the high school academic department chair in relation to the amount of department chair time devoted to each activity, the importance of each activity to the department chair role, and the importance for the department chair to continue to improve in each activity. Frequency distributions of superintendent and principal responses to the activities comprising each of the five categories of department chair responsibility (human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision) are located in Appendix C, Charts C1 through C5, respectively.

For Hypothesis 1, application of chi-square found no significant differences within any category. Therefore, Null Hypothesis 1 could not be rejected.

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis, stated in the null form for test purposes, was that administrators in the role of superintendent and administrators in the role of high school principal would not differ significantly in their rank ordering of the importance of the five categories of department chair responsibility delineated for this study. Table 6 provides frequency data used for testing Hypothesis 2. Chi-square values are reported in Table 7.

Table 6

Ranking of Five Categories of Department Chair Responsibility [By Frequency of Response for Each Ranking], Subjects: Superintendents (N = 27) and High School Principals (N = 34)

Category of Department Chair Responsibility	Ranking				
	1	2	3	4	5
Human Relations					
Superintendents	10	6	4	4	3
Principals	14	4	4	12	0
Management					
Superintendents	3	3	4	12	5
Principals	4	5	6	6	13
The Organization					
Superintendents	4	7	9	4	3
Principals	4	7	9	11	3
Program					
Superintendents	5	9	7	3	3
Principals	10	13	9	2	0
Supervision					
Superintendents	5	2	3	4	13
Principals	2	5	6	3	18

The rating scale was 1–5: (1) *most important*; (5) *least important*.

Table 7

Summary of Chi-square Values: Rank Ordering of Five Categories of Department Chair Responsibility by Superintendents and Principals, Subjects: N = 61

Category	N	χ^2	df	p
Human Relations	61	7.360	4	0.118
Management	61	5.872	4	0.209
The Organization	61	2.496	4	0.645
Program	61	5.108	4	0.276
Supervision	61	3.767	4	0.438

Chi-square analysis of the rank ordering by superintendents and principals of the five categories of department chair responsibility according to their perceived importance to the role of the department chair disclosed no significant differences at the $p < .05$ level between the perceptions of the two groups. Therefore, Null Hypothesis 2 could not be rejected.

Summary

As previously indicated, analysis of data for Hypothesis 1 revealed no significant incongruence of perception between superintendents and principals in any of the 132 items in Part II of the questionnaire. Neither did analysis of data for Hypothesis 2 identify significant differences at the $p < .05$ level of confidence in the rank orderings of importance the superintendents and principals

assigned to the five categories of department chair responsibility. Therefore, no conflicting expectations could be inferred between the expectations of superintendents and and those of principals for performance of the role of high school department chair.

The Voice of the Administrator

No significant differences ($p < .05$) were found between superintendents and principals for any of the questionnaire items as applied to Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2. These strikingly similar perceptions of superintendents and high school principals over the entire 132 items on the questionnaire as well as in the rank ordering of the categories of department chair role responsibilities is a major finding of this study. Such unpredicted similarity of perception also allowed the researcher to collapse the responses of the two administrative roles into one group of administrative responses—the voice of the administrator. Collapsing the administrative data for statistical purposes increased the size of N for this reporting category, thereby lessening the differences in total numbers comparison between perceptions of the administrator and perceptions of the department chair.

This study examined the potential for the high school academic department chair to function as an administrative

resource in five role areas: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision. In determining the congruence of perceptions held by administrators and department chairs, the study focused on three issues: time, importance to the role of the department chair, and importance for the chair to continue to improve. Charts E1 through E5, located in Appendix E, provide complete frequency distributions on which the statistical tests for the next three hypotheses were based.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis, stated in the null form for test purposes, was that perceptions of administrators and those of high school department chairs would not differ significantly regarding the amount of department chair time required to perform activities defined for this study as comprising five categories of role responsibility of the high school academic department chair: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision.

Table 8 identifies the 11 activities for which chi-square analysis of frequencies of responses of administrators and high school department chairs revealed significant differences in perceptions between the two groups at the $p = < .05$ desired level of confidence on the

issue of amount of time spent. Null Hypothesis 3 was therefore rejected.

Table 8

Summary of Significant Chi-square Values: Amount of Department Chair Time Spent as Perceived by Administrators and Department Chairs, Subjects: N = 179

Activity	N	χ^2	df	p
HR6T*	179	8.469	3	0.037
MG1T	179	9.448	3	0.024
MG3T	179	9.256	3	0.026
MG4T	179	10.701	3	0.013
MG5T	179	9.666	3	0.022
MG8T	179	9.664	3	0.022
PG4T	179	9.943	3	0.019
PG5T	179	13.887	3	0.003
PG6T	179	14.924	3	0.002
SP6T	179	8.132	3	0.043
SP10T	179	11.929	3	0.008

* More than one-fifth of fitted cells were sparse (frequency < 5).

Responsibility for human relations. For only one activity, maintain regular, open communication with department members (HR6), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 8.469$, $p < 0.037$, was any evidence of significant difference at the $p < .05$ level of confidence found, and the fact that more than one-fifth of the cells in this test were sparse made that finding suspect. It was concluded that there was a high degree of congruence in the perceptions of administrators and department chairs in regard to how much

time department chairs devote to their human relations responsibilities.

Responsibility for management. In testing Hypothesis 3 in the category of Responsibility for Management, for five of the eight activities chi-square analysis revealed significant differences at the $p < .05$ level between administrators and department chairs in their perceptions of the amount of department chair time devoted to the activity as reported in Table 8. Statistically significant differences in perception were found for develop department teaching schedule and assignments (MG1), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 9.448$, $p < 0.024$, develop and administer the department budget (MG3), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 9.256$, $p < 0.026$, disseminate information to department staff (MG4), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 10.701$, $p < 0.013$, allocate and maintain equipment, instructional materials, and facilities (MG5), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 9.666$, $p < 0.022$, and serve as liaison between department members and the administration (MG8), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 9.664$, $p < 0.022$. Greater numbers of department chairs perceived themselves to spend greater amounts of time on scheduling, budgeting, disseminating information, and acting as a liaison than administrators perceived the chairs to spend. Administrators perceived allocation and maintenance of equipment, instructional materials, and facilities (MG5)

to require more time than department chairs perceived themselves to spend on this activity.

Responsibility for the organization. No significant differences at the $p < .05$ level of confidence were found in perceptions of the amount of time spent on activities related to the organization by testing the responses of administrators against those of the department chairs. Presumably, congruence in perceptions between administrators and department chairs would preclude this category's being a source of role conflict for the chairs.

Responsibility for program. As reported in Table 8, chi-square testing of administrator and department chair responses in this category identified significant differences at the $p < .05$ level of confidence in perceptions of the amount of department chair time devoted to three activities: devise and implement process for program evaluation (PG4), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 9.943$, $p < 0.019$, provide leadership in the selection and development of instructional materials (PG5), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 13.887$, $p < 0.003$, and coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials (PG6), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 14.924$, $p < 0.002$. Administrators perceived the department chairs to spend more time on the process of program evaluation than the chairs perceived themselves to spend, whereas the chairs perceived themselves to spend

more time on materials selection than the administrators saw them as spending.

Responsibility for supervision. Chi-square analysis used to test Hypothesis 3 in the category of Responsibility for Supervision revealed significant differences at the desired level of confidence ($p < .05$) in perceptions of administrators and department chairs with regard to the amount of department chair time spent on two department chair activities. Although the majority of both groups agreed that chairs spend *little* or *no time* on the activities, administrators perceived department chairs to spend more time on monitor teacher lesson plans (SP6), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 8.132$, $p < 0.043$, and organize plan for teacher sharing (SP10), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 11.929$, $p < 0.008$, than chairs perceived themselves to devote to those activities.

In summary for the issue of time, congruence of perceptions between administrators and department chairs was found regarding the amount of time spent on activities in human relations and the organization. Thus, it was concluded that there was relatively little potential for role conflict caused by different perceptions about how department chairs currently spend their time in two of the five categories of department chair role responsibilities.

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis, stated in the null form for test purposes, was that perceptions of administrators and those of high school department chairs would not differ significantly regarding the importance to the department chair role for activities comprising five categories of role responsibility of the high school academic department chair: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision.

Table 9 identifies the 18 activities for which chi-square analysis of frequencies of responses of administrators and high school department chairs (refer to Appendix E) revealed significant differences in perception between the two groups at the $p = < .05$ level on the issue of the importance of each activity to the role of the department chair.

Therefore, Null Hypothesis 4 was rejected.

Responsibility for human relations. Chi-square analysis revealed significant differences at the desired level of confidence ($p < .05$) in perceptions of administrators and department chairs for three human relations activities with regard to their importance to the role of department chair.

Table 9

Summary of Significant Chi-square Values: Importance to the Role of Department Chair as Perceived by Administrators and Department Chairs, Subjects: N = 179

Activity	N	χ^2	df	p
HR3P	179	8.284	3	0.040
HR4P	179	8.395	3	0.039
HR8P*	179	10.635	3	0.014
MG1P*	179	8.781	3	0.032
OR2P	179	13.368	3	0.004
PG2P	179	7.867	3	0.049
PG3P	179	9.905	3	0.019
PG4P	179	16.459	3	0.001
PG7P	179	17.017	3	0.001
PG8P	179	8.656	3	0.034
SP1P	179	16.705	3	0.001
SP2P	179	13.019	3	0.005
SP5P	179	11.439	3	0.010
SP6P	179	19.336	3	0.000
SP7P	179	16.423	3	0.001
SP8P	179	23.483	3	0.000
SP9P	179	17.763	3	0.000
SP10P	179	23.406	3	0.000

* More than one-fifth of fitted cells were sparse (frequency < 5).

Responsibility for management. Chi-square analysis revealed no valid identification of significant differences at the desired level of confidence ($p < .05$) in perceptions of administrators and department chairs with regard to the importance of any management activity to the role of department chair. One activity, develop department teaching schedule and assignments (MG1), was seen as more important by department chairs than by

administrators, but with more than one-fifth of the cells being sparse, the test result is uncertain. The congruence of perceptions of administrators and department chairs would suggest no potential for role conflict for the department chair because of differing values in the category of management.

Responsibility for the organization. Represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort (OR2) was found to yield a significant chi-square value $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 14.04$, $p < 0.007$. Administrators perceived the department chairs' leadership in the school's organized improvement effort to be significantly more important than did the department chairs themselves.

Responsibility for program. Significant chi-square values were found for more than one-half of the activities. As shown in Chart E4 (Appendix E), higher percentages of administrators valued the importance of five program activities to the role of the department chair more highly than did the chairs themselves. In the category of Responsibility for Program, the degree of congruence in perceptions of administrators and department chairs was also concluded to be lower than it was for either Human Relations or Management Responsibility, therefore suggesting more potential for role conflict.

Responsibility for supervision. The most incongruence was revealed in what was most highly valued by administrators and by department chairs. As shown in Table 9, for 8 of the 11 activities, significant chi-square values were obtained, with administrators in all instances placing significantly higher importance on these activities than the department chairs did.

For the issue of importance to the role of the department chair, there were significant differences in perceptions of administrators and department chairs at the $p = < .05$ level of confidence for a total of 18 of the 44 activities as shown in Table 9.

Hypothesis 5

The fifth hypothesis, stated in the null form for test purposes, was that perceptions of administrators and those of high school department chairs would not differ regarding the importance for the department chair to continue to improve in the performance of activities defined for this study as comprising five categories of role responsibility of the high school academic department chair: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision.

Table 10 summarizes the results of chi-square analysis of frequencies of responses of administrators and high school department chairs (refer to Appendix E) which revealed significant differences in perceptions between

the two groups at the p = < .05 level on the issue of importance for the department chair to continue to improve in the performance of each activity comprising his/her role as department chair. Therefore, Null Hypothesis 5 was rejected.

Table 10

Summary of Chi-square Values: Importance for the Department Chair to Continue to Improve as Perceived by Administrators and Department Chairs, Subjects: N = 179

Response Item	N	χ^2	df	p
HR3M	179	14.170	3	0.003
HR4M	179	8.674	3	0.034
HR7M*	179	10.232	3	0.017
HR8M*	179	11.681	3	0.009
OR1M	179	10.749	3	0.013
OR2M	179	18.015	3	0.000
PG1M	179	11.930	3	0.008
PG2M	179	13.294	3	0.004
PG3M	179	9.407	3	0.024
PG4M	179	17.257	3	0.001
PG7M	179	26.264	3	0.000
PG8M	179	10.937	3	0.012
SP1M	179	19.606	3	0.000
SP2M	179	16.025	3	0.001
SP5M	179	11.705	3	0.008
SP6M	179	14.344	3	0.002
SP7M	179	21.456	3	0.000
SP8M	179	23.586	3	0.000
SP9M	179	16.201	3	0.001
SP10M	179	22.244	3	0.000

* More than one-fifth of fitted cells were sparse (frequency < 5).

Responsibility for human relations. Testing revealed two activities in which significant differences existed between the perceptions of administrators and department chairs regarding the issue of importance for the department chair to continue to improve: facilitate effective conflict resolution (HR3), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 14.170, p < 0.003$, and foster cooperative problem solving (HR4), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 8.674, p < 0.034$.

A higher proportion of administrators rated both these activities as more important for the department chair to continue to improve than the chairs themselves rated them to be. Overall, however, there appeared to be a fairly high degree of congruence in the perceptions of administrators and department chairs regarding the importance of the department chair's continuing to improve in the category of Responsibility for Human Relations.

Responsibility for management. Chi-square analysis revealed no significant differences in the frequencies of responses of administrators and department chairs for any of the activities in the category of Responsibility for Management in testing Hypothesis 5. Congruence was apparent between perceptions of administrators and department chairs.

Responsibility for the organization. Perceptions of administrators and department chairs were found to differ significantly for two activities in this category: engage

department members in an organized department growth and improvement effort (OR1), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 10.749$, $p < 0.013$, and represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort (OR2), $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 18.015$, $p < 0.000$.

Administrators perceived both of these activities to be significantly more important for the department chairs to continue to improve than did the department chairs.

Responsibility for program. Chi-square analysis revealed significant differences in perception ($p < .05$) for more than one-half of the activities. Facilitate development of curriculum (PG1), supervise the implementation of curriculum (PG2), monitor the continued maintenance of curriculum (PG3), devise and implement process of program evaluation (PG4), assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses (PG7), and establish goals for program improvement (PG8) all yielded a chi-square statistic considered significant at the $p < .05$ level of confidence (refer to Table 10).

In all instances in which significant differences were found, the pattern of disagreement was the same. Administrators consistently rated the importance of the department chairs' continuing to improve in their program responsibilities higher than the chairs themselves rated the importance of their continuing to improve in this area.

Responsibility for supervision. Significant differences in perception ($p < .05$) were found for the majority of the activities from the perspective of importance for the department chair to continue to improve (see Table 10).

In Responsibility for Supervision, administrators' expectations for the department chair's continuing to improve in model a variety of instructional strategies (SP1), assist teachers in developing professional growth plans (SP2), observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback (SP5), monitor teacher lesson plans (SP6), practice clinical supervision (SP7), communicate high expectations for teacher performance (SP8), assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction (SP9), and organize plan for teaching sharing, peer coaching (SP10) were again higher than were the expectations of the chairs themselves.

The greatest degree of incongruence between perceptions of administrators and department chairs was found in Responsibility for Supervision, a pattern of disagreement consistent with that reported for Responsibility for Program. Administrators again considered the chairs' continuing to improve in their supervisory responsibilities to be of higher importance than the department chairs themselves rated its importance.

In conclusion, Null Hypothesis 5 was rejected. For the issue of importance for the department chair to continue to improve, significant differences of perceptions between administrators and department chairs at the $p = < .05$ level of confidence were found for a total of 20 of the 44 activities.

Summary

Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 addressed five categories of department chair role responsibilities in relation to three issues: time spent, importance to the role, and importance for the chair to continue to improve. Results of chi-square testing of responses from administrators and department chairs may be summarized as follows:

Time spent. Significant differences ($p < .05$) in perception between administrators and department chairs were found regarding the amount of time department chairs are perceived to spend on their department chair role responsibilities. Although no significant differences in perceptions of the amount of time spent were found in Responsibility for Human Relations or the Organization, administrators perceived department chairs to spend more time than the chairs perceived themselves to spend in a total of four activities in the remaining three categories:

- Management

  Allocate and maintain of equipment, materials, and facilities (MG5)

- Program

  Evaluate program (PG4)

- Supervision

  Monitor lesson plans (SP6)

  Organize peer sharing and coaching (SP10).

On the other hand, department chairs perceived themselves to be spending more time than their administrators perceived them to be spending on a total of seven department chair activities within three of the five categories.

- Human Relations

  Maintain regular communication (HR6)

- Management

  Schedule teachers (MG1)

  Administer budget (MG3)

  Disseminate information (MG4)

  Act as liaison between teachers and administrators (MG8)

- Program

  Select instructional materials (PG5)

  Select textbooks (PG6).

Importance to the department chair role. Statistically significant ($p < .05$) differences in

perception between administrators and department chairs were found in several categories regarding the importance of specific activities to the role of the department chair. Administrators perceived 17 department chair activities to be more important to the department chair role than chairs perceived those same activities to be.

- Human Relations

  Facilitate conflict resolution (HR3)

  Foster cooperative problem solving (HR4)

  Encourage continuous improvement (HR8)

- The Organization

  Represent department in school's improvement effort (OR2)

- Program

  Supervise curriculum development (PG2)

  Monitor curriculum maintenance (PG3)

  Devise and implement program evaluation processes (PG4)

  Assess learning outcomes (PG7)

  Establish goals for program improvement (PG8)

- Supervision

  Model instructional strategies (SP1)

  Assist teachers with planned professional growth (SP2)

  Observe teachers and provide feedback (SP5)

  Monitor lesson plans (SP6)

Practice clinical supervision (SP7)

Communicate high expectations for teacher performance (SP8)

Assist teachers with instructional improvement (SP9)

Organize plan for teacher sharing, peer coaching (SP10).

Of all 44 activities across the five categories, department chairs perceived only one activity to be significantly ($p < .05$) more important to the role of department chair than administrators perceived it to be. This activity was develop department teaching schedule and assignments (MG1).

Importance for the department chair to continue to improve. Statistically significant ($p < .05$) differences in perception between administrators and department chairs were found in several categories regarding the importance of specific activities for the department chair to continue to improve. Administrators perceived 20 department chair activities to be significantly more important for the department chairs to continue to improve than the chairs perceived those same activities to be.

Human Relations:

Facilitate conflict resolution (HR3)

Foster cooperative problem solving (HR4)

Practice collaborative, participative decision making (HR7)

Encourage continuous improvement (HR8)

The Organization:

Engage department members in organized improvement (OR1)

Represent department in school's improvement effort (OR2)

Program:

Facilitate curriculum development (PG1)

Supervise curriculum development (PG2)

Monitor curriculum maintenance (PG3)

Devise and implement program evaluation processes (PG4)

Assess learning outcomes (PG7)

Establish goals for program improvement (PG8)

Supervision:

Model instructional strategies (SP1)

Assist teachers with planned professional growth (SP2)

Observe teachers and provide feedback (SP5)

Monitor lesson plans (SP6)

Practice clinical supervision (SP7)

Communicate high expectations for teacher performance (SP8)

Assist teachers with instructional improvement (SP9)

Organize plan for teacher sharing, peer coaching (SP10).

Department chairs did not perceive any one of the 44 activities to be more important for the chairs to continue to improve than the administrators perceived it to be.

Hypothesis 6

To determine how administrators and department chairs perceived the relative importance of each category of department chair role responsibility, the questionnaire asked them to rank order the five categories from one (*most important*) to five (*least important*). Hypothesis 6 was that there would be no significant differences in the rankings of relative importance that administrators and department chairs would assign to the five categories of department chair responsibility.

Table 11 provides frequency distribution data on which Hypothesis 6 was tested.

Table 12 reports statistical values obtained through testing Hypothesis 6 by chi-square analysis.

Table 11

Rank Ordering of Importance of Five Categories of Department Chair Responsibility [By Frequency of Responses (no.) and Percentages (%) for Each Ranking], Subjects: Administrators (N = 61); Department Chairs (N = 118)

Category of Responsibility	Ranking 1		2		3		4		5	
	(no.)	%	(no.)	%	(no.)	%	(no.)	%	(no.)	%
Human Relations										
Administrators	(24)	39.34	(10)	16.39	(8)	13.11	(16)	26.23	(3)	4.92
Department Chairs	(51)	43.22	(26)	22.03	(12)	10.17	(21)	17.80	(8)	6.78
Management										
Administrators	(7)	11.48	(8)	13.11	(10)	16.39	(18)	29.51	(18)	29.51
Department Chairs	(26)	22.03	(25)	21.19	(25)	21.19	(37)	31.36	(5)	4.24
The Organization										
Administrators	(8)	13.11	(14)	22.95	(18)	29.51	(15)	24.59	(6)	9.84
Department Chairs	(13)	11.02	(27)	22.88	(35)	29.66	(34)	28.81	(9)	7.63
Program										
Administrators	(15)	24.59	(22)	36.07	(16)	26.23	(5)	8.20	(3)	4.92
Department Chairs	(22)	18.64	(34)	28.81	(37)	31.36	(20)	16.95	(5)	4.24
Supervision										
Administrators	(7)	11.48	(7)	11.48	(9)	14.75	(7)	11.48	(31)	50.82
Department Chairs	(4)	3.39	(5)	4.24	(9)	7.63	(6)	5.08	(94)	79.66

The rating scale was 1–5: (1) *most important*–(5) *least important*.

Table 12

Summary of Statistical Values: Rank Ordering by Administrators and Department Chairs of Five Categories of Department Chair Responsibility, Subjects: N = 179

Category	N	χ^2	df	p
Human Relations	179	2.703	4	0.609
Management	179	24.356	4	0.000
The Organization	179	0.647	4	0.958
Program	179	3.968	4	0.410
Supervision	179	16.503	4	0.002

Since significant differences were found in three of the five categories of department chair responsibility, Null Hypothesis was rejected. Both administrators and department chairs gave the highest ranking to the importance of fostering positive human relations. Approximately 40% of both groups (administrators: n = 24, 39%; department chairs: n = 51, 43%) ranked Responsibility for Human Relations as the most important department chair role category.

Also of interest is the fact that both administrators and department chairs gave the department chair Responsibility for Supervision the lowest ranking. Slightly more than 50% (n = 31, 51%) of the administrators perceived supervision as the least important of the five

department chair role categories, while 80% (n = 94) of the department chairs perceived their responsibilities for supervision as the least important of the five department chair areas of role responsibility.

While no significant differences at the $p < .05$ level of confidence were observed between the perceptions of administrators and department chairs regarding the relative importance of department chair responsibilities for human relations, the organization, and program, there were definite disagreements regarding the importance of responsibilities in management and supervision. Department chairs ranked their Responsibility for Management at a significantly higher level of importance than administrators ranked that aspect of the role of the department chair, $\chi^2(4, N = 179) = 24.356$, $p < 0.000$. Even though both groups ranked supervision responsibilities as the least important of the five role categories, administrators gave Responsibility for Supervision a significantly higher level of importance than did department chairs, $\chi^2(4, N = 179) = 16.503$, $p < 0.002$.

Hypothesis 7

The seventh hypothesis, stated in the null form for test purposes, was that administrators in the role of superintendent and administrators in the role of high

school principal would not differ in their perceptions of the potential for the high school academic department chair to act as an administrative resource for educational leadership.

Potential for leadership. Table 13 displays frequencies of responses given by superintendents and high school principals for each of the statements designed to ascertain opinions regarding the educational leadership potential for the high school academic department chair.

Both superintendents (n = 19, 70%) and principals (n = 28, 82%) gave their highest ratings to the importance of the instructional leadership role of the high school academic department chair.

Chi-square analysis of the frequency responses shown in Table 13 yielded only one significant difference at the $p = < .05$ level of confidence. Opinion (12), being in a department chair role enhances the chair's own classroom instruction, yielded a significant chi-square statistic, $\chi^2(3, N = 179) = 9.200$, $p < 0.027$, with principals more strongly agreeing with the statement than did superintendents. Null Hypothesis 7 was therefore rejected.

Table 13

Opinions of Department Chair Potential for Educational Leadership [By Frequencies (no.) and Percentages (%) of Responses] Superintendents (N = 27), Principals (N = 34)

Opinion Statement	Responses 2 (no.)	2 %	3 (no.)	3 %	4 (no.)	4 %	5 (no.)	5 %
A successful department chair:								
1. must be a strong leader.								
Superintendents	(0)	0.00	(3)	11.11	(10)	37.04	(14)	51.85
Principals	(1)	2.94	(0)	0.00	(16)	47.06	(17)	50.00
2. must be a good manager.								
Superintendents	(0)	0.00	(1)	3.70	(21)	77.78	(5)	18.52
Principals	(0)	0.00	(2)	5.88	(20)	58.82	(12)	35.29
3. should be a master teacher.								
Superintendents	(1)	3.70	(2)	7.40	(7)	25.93	(17)	62.96
Principals	(0)	0.00	(0)	0.00	(12)	35.29	(22)	64.71
4. should assist teachers to improve their instruction.								
Superintendents	(0)	0.00	(2)	7.40	(9)	33.33	(16)	59.26
Principals	(0)	0.00	(1)	2.94	(17)	50.00	(16)	47.60
5. should have some training in supervision.								
Superintendents	(1)	3.70	(2)	7.40	(17)	62.96	(7)	25.93
Principals	(0)	0.00	(6)	17.65	(16)	47.06	(12)	35.29
6. should participate in the implementation of plans of assistance.								
Superintendents	(12)	44.45	(4)	14.81	(6)	22.22	(5)	18.52
Principals	(12)	35.29	(9)	26.47	(12)	35.29	(1)	2.94
7. must be a skilled problem solver.								
Superintendents	(0)	0.00	(3)	11.11	(14)	51.85	(10)	37.04
Principals	(0)	0.00	(1)	2.94	(18)	52.94	(15)	44.12
8. Principals should seek and support department chairs who are strong instructional leaders.								
Superintendents	(0)	0.00	(1)	3.70	(7)	25.93	(19)	70.37
Principals	(0)	0.00	(0)	0.00	(6)	17.65	(28)	82.35
9. Dept. chairs should have training in administration.								
Superintendents	(2)	7.40	(9)	33.33	(14)	51.85	(2)	7.40
Principals	(2)	5.88	(16)	47.06	(11)	32.35	(5)	14.71
10. For a department chair to be an effective supervisor requires the credibility of expertise in the discipline.								
Superintendents	(2)	7.40	(3)	11.11	(10)	37.04	(12)	44.44
Principals	(2)	5.88	(6)	17.65	(18)	52.94	(8)	23.53
11. Department chairs cannot be effective supervisors of instruction because they regard themselves as teachers rather than as supervisors.								
Superintendents	(17)	62.96	(4)	14.81	(4)	14.81	(2)	7.40
Principals	(13)	38.24	(11)	32.35	(9)	26.47	(1)	2.94
12. Being in a department chair role enhances the chair's own classroom instruction.								
Superintendents	(3)	11.11	(12)	44.44	(7)	25.93	(5)	18.52
Principals	(3)	8.82	(5)	14.71	(21)	61.76	(5)	14.71

* Scale was 2–5: 2 = strongly *disagree /disagree*; 3 = *neutral*; 4 = *agree*; and 5 = *strongly agree*.

Opinions of superintendents and principals regarding the potential for the high school academic department chair to act as an administrative resource for educational leadership did not differ significantly for any of the other 11 statements. However, even though a significant chi-square statistic was obtained for one statement, because of the small sample size the numbers in some cells were insufficient to find significant differences. Once again, though, the data suggest strong agreement between the opinions of principals and superintendents.

Hypothesis 8

To obtain sufficient cell sizes to run valid chi-square tests for Hypothesis 8, the data gathered from superintendents and principals in response to Part IV of the questionnaire were again collapsed for purposes of comparison to the opinions offered by high school department chairs. Hypothesis 8, stated in the null form for test purposes, was that administrators and high school department chairs would not differ in their perceptions of the potential for the high school academic department chair to act as an administrative resource for instructional leadership. Table 14 offers a frequency distribution of the responses of administrators and department chairs as well as percentages.

Table 14

Opinions of Department Chair Potential for Educational Leadership [By Frequencies (no.) and Percentages (%) of Responses] Administrators (N = 61), Department Chairs (N = 118)

Opinion Statement	Responses 2 (no.)	%	3 (no.)	%	4 (no.)	%	5 (no.)	%
A successful department chair								
1. must be a strong leader.								
Administrators	(1)	1.64	(3)	4.92	(26)	42.62	(31)	50.82
Department Chairs	(4)	3.39	(13)	11.02	(60)	50.85	(41)	34.75
2. must be a good manager.								
Administrators	(0)	0.00	(3)	4.92	(41)	67.21	(17)	27.87
Department Chairs	(1)	0.85	(4)	3.39	(60)	50.58	(53)	44.92
3. should be a master teacher.								
Administrators	(1)	1.64	(2)	3.28	(19)	31.15	(39)	63.93
Department Chairs	(4)	3.39	(14)	11.86	(45)	38.14	(55)	46.61
4. should assist teachers to improve their instruction.								
Administrators	(0)	0.00	(3)	4.92	(26)	42.62	(32)	52.46
Department Chairs	(7)	5.93	(17)	14.41	(69)	58.47	(25)	21.19
5. should have some training in supervision.								
Administrators	(1)	1.64	(8)	13.11	(33)	54.10	(19)	31.15
Department Chairs	(13)	11.02	(32)	27.12	(50)	42.37	(23)	19.49
6. should participate in implementation of plans of assistance.								
Administrators	(24)	39.34	(13)	21.31	(18)	29.51	(6)	9.84
Department Chairs	(50)	42.38	(27)	22.88	(31)	26.27	(10)	8.47
7. must be a skilled problem solver.								
Administrators	(0)	0.00	(4)	6.56	(32)	52.46	(25)	40.98
Department Chairs	(6)	4.24	(6)	5.08	(65)	55.93	(41)	34.75
8. Principals should seek and support department chairs who are strong instructional leaders.								
Administrators	(0)	0.00	(1)	1.64	(13)	21.31	(47)	77.05
Department Chairs	(3)	2.54	(7)	5.93	(53)	44.92	(55)	46.61
9. Dept. chairs should have training in administration.								
Administrators	(4)	6.56	(25)	40.98	(25)	40.98	(7)	11.48
Department Chairs	(22)	18.65	(53)	44.92	(32)	27.12	(11)	8.47
10. For a department chair to be an effective supervisor requires the credibility of expertise in the discipline.								
Administrators	(4)	6.56	(9)	14.75	(28)	45.90	(20)	32.79
Department Chairs	(5)	4.24	(16)	13.56	(4)	38.98	(51)	43.22
11. Department chairs cannot be effective supervisors of instruction because they regard themselves as teachers rather than as supervisors.								
Administrators	(30)	49.18	(15)	24.59	(13)	21.31	(3)	4.92
Department Chairs	(67)	56.78	(17)	14.41	(23)	19.49	(11)	9.32
12. Being in a department chair role enhances the chair's own classroom instruction.								
Administrators	(6)	9.84	(17)	27.87	(28)	45.90	(10)	16.39
Department Chairs	(30)	25.42	(28)	23.73	(42)	35.59	(18)	15.25

* Scale was 2–5: 2 = *disagree*; 3 = *neutral*; 4 = *agree*; and 5 = *strongly agree*.

When the frequencies of responses delineated in Table 14 were subjected to chi-square analysis, significant differences ($p = < .05$) were identified between the responses of administrators and those of high school department chairs on three of the 12 opinion statements. Thus, Null Hypothesis 8 was rejected.

In each case the direction of the response was the same for both administrators and high school department chairs, but also in each case the administrators registered a stronger opinion than did the department chairs. Table 15 reports the statements for which chi-square testing revealed significant differences in opinions between the two groups.

Table 15

Summary of Statistical Values of Opinion Statements: Responses of Administrators and Department Chairs, Subjects: N = 179

Response	N	χ^2	df	p
Statement 4	179	21.113	3	0.000
Statement 5	179	11.571	3	0.009
Statement 8	179	15.824	3	0.001

On (4), the chair should assist teachers to improve their instruction, the frequency of administrative responses was found to differ significantly from the

frequency of department chair responses, $\chi^2(3, \underline{N} = 179) = 21.113$, $\underline{p} < 0.000$. Administrators agreed much more strongly that high school department chairs should assist teachers with instructional improvement than did the chairs themselves.

A significant chi-square statistic was also found for (5), department chairs should have some training in supervision, $\chi^2(3, \underline{N} = 179) = 11.571$, $\underline{p} < 0.009$. Although the responses of both administrators and department chairs indicated agreement with the statement, administrators again agreed much more strongly than did department chairs.

Opinion statement (8) principals should seek and support department chairs who are strong instructional leaders, produced responses of agreement from both administrators and department chairs. However, chi-square analysis again revealed a significant difference, $\chi^2(3, \underline{N} = 179) = 15.824$, $\underline{p} < 0.001$.

Significant differences of opinion were found between perceptions of department chairs and those of principals regarding the potential for the high school academic department chair to act as an administrative resource for instructional leadership. From these responses, it was concluded that there was potential for role conflict for

department chairs in that their own perceptions of their role differed from expectations of their administrators for that role.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study and its companion study, The Voice of the Teacher-Department Chair, an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Rachel Mae Korach (1996), were based upon several major assumptions about the potential for the high school academic department chair to perform a valuable instructional leadership role in the developing context of school reform in the state of Oregon. These assumptions were the following:

1. The role of the high school academic department chair is currently an important part of the instructional leadership structure in Oregon high schools;

2. The high school academic department chair will continue to play a valuable role in the organizational structure of public high schools;

3. A lack of congruence in values and expectations among referent groups who influence the role of the department chair can have a negative impact on the chair's role performance;

4. A lack of congruence in values and expectations between the chairs themselves and their *superordinates* (superintendents/principals), their *subordinates* (teachers), and/or their *colleagues* (chairs in other academic departments) can have a negative impact on department chairs' role performance;

5. A measure of the congruence of these values and expectations could be determined by surveying the perceptions of superintendents, high school principals, high school academic department chairs, and high school academic subject matter teachers on specific department chair activities comprising five categories of department chair role responsibility in relation to time spent, importance to the role, and importance for the department chair to continue to improve; and

6. One means of increasing the probability of high school department chairs becoming more effective in their role would be to focus on a combination of top-down, bottom-up collaborations among individuals in key organizational roles, including superintendents, high school principals, high school academic department chairs, and high school teachers.

Working from those assumptions, this study initially focused on establishing an administrative voice on the role of the high school academic department chair. An examination of the degree of congruence in the perceptions

of superintendents and high school principals regarding issues of time spent, importance to the role, and importance for the department chair to continue to improve in five categories of department chair role responsibility determined an administrative point of view which could then be compared to the point of view voiced by the high school department chairs in the study population.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide a first step in clarifying the role of the high school academic department chair as it is currently being practiced in the state of Oregon. Additionally, this study sought to examine from the administrative perspective the potential for the continued development of the educational leadership role of the department chair as an administrative resource for instructional improvement.

To accomplish this purpose, this study voiced the perspective of administrators in the organizational roles of superintendent and high school principal. Both administrators fill line positions in the educational hierarchy that give them the authority and the responsibility for establishing instructional priorities at the district and building level.

Questions Investigated

This study identified and described the perceptions of superintendents and high school principals concerning the nature and value of the role of the high school academic department chair and compared those perceptions to those of the chairs themselves. Specifically, this study examined the congruence of perceptions held by these groups of educators as they relate to five categories of responsibility comprising the role of the high school department chair:

1. responsibility for human relations
2. responsibility for management
3. responsibility for the organization
4. responsibility for program, and
5. responsibility for supervision.

From the voice of the administrator, this study investigated the congruence of perceptions of superintendents and high school principals in comparison to the perceptions of high school department chairs regarding: (a) the amount of time high school academic department chairs spend on each activity specified in each of the five defined categories responsibility; (b) the importance of each activity in each of the five categories to the role of the high school department chair; and (c) the importance of the high school department chair's

continuing to improve in each activity in each of the five categories.

Limitations of the Study

1. The findings reported in this study are specific to the state of Oregon in AAAA high schools in school districts with a total district population of under 12,000 students. These findings could be generalized to other high schools with similar conditions but should not be generalized with complete confidence outside the state of Oregon.

2. This study addresses the role of the high school academic department chair only in relation to 44 activities defined by the researchers as comprising five areas of department chair responsibility: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision. Department chairs undoubtedly engage in many activities which were not addressed by the survey instrument. Therefore the general trends identified in this study are confined to the perceptions of the respondents regarding a limited number of department chair activities.

3. The study population was restricted to only those department chairs in the academic disciplines of English, mathematics, science, and social studies. Conclusions may not be generalizable to chairs in other subject matter areas.

4. Although a very high percentage of superintendents (90%) and principals (92%) targeted to participate in this study responded to the survey, the limited size of the study population restricts the degree of certainty of some of the study results.

Theoretical Framework

A review of the literature provided a theoretical framework to guide this study. First, the evolution of the supervisory role of the department chair was placed into a historical context in order to provide perspective from which to view the educational leadership role of the department chair. Second, the literature on organizational theory was reviewed to establish the importance of role performance to organizational effectiveness. Third, an examination of role theory established that the expectations held by both supervisors and subordinates for one's leadership performance substantially influence one's effectiveness in a particular role. Additionally, role theory confirmed that such expectations for performance are influenced by the relative value placed upon various aspects of one's role by both supervisors and subordinates. Finally, the literature suggested the effectiveness of "top-down," "bottom-up" collaborations as management strategies. Based upon these theoretical perspectives, this study and its companion study, comprising conversations between two

voices—that of the administrator and that of the teacher-department chair—offer a comprehensive "top-down," "bottom-up" perspective on these administrative and teacher leadership roles.

Summary of the Findings

1. The results of this study indicate a strong similarity of opinion among administrators (superintendents and principals) about the role of the high school academic department chair. Results demonstrate congruence of perceptions regarding time, importance to the department chair role, and importance for the department chair to continue to improve in the five categories of department chair responsibilities: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision. This strong similarity of perception supports the assumption that administrators, regardless of their distinctly different organizational roles of superintendent and high school principal, voice strikingly similar opinions—opinions based upon perceptions yielding no statistically significant differences across the entire range of 132 items from the questionnaire.

2. Many areas of agreement between administrators and department chairs were found in several of the categories of department chair role responsibilities. Of particular note, however, were two areas of agreement between administrators and department chairs, identifying

what they considered to be both the most important and least important categories of responsibility of the department chair role.

- Responsibility for Human Relations. Both administrators and department chairs rated human relations the highest priority of all department chair role responsibilities.
- Responsibility for Supervision. Both administrators and department chairs rated supervision as having the lowest priority of all department chair role responsibilities.

For this study, administrators and department chairs agreeing as to the most important and the least important areas of department chair role responsibilities demonstrates a general congruence of opinion. One might expect this congruence to minimize department chair role conflict resulting from differences in perceptions between administrators and department chairs. However, this general agreement could well be deceiving. What is not indicated by the congruence in administrator and department chair rankings of the categories according to their relative importance is the amount of value each group places on specific activities within each of these categories of responsibility.

3. As demonstrated in the analyses of Hypotheses 3, 4 and 5, statistically significant differences existed

between administrator and department chair perceptions regarding the importance of specific activities within the category of Responsibility for Human Relations and within the Category of Responsibility for Supervision. Despite their agreement in ranking human relations responsibilities as most important and supervision responsibilities as least important, this incongruence between administrator and department chair perceptions of the importance of specific activities in each of those categories could still generate substantial role conflict for department chairs in their performance of those role responsibilities.

4. The results of this study indicate that the department chairs, who manage and deliver the instructional program at the classroom level, further demonstrate statistically significant differences in perception from administrators, who manage the instructional program at the building or district level. Of particular note were several statistically significant areas of disagreement between administrators and department chairs as to the current value of the role of the department chair as well as to the importance of continued improvement in the performance of the role.

5. In regard to the potential for the department chair performing as an educational leader, administrators continued to perceive the supervisory and improvement of

instruction role of the department chair to be more important than did the department chairs themselves. Specifically, administrators perceived it to be more important that department chairs assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction and obtain training in supervision. Additionally, administrators believed it was more important to seek and support department chairs who were strong instructional leaders than did the department chairs.

6. The fact that administrators perceive department chairs to spend considerably less time on the managerial responsibilities of the department chair role than the chairs themselves indicated they spend should be taken into consideration. Because administrators in this study were found to have consistently higher expectations for the department chair's influence on the improvement of program and instruction than did the chairs themselves, a potential for conflict between administrators and department chairs exists in that administrators may be overestimating the amount of time chairs have available to fulfill the administrators' supervisory expectations.

Conclusions

In terms of the purpose of this study, the implication of the high degree of incongruence between administrators and department chairs in their perceptions

of the activities comprising the five department chair role responsibilities is that a high potential exists for role conflict for department chairs. Statistically significant differences between administrators and department chairs in the amount of time they perceive is required to perform the department chair role activities and in their perceptions of which activities are valued as important to the role of the department chair confirms that there is a lack of clarity in the definition of the role. Consequently, a high potential exists for negative impact on the department chairs' role performance in that the performance expectations being communicated from their administrators are likely to differ from their own expectations of what should constitute strong role performance.

In examining perceptions of what the two groups value as most important for the department chair to continue to improve, incongruence suggests conflict in envisioning what the role of the department chair should become under educational reform efforts. Statistically significant differences were found for 20 of the 44 activities in the five categories of responsibility. In each case, administrators perceived it to be more important than did the department chairs for the activity to become part of the improvement agenda. Being faced with role expectations based on perceptions of value which differ

from one's own may also create role conflict. As Katz and Kahn (1978) indicated, such conflict produces negative psychological responses in the individual. Thus the results of this study point out the continuing problem posed for administrators by Getzels and Guba (1957) to "integrate the demands of the institution and the demands of individuals in a way that is organizationally productive and individually fulfilling" (p. 430).

This study also offers support for the contention that neither solely top-down nor solely bottom-up strategies for educational change really work (Crowson & Glass, 1991; Fullan, 1991; Joyce et al., 1993; McLaughlin, Talbert & Bascia, 1990; Wimpelberg, 1987). From results of this study, as informed also by results of the study by R. M. Korach (1996), it is clear that the perceptions of administrators at the top of the hierarchy are substantially different from perceptions of teachers at the bottom of the hierarchy.

These differences in perception have obvious implications for the design and implementation of educational changes. Individuals in the two administrative roles of superintendent and high school principal presumably have the most power in the organizational hierarchy and thus the most influence over setting the organizational agenda. Since these two groups of administrators demonstrate no statistically significant

differences in their perceptions regarding the role of the department chair, without the department chairs (and through the chairs, the teachers) being given a legitimate voice in setting the improvement agenda, those who deliver the program will have little ability to influence the organization's priorities and therefore its allocation of resources. On the other hand, department chairs, who in their teaching roles have direct influence over what actually gets implemented, demonstrate several statistically significant differences of perception from those of administrators.

Ultimately, the power of administrators to set organizational priorities can never outweigh the power of teachers to enact actual practices. If the perceptions of administrators and department chairs are going to become more closely aligned, then administrators are going to have to examine and address the reasons underlying those differences. As Fullan (1991) said, the restructuring efforts which are most important to be addressed are those that bring about changes in school culture. In an authoritative culture, organizational power is distributed and exercised through roles defined by hierarchical structures. Barth (1988) saw such "top-down hierarchical relationships as foster[ing] dependency" (p. 146). Thus, an organization which envisions establishing a community

of leaders would strive to eliminate solely top-down as well as solely bottom-up structures (Sergiovanni, 1994).

A combination of top-down, bottom-up collaborations could be an effective means of improving understanding through increased communication, therefore reducing role conflict and decreasing the potential for reduced performance by the department chairs. The implication of the results of this study is that developing the potential of more effective and extensive top-down, bottom-up collaborations between administrators and teachers, especially those in the role of the academic department chair, could be beneficial in developing a culture based on collegiality. In such a culture, power evolves from and is shared through the relationships of individuals bonded together by their commitment to common goals within the organization.

This study was designed to establish sound perspective from which to base organizational decisions regarding the potential value of establishing a combination of top-down and bottom-up collaborations as a means of fostering instructional improvement. If effective top-down, bottom-up collaborations among superintendents, high school principals, and high school academic department chairs were established, three primary issues which emerge from this study could be addressed.

First, the strikingly similar voice of the administrator—the perceptions of superintendents and principals in organizational decision making—could be informed and modified by the perceptions of the academic department chairs. More meaningful and extensive collaborative involvement in organizational decision making by teachers performing in supervisory, management, and teaching roles offers potential for broadening and clarifying the perspective upon which organizational decisions for the improvement of instruction are based.

Second, administrators and department chairs demonstrated significant disagreement regarding the amount of managerial time required to perform the role of the department chair as well as the importance of management activities to that role. Department chairs perceived their managerial responsibilities to take more time than administrators perceived them to take. Additionally, department chairs perceived the development of the department's teaching schedule—the "what one teaches, when one teaches, and where one teaches" decisions—to be significantly more important to the role of the department chair than administrators perceived it to be.

These issues of the amount of time required to perform the managerial role and the relative importance of management as the department chairs perceive it to affect teachers are important areas for dialogue among

superintendents, principals, and department chairs. Administrators appear to be overlooking the need for providing enough time for department chairs to accomplish the highly valued managerial expectations of their role. Without enough time to perform the managerial role well, it is unlikely that the department chairs will have the time to address the improvement agenda that administrators perceive to be of more importance.

Third, a major area of statistically significant disagreement between administrators and department chairs in this study was found to be in their perception of the importance of what is generally considered the instructional leadership role of the department chair. This instructional leadership role includes activities in the supervision and improvement of teacher performance and program effectiveness. The direct collaborative involvement of department chairs with superintendents and principals in the designing of systems and strategies to bring about improvement of programs and instruction could have a positive impact on reducing role conflict and leading to better role performance by department chairs in their responsibilities for instructional leadership.

Department chairs consistently rated their management activities to be of greater importance to the role and more important to improve than they rated their activities in either program or supervision to be. Higher

percentages of administrators, on the other hand, consistently rated program activities more highly both for their importance to the role and for their importance to improve than the percentages of administrators who rated management activities highly on those issues.

In summary, three benefits of top-down, bottom-up collaborations emerge from this study.

- First, the singular voice of the administrator in organizational decision making could be informed and modified by the voice of the academic department chair, a teacher performing in a management and supervisory role.
- Second, management operations, processes, and systems designed to produce organizational effectiveness could be influenced and modified by department chairs, whose daily role includes the management of resources as well as the instructional program.
- Third, establishment of practices designed to bring about improvement of instruction and the instructional program could be influenced and modified by department chairs, people who supervise the improvement of instruction as well as deliver the instructional program.

Some of the most promising approaches to educational improvement are being offered by those who believe many of

the best ideas for improving practice often result from the synthesis and integration of opposite, contradictory, or competing points of view (Deal & Peterson, 1994; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992; Irwin, 1995; Joyce, Wolf, & Calhoun, 1993). That administrators in the influential roles of superintendent and high school principal share such a similar and highly predictable point of view will need to be considered as these reform efforts go forward.

Given that there is such similarity in their perspectives, administrators may be unlikely to consider the possibility of differing points of view, and thus fail to design organizational processes for open communication with those in other significant roles in the educational hierarchy. If administrators are unaware of the issues and concerns of department chairs and teachers, and therefore do not take them into account, even the most promising reforms may not be successful. At the same time, because of the expected similarity and predictability of administrative opinions, department chairs may tend to view an administrator as not having an insightful or valuable perspective to contribute to the development of innovative instructional practice.

Application of the Findings

The findings of this study, informed by related findings of the companion study by R. M. Korach (1996), offer several key distinctions among the perceptions of

administrators, high school department chairs, and high school teachers that should be taken into account in designing the goals, strategies, processes, and practices to bring about the improvement of education in Oregon high schools.

1. Administrators in the roles of superintendents and principals demonstrated no statistically significant differences of perception with respect to any of the 44 activities in five categories of responsibility comprising the role of the high school academic department chair as defined for this study. Therefore, administrators need to be aware that they are most likely to reinforce one another's point of view and thus also need to recognize the importance of developing processes for an ongoing dialogue with those in other organizational roles.

2. For the 12 opinion statements regarding the potential for the high school academic department chair to act as an administrative resource for instructional leadership, one significant chi-square statistic was found between responses of superintendents and those of principals. Principals registered a much stronger agreement that being in the role of the department chair had a positive impact on the chair's own classroom instruction. It may be that the principals, whose role includes direct supervision of department chairs, are in a better position than are superintendents to determine the

changes which may occur in the chair's own instruction as a result of his/her performance in the department chair role.

3. Significant differences in perception were found to exist between administrators and department chairs regarding all five areas of department chair responsibility: human relations, management, the organization, program, and supervision. Notably, with the exception of one activity, department chairs perceived their Responsibility for Management to require more time than administrators perceived it to require.

These findings suggest the need to involve department chairs in decisions about management practices, especially those related to time management expectations.

4. In placing the five categories of department chair responsibility in order of their importance, department chairs gave significantly higher rankings to their management responsibilities than did administrators. That department chairs place higher value on their management responsibilities than do administrators reinforces the need for chairs to participate in decisions regarding management practices.

5. Administrators' expectations for the supervisory role of the department chair were substantially higher than were those of the department chairs themselves. For example, in rank ordering the five categories of

department chair responsibilities, administrators ranked supervision of much higher importance than did the chairs.

While R. M. Korach (1996) found only one statistically significant difference between perceptions of department chairs and teachers in this Responsibility for Supervision category, a consistent frequency response pattern of greater percentages of department chairs more highly valuing the importance of supervisory activities to the role than did teachers was noted.

6. The administrative voice in this study is almost exclusively a male voice, whereas the voice of the teacher-department chair is comprised of perspectives of both male and female high school department chairs and teachers. Findings in the study by R. M. Korach (1996) indicate that there are definite male and female patterns of responses. Administrators need to be mindful of possible differences in perception between male and female department chairs and teachers that could influence the success or failure of leadership and management strategies intended to bring about instructional improvement.

Recommendations

If Fullan (1991) is right, and what is needed is a more sophisticated blend of top-down, bottom-up strategies, then this study's findings of statistically significant differences in perception, indicating

competing values leading to role conflict and the potential for reduced role performance, must be considered in continuing to address the issue of instructional improvement. These differences in perception are, however, unlikely to be addressed if they are not acknowledged. To make a contribution to the improvement of practice, this study then serves to identify issues that should be addressed if educators in separate leadership roles are to work better in concert to bring about improvement of the high school instructional program.

Often the prescription for accomplishing effective organizational improvement is easy to characterize, but difficult to accomplish. First, the goal of what is to be accomplished must be defined, and second, people's actions must be focused toward achieving the goal. Specifically, to bring about effective department chair instructional leadership first requires that administrators and teacher leaders develop a shared vision of what conditions are necessary for department chairs to be successful in such a role. Then superintendents, principals, and teacher leaders must behave in concert, acting in a consistent and supportive manner to bring about those conditions, thus making it possible for administrative and teacher leaders to both learn from and support one another in

accomplishing the goal of genuine improvement of instruction.

Fundamental to this study is the belief that for education to be improved through collaborative leadership between administrators and teachers, both top-down administrative influence and bottom-up teacher influence must be combined within a coherent, systematic organizational improvement effort. Administrators and teacher leaders cannot accomplish as much on their own as they can if they work together as part of a system-wide improvement effort.

Additionally, for teachers and administrators to accomplish successful system-wide change efforts requires substantial support from the district. These kinds of system-wide top-down, bottom-up collaborations between administrators and teacher leaders require open, trusting dialogue—a willingness to risk, to suspend judgment, and to think together (Schrage, 1990). This study provides one means of assisting such a dialogue by offering questions and a series of statements as a discussion guide for developing shared vision.

Recommendations for Practice

Results of this study point to the need for meaningful dialogue among superintendents, high school principals, high school department chairs, and high school teachers to develop a vision of the organizational

conditions that are necessary for administrators and teacher leaders to work collaboratively in parallel roles to bring about instructional improvement. To help focus discussion, the following three questions could be applied to several perspective statements which are offered later in this chapter:

- To what extent does the statement characterize your vision of what the organization should be? (What is the desired state? Is this a clear statement of what should be?) If the statement is not an accurate characterization, develop consensus about what the statement should be and rewrite the statement to express that collective vision.
- Once agreement is reached about the statement, what is the difference between the organization as it currently exists and the vision being characterized in the discussion statement? (What is the state of current practice in regard to this statement?)
- What changes need to be made in the organization in order to accomplish the vision being characterized in the discussion statement? (What are the human as well as the structural needs?)

To begin the dialogue, it seems obvious that effective system-wide improvement requires congruence of

vision and action: a vision which is clear, engaging, and attainable and actions which directly support the accomplishment of the vision. Without a clear vision of what the organization wants to accomplish and the expectation that organizational behaviors should be aligned with accomplishment of that vision, there would be little basis from which to build a collaborative improvement effort.

Three questions offer a starting point. First, how clear, engaging, and attainable is the district's vision for what administrators and teacher leaders are to accomplish? Second, how congruent are the current behaviors of administrators and teacher leaders with the accomplishment of the goal as defined in the district vision? Third, what further actions should the district take to increase the likelihood of accomplishing its goal?

Without a meaningful dialogue between department chairs and administrators, it is unlikely that shared vision will emerge. Without shared vision, it is unlikely that integrated practices for the continuation of the current program can be merged with practices for implementing the vision. It is recommended that administrators and teacher leaders address a series of belief statements offered on the following pages in an effort to develop a shared vision of the role of teacher leadership with respect to the ongoing improvement efforts

in their district. These belief statements from the voice of the administrator, when combined with those from the voice of the teacher-department chair offered in the study by R. M. Korach (1996), provide a comprehensive series of concepts to address through dialogue in defining and clarifying a district's integrated vision for instructional improvement.

Statements for dialogue. The role of the department chair exists within the context of the larger organization: the department within the context of the school and the school within the context of the district. To develop a school district as a system within which many individuals can perform complementary organizational roles requires that the district first articulate a comprehensive vision for the accomplishment of instructional leadership.

Guided by the results of this study, and informed by the experience of having performed in the roles of high school English teacher, high school English department chair, high school principal, and district superintendent, the researcher proposes a broad series of statements for dialogue. The following statements are designed to offer perspectives

- which could be considered by a district that wants to clarify its vision for instructional leadership, and

- that could form the basis for a thoughtful dialogue among administrators, department chairs, and teachers.

These perspectives are not intended to be imposed as a blueprint, but rather are designed to stimulate discussion leading to the refinement of what a particular district believes is most valuable to include in its vision for instructional leadership.

From the voice of the administrator, perspectives for discussion are organized in five categories: organizational vision, organizational strategic improvement, organizational conditions and systems, organizational values, and organizational roles.

Organizational Vision

1. An improving school district requires vision, a kind of attainable foresight about what the organization is ideally capable of becoming.

2. The degree of system-wide improvement that a school district is capable of attaining is greatly dependent upon the organization's ability and willingness to define and clarify its vision in specific terms, including beliefs, values, goals, and practices as they relate to teaching and learning.

3. Forming and clarifying a school district's vision requires a continuing, ongoing dialogue. The building of

shared vision should not be a singular event which is discussed, agreed upon, written, and shelved.

4. A clearly defined, insightful, and realistic district vision of the teaching profession is essential if the high school department chair is going to work effectively in concert with administrators in a collective effort to bring about instructional improvement.

5. The district should develop a comprehensive vision of instruction where teachers are expected to demonstrate a repertoire of instructional approaches appropriate to a variety of specific learning outcomes and teaching is defined as behavior which increases the probability of learning.

6. A critical part of communicating vision from the top of the organization is in being specific enough for clarity without being overly prescriptive and thus damaging teacher ownership, creativity, and autonomy.

Organizational Strategic Improvement

1. An organization that is not improving is not keeping pace with a rapidly changing environment and thus is, relatively speaking, becoming worse.

2. Effective district-wide improvement requires a congruence of vision and action

- A vision which is clear, attainable, engaging, workable, and shared; and

- Actions by administrators and teachers which support the accomplishment of the vision.

3. To accomplish system-wide improvement, a district must encourage and support the sharing of organizational power if the talent, creativity and decision-making ability of the entire school community is to be meaningfully involved in the district's improvement efforts.

4. Effective organizational improvement requires balance, a dynamic tension between complementary forces which define and strengthen one another, stimulating organizational growth.

• Top-down Influence	Bottom-up Influence
• Challenge	Support
• Independence	Interdependence
• Collaborative Teaming	Individual Initiative
• Innovation/Change	Status Quo/Stability
• Strong Centralized Direction	Site-Based Management
• Process	Product
• Task	Relationship

5. The best way to realize a vision is to develop a strategic plan, a comprehensive combination of insightful analysis, specific strategies, and phased objectives designed to bring about the desired outcome.

6. The two essential actions of a strategic improvement plan must be (a) to develop the conditions

necessary for improvement at the building level, and (b) to support people at the building level who are engaged in making the improvements.

7. Effective system-wide improvement requires commonly understood frameworks, reliable and generalizable patterns which can be applied to many situations and which inform participants in the change process as to the district's beliefs, values, assumptions, and intentions.

8. A strategic improvement plan should be designed to help a school district to focus its limited resources to accomplish the improvements it values most.

Organizational Conditions and Systems

1. The most effective organizational condition for the improvement of instruction is a balanced system which includes both centralized and decentralized influence and control.

2. For collaborative leadership between administrators and teachers to be effectively realized, top-down administrative influence must be combined with bottom-up teacher influence.

3. The key to achieving a proper balance between being specific enough for clarity without being too prescriptive is to provide workable frameworks that establish sound direction, yet still allow for personalized approaches to accomplishing the vision.

4. The district should insure that processes are clearly in operation which support the assumption that better quality decisions occur when the creativity, innovativeness, and decision-making ability of the people within the organization are utilized.

5. The district should develop the capacity to engage the talent, expertise, creativity, and enthusiasm of administrators and teachers in organizational roles focused on improving learning and instruction.

6. The district should focus its model of leadership on creating the conditions for change through cooperation, collaboration, shared decision making, and the engagement of collective energies to bring about innovation and productive change.

7. The district must develop systems which give the department chair a role and a voice to influence not only the department, but the school and the district, since understanding and being able to influence the context within which the leader functions is an important determiner of any leader's success.

8. To create the best possible conditions for system-wide improvement, the district should clearly define what will not change as well as what will change. For example, strategies are more likely to change than values.

9. Lasting system-wide improvements are not likely to happen from the bottom up without the district playing a major support role.

Organizational Values

1. The primary value influencing all district decisions and actions should be learning, both for students and for educators, characterized by an openness to new ideas, a desire to explore new possibilities, the capacity to suspend assumptions, and a willingness to think together.

2. All adults should be involved in developing and participating in activities which promote the attitude that people within the district are a community of learners and that there is significant potential for human growth inherent in the adult interaction within a school community.

3. The district must demonstrate a commitment to innovation, growth, and improvement that encourages adults to model the learning behaviors desired of students.

4. The district should make a commitment to participatory decision making, developing processes that encourage widespread input before major decisions are made, particularly from those who will be directly affected by the decisions.

5. The district should strive to develop a culture where high levels of trust, pervasive caring, and respect

for the dignity and worth of the individual are clearly evident, including the accepting and valuing of divergent feelings and opinions.

6. The district should strive for open, clear, and forthright communication where essential information is shared in a timely and accurate manner.

7. The district must develop a system-wide culture that encourages cooperation, where individuals seek to complement and support one another. Characteristics of a cooperative school culture would include: (a) spirited teamwork among staff; (b) group problem solving; (c) shared decision making; (d) team planning; (e) peer sharing; and (f) a shared sense of responsibility.

8. In addition to communication and cooperation, the district should emphasize collaboration—the ability to think together through an open dialogue, deepening and clarifying understanding by sharing goals, insights, questions, and ideas while developing a shared sense of meaning. Dialogue is discussion which requires people (a) to seek to know and understand; (b) to suspend judgment; (c) to view others as colleagues; and (d) to value the thinking process.

9. In times of uncertainty and rapidly changing conditions, no single leadership quality is as important to the district as integrity, which provides a central point of stability that encourages innovation and risk

taking. Integrity is founded upon the trust that the district will demonstrate its beliefs and values through its behaviors.

Organizational Roles

1. Effective system-wide improvement requires role clarity for both administrators and teachers where specific role expectations are defined without being overly prescriptive and thus destructively diminishing the personalization of the role.

2. Superintendents must exert instructional leadership downward through an organization, simultaneously providing clear direction while offering support to individuals who are encouraged to personalize their means of accomplishing the organization's goals.

3. An effective instructional leader in the role of administrator must inspire and engage others in a focused cooperative effort toward instructional improvement.

4. The district should develop a variety of leadership opportunities, encouraging contributions from both administrators and teachers in formal and informal roles.

5. It is the role of superintendents and high school principals to communicate, to model, represent, clarify, and interpret the vision, values, beliefs, and goals of the school district.

6. It is the role of administrators to help teachers establish achievable instructional goals that are congruent with the district's vision and strategic improvement plan.

7. It is the role of administrators to hold teachers accountable for achieving the results defined in district, school, department, and personal goals.

8. It is the role of administrators to support teacher improvement efforts by establishing priorities, securing resources, allowing flexibility, promoting shared decision making, providing time for professional development, and encouraging collaborative leadership.

9. It is the role of administrators to define the commitments that are not negotiable, while being willing to discuss, problem solve, and negotiate all other differences of opinion resulting from perceived differences between district goals and school goals.

10. It is the role of administrators to model the importance of learning and instruction by being knowledgeable about the district's improvement efforts, by participating directly in professional development activities, and by making sure building improvement plans are focused on learning and curriculum.

These statements, developed from an administrative organizational perspective, were designed to be combined with a series of statements developed from the

instructional practice perspective of a teacher-department chair (Korach, 1996). By combining the statements from an administrative perspective with the statements from a teacher leader perspective, the entire top-down, bottom-up spectrum is offered for dialogue by administrators and teacher leaders.

Recommendations for Use of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument seems to be an effective means of determining the perceptions of superintendents, high school principals, and high school academic department chairs concerning the amount of time department chairs spend on activities specific to their role, the relative importance of those activities, and the importance of the chair's continuing to improve in the activities. The survey instrument can be recommended for further use: (a) in its current form, (b) in a modified form to include different activities, and (c) in a modified form to create additional areas of focus. For example, activities could be made specific to additional distinctions, such as the importance of providing specific feedback to teachers on skill instruction versus the importance of providing specific feedback to teachers on concept development instruction. The instrument could also be easily redesigned to focus the inquiry on additional questions. For example, it would be simple to ask how difficult or

costly bringing about improvement would be in a particular area rather than how important the area was to improve.

The survey instrument was an effective tool for gathering perceptual data from a large number of respondents from throughout the state of Oregon. Additionally, the data from the survey instrument allowed the researcher to draw conclusions about the perceptions of the amount of time spent on and the value placed on specific department chair activities. It should also be noted that the format of the information from the survey allowed for an effective transfer of data into the structure used in the data analysis for the study. Finally, it is important to stress that the single survey worked well for all study participants regardless of role differences, eliminating problems associated with multiple forms of a survey.

One area that should be considered for expansion or revision would be the demographic section of the survey. Because the intention of this study was only to describe the participants, this section was not extensive, nor was it designed to reveal meaningful distinctions among study respondents. Those considering future research may wish to make such distinctions.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. This study sought to determine the perceptions of superintendents, high school principals, and high school academic department chairs. Future research should seek to determine if there are similar patterns of congruence and incongruence among the perceptions of superintendents, elementary principals, and elementary school teachers performing in defined leadership roles. Additionally, this study should also be replicated with superintendents, middle level principals, and middle level teachers performing in defined leadership roles.

2. This study sought to determine the importance of the department chair's seeking to improve in several department chair areas of role responsibility. Several additional questions could be proposed in further research: for example, how important is department chair improvement to individual school goals, how important is it to the district improvement agenda, how important is it to the perceived needs of teachers, how difficult is it to accomplish, how costly is it to achieve?

3. This study sought to determine the perceptions of superintendents, high school principals, and high school department chairs relative to specific department chair role activities. No attempt was made to relate the perceptions of any participant groups to student performance. Future research could be done to see if

perceptions of the value of the instructional leadership role of the department chair correlate with levels of student achievement.

4. This study sought to describe the perceptions of superintendents and high school principals regarding the role of the high school department chair. The strikingly similar voice of administrators, demonstrating no significant difference between the perceptions of superintendents and the perceptions of high school principals, was a major finding of this study. Its companion study, *The Voice of the Teacher-Department Chair* (Korach, 1996), found several significant differences in perceptions divided along gender lines. With the vast majority of administrators (58 males, 3 females) in this study being male, further research should be conducted to determine if the strikingly similar voice of the superintendents and high school principals is more a consequence of role or gender.

REFERENCES

Ackoff, R. L. (1981). Creating the corporate future: Plan or be planned for. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Anderson, C. J. (1987, December/January). Instructional leadership behaviors of high school principals, assistant principals, and department chairpersons: A comparison. The High School Journal, 70, 115-123.

Anderson, J. G. (1967, Spring). The authority structure of the school system, system of social change. Educational Administration Quarterly, 130-148.

Arredondo, D. E., Brody, J. L., Zimmerman, D. P., & Moffett, C. A. (1995, November). Pushing the envelope in supervision. Educational Leadership, 53, 74-78.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (1985). Introduction to research in education (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bacharach, S. B., & Conley, S.C. (1990, March). From school-site management to participatory school-site management. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 539-544.

Badaracco, J. L., Jr., & Ellsworth, R. R. (1989). Leadership and the quest for integrity. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Barth, R. S. (1988). School: A community of leaders. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp. 129-147). New York: Teachers College Press.

Beare, H., Caldwell, B. J., & Millikan, R. H. (1989). Creating an excellent school: Some new management techniques. London: Routledge.

Bennis, W. (1966). Changing organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Blum, R. E., & McEady, B. J. (1984). Instructional leadership training. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Blumberg, A. (1974). Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1993). Everyday epistemology in school leadership: patterns and perspectives. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy (Eds.), Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 21-33). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bolman. L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1994). Becoming a teacher leader. New York: Corwin Press, Inc.

Burlingame, M. (1987). Images of leadership in effective schools literature. In W. D. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues and controversies (pp. 3-16). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the twenty-first century. Washington, DC: Author.

Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., & Astuto, T. A. (1984, Summer). Effective schools and school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of inquiry. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20, 41-68.

Conley, S. C., & Cooper, B. S. (1991). The school as a work environment: Implications for reform. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Conway, J. A., & Jacobson, S. L. (Eds.). (1991). Educational leadership in an age of reform. New York: Longman.

Costanza, J. F., Tracy, S. J., & Holmes, R. (1987, November). Expanding instructional leadership through the department chair. NASSP Bulletin, 68, 77-82.

Crowson, R. L., & Glass, T. E. (1991, April). The changing role of the local school district superintendent in the United States. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Amerian Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Cuban, L. (1988). The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools. New York: State University of New York Press.

Deal, T. E. (1987). The culture of schools. In L. T. Sheive & M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the elusive (pp. 3-15). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1994). The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

DeRoche, E., Hunsaker, J., & Kujawa, E. (1987, November/ December). Rules and responsibilities of the department chair. Thrust, 17, 40-42.

DeRoche, E., Hunsaker, J., & Kujawa, E. (1988, February/ March). Department chairs: A school's untapped resource. The High School Journal, 71, 135-137).

Duke, D. L. (1982, October). Leadership functions and instructional effectiveness. NASSP Bulletin, 1-12.

Duke, D. L. (1987). School leadership and instructional improvement. New York: Random House.

Durkee, F. M. (1947, April). Department heads in action. Clearing House, 21, 47-59.

Easterday, K. (1965, October). The department chair: What are his duties and qualifications? NASSP Bulletin, 49, 77-85.

Edmonds, R. R. (1979, October). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 15-24.

Edmonds, R. R. (1982, December). Programs of school improvement: An overview. Educational Leadership, 40, 4-11.

Foster, H. H. (1928). High school administration. New York: Century Company.

Francis, P., & Nolan, J. (1992). Changing perspectives in curriculum and instruction. In C. D. Glickman (Ed.), Supervision in transition (pp. 44-60). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Getzels, J. W., & Guba, E. G. (1957, Winter). School behavior and the administrative process. School Review, 55, 423-444.

Glasser, W. (1994). The control theory manager. New York: Harper Business.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1990). Supervisory leadership: Introduction to instructional supervision. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown Higher Education.

Goldring, E. B., & Rallis, S. F. (1993). Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Goodlad, J. I. (1983). The problem of getting markedly better schools. In J. Frymier (Ed.), Bad times, good schools (pp. 59-78). West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Gorton, R. A., & Thierbach-Schneider, G. (1991). School-based leadership: Challenges and opportunities (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown Publishers.

Greenfield, W. D. (1985, Winter). Value leadership: The department chair's role in instructional improvement. Illinois School Research and Development, 21, 22-27.

Hall, G. E., & Guzman, F. M. (1984). Sources of leadership for change. Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hambrick, D. C., & Brandon, G. L. (1988). Executive values. In D. C. Hambrick (Ed.), The executive effect: Concepts and methods for studying top managers (pp. 3-35). Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. G. (Eds.). (1992). Understanding teacher development. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hatfield, R. C., Blackman, C., Claypool, C., & Master, F. (1986). Exploring leadership roles performed by teaching faculty in K-12 schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

Hodgkinson, C. (1983). The philosophy of leadership. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hord, S. M., & Murphy, S. C. (1985). The high School department head: Powerful or powerless in guiding change? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1982). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.

Irwin, R. L. (1995). A circle of empowerment: Women, education, and leadership. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Johnson, S. M. (1990). Redesigning teachers' work. In R. F. Elmore & Associates (Eds.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 125-151). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Joyce, B., Wolf, J., & Calhoun, E. (1993). The self-renewing school. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kanter, R. M. (1989). When giants learn to dance. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Kauffman, D. J. (1980). Systems one: An introduction to systems thinking. Cambridge, MA: Pegasus Communications.

Keefe, J. W., & Jenkins, J. M. (Eds.). (1984). Instructional leadership handbook. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Kirkland, G. G. (1978). The role of the department head in large, public senior high schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 6436A.

Korach, R. M. (1996). A comparative study of perceptions of high school department chairs and high school teachers on the role of the high school academic department chair: The voice of the teacher-department chair. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Portland State University, Portland, OR.

Little, J. W. (1981). School success and staff development: The role of staff development in urban desegregated schools. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Louis, K., & Miles, M. B. (1990). Improving the urban high school: What works and why. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lucio, W. H., & McNeil, J. D. (1969). Supervision: A synthesis of thought and action (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Lucy, J. R. (1986, November). Curriculum revision: Who will provide the leadership? NASSP Bulletin, 70, 85-6.

Manlove, D. C., & Buser, R. (1966, November). The department head: Myth and reality. NASSP Bulletin, 50, 99-107.

McLaughlin, M., Talbert, J. E., & Bascia, N. (Eds.). (1990). The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities. New York: Teachers College Press.

McPherson, R. B., Crowson, R. L., & Pitner, N. J. (1986) Managing uncertainty: Administrative theory and practice in education. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Mitchell, J. G. (1990). Re-visioning educational leadership: A phenomenological approach. New York: Garland Publishing Company.

Morphet, E. L., Johns, R. L., & Reller, T. L. (1982). Educational organization and administration: Concepts, practices and issues (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Mouzelis, N. P. (1967). Organization and bureaucracy: An analysis of modern theories. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.

Murphy, J. (1988, Summer). Methodological, measurement, and conceptual problems in the study of instructional leadership. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10, 117-139.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). At nation at risk: The imperative of educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Oliva, P. F. (1993). Supervision for today's schools (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Oregon Department of Education. (1990). Oregon school directory. Salem: ODE Publications and Media Center.

Orfinger, M. P. (1980). Perceptions of instructional improvement behaviors of English department chairpersons in large, urban, public high schools (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41(4), 1326A.

Owens, R. G. (1981). Organizational behavior in education (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Pascale, R. T. (1990). Managing on the edge. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Patterson, J. L., Purkey, S., & Parker, J. V. (1986). Productive school systems for a nonrational world. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

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

Pitner, N. J. (1986, Spring). Substitutes for principal leader behavior: An exploratory study. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22, 23-42.

Poole, W. L. (1994). Removing the "super" from supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 9(3), 284-309.

Price, S. L. (1969). A study of the role of the department head in selected Oregon secondary schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 30, 3200A.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1982, December). Too soon to cheer? Synthesis of research on effective schools. Educational Leadership, 40, 64-69.

Raun, T., & Leithwood, K. (1993). Pragmatism, participation and duty: Value themes in superintendents' problem-solving. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy (Eds.), Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 54-70). New York: Teachers College Press.

Reber, A. S. (1985). The Penguin dictionary of psychology. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Ritter, W. E. (1979). Responsibilities of department chairpersons as perceived by exemplary high school principals (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 6097A.

Rosenholtz, S .J (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Sarason, S. B. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schein, E. H. (1990, February). Organizational culture. American Psychologist, 45, 109-119.

Schlechty, P. C. (1990). Schools for the twenty-first century: The conditions for invention. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now (pp. 233-255). New York: The Falmer Press

Schmuck, R. A., & Runckel, P. J. (1988). The handbook of organizational development in schools (3rd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Schrage, M. (1990). Shared minds: The new technologies of collaboration. New York: Random House.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline. New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J (1984). Handbook for effective department leadership: Concepts and practices in today's secondary schools. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1987). The theoretical basis for cultural leadership. In L. T. Sheive & M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: Examining the elusive (pp. 116-129). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). Building community in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J (1993). Supervision: A redefinition. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Siskin, L. S. (1991, May). Departments as different worlds: Subject subcultures in secondary schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27, 134-160.

Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1987). Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Taylor, F. W. (1980). The principles of scientific management. In D. Mankin, R. E. Ames Jr., & M. A. Grodsky (Eds.). Classics of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 15-28). Oak Park, IL: Moore Publishing Company, Inc.

Turner, H. E. (1983, September). The department head—An untapped source of instructional leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 67, 25-28.

Wasley, P. A. (1991). Teachers who lead: The rhetoric of reform and the realities of practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Weaver, F., & Gordon, J. (1979, May). Staff development needs of department heads. Educational Leadership, 36, 578-580.

Weber, J. R. (1987). Instructional leadership: Contexts and challenges. Eugene: Oregon School Study Council.

Wilkinson, L., Hill, M., & Vang, E. (1992). SYSTAT for the Macintosh, version 5.2 [Computer program]. Evanston, IL: SYSTAT, Inc.

Williams, P. A. (1979, October). A comparative study of the perceptions of the role of the English departmental chairperson. CSSEDC Quarterly, 1, 2-3.

Wimpelberg, R. K. (1987). The dilemma of instructional leadership and a central role for central office. In W. D. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies (pp. 100-117). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Yukl, G. A. (1981). Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

PERCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE OF THE HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT CHAIR

PART I

1. CURRENT POSITION
___1) Superintendent
___2) Principal
___3) English Department Chair
___4) Math Department Chair
___5) Science Department Chair
___6) Social Studies Department Chair
___7) English Teacher
___8) Math Teacher
___9) Science Teacher
___10) Social Studies Teacher

2. GENDER
___1) Male
___2) Female

3. AGE
___1) 29 or under
___2) 30-39
___3) 40-49
___4) 50 or over

4. LENGTH OF TIME IN CURRENT POSITION
___1) This has been the first year.
___2) 2-4 years
___3) 5-9 years
___4) 10 years or more

5. ADMINISTRATIVE CERTIFICATE HELD
___NO ___In Progress
___YES .....Type?_____

6. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND (please complete all that apply)
___1) Bachelor's degree(s) Major(s)_____Minor(s)_____
___2) Master's degree(s) Major(s)_____
___3) Doctorate Major_____

7. EXPERIENCE (Indicate total years of experience in each position that applies; include this year.)
___1) Teacher only Area(s) _____(science, p.e., etc.)
___2) Teacher/Dept. Chair Area(s) _____(science, math, etc.)
___3) Principal Level:_____high school ___middle school ___elementary school
___4) Superintendent.

IF YOU ARE NOT CURRENTLY A DEPARTMENT CHAIR, PLEASE GO ON TO PART II ON THE NEXT PAGE

DEPARTMENT CHAIRS ONLY. PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 8 — 15

8. How many instructional periods constitute a full-time teaching load in your department?
___1) 5 periods ___2) 6 periods ___other (specify)

9. How many periods per day do you teach? _____

10) How many periods per day does your school provide you for your department chair duties?

11) Excluding yourself, how many teachers are in your department?

12. What is the term of appointment for your department chair position?
___1) 1 years ___3) indefinite time/permanent
___2) 3 years ___5) other (specify)_____

13. How is the department chair selected?
___1) appointed by the principal
___2) elected by the department
___3) other (specify)_____

14. Do you receive additional yearly compensation for your DC position?
___YES (specify amount)_____
___NO

15. As a department chair, are you on an extended contract?
___YES (specify number of days)_____
___NO

PLEASE GO ON TO PART II

PART II. Using the scales below, please circle the number in each column which best represents your judgment regarding the role of the department chair.

HOW MUCH TIME DOES THE CHAIR SPEND ON THIS ACTIVITY?	HOW IMPORTANT IS THIS ACTIVITY TO THE ROLE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR?	HOW IMPORTANT IS IT FOR THIS CHAIR TO CONTINUE TO IMPROVE IN THIS AREA?
(1) No time is spent	(1) It is of no importance	(1) It is of no importance
(2) Little time is spent	(2) It is of little importance	(2) It is of little importance
(3) A moderate amount of time is spent	(3) It is of moderate importance	(3) It is of moderate importance
(4) A good deal of time is spent	(4) It is very important	(4) It is very important
(5) A great deal of time is spent	(5) It is extremely important	(5) It is extremely important

A. HUMAN RELATIONS RESPONSIBILITIES	DC Time Spent	Importance to DC Role	Importance to Improve
1. Build and maintain a supportive department team	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Encourage open communication among department members	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Facilitate effective conflict resolution	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Foster cooperative problem solving	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Encourage trust, caring, and respect among department members	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Maintain regular, open communication with department members	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Practice collaborative, participative decision-making processes	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. Encourage department members to share in leadership roles	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

B. MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES	DC Time Spent	Importance to DC Role	Importance to Improve
1. Develop department teaching schedule and assignments	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Participate in the selection of department instructional personnel	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Develop and administer the department budget	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Disseminate information to department staff	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Allocate and maintain equipment, instructional materials, facilities	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Interpret and apply district policy and building standards	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Plan and organize relevant department meetings	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Serve as liaison between department members and administration	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

PART II, con't. Using the scales below, circle the number in each column which best represents your judgment regarding the role of the department chair.

HOW MUCH TIME DOES THE CHAIR SPEND ON THIS ACTIVITY?	HOW IMPORTANT IS THIS ACTIVITY TO THE ROLE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR?	HOW IMPORTANT IS IT FOR THE CHAIR TO CONTINUE TO IMPROVE IN THIS AREA?
(1) No time is spent	(1) It is of no importance	(1) It is of no importance
(2) Little time is spent	(2) It is of little importance	(2) It is of little importance
(3) A moderate amount of time is spent	(3) It is of moderate importance	(3) It is of moderate importance
(4) A good deal of time is spent	(4) It is very important	(4) It is very important
(5) A great deal of time is spent	(5) It is extremely important	(5) It is extremely important

C. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE ORGANIZATION	DC Time Spent	Importance to DC Role	Importance to Improve
1. Engage department members in an organized department growth and improvement effort	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Serve as department spokesperson at community and board meetings	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Prepare requested information on department topics for principal, central office, board	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Act as advocate for the protection of classroom instructional time	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Support teachers' professional needs and concerns	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Work with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Participate in curricular planning and decision making at the district level	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

D. PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITIES	DC Time Spent	Importance to DC Role	Importance to Improve
1. Facilitate development of curriculum (philosophy, goals, objectives)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Supervise the implementation of curriculum	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Monitor the continued maintenance of curriculum	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Devise and implement processes for program evaluation	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Provide leadership in selection and development of instructional materials	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Establish goals for program improvement	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

PART II, con't. Using the scales below, circle the number in each column which best represents your judgment regarding the role of the department chair.

HOW MUCH TIME DOES THE CHAIR SPEND ON THIS ACTIVITY?	HOW IMPORTANT IS THIS ACTIVITY TO THE ROLE OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR?	HOW IMPORTANT IS IT FOR THE CHAIR TO CONTINUE TO IMPROVE IN THIS AREA?
(1) No time is spent (2) Little time is spent (3) A moderate amount of time is spent (4) A good deal of time is spent (5) A great deal of time is spent	(1) It is of no importance (2) It is of little importance (3) It is of moderate importance (4) It is very important (5) It is extremely important	(1) It is of no importance (2) It is of little importance (3) It is of moderate importance (4) It is very important (5) It is extremely important

E. SUPERVISION RESPONSIBILITIES	DC Time Spent	Importance to DC Role	Importance to Improve
1. Model a variety of instructional strategies	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Assist teachers in developing professional growth plans	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Encourage experimentation and innovation among teachers	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Coordinate instruction among department members	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Monitor teacher lesson plans	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Practice clinical supervision (pre-conference, data collection, post-conference)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Communicate high expectations for teacher performance	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. Assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. Organize plan for teacher sharing, peer coaching (e.g., videotaped lessons, classroom visitations	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11. Evaluate teacher performance	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

PART III

On the lines below, please rank order the previously defined areas of department chair from 1 through 5, with 1 representing the most important area of responsibility and 5 representing the least important area of responsibility.

____Human Relations
____Management
____Organization
____Program
____Supervision

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTERS

April 20, 1991

Dear Educator:

We are writing to request your participation in a study of the role of the secondary department chair we are conducting through the Portland State University School of Education. This dissertation study is a cooperative effort of Bill Korach, the superintendent of schools in the Lake Oswego School District, and Ricky Korach, the English department chair of Lake Oswego High School. Our study seeks to define the current role of the secondary department chair in the state of Oregon from the perspectives of superintendents and principals as well as those of department chairs and teachers in four areas: English, social studies, mathematics, and science.

We would appreciate your taking the time to respond to the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us in the self-addressed, stamped envelope before May 8.

In reporting the results of the study, only statistical summaries of the responses of the four groups (superintendents, principals, department chairs, and teachers) will be shared. Persons, schools, or school districts will not be individually identified. All information will be treated in strictest confidence.

Your response is important in helping us to develop a definitive profile of the role of the secondary department chair in Oregon schools. As we analyze and report the results of our study, we will be happy to share that information with you if you would care to request it.

Thank you for your cooperation in support of this project.

Sincerely,

William A. Korach, Superintendent
Lake Oswego School District

Rachel M. Korach
English Department Chair
Lake Oswego High School

May 6, 1991

Dear Colleague:

For the past year we have been conducting a study of the role of the department chair in Oregon high schools through the Portland State University School of Education. This dissertation study is a cooperative effort of Bill Korach, the superintendent of schools in the Lake Oswego School District, and Ricky Korach, the English department chair of Lake Oswego High School. Our study seeks to define the current role of the secondary department chair in the state of Oregon from the perspectives of superintendents and principals as well as those of department chairs and teachers in four areas: English, social studies, mathematics, and science.

As the culminating activity of this study, we would appreciate your taking the time to respond to the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us in the self-addressed, stamped envelope before May 28.

In reporting the results of the study, only statistical summaries of the responses of the four groups (superintendents, principals, department chairs and teachers) will be shared. Persons, schools, or school districts will not be individually identified. All information will be treated in strictest confidence.

Your response is important in helping us to develop a definitive profile of the role of the secondary department chair in Oregon schools. As we analyze and report the results of our study, we will be happy to share that information with you if you would care to request it.

Thank you for your cooperation in support of this project.

Sincerely,

William A. Korach, Superintendent
Lake Oswego School District

Rachel M. Korach
English Department Chair
Lake Oswego High School

May 29, 1991

Dear Administrator:

Recently we wrote to you requesting your participation in a study of the role of the secondary department chair in Oregon. For this study to be truly representative, a return from each person to whom we sent the questionnaire is important. If you have already completed the questionnaire, thank you very much for your participation. If you have not done so, we would be appreciative if you could complete and return it within the next week.

For your convenience in responding, we have enclosed an additional copy of the questionnaire and a stamped, return-addressed envelope.

Your participation in this study will help to define the current leadership role of the academic department chair in Oregon high schools. Thank you for your professional interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

William A. Korach, Superintendent
Lake Oswego School District

Rachel M. Korach, English Department Chair
Lake Oswego High School

May 29, 1991

Dear Department Chair:

Recently we wrote to you requesting your participation in a study of the role of the secondary department chair in Oregon. For this study to be truly representative, a return from each person to whom we sent the questionnaire is important. If you have already completed the questionnaire, thank you very much for your participation. If you have not done so, we would be appreciative if you could complete and return it within the next week.

For your convenience in responding, we have enclosed an additional copy of the questionnaire and a stamped, return-addressed envelope. Since we cannot personally contact the members of your department to whom the teacher questionnaire was distributed, we would also appreciate your reminding them to return their completed questionnaires.

Your participation in this study will help to define the current leadership role of the academic department chair in Oregon high schools. Thank you for your professional interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

William A. Korach, Superintendent
Lake Oswego School District

Rachel M. Korach, English Department Chair
Lake Oswego High School

APPENDIX C

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION CHARTS: SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS

Chart C1

Department Chair Responsibility for Human Relations: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importanceto the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Superintendents and High School Principals
[By Frequencies of Responses for Each of Four Ratings]
Subjects: Superintendents (N =27), Principals (N =34)

Activity	Group	Time*				Role**				Improve**			
		2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
HR1. Build and maintain a supportive department team	Superintendents	4	9	8	6	0	3	12	12	1	4	9	13
	Principals	3	16	14	1	1	2	13	18	0	2	16	16
HR2. Encourage open communication among department members	Superintendents	5	6	6	10	0	3	10	14	2	2	9	14
	Principals	4	17	8	5	1	2	11	20	1	1	11	21
HR3. Facilitate effective conflict resolution	Superintendents	9	8	7	3	0	5	13	9	0	5	12	10
	Principals	11	14	6	3	1	4	14	15	0	4	13	17
HR4. Foster cooperative problem solving	Superintendents	5	8	8	6	0	4	11	12	1	4	10	12
	Principals	7	14	12	1	1	2	15	16	0	2	15	17
HR5. Encourage trust, caring, and respect among department members	Superintendents	5	9	8	5	0	7	11	9	1	5	10	11
	Principals	4	11	16	3	1	4	9	20	0	4	10	20
HR6. Maintain regular, open communication with department members	Superintendents	1	8	12	6	2	1	9	15	3	1	9	14
	Principals	4	7	13	10	1	1	6	26	1	3	6	24
HR7. Practice collaborative, participative decision-making processes	Superintendents	4	10	10	3	1	4	10	12	2	2	11	12
	Principals	6	13	10	5	3	1	12	18	0	2	12	20
HR8. Promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement	Superintendents	5	13	3	6	0	1	9	17	1	1	7	18
	Principals	8	10	12	4	3	1	7	23	2	0	8	24
HR9. Encourage department members to share in leadership roles	Superintendents	8	12	5	2	3	6	11	7	2	7	8	10
	Principals	15	11	8	0	1	12	13	8	1	10	10	13

* Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no time); 3 (a moderate amount of time); 4 (a good deal of time); and 5 (a great deal of time)
** Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no importance); 3 (moderate importance); 4 (very important); and 5 (extremely important)

Chart C2

Department Chair Responsibility for Management: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Superintendents and High School Principals
[By Frequencies of Responses for Each of Four Ratings]
Subjects: Superintendents (N=27), Principals (N=34)

Activity	Group	Time*				Role**				Improve**			
		2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
MG1. Develop department teaching schedule and assignments	Superintendents	7	10	10	0	3	12	8	4	8	9	7	3
	Principals	2	14	15	3	1	9	14	10	1	15	11	7
MG2. Participate in the selection of department instructional personnel	Superintendents	5	10	8	4	2	5	11	9	3	6	8	10
	Principals	6	11	14	3	3	5	13	13	4	7	10	11
MG3. Develop and administer the department budget	Superintendents	6	7	11	3	2	9	12	4	4	9	11	3
	Principals	5	7	16	6	2	4	13	15	4	9	12	9
MG4. Disseminate information to department staff	Superintendents	3	10	10	4	2	7	9	9	3	6	11	7
	Principals	4	9	15	6	1	2	15	16	2	5	17	10
MG5. Allocate and maintain equipment, instructional materials, and facilities	Superintendents	6	14	6	1	5	14	5	3	6	15	3	3
	Principals	5	11	15	3	4	8	13	9	4	12	12	6
MG6. Interpret and apply district policy and building standards	Superintendents	11	9	4	3	2	10	8	7	3	11	5	8
	Principals	13	11	9	1	4	11	12	7	5	14	11	4
MG7. Plan and organize relevant department meetings	Superintendents	3	11	8	5	0	3	11	13	1	4	7	15
	Principals	4	9	18	3	1	2	16	15	1	6	12	15
MG8. Serve as liaison between department members and the administration	Superintendents	3	9	9	6	1	3	13	10	1	6	11	9
	Principals	3	10	15	6	2	1	11	20	2	1	14	17

* Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no time); 3 (a moderate amount of time); 4 (a good deal of time); and 5 (a great deal of time)
** Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no importance); 3 (moderate importance); 4 (very important); and 5 (extremely important)

Chart C3

Department Chair Responsibility for the Organization: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Superintendents and High School Principals
[By Frequencies of Responses for Each of Four Ratings]
Subjects: Superintendents (N=27), Principals (N=34)

Activity	Group	Time*				Role**				Improve**			
		2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
OR1. Engage department members in an organized department growth and improvement effort	Superintendents	13	8	5	1	1	5	10	11	2	2	8	15
	Principals	12	15	5	2	1	3	16	14	0	4	11	19
OR2. Represent the department in developing/implementing school's organized improvement effort	Superintendents	6	10	8	3	2	3	11	11	2	2	10	13
	Principals	9	12	10	3	1	2	16	16	0	2	16	16
OR3. Serve as department spokesperson at community and board meetings	Superintendents	14	9	1	3	5	10	8	4	4	8	8	7
	Principals	21	6	7	0	10	12	8	4	8	11	8	7
OR4. Prepare requested information on department topics for principal, central office, school board	Superintendents	10	11	2	4	2	12	9	4	3	13	7	4
	Principals	14	12	7	1	4	12	13	5	6	7	14	7
OR5. Act as an advocate for the protection of classroom instructional time	Superintendents	10	7	6	4	0	8	13	6	4	6	10	7
	Principals	8	16	8	2	3	7	18	6	4	9	16	5
OR6. Support teachers' professional needs and concerns	Superintendents	6	9	8	4	2	9	11	5	4	8	9	6
	Principals	6	16	10	2	3	5	18	8	4	6	19	5
OR7. Work with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program	Superintendents	8	10	7	2	1	5	8	13	1	5	7	14
	Principals	12	12	6	4	2	6	12	14	2	4	11	17
OR8. Participate in district-level planning and decision making	Superintendents	8	10	5	4	3	3	11	10	7	1	5	7
	Principals	8	13	13	0	2	6	12	14	0	4	5	12

* Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no time); 3 (a moderate amount of time); 4 (a good deal of time); and 5 (a great deal of time)
** Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no importance); 3 (moderate importance); 4 (very important); and 5 (extremely important)

Chart C4

Department Chair Responsibility for Program: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Superintendents and High School Principals
[By Frequencies of Responses for Each of Four Ratings]
Subjects: Superintendents (N=27), Principals (N=34)

Activity	Group	Time*				Role**				Improve**			
		2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
PG1. Facilitate development of curriculum	Superintendents	7	9	7	4	0	3	16	8	0	6	9	12
	Principals	5	13	13	3	1	3	11	19	1	5	7	21
PG2. Supervise the implementation of curriculum	Superintendents	7	9	8	3	0	1	15	11	0	3	10	14
	Principals	5	15	12	2	1	4	12	17	0	5	11	18
PG3. Monitor the continued maintenance of curriculum	Superintendents	8	9	7	3	0	4	14	9	1	6	11	9
	Principals	6	12	12	4	1	2	16	15	1	3	18	12
PG4. Devise and implement process for program evaluation	Superintendents	12	4	8	3	1	2	13	11	1	3	12	11
	Principals	17	7	8	2	2	6	16	10	1	4	15	4
PG5. Provide leadership in the selection and development of instructional materials	Superintendents	5	7	12	3	0	4	15	8	1	8	13	5
	Principals	3	14	15	2	0	6	12	16	2	8	12	12
PG6. Coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials	Superintendents	4	6	14	3	0	3	15	9	1	9	11	6
	Principals	1	9	19	5	1	1	18	14	3	5	15	11
PG7. Assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses	Superintendents	9	10	5	3	1	2	12	12	1	4	6	16
	Principals	15	12	6	1	2	3	15	14	0	4	11	19
PG8. Establish goals for program improvement	Superintendents	10	6	8	3	0	1	15	11	0	2	13	12
	Principals	12	10	11	1	1	5	13	15	0	4	16	14

* Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no time); 3 (a moderate amount of time); 4 (a good deal of time); and 5 (a great deal of time)
** Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no importance); 3 (moderate importance); 4 (very important); and 5 (extremely important)

Chart C5

Department Chair Responsibility for Supervision: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Superintendents and High School Principals
[By Frequencies of Responses Given for Each of Four Ratings]
Subjects: Superintendents (N = 27) Principals (N = 34)

Activity	Group	Time*				Role**				Improve**			
		2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
SP1. Model a variety of instructional strategies	Superintendents	16	7	2	2	3	3	17	4	2	2	11	12
	Principals	17	9	8	0	2	10	10	12	1	7	12	14
SP2. Assist teachers in developing professional growth plans	Superintendents	15	8	4	0	3	8	13	3	3	6	11	7
	Principals	22	8	4	0	5	12	9	8	4	9	11	10
SP3. Encourage experimentation and innovation among teachers	Superintendents	12	10	2	3	2	5	13	7	2	3	12	10
	Principals	14	16	4	0	2	7	15	10	2	7	10	15
SP4. Coordinate instruction among department members	Superintendents	6	10	8	3	1	3	13	10	2	2	13	10
	Principals	7	17	9	1	3	6	15	10	2	8	11	13
SP5. Observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback	Superintendents	12	11	4	0	4	8	9	6	2	6	9	10
	Principals	21	8	3	2	3	4	18	9	3	6	11	14
SP6. Monitor teacher lesson plans	Superintendents	21	5	1	0	10	9	5	5	10	10	2	5
	Principals	27	5	2	0	10	17	4	3	10	13	6	5
SP7. Practice clinical supervision	Superintendents	16	5	4	2	7	7	7	6	8	3	7	9
	Principals	26	5	1	2	13	6	9	6	10	7	10	7
SP8. Communicate high expectations for teacher performance	Superintendents	9	9	4	5	1	4	6	16	2	3	5	17
	Principals	11	16	6	1	1	7	11	15	2	6	11	15
SP9. Assist teachers with improvement of their instruction	Superintendents	12	8	3	4	2	3	7	15	3	2	5	17
	Principals	16	11	7	0	2	6	13	13	1	6	13	14
SP10. Organize plan for teacher sharing, peer coaching	Superintendents	12	10	5	0	2	5	13	7	2	5	11	9
	Principals	22	7	4	1	4	6	15	9	2	7	12	13
SP11. Evaluate teacher performance	Superintendents	18	8	1	0	13	5	6	3	13	4	4	6
	Principals	27	5	1	1	19	5	6	4	18	5	5	6

* Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no time); 3 (a moderate amount of time); 4 (a good deal of time); and 5 (a great deal of time)

APPENDIX D

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION CHARTS: SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS

Chart D1

Department Chair Responsibility for Human Relations: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Superintendents and Principals Subjects (N = 61)

Activity	Issue	Superintendents (N = 27)		Principals (N = 34)	
		M	SD	M	SD
1. Build and maintain a supportive department team	Time Spent	3.556	1.086	3.382	0.697
	Importance to Role	4.333	0.679	4.382	0.870
	Importance to Improve	4.259	0.859	4.412	0.609
2. Encourage open communication among department members	Time Spent	3.778	1.155	3.412	0.892
	Importance to Role	4.407	0.690	4.471	0.748
	Importance to Improve	4.296	0.912	4.500	0.826
3. Facilitate effective conflict resolution	Time Spent	3.111	1.086	2.971	1.029
	Importance to Role	4.148	0.718	4.235	0.890
	Importance to Improve	4.185	0.736	4.382	0.697
4. Foster cooperative problem solving	Time Spent	3.556	1.050	3.206	0.808
	Importance to Role	4.296	0.724	4.353	0.734
	Importance to Improve	4.222	0.847	4.441	0.613
5. Encourage trust, caring, and respect among department members	Time Spent	3.444	1.086	3.471	0.961
	Importance to Role	4.074	0.781	4.382	0.922
	Importance to Improve	4.148	0.864	4.471	0.706
6. Maintain regular, open communication with department members	Time Spent	3.852	0.818	3.853	0.989
	Importance to Role	4.370	0.884	4.676	0.684
	Importance to Improve	4.259	0.984	4.529	0.896
7. Practice collaborative, participative decision-making processes	Time Spent	3.444	0.892	3.382	1.015
	Importance to Role	4.222	0.847	4.294	1.001
	Importance to Improve	4.222	0.892	4.529	0.615
8. Promote atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement	Time Spent	3.333	1.109	3.294	1.088
	Importance to Role	4.593	0.572	4.412	1.104
	Importance to Improve	4.556	0.751	4.529	0.992
9. Encourage department members to share in leadership roles	Time Spent	3.000	0.961	2.588	1.076
	Importance to Role	3.815	0.962	3.794	0.914
	Importance to Improve	3.963	0.960	4.029	0.904

* Rating scale 1—5: 1 (*no time*); 2 (*little time*); 3 (*a moderate amount of time*); 4 (*a good deal of time*); and 5 (*a great deal of time*)

** Rating scale 1—5: 1 (*no importance*); 2 (*little importance*); 3 (*moderate importance*); 4 (*very important*); and 5 (*extremely important*)

Chart D2

Department Chair Responsibility for Management: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Superintendents and Principals Subjects (N = 61)

Activity	Issue	Superintendents (N = 27)		Principals (N = 34)	
		M	SD	M	SD
1. Develop department teaching schedule and assignments	Time Spent	3.074	0.874	3.559	0.746
	Importance to Role	3.481	0.8931.	3.971	0.834
	Importance to Improve	3.111	121	3.706	0.836
2. Participate in the selection of department instructional personnel	Time Spent	3.333	1.109	3.353	1.012
	Importance to Role	4.000	0.920	4.029	1.029
	Importance to Improve	3.852	1.199	3.765	1.156
3. Develop and administer the department budget	Time Spent	3.407	0.971	3.676	0.945
	Importance to Role	3.407	0.971	4.153	0.888
	Importance to Improve	3.407	1.047	3.706	1.115
4. Disseminate information to department staff	Time Spent	3.556	0.892	3.676	0.912
	Importance to Role	3.926	0.958	4.353	0.730
	Importance to Improve	3.704	1.203	4.000	0.921
5. Allocate and maintain equipment, instructional materials, and facilities	Time Spent	3.074	0.781	3.441	0.927
	Importance to Role	3.222	0.892	3.765	1.046
	Importance to Improve	1.963	1.126	3.500	1.108
6. Interpret and apply district policy and building standards	Time Spent	2.889	1.121	2.882	0.977
	Importance to Role	3.741	0.944	3.618	1.015
	Importance to Improve	3.593	1.185	3.353	1.012
7. Plan and organize relevant department meetings	Time Spent	3.556	0.934	3.588	0.821
	Importance to Role	4.370	0.688	4.324	0.727
	Importance to Improve	4.296	0.993	4.206	0.845
8. Serve as liaison between department members and the administration	Time Spent	3.667	0.961	3.706	0.871
	Importance to Role	4.185	0.786	4.441	0.824
	Importance to Improve	4.037	0.854	4.324	0.912

* Rating scale 1—5: 1 (*no time*); 2 (*little time*); 3 (*a moderate amount of time*); 4 (*a good deal of time*); and 5 (*a great deal of time*)

** Rating scale 1—5: 1 (*no importance*); 2 (*little importance*); 3 (*moderate importance*); 4 (*very important*); and 5 (*extremely important*)

Chart D3

Department Chair Responsibility for the Organization: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent.* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Superintendents and Principals
Subjects (N = 61)

Activity	Issue	Superintendents (N = 27)		Principals (N = 34)	
		M	SD	M	SD
1. Engage department members in an organized department growth and improvement effort	Time Spent	2.704	0.993	2.882	0.913
	Impt. to Role	4.111	0.974	4.265	0.751
	Impt. to Improve	4.296	1.031	4.441	0.705
2. Represent the department in developing/implementing the school's organized improvement effort	Time Spent	3.185	1.145	3.206	0.946
	Impt. to Role	4.111	1.013	4.324	0.727
	Impt. to Improve	4.222	1.013	4.412	0.609
3. Serve as department spokesperson at community meetings, board meetings	Time Spent	2.519	1.221	2.412	1.019
	Impt. to Role	3.333	1.109	3.088	1.138
	Impt. to Improve	3.630	1.115	3/324	1.224
4. Prepare requested information on department topics for principal, central office, school board	Time Spent	2.852	1.231	2.765	0.987
	Impt. to Role	3.556	0.847	3.471	1.080
	Impt. to Improve	3.407	0.971	3.529	1.237
5. Act as advocate for the protection of classroom instructional time	Time Spent	3.111	1.155	3.118	0.844
	Impt. to Role	3.926	0.730	3.765	0.923
	Impt. to Improve	3.667	1.177	3.588	1.019
6. Support teachers' professional needs and concerns	Time Spent	3.296	1.137	3.206	0.880
	Impt. to Role	3.704	0.689	3.882	0.946
	Impt. to Improve	3.519	1.221	3.647	1.070
7. Work with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program	Time Spent	2.926	1.207	2.853	1.282
	Impt. to Role	4.222	0.892	4.088	0.996
	Impt. to Improve	4.222	1.103	4.265	0.898
8. Participate in curricular planning and decision making at the district level	Time Spent	3.074	1.207	3.088	0.900
	Impt. to Role	3.963	1.160	4.088	0.996
	Impt. to Improve	3.963	1.224	4.000	1.015

* Rating scale 1—5: 1 (*no time*); 2 (*little time*); 3 (*a moderate amount of time*); 4 (*a good deal of time*); and 5 (*a great deal of time*)

** Rating scale 1—5: 1 (*no importance*); 2 (*little importance*); 3 (*moderate importance*); 4 (*very important*); and 5 (*extremely important*)

Chart D4

Department Chair Responsibility for Program: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Superintendents and Principals Subjects (N = 61)

Activity	Issue	Superintendents (N = 27)		Principals (N = 34)	
		M	SD	M	SD
1. Facilitate development of curriculum (philosophy, goals, objectives)	Time Spent	2.296	1.031	3.412	0.857
	Importance to Role	4.185	0.622	4.412	0.873
	Importance to Improve	4.222	0.801	4.412	0.857
2. Supervise the implementation of curriculum	Time Spent	3.222	1.050	3.265	0.931
	Importance to Role	4.370	0.565	4.294	0.906
	Importance to Improve	4.407	0.692	4.382	0.739
3. Monitor the continued maintenance of curriculum	Time Spent	3.148	1.064	3.353	1.041
	Importance to Role	4.185	0.681	4.294	0.836
	Importance to Improve	4.037	0.854	4.176	0.834
4. Devise and implement process for program evaluation	Time Spent	3.000	1.209	2.676	1.199
	Importance to Role	4.259	0.764	3.941	1.103
	Importance to Improve	4.222	0.801	4.206	0.880
5. Provide leadership in the selection and development of instructional materials	Time Spent	3.481	0.935	3.471	0.748
	Importance to Role	4.148	0.662	4.294	0.760
	Importance to Improve	3.815	0.876	3.971	1.000
6. Coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials	Time Spent	3.593	0.880	3.824	0.716
	Importance to Role	4.222	0.641	4.324	0.684
	Importance to Improve	3.815	0.834	3.971	1.000
7. Assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses	Time Spent	2.963	1.160	2.647	1.041
	Importance to Role	4.296	0.775	4.276	0.936
	Importance to Improve	4.370	0.884	4.441	0.705
8. Establish goals for program improvement	Time Spent	3.111	1.121	2.941	1.043
	Importance to Role	4.370	0.565	4.206	0.914
	Importance to Improve	4.370	0.629	4.294	0.676

* Rating scale 1—5: 1 (*no time*); 2 (*little time*); 3 (*a moderate amount of time*); 4 (*a good deal of time*); and 5 (*a great deal of time*)

** Rating scale 1—5: 1 (*no importance*); 2 (*little importance*); 3 (*moderate importance*); 4 (*very important*); and 5 (*extremely important*)

Chart D5

Department Chair Responsibility for Supervision: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Superintendents and Principals
Subjects (N = 61)

Activity	Issue	Superintendents (N = 27)		Principals (N = 34)	
		M	SD	M	SD
1. Model a variety of instructional strategies	Time Spent	2.444	1.121	2.588	1.019
	Importance to Role	3.815	0.834	3.882	1.094
	Importance to Improve	4.222	0.892	4.118	0.946
2. Assist teachers in developing professional growth plans	Time Spent	2.370	1.006	2.235	0.955
	Importance to Role	3.556	0.934	3.529	1.134
	Importance to Improve	3.778	1.050	3.735	1.136
3. Encourage innovation and experimentation among teachers	Time Spent	2.704	1.171	2.588	0.857
	Importance to Role	3.889	0.974	3.941	0.952
	Importance to Improve	4.074	0.997	4.118	0.946
4. Coordinate instruction among department members	Time Spent	3.259	1.023	3.059	0.886
	Importance to Role	4.185	0.780	3.912	0.990
	Importance to Improve	4.148	0.864	4.029	0.937
5. Observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback	Time Spent	2.556	0.934	2.382	1.101
	Importance to Role	3.593	1.083	3.912	1.026
	Importance to Improve	3.963	1.055	4.029	0.937
6. Monitor teacher lesson plans	Time Spent	1.963	0.808	1.765	0.923
	Importance to Role	2.963	1.126	2.824	1.141
	Importance to Improve	2.963	1.255	2.971	1.314
7. Practice clinical supervision	Time Spent	2.444	1.251	1.853	1.158
	Importance to Role	3.370	1.245	3.059	1.391
	Importance to Improve	3.556	1.368	3.265	1.355
8. Communicate high expectations for teacher performance	Time Spent	3.000	1.359	2.794	0.978
	Importance to Role	4.333	1.000	4.147	0.958
	Importance to Improve	4.333	1.074	4.147	0.925
9. Assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction	Time Spent	2.852	1.231	2.647	0.917
	Importance to Role	4.259	1.059	4.059	0.983
	Importance to Improve	4.296	1.137	4.147	0.925
10. Organize plan for teacher sharing, peer coaching	Time Spent	2.556	1.013	2.265	1.082
	Importance to Role	3.852	1.064	3.765	1.156
	Importance to Improve	3.296	1.107	4.000	1.073
11. Evaluate teacher performance	Time Spent	1.963	0.940	1.676	1.036
	Importance to Role	2.630	1.145	2.382	1.518
	Importance to Improve	2.778	1.601	2.529	1.600

* Rating scale 1—5: 1 *(no time)*; 2 *(littletime)*; 3 *(moderate amount)*; 4 *(a good deal)*; 5 *(a great deal)*
** Rating scale 1—5: 1 *(no importance)*; 2 *(little importance)*; 3 *(moderate importance)*; 4 *(very important)*; and 5 *(extremely important)*

APPENDIX E

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION CHARTS: ADMINISTRATORS, DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

Chart E1

Department Chair Responsibility for Human Relations: Ratings of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs
[By Frequencies of Responses Given for Each of Four Ratings]
Subjects: Department Chairs (N = 118), Administrators (N = 61)

Activity	Group	Time*				Role**				Improve**			
		2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
HR1. Build and maintain a supportive department team	Department Chair	15	51	39	13	9	11	61	37	7	17	47	47
	Administrator	7	25	22	7	1	5	25	30	1	6	25	29
HR2. Encourage open communication among department members	Department Chair	9	45	38	26	4	6	57	51	3	13	50	52
	Administrator	9	23	14	15	1	5	21	34	3	3	20	35
HR3. Facilitate effective conflict resolution	Department Chair	44	42	23	9	12	25	53	28	11	31	49	27
	Administrator	20	22	13	6	1	9	27	24	0	9	25	27
HR4. Foster cooperative problem solving	Department Chair	24	48	35	11	7	27	49	35	8	26	48	36
	Administrator	12	22	20	7	1	6	26	28	1	6	25	29
HR5. Encourage trust, caring, and respect among department members	Department Chair	13	41	38	26	5	12	43	58	4	21	44	49
	Administrator	9	20	24	8	1	11	20	29	1	9	20	31
HR6. Maintain regular, open communication with department members	Department Chair	1	32	41	44	2	7	32	78	2	18	33	65
	Administrator	5	15	25	16	3	2	15	41	4	4	15	38
HR7. Practice collaborative, participative decision-making processes	Department Chair	17	41	34	26	2	21	43	52	1	28	45	44
	Administrator	10	23	20	8	4	5	22	30	2	4	23	32
HR8. Promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement	Department Chair	12	39	48	19	1	15	45	57	2	17	40	59
	Administrator	13	23	15	10	3	2	16	40	3	1	15	42
HR9. Encourage department members to share in leadership roles	Department Chair	30	57	22	9	6	39	46	27	10	30	50	28
	Administrator	23	23	13	2	4	18	24	15	3	17	18	23

* Rating scale 2—5: 2 (*little or no time*); 3 (*a moderate amount of time*); 4 (*a good deal of time*); and 5 (*a great deal of time*)
** Rating scale 2—5: 2 (*little or no importance*); 3 (*moderate importance*); 4 (*very important*); and 5 (*extremely important*)

Chart E2

Department Chair Responsibility for Management: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs
[By Frequencies of Responses Given for Each of Four Ratings]
Subjects: Department Chairs (N=118) Administrators (N=61)

Activity	Group	Time*				Role**				Improve**			
		2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
MG1. Develop department teaching schedule and assignments	Department Chair	19	38	35	26	2	24	48	44	12	29	39	38
	Administrator	9	24	25	3	4	21	22	14	9	24	18	10
MG2. Participate in the selection of department instructional personnel	Department Chair	42	32	29	16	4	18	43	53	8	19	44	47
	Administrator	11	21	22	7	5	10	24	22	7	15	18	21
MG3. Develop and administer the department budget	Department Chair	9	37	39	33	4	22	43	49	7	30	42	39
	Administrator	11	14	27	9	4	13	25	19	8	18	23	12
MG4. Disseminate information to department staff	Department Chair	6	31	35	46	5	18	40	55	8	33	34	43
	Administrator	7	19	25	10	3	9	24	25	5	11	28	17
MG5. Allocate and maintain equipment, instructional materials, and facilities	Department Chair	41	43	21	13	29	42	33	14	29	47	27	15
	Administrator	11	25	21	4	9	22	18	12	10	27	15	9
MG6. Interpret and apply district policy and building standards	Department Chair	43	46	20	9	25	41	33	19	26	47	25	20
	Administrator	24	20	13	4	6	21	20	14	8	25	16	12
MG7. Plan and organize relevant department meetings	Department Chair	13	27	42	26	4	17	51	46	8	22	41	47
	Administrator	7	20	26	8	1	5	27	28	2	10	19	30
MG8. Serve as liaison between department members and the administration	Department Chair	5	31	33	49	3	10	50	55	7	22	41	48
	Administrator	6	19	24	12	3	4	24	30	3	7	25	26

* Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no time); 3 (a moderate amount of time); 4 (a good deal of time); and 5 (a great deal of time)
** Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no importance); 3 (moderate importance); 4 (very important); and 5 (extremely important)

Chart E3

Department Chair Responsibility for the Organization: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs
[By Frequencies of Responses Given for Each of Four Ratings]
Subjects: Department Chairs (N = 118) Administrators (N = 61)

Activity	Group	Time*				Role**				Improve**			
		2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
OR1. Engage dept. members in an organized department growth/ improvement effort	Department Chair	36	43	26	13	9	32	44	34	6	35	34	43
	Administrator	25	23	10	3	2	7	26	25	2	6	19	34
OR2. Represent the department in developing/implementing school's organized improvement effort	Department Chair	20	38	41	19	9	35	45	29	11	36	38	33
	Administrator	15	22	18	6	3	5	27	26	2	4	26	29
OR3. Serve as department spokesperson at community and board meetings	Department Chair	69	26	12	11	31	31	41	15	28	41	34	15
	Administrator	35	15	8	3	15	22	16	8	12	19	16	14
OR4. Prepare requested information on department topics for principal, central office, school board	Department Chair	43	32	34	9	17	45	45	11	20	53	33	12
	Administrator	24	23	9	5	6	24	22	12	9	20	21	11
OR5. Act as an advocate for the protection of classroom instructional time	Department Chair	35	44	24	15	13	29	38	38	15	40	28	35
	Administrator	18	23	14	6	3	15	31	12	8	15	26	12
OR6. Support teachers' professional needs and concerns	Department Chair	31	38	33	16	8	32	42	36	14	37	32	35
	Administrator	12	25	18	6	5	14	29	13	8	14	28	11
OR7. Work with other dept. chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program	Department Chair	38	39	25	16	7	30	40	41	5	32	36	45
	Administrator	20	22	13	6	3	11	20	27	3	9	18	31
OR8. Participate in district-level planning and decision making	Department Chair	32	32	33	21	8	29	44	37	9	30	41	38
	Administrator	16	23	18	4	5	9	23	24	7	10	19	25

* Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no time); 3 (a moderate amount of time); 4 (a good deal of time); and 5 (a great deal of time)
** Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no importance); 3 (moderate importance); 4 (very important); and 5 (extremely important)

Chart E4

Department Chair Responsibility for Program: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs
[By Frequencies of Responses Given for Each of Four Ratings]
Subjects: Department Chairs (N=118) Administrators (N=61)

Activity	Group	Time*				Role**				Improve**			
		2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
PG1. Facilitate development of curriculum	Department Chair	15	37	38	28	5	20	56	37	6	25	53	34
	Administrator	12	22	20	7	1	6	27	27	1	11	16	33
PG2. Supervise the implementation of curriculum	Department Chair	35	34	32	17	9	22	50	37	8	32	43	35
	Administrator	12	24	20	5	1	5	27	28	0	8	21	32
PG3. Monitor the continued maintenance of curriculum	Department Chair	37	40	28	13	8	31	43	36	8	39	36	35
	Administrator	14	21	19	7	1	6	30	24	2	9	29	21
PG4. Devise and implement process for program evaluation	Department Chair	55	41	20	2	14	38	50	16	13	37	46	22
	Administrator	29	11	16	5	3	8	29	21	2	7	27	25
PG5. Provide leadership in the selection and development of instructional materials	Department Chair	19	47	24	28	6	32	44	36	8	36	37	37
	Administrator	8	21	27	5	0	10	27	24	3	16	25	17
PG6. Coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials	Department Chair	17	35	31	35	4	24	47	43	7	30	38	43
	Administrator	5	15	33	8	1	4	33	23	4	14	26	17
PG7. Assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses	Department Chair	49	38	26	5	11	31	55	21	12	28	54	24
	Administrator	24	22	11	4	3	5	27	26	1	8	17	35
PG8. Establish goals for program improvement	Department Chair	36	41	31	10	7	24	58	29	8	25	55	30
	Administrator	22	16	19	4	1	6	28	26	0	6	29	26

* Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no time); 3 (a moderate amount of time); 4 (a good deal of time); and 5 (a great deal of time)
** Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no importance); 3 (moderate importance); 4 (very important); and 5 (extremely important)

Chart E5

Department Chair Responsibility for Supervision: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent,* Importance to the Department Chair Role,** and Importance for the Chair to Continue to Improve** as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs
[By Frequencies of Responses Given for Each of Four Ratings]
Subjects: Department Chairs (N=118) Administrators (N=61)

Activity	Group	Time*				Role**				Improve**			
		2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5	2	3	4	5
SP1. Model a variety of instructional strategies	Department Chair	62	36	14	6	33	38	31	16	27	35	31	25
	Administrator	33	16	10	2	5	13	27	16	3	9	23	26
SP2. Assist teachers in developing professional growth plans	Department Chair	83	21	10	4	40	42	27	9	34	43	28	13
	Administrator	37	16	8	0	8	20	22	11	7	15	22	17
SP3. Encourage experimentation and innovation among teachers	Department Chair	37	47	25	9	18	22	48	30	16	21	48	33
	Administrator	26	26	6	3	4	12	28	17	4	10	22	25
SP4. Coordinate instruction among department members	Department Chair	31	51	30	6	10	35	50	23	6	37	43	32
	Administrator	13	27	17	4	4	9	28	20	4	10	24	23
SP5. Observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback	Department Chair	81	22	6	9	36	30	35	17	31	30	30	27
	Administrator	33	19	7	2	7	12	27	15	5	12	20	24
SP6. Monitor teacher lesson plans	Department Chair	107	6	3	2	78	26	11	3	72	27	12	7
	Administrator	48	10	3	0	20	26	9	6	20	23	8	10
SP7. Practice clinical supervision	Department Chair	97	11	8	2	67	28	17	6	63	31	14	10
	Teacher	42	10	5	4	20	13	16	12	18	10	17	16
SP8. Communicate high expectations for teacher performance	Department Chair	47	42	20	9	13	36	49	20	13	37	47	21
	Administrator	20	25	10	6	2	11	17	31	4	9	16	32
SP9. Assist teachers with improvement of their instruction	Department Chair	60	40	1	4	19	33	45	21	18	28	46	26
	Administrator	28	19	10	4	4	9	20	28	4	8	18	31
SP10. Organize plan for teacher sharing, peer coaching	Department Chair	92	18	5	3	39	38	26	15	36	36	27	19
	Administrator	34	17	9	1	6	11	28	16	4	12	23	22
SP11. Evaluate teacher performance	Department Chair	97	11	7	3	67	23	19	9	64	21	19	14
	Administrator	45	13	2	1	32	10	12	7	31	9	9	12

* Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no time); 3 (a moderate amount of time); 4 (a good deal of time); and 5 (a great deal of time)
** Rating scale 2—5: 2 (little or no importance); 3 (moderate importance); 4 (very important); and 5 (extremely important)

APPENDIX F

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION CHARTS: ADMINISTRATORS, DEPARTMENT CHAIRS—TIME SPENT

Chart F1

* Department Chair Responsibility for Human Relations: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent as Perceived by Administrators and High School Academic Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Build and maintain a supportive dept. team	3.459	0.886	3.415	0.870
2. Encourage open communication among department members	3.574	1.024	3.686	0.903
3. Facilitate effective conflict resolution	3.033	1.048	2.949	0.977
4. Foster cooperative problem solving	3.361	0.932	3.229	0.991
5. Encourage trust, caring, and respect among department members	3.459	1.010	3.664	0.965
6. Maintain regular, open communication with department members	3.852	0.910	4.085	0.823
7. Practice collaborative, participative decision-making processes	3.410	0.955	3.551	1.059
8. Promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement	3.311	1.088	3.619	0.896
9. Encourage department members to share in leadership roles	2.770	1.039	3.069	0.894

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) No time is spent; (2) Little time is spent; (3) A moderate amount of time is spent; (4) A good deal of time is spent; (5) A great deal of time is spent

Chart F2

* Department Chair Responsibility for Management: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent as Perceived by Administrators and High School Academic Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Develop department teaching schedule and assignments	3.344	0.834	3.559	1.042
2. Participate in the selection of department instructional personnel	3.344	1.047	3.017	1.247
3. Develop and administer the dept. budget	3.557	0.958	3.797	0.975
4. Disseminate information to dept. staff	3.623	0.897	4.008	0.974
5. Allocate and maintain equipment, instructional materials, and facilities	3.279	0.878	2.924	1.163
6. Interpret and apply district policy and building standards	2.885	1.034	2.856	1.064
7. Plan and organize relevant department meetings	3.574	0.865	3.661	0.998
8. Serve as liaison between department members and the administration	3.689	0.904	4.068	0.922

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) No time is spent; (2) Little time is spent; (3) A moderate amount of time is spent; (4) A good deal of time is spent; (5) A great deal of time is spent

Chart F3

* Department Chair Responsibility for the Organization: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent as Perceived by Administrators and High School Academic Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Engage department members in an organized department growth and improvement effort	2.803	0.946	3.059	1.096
2. Represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort	3.197	1.030	3.466	1.027
3. Serve as department spokesperson at community meetings, board meetings	2.459	1.104	2.483	1.211
4. Prepare requested information on department topics for principal, central office, school board	2.803	1.093	2.975	1.128
5. Act as advocate for the protection of classroom instructional time	3.115	0.985	3.093	1.102
6. Support teachers' professional needs and concerns	3.246	0.994	3.229	1.105
7. Work with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program	2.885	1.240	3.093	1.132
8. Participate in curricular planning and decision making at the district level	3.082	1.038	3.280	1.205

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) No time is spent; (2) Little time is spent; (3) A moderate amount of time is spent; (4) A good deal of time is spent; (5) A great deal of time is spent

Chart F4

* Department Chair Responsibility for Program: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent as Perceived by Administrators and High School Academic Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Facilitate development of curriculum	3.361	0.932	3.627	1.069
2. Supervise the implementation of curriculum	3.246	0.977	3.186	1.162
3. Monitor the continued maintenance of curriculum	3.262	1.047	3.068	1.107
4. Devise and implement process for program evaluation	2.820	1.204	2.559	1.026
5. Provide leadership in the selection and development of instructional materials	3.475	0.829	3.500	1.060
6. Coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials	3.721	0.799	3.678	1.116
7. Assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses	2.787	1.097	2.780	1.047
8. Establish goals for program improvement	3.016	1.072	3.076	1.031

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) No time is spent; (2) Little time is spent; (3) A moderate amount of time is spent; (4) A good deal of time is spent; (5) A great deal of time is spent

Chart F5

* Department Chair Responsibility for Supervision: Ratings of Amount of Time Spent as Perceived by Administrators and High School Academic Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Model a variety of instructional strategies	2.525	1.058	2.492	1.100
2. Assist teachers in developing professional growth plans	2.295	0.972	2.059	1.104
3. Encourage experimentation and innovation among teachers	2.639	1.001	2.966	1.045
4. Coordinate instruction among department members	3.148	0.946	3.051	0.923
5. Observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback	2.459	0.026	2.169	1.186
6. Monitor teacher lesson plans	1.852	0.872	1.441	0.843
7. Practice clinical supervision	2.115	1.226	1.627	1.019
8. Communicate high expectations for teacher performance	2.885	1.156	2.780	1.126
9. Assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction	2.738	1.063	2.525	1.002
10. Organize plan for teacher sharing, peer coaching	2.393	1.053	1.898	0.982
11. Evaluate teacher performance	1.803	0.997	1.627	1.044

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) No time is spent; (2) Little time is spent; (3) A moderate amount of time is spent; (4) A good deal of time is spent; (5) A great deal of time is spent

APPENDIX G

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION CHARTS: ADMINISTRATORS, DEPARTMENT CHAIRS—IMPORTANCE TO THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR ROLE

Chart G1

* Department Chair Responsibility for Human Relations: Ratings of Importance to the Department Chair Role as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Build and maintain a supportive department team	4.361	0.775	4.059	0.870
2. Encourage open communication among department members	4.443	0.719	4.305	0.757
3. Facilitate effective conflict resolution	4.197	0.813	3.805	0.954
4. Foster cooperative problem solving	4.328	0.724	3.932	0.922
5. Encourage trust, caring, and respect among department members	4.246	0.869	4.297	0.850
6. Maintain regular, open communication with department members	4.451	0.787	4.568	0.685
7. Practice collaborative, participative decision-making processes	4.262	0.929	4.220	0.828
8. Promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement	4.492	0.906	4.339	0.731
9. Encourage department members to share in leadership roles	3.803	0.928	3.780	0.888

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) It is of no importance; (2) It is of little importance; (3) It is of moderate importance; (4) It is very important; (5) It is extremely important.

Chart G2

* Department Chair Responsibility for Management: Ratings of Importance to the Role of the Chair as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Develop department teaching schedule and assignments	3.754	0.888	4.136	0.794
2. Participate in the selection of department instructional personnel	4.016	0.975	4.212	0.885
3. Develop and administer the department budget	3.967	0.894	4.153	0.888
4. Disseminate information to department staff	4.164	0.860	4.220	0.888
5. Allocate and maintain equipment, instructional materials, and facilities	3.525	1.010	3.186	1.109
6. Interpret and apply district policy and building standards	3.672	0.978	3.322	1.116
7. Plan and organize relevant department meetings	4.344	0.704	4.161	0.857
8. Serve as liaison between department members and the administration	4.328	0.811	4.322	0.772

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) It is of no importance; (2) It is of little importance; (3) It is of moderate importance; (4) It is very important; (5) It is extremely important.

Chart G3

* Department Chair Responsibility for the Organization: Ratings of Importance to the Role of the Chair as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs
Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Engage department members in an organized department growth and improvement effort	4.197	0.853	3.864	0.942
2. Represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort	4.230	0.864	3.788	0.923
3. Serve as department spokesperson at community meetings, board meetings	3.197	1.123	3.263	1.136
4. Prepare requested information on department topics for principal, central office, school board	3.508	0.977	3.390	0.925
5. Act as advocate for the protection of classroom instructional time	3.836	0.840	3.831	1.057
6. Support teachers' professional needs and concerns	3.803	0.910	3.881	0.962
7. Work with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program	4.148	0.946	3.975	0.920
8. Participate in curricular planning and decision making at the district level	4.033	1.064	3.907	0.978

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) It is of no importance; (2) It is of little importance; (3) It is of moderate importance; (4) It is very important; (5) It is extremely important.

Chart G4

* Department Chair Responsibility for Program: Ratings of Importance to the Role as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Facilitate development of curriculum (philosophy, goals, objectives)	4.311	0.720	4.051	0.836
2. Supervise the implementation of curriculum	4.328	0.769	3.958	0.946
3. Monitor the continued maintenance of curriculum	4.246	0.767	3.890	0.959
4. Devise and implement process for program evaluation	4.082	0.918	3.534	0.967
5. Provide leadership in the selection and development of instructional materials	4.230	0.716	3.932	0.884
6. Coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials	4.279	0.662	4.093	0.837
7. Assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses	4.230	0.864	3.720	0.886
8. Establish goals for program improvement	4.279	0.777	3.915	0.853

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) It is of no importance; (2) It is of little importance; (3) It is of moderate importance; (4) It is very important; (5) It is extremely important.

Chart G5

* Department Chair Responsibility for Supervision: Ratings of Importance to the Role as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Model a variety of instructional strategies	3.852	0.980	3.169	1.150
2. Assist teachers in developing professional growth plans	3.541	1.042	2.907	1.132
3. Encourage experimentation and innovation among teachers	3.918	0.954	3.703	1.127
4. Coordinate instruction among department members	4.033	0.912	3.720	0.895
5. Observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback	3.770	1.055	3.136	1.267
6. Monitor teacher lesson plans	2.885	1.127	2.017	1.140
7. Practice clinical supervision	3.197	1.327	2.237	1.292
8. Communicate high expectations for teacher performance	4.230	0.973	3.576	1.041
9. Assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction	4.148	1.014	3.483	1.145
10. Organize plan for teacher sharing, peer coaching	3.803	1.108	3.000	1.226
11. Evaluate teacher performance	2.492	1.479	2.297	1.379

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) It is of no importance; (2) It is of little importance; (3) It is of moderate importance; (4) It is very important; (5) It is extremely important.

APPENDIX H

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION CHARTS: ADMINISTRATORS, DEPARTMENT CHAIRS—IMPORTANCE FOR THE CHAIR TO CONTINUE TO IMPROVE

Chart H1

* Department Chair Responsibility for Human Relations: Ratings of Importance to Continue to Improve as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs
Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Build and maintain a supportive department team	4.344	0.728	4.127	0.902
2. Encourage open communication among department members	4.410	0.864	4.280	0.761
3. Facilitate effective conflict resolution	4.295	0.715	3.771	0.928
4. Foster cooperative problem solving	4.344	0.728	3.932	0.940
5. Encourage trust, caring, and respect among department members	4.328	0.790	4.161	0.867
6. Maintain regular, open communication with department members	4.410	0.938	4.364	0.802
7. Practice collaborative, participative decision-making processes	4.393	0.759	4.119	0.797
8. Promote an atmosphere that encourages continuous improvement	4.541	0.886	4.322	0.783
9. Encourage department members to share in leadership roles	4.000	0.931	3.805	0.918

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) It is of no importance; (2) It is of little importance; (3) It is of moderate importance; (4) It is very important; (5) It is extremely important.

Chart H2

* Department Chair Responsibility for Management: Ratings of Importance to Continue to Improve as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Develop department teaching schedule and assignments	3.443	1.009	3.864	1.004
2. Participate in the selection of department instructional personnel	3.803	1.166	4.085	0.957
3. Develop and administer the department budget	3.574	1.087	3.941	0.954
4. Disseminate information to department staff	3.869	1.056	3.924	1.022
5. Allocate and maintain equipment, instructional materials, and facilities	3.262	1.139	3.153	1.107
6. Interpret and apply district policy and building standards	3.459	1.089	3.254	1.134
7. Plan and organize relevant department meetings	4.246	0.907	4.059	0.972
8. Serve as liaison between department members and the administration	4.197	0.891	4.085	0.957

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) It is of no importance; (2) It is of little importance; (3) It is of moderate importance; (4) It is very important; (5) It is extremely important.

Chart H3

* Department Chair Responsibility for the Organization: Ratings of Importance to the Role of the Chair as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Engage department members in an organized department growth and improvement effort	4.197	0.853	3.864	0.942
2. Represent the department in developing and implementing the school's organized improvement effort	4.230	0.864	3.788	0.923
3. Serve as department spokesperson at community meetings, board meetings	3.197	1.123	3.263	1.136
4. Prepare requested information on department topics for principal, central office, school board	3.508	0.977	3.390	0.925
5. Act as advocate for the protection of classroom instructional time	3.836	0.840	3.831	1.057
6. Support teachers' professional needs and concerns	3.803	0.910	3.881	0.962
7. Work with other department chairs to develop an integrated school instructional program	4.148	0.946	3.975	0.920
8. Participate in curricular planning and decision making at the district level	4.033	1.064	3.907	0.978

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) *It is of no importance*; (2) *It is of little importance*; (3) *It is of moderate importance*; (4) *It is very important*; (5) *It is extremely important*.

Chart H4

* Department Chair Responsibility for Program: Ratings of Importance to the Role as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Facilitate development of curriculum (philosophy, goals, objectives)	4.311	0.720	4.051	0.836
2. Supervise the implementation of curriculum	4.328	0.769	3.958	0.946
3. Monitor the continued maintenance of curriculum	4.246	0.767	3.890	0.959
4. Devise and implement process for program evaluation	4.082	0.918	3.534	0.967
5. Provide leadership in the selection and development of instructional materials	4.230	0.716	3.932	0.884
6. Coordinate departmental selection of textbooks and supplemental materials	4.279	0.662	4.093	0.837
7. Assess learning outcomes to identify program strengths and weaknesses	4.230	0.864	3.720	0.886
8. Establish goals for program improvement	4.279	0.777	3.915	0.853

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) *It is of no importance*; (2) *It is of little importance*; (3) *It is of moderate importance*; (4) *It is very important*; (5) *It is extremely important*.

Chart H5

*Department Chair Responsibility for the Supervision: Ratings of Importance to Continue to Improve as Perceived by Administrators and High School Department Chairs Subjects (N = 179)

Activity	Administrators (N = 61)		Department Chairs (N = 118)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. Model a variety of instructional strategies	4.164	0.916	3.373	1.211
2. Assist teachers in developing professional growth plans	3.754	1.090	3.051	1.154
3. Encourage experimentation and innovation among teachers	4.098	0.961	3.780	1.103
4. Coordinate instruction among department members	4.082	0.900	3.927	0.906
5. Observe teachers in their classrooms and provide feedback	4.000	1.041	3.314	1.325
6. Monitor teacher lesson plans	2.967	1.278	2.161	1.267
7. Practice clinical supervision	3.393	1.357	2.322	1.358
8. Communicate high expectations for teacher performance	4.230	0.990	3.593	1.015
9. Assist teachers with the improvement of their instruction	4.213	0.108	3.585	1.172
10. Organize plan for teacher sharing, peer coaching	3.967	1.080	3.102	1.270
11. Evaluate teacher performance	2.639	1.592	2.424	1.470

* The rating scale was 1—5: (1) It is of no importance; (2) It is of little importance; (3) It is of moderate importance; (4) It is very important; (5) It is extremely important.

APPENDIX I

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION CHART: OPINIONS OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR POTENTIAL FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Chart I-1

Summary of Responses Concerning Opinions of Department Chair Potential for Educational Leadership Subjects (N = 61)

Opinion	Superintendents (N = 27)		Principals (N = 34)	
	M	SD	M	SD
1. A successful department chair must be a strong leader	4.407	0.694	4.441	0.660
2. A successful department chair must be a good manager	4.148	0.456	4.294	0.579
3. A department chair should be a master teacher	4.481	0.802	4.647	0.485
4. The department chair should assist teachers to improve their instruction.	4.519	0.643	4.441	0.561
5. Department chairs should have some training in supervision.	4.074	0.829	4.176	0.716
6. Department chairs should participate in the implementation of plans of assistance.	2.963	1.427	2.941	1.099
7. A successful department chair must be a skilled problem solver	4.259	0.656	4.412	0.557
8. Principals should seek and support department chairs who are strong instructional leaders.	4.667	0.555	4.824	0.387
9. Department chairs should have some training in administration.	3.556	0.847	3.559	0.824
10. For a department chair to be an effective supervisor requires the credibility of expertise in the discipline	4.185	0.921	3.941	0.814
11. Department chairs cannot be effective supervisors of instruction because they regard themselves as teachers rather than as supervisors.	2.519	1.156	2.941	0.886
12. Being in a department chair role enhances the chair's own classroom instruction.	3.519	0.935	3.824	0.797

* Scale was 1—5:
1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; and 5 = strongly agree