

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9020147

**The role of the principal as verified by the secondary school
department chairpersons in Guilford County, North Carolina**

Crowell, Julius Alexander, Jr., Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1989

Copyright ©1989 by Crowell, Julius Alexander, Jr. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AS VERIFIED BY THE
SECONDARY SCHOOL DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS IN
GUILFORD COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

by

Julius Alexander Crowell, Jr.

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1989

Approved by



Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser Walter Brubaker

Committee Members Harold J. Dugger
James B. Burt
J. E. Lee Brumby

September 14, 1989
Date of Acceptance by Committee

September 14, 1989
Date of Final Oral Examination

Copyright © 1989 by Julius Alexander Crowell, Jr.

CROWELL, JULIUS ALEXANDER, JR., Ed.D. The Role of the Principal as Verified by the Secondary School Department Chairpersons in Guilford County, North Carolina. (1989)
Directed by Dr. Dale L. Brubaker. 149 pp.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions which the secondary school department chairpersons, within Guilford County, North Carolina, have regarding the role of the principal according to a five conception framework initially designed by Brubaker and Simon (1987). The effects of four independent variables--the number of years experience as a department chairperson, the degree of the chairperson, the subject area of the chairperson, and the gender of the department chairperson--on the conceptual leadership roles selected by the department chairperson were also examined.

Data were obtained from a survey of 142 public secondary school department chairpersons in the three public school districts within Guilford County, North Carolina--Greensboro City, Guilford County, and High Point City. An analysis of the data suggested the secondary school department chairpersons view the actual role of the principal as that of a general manager. For the preferred principal's role, the department chairpersons selected the administrative/instructional leader's role even though their comments on the open-ended question were considered to be managerial rather than instructional in nature.

An analysis of data indicated only one of the four independent variables to appear significant in the chairperson's perception of the role of the principal. The length of service as a department

chairperson does appear to influence perceptions in that the less experienced chairperson perceives the actual principal's role to be that of a general manager, whereas the more experienced individual selected the administrative/instructional role. When the chairpersons' perceptions of the actual and desired principal roles were contrasted, however, a lack of congruency was detected in both areas. Most of the incongruency existed among those who want an administrative/instructional leader but perceive principals to act as general managers. Analysis indicates little relationship between what the chairperson wants in a principal and what he/she thinks presently exists.

As the organization and governance of contemporary secondary schools change, principals must recognize and enhance the leadership potential of the department chairperson. As the liaison between the faculty and administration, the chairperson remains an integral force in the creation of effective schooling.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere appreciation to my advisor and chairman of my committee, Dr. Dale Brubaker. His continued support and encouragement were invaluable. I also wish to thank the other members of my committee, Drs. Lois Edinger, Lee Bernick, James Runkel, and Harold Snyder. Their guidance, comments, and direction were critical to the success of this work. In addition, I must mention Dr. Rita O'Sullivan. Her assistance, computer expertise, and thoughtful discussions gave stability to my preliminary research.

To the Grimsley School community, faculty, and especially the department chairpersons, a deep felt "thank you" for all their contributions! This research is, after all, a representation of them and all they do for our students!

Finally, I express personal gratitude to my family as the past few years have not been easy. Kelly and Jonathan frequently did without Dad and, I am certain, wondered if they really had one! My wife, Barbara, held the family together and probably listened to the word "library" more than she ever thought possible. For these and other reasons, this study is dedicated to my family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem.	4
Research Methodology.	6
Definition of Terms	7
Limitations of the Study.	8
Significance of the Study	9
Summary	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
Introduction.	14
A Historical Review of the Principalship.	15
Complexities of the Position.	18
Leadership.	27
Effective Principals/Effective Schools.	36
Instructional Assistance: The Department Chairperson	48
Conclusions	52
II. PROCEDURES	54
Introduction.	54
Research Methodology.	55
Description of the Instrument	58
Reliability	61
Validity.	64
Description of the Population	66
Summary	68

	Page
CHAPTER	
IV. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	72
Introduction.	72
Discussion of Results	76
Summary of Open-Ended/Related Data.	103
Summary of Analysis	111
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	116
Introduction.	116
Summary	117
Conclusions	121
Recommendations for Further Study	125
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	129
APPENDICES	
Appendix A. Letter to the Guilford County, North Carolina Secondary School Principals.	138
Appendix B. Letter to the Guilford County, North Carolina Secondary School Department Chairpersons.	140
Appendix C. Conceptions of the Principal.	142
Appendix D. Survey Instrument	144
Appendix E. Follow-Up Letter to Principals.	148

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Item Agreement From Test-Retest Administration of Survey to Grimsley High School Department Chairpersons	63
2	Number of Years Experience as a Secondary School Department Chairperson	67
3	Extracurricular Activities as Reported by Department Chairpersons.	69
4	Representative Subject Areas for Department Chairpersons	70
5	Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual Leadership Role of Principals.	77
6	Department Chairperson's Perception of the Most Desirable Principal Leadership Role.	79
7	Degree Distribution for Secondary School Department Chairpersons and Other Professional Educators Within Guilford County, North Carolina.	82
8	Secondary School Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual Role of the Principal According to Degree	83
9	Secondary School Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Desired Principal's Role According to Degree.	85
10	Department Chairpersons Responding by Recorded Subject/Support Areas for the Guilford County, North Carolina Secondary Schools	86
11	Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual Role of the Principal According to Subject Area.	87
12	Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Desired Role of the Principal According to Subject Area.	89
13	Number of Years Experience as a Secondary School Department Chairperson	90

Table	Page
14 Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual Role of the Principal According to the Number of Years Experience	92
15 Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Desired Role of the Principal According to the Number of Years Experience	93
16 Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual Role of the Principal According to Gender.	95
17 Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Desired Role of the Principal According to Gender.	97
18 Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual and Desired Leadership Roles for Past Principals	98
19 Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual and Desired Leadership Roles of Guilford County, North Carolina Principals in General	100

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Immediately following the 1983 National Commission on Excellence in Education report entitled A Nation at Risk, the American public began to view education as a resource in serious difficulty. Even through the school reform movement started in the 1970s, the Commission's report created national concern and stimulated a wave of inquiry now referred to as Effective School Research (Howe, 1986). This dramatic alteration of previous public perception was further magnified by the Carnegie report, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twenty-First Century (1986) and the National Governors' Association's Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education (1986). All three reports combined to heighten national concern for education and, as a result, the reform movement has focused research attention on the effectiveness of the total educational process. A variety of recommendations have, therefore, been adopted and/or posited by researchers and state legislators as a remedy for our ailing educational system. The Carnegie Report, in fact, presented clearly the national issue by stating,

In the past three years, the American people have made a good beginning in the search for educational renaissance. They have pointed to educational weaknesses to be corrected; they have outlined ways to recapture a commitment to quality.

They have reaffirmed the belief that the aim for greater productivity is not in conflict with the development of independent and creative minds. There is new consensus on the urgency of making our schools once again the engines of progress, productivity and prosperity. (Carnegie Report, 1986, p. 2)

One of the major and more recognizable factors attributable to effective schooling is leadership. Since the individual responsible for the effective operation of any organization is ultimately held accountable for that organization's success or failure, the focus of much of America's recent educational research has been directed toward the principalship as the primary source of school excellence. "Strong leaders create strong schools . . . effective schools have strong leaders" (Clinton, 1986, p. 208) and "the principal provides the vision and energy to create success" (Lewis, 1986, p. 187). Earlier Jane Eisner (1979) articulated a similar position after she visited numerous schools throughout America. She observed the key to the schools' success to be the fact that strong administrators with clear visions made the difference.

Although research indicates that there may or may not be distinct differences between effective and ineffective schools and their leaders (Good & Brophy, 1985), Sergiovanni (1984) clearly noted: "Schools managed by incompetent leaders simply do not get the job done" (p. 6). In addition, the Secondary School Recognition Program, initiated in 1983 by former Secretary of Education Terrel Bell indicated, "In the more than 600 high schools and junior high/middle schools that became program finalists, the principal, with rare

exception, emerged as a significant force in the schools' success" (Richardson & Barbe, 1987). Evidence such as this obviously motivated researchers to concentrate on the administrative aspects of school leadership. The role of the principal is, therefore, under scrutiny and attempts to identify and/or define those functions relating to instructional excellence continue.

Despite contemporary evidence indicating the principalship to be a dynamic position in every sense of the word, the complexity of the modern position frequently overshadows the primary responsibility of an educational leader--instructional excellence. Many principals do not allocate the time or the resources to the instructional aspects of the school program because of internal and/or external forces. They feel the demands of managing the physical plant, solving discipline and attendance problems, placating angry parents and teachers, writing endless (and often meaningless) reports, and attending a myriad of meetings, few of which deal with teaching and learning, leave them with little time for tasks designed to increase teacher effectiveness and student learning (Anders, Centofante, & Orr, 1987).

Even though the role of the principal continues to be analyzed and refined, research has verified the fact that schools reflect the cooperation and mutual respect of the total population (Goodlad, 1984). This "culture" (Good & Brophy, 1985) creates a positiveness which, in turn, leads to an effective learning environment for faculty and students alike. Although the principal is

ultimately responsible for the instructional effectiveness of the school, as noted previously many factors enter into the development of this atmosphere. If the instructional program is to be a priority for the principal, then authority must be delegated in order for others to assume many of the operational details of the school. Thomas (1965) recognized this fact and observed that the department chairperson was an obvious outgrowth of the increased demands being placed upon the principalship. The position was originally established to assist the principal with curriculum matters but rapidly expanded to include middle management duties such as budgeting, scheduling, and staff development. This study, therefore, examined the existing perceptions of the secondary school department chairperson with respect to the role of the principal in a high school setting.

Statement of the Problem

The study investigated the perceptions of the secondary school department chairperson regarding the role of the principal based upon a conceptual framework designed by Brubaker and Simon (1987). The purpose of the study was to:

1. Determine the most desirable role of the secondary school principal as perceived by the department chairpersons within the three public school systems of Guilford County, North Carolina.

2. Determine if there is a correlation between the desired role of the principal and the actual role of the principal as perceived by the Guilford County department chairpersons.
3. Determine if the highest degree earned by the department chairperson influences his/her perception of the appropriate role of the principal.
4. Determine if the subject area of the department chairperson influences the chairperson's perception of the appropriate leadership role for the principal.
5. Determine if the number of years of experience as a department chairperson influences the chairperson's perception of the appropriate principal's role.
6. Determine if the gender of the department chairperson has any relationship to the chairperson's perception of the role of the principal.

Based upon the stated purpose of the study, the following questions will be specifically addressed:

1. What is the most desirable principalship role as determined by the Guilford County, North Carolina, public secondary school department chairperson?
2. Is there a correlation between the desired role of the principal and the actual role of the principal as perceived by the secondary school department chairpersons within Guilford County, North Carolina?

3. Does the highest degree earned by the Guilford County department chairperson influence his/her perception of the most desired principalship role?
4. Does the subject area of the department chairperson influence the chairperson's perception of the principal's role?
5. Does the number of years of experience as a secondary school department chairperson influence the chairperson's perception of the principal's role?
6. Will gender influence the department chairperson's perception of the role of the principal?

Research Methodology

This study surveyed the perceptions of teachers within Guilford County North Carolina currently designated as department chairpersons. In December 1987, all public secondary schools within Guilford County, North Carolina were invited by letter to participate in a specified study of the role of the principal. The letter not only requested the identification of teachers designated as department chairpersons, but also requested permission to distribute individual surveys to the department chairpersons at a later date. Of the 16 Guilford County schools contacted, all but two responded favorably. Both negative responses were clarified by statements indicating that they did not use the department chairperson concept.

The instrument employed was a modification of the instruments used to survey the perceptions of central office personnel (Briggs, 1986), teachers (Williams, 1987), and principals (Brubaker & Simon, 1987) with regard to the conceptual role of the principal. The reliability of the survey instrument was confirmed by a test-retest process applied to 17 department chairpersons at Grimsley High School, Greensboro, North Carolina, with response consistency measured between administrations. A free response question was also employed in order to provide an opportunity for the department chairperson to express opinions regarding the position.

Definition of Terms

Since semantics are frequently left to individual interpretations, the following terms and/or phrases are clarified for consistency within the context of this study:

- a. Concept - A "paradigm or pattern of thinking" as presented by Brubaker and Simon in a 1987 study entitled "How do Principals View Themselves, Others?"
- b. Curriculum - Course of study.
- c. Department chairperson - Formally designated head of an area of the curriculum within an educational organization.
- d. Empowerment - For an educator, it means "working in an environment in which the teacher acts and is treated as a professional" (Maeroff, 1989, p. 6).

- e. Instruction - Implementation of the "course of study" and guidance of learners wherever learning takes place within school-related activities.
- f. Leadership - Cuban (1988) states ". . . viewed as a relationship within a process of getting things done; that is, a way of organizing followers and manipulating settings to produce desired results" (p. 19).
- g. Principal - Formally designated head of a school.
- h. Secondary school - An educational organization designed for grades 9 through 12.

Limitations of the Study

Although the principal has been identified as being a primary force for the improvement of schools (Cohen, 1982), very little has been produced which states exactly how this is to be accomplished. The process of improvement appears to be individualized and school specific, i.e., what works well for one school in a particular community may not work as well in a similar school in a nearby community. This may or may not relate directly to the delegation/organizational skills of the individual involved. Since "the essence of leadership is the capacity to build and develop the self-esteem of the workers" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 225), perhaps this is an aspect of the principal/faculty relationship that should have been included in the study.

A major limitation is the fact that the study was directed only to the secondary department chairpersons within a specific geographical location, i.e., Guilford County, North Carolina. Because of that fact, generalizations may be drawn statewide, but there is no data indicating that department chairpersons' perceptions will be the same throughout the state or even the nation.

The instrument itself was limiting because department chairpersons were not able to select more than one role concept within a specific response pattern. No opportunity was provided for the department chairperson to indicate a blend of conceptions, although additional comments were encouraged.

In addition, another limitation was the survey distribution and collection process. The appropriate school principal was depended upon to distribute the instrument to the identified individual. The return rate was, therefore, dependent upon the principal and the selected department chairperson.

Each of the identified variables listed above was dependent upon individual initiative as a source of data. The accuracy of the information was, therefore, left up to the discretion of the individual involved.

Significance of the Study

The complexities of the contemporary principalship have been well documented by more than a decade of research (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986; Roe & Drake, 1974; Wood, Nicholson, & Findley,

1979). The position has, in fact, become a focal point for educational reformers as they seek ways to enhance or restrict the power and authority of the principal. Blumberg and Greenfield succinctly summarized this dilemma by observing that "principals daily face pressures of competing images about what their role should be, and even the best have a difficult time maintaining an appropriate balance between the tasks of managing a smooth-running school and serving as a catalyst for and facilitator of instructional improvement" (1980, p. 9). The position has clearly been magnified to the point that resolution is difficult and role identification is situational at best.

Even though the basic nature of the principalship is instructional, the management aspects of the position appear to overshadow that fact. This places a priority on the staffing skills of the individual in that personnel are critical to the development of an effective educational program. Without placing the right people in the right jobs and giving them the authority to operate in that capacity, the principal restricts opportunities for excellence in education. There is, in fact, an increasing conviction among effective school researchers that leadership must come from school-site management (Finn, 1987; Levin, 1983; Purkey & Smith, 1983). If this is true, then faculty positions such as the department chairperson become vital to the development of a quality instructional program.

This study examined the department chairperson's perceptions of the principal's role. Since evidence exists that indicates principals are "accustomed by experience and their professional training to conceive of their role as managers and are often unprepared to fulfill their leadership role in curriculum, evaluation, and teaching" (Committee of Correspondence, 1984, p. 379), the department chairperson stands as the logical choice for effective assistance. The position is, by training and experience, uniquely qualified to function in the areas of instructional leadership, curriculum planning, evaluation, and staffing. Although the perceptions of both principal and department chairperson are important to the effectiveness of the total school program, this study concentrates on the department chairperson and role perceptions from that position. The resulting data will, in turn, contribute to a significant area of educational research--the principal/department chairperson relationship.

Summary

In the past two decades, the complexities of a modern high school have been documented (Roe & Drake, 1974), verified (Scribner & Stevens, 1975), and reviewed (Gross, 1985). The economic, social, and political changes that surged through America following World War II created unprecedented demands on local educational systems. Technology rapidly expanded during this time and schools were caught in a cyclone of change (Naisbitt, 1982). The position of the

principalship was also swept up in this change, as the growth of schools emphasized administration rather than instructional functions (Cuban, 1988). The search for the ideal leadership role for the principal, therefore, became more and more difficult as society changed values, urbanization increased, and school districts reorganized to meet legal desegregation requirements (Wood, Freeland, & Szabo, 1985).

As technology continues the acceleration of change throughout modern society, so too must the organization and governance of education keep pace. Change, however, creates insecurity, instability, and "radically alters the balance between novel and familiar situations. Rising rates of change thus compel us not merely to cope with a faster flow, but with more and more situations to which previous personal experience does not apply" (Toffler, 1970, p. 33). Under such conditions, the principal often deals with leadership situations which require resources beyond the individual's capacity. Given such circumstances, as well as a variety of leadership roles, it is obvious that the principal cannot do all things for all persons on the staff. Assistance must, therefore, be provided in order for the management aspects of the organization to continue. In large schools the position of the department chairperson was created to assist with just this issue.

Given the nature and complexity of the principalship, as well as the leadership concepts considered, what leadership role does the department chairperson deem to be more effective and significant for

the principal? Does the gender of the department chairperson play a role in leadership perceptions? Does the relationship between the two positions positively affect the instructional program? Does the subject area, degree, and years of experience as a chairperson affect the individual's perception of the principal's role?

In order to answer the preceding questions, this study employed a survey of secondary school department chairpersons in Guilford County, North Carolina, as a way to examine the role of the principal from that perspective. Additional parts of the study will determine whether or not other factors influence the department chairperson's perception of the principal's role.

Chapter two presents a literature review of the evolutionary complexities of the principalship. Chapter three describes the design and methodology of the study with accompanying procedures and population descriptions. Chapter four contains survey information as well as an analysis of data. Chapter five indicates both conclusions and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the secondary school department chairperson's perceptions of the roles of the principal based upon five leadership role concepts proposed by Brubaker and Simon (1987). This chapter will present a review of the literature as it relates to the traditional leadership roles played by the principal. In addition, each section of the chapter will highlight a specific aspect of the traditional principal's role as well as the relationship that role may or may not play with the department chairperson.

The first section introduces the five leadership concepts used as a basis for this research (Brubaker & Simon, 1987). Subsequent sections examine the historical significance of traditional roles as they relate to the development of the principalship. Effective schools research (Boyer, 1984; Edmonds, 1979; Sizer, 1983) will also be useful in that contemporary writers identify the principal's instructional role as being crucial to educational programs and, yet, in reality, it is largely prioritized below administrative/management duties.

The concluding section of chapter two will focus on the relationship of the principal with the department chairperson. In

large schools, the chairperson's position is vital to the development of a quality educational program (Hord & Murphy, 1985). Acting primarily as a liaison between principal and faculty, this position creates efficient avenues of communication, serves as a resource to the members of the department and maintains accurate records with regard to instructional supplies. The evolution of this position is, therefore, significantly tied to the complexities of the principalship. The two positions do not operate separately one from the other but function collectively in harmony to the benefit of the total educational program (Bailey, 1973).

A Historical Review of the Principalship

"The job of today's principal is far more complex than in previous decades."

Terrel Bell, U.S. Secretary of Education
(1981 - 1985)

The secondary school principalship is an extremely challenging and complex position (Wood, Nicholson, & Findley, 1979). The extent to which historical forces have influenced various conceptions of the position vary and are difficult to accurately isolate. One method, however, is to propose a calendar which develops the evolutionary duties and responsibilities of the principal. Another is to use a conceptual model with historical references as points of demarcation. Brubaker and Simon selected the latter and, in 1986, proposed a five conception model with distinct roles delineated within

each. Although the time references are estimated, the Brubaker/Simon concepts presented the principalship in a succinct fashion ideally suited to this study. Historical references are, therefore, deemed necessary in order for the reader to view the various roles of this complex position from a contemporary perspective.

Since the concepts suggested by Brubaker and Simon fit conveniently into historical frames of reference, the various roles of the principalship (within each time period) blend to form a primary leadership classification. Accordingly, the following conceptual summaries are presented as a historical review of the principal's position.

The Principal Teacher (1647-1850)

The principal-teacher spends a part of each day in the classroom teaching and is also responsible for daily school routines and clerical duties. He does not believe special training is needed to be an effective principal.

The Principal as General Manager (1850-1920)

The principal as general manager is the office liaison between the school and the central office. He spends the majority of time on clerical duties and has the right to give as well as enforce orders to teachers. He relies upon common sense as a basis for decision-making and reacts to problems as they arise. He implements the curriculum as mandated by state and local school boards.

The Principal as Professional and
Scientific Manager (1920-1970)

The principal as professional and scientific manager spends more time on classroom supervision than administrative duties and uses test data as a basis for planning, implementing, and evaluating instruction. He is accustomed to the bureaucratic command-compliance organizational system and is interested in efficiency as a means to meet management goals and objectives.

The Principal as Administrator and
Instructional Leader (1970-present)

Under this classification, the principal operates through the bureaucratic governance process and views instructional functions within a collegial structure; treats faculty as professionals and attempts to give them opportunities for decision-making in the areas of scheduling, hiring, planning, and evaluation.

The Principal as Curriculum Leader
(present-the future)

The principal as curriculum leader believes the curriculum is more than a program of study and that it should be viewed in broad terms encompassing all forms of individual experiential learning. He sees the principal's role as too complex for simple job descriptions and, therefore, does not differentiate between administrative and instructional functions.

Each conceptual role within the Brubaker/Simon model exists as an entity unto itself. As such, when viewed separately, each role highlights the dominant leadership concept prevalent within a specific period of time. Viewed collectively, however, the roles blend to form a perplexing mosaic of leadership styles. This "blend" of styles contributes to the principal's decision predicament.

Complexities of the Position

"The role of the school principal has never been simple, and it is increasing in complexity" (Hughes & Ubben, 1980, p. 3).

Even from its inception, the role of the secondary principal has been complex and fraught with administrative challenges. Although the position was initially established to facilitate the maintenance of records (Nolte, 1986), as schools became larger and districts expanded the number of students served, the demands placed upon the position exceeded the time available. Even though the duties were primarily clerical, custodial, and organizational in nature (Brubaker & Simon, 1986), "by 1900 the principal's duties covered not only discipline and care of the pupils, care and distribution of equipment and supplies, recording and reporting, but also organization and general management, and supervision of maintenance of buildings and grounds" (Pierce, 1935, pp. 210-211). "By 1930 . . . the principal was spending most of his time on administration, supervision, clerical duties, and an assortment of other responsibilities"

(Benben, 1968, p. 276). In addition, Moehlman (1940) noted that:

the duties of the building principal may be encompassed in the responsibility within a building or attendance district for the facilitation of instruction through: 1) operating the course of study, instructions, standards of achievement, and supervising the formal and informal instructional and social activities in order that these standards may be achieved; 2) executing the adopted policies through approved means as directed by the superintendent that provide physical and educational conditions under which child and teacher may work to best advantage; 3) appraising and reporting educational, social, and physical conditions within the schools, preparing reports, and making recommendations for the improvement of conditions; 4) furnishing professional leadership to administrative, teaching, and operating agents by collecting data, conducting research; and 5) maintaining community relationships. (pp. 288-289)

School trustees soon recognized that the duties of the principalship exceeded the time available, and the position was upgraded to a full-time situation. The fact that the principalship operated on a full-time basis did not, however, alleviate the dilemma between the forces within the various responsibilities of the position.

Even with a full-time situation, the principal still had difficulty adjusting to the increasing demands of the position. "The role gradually evolved from 'teaching principals' who knew their fellow teachers well and regarded themselves the lead teacher, into members of a management team who do much paperwork, attend meetings, and busy themselves with other tasks which prevent them from fulfilling their original function--that of leading the school toward ever improving instruction" (Jones, Hersh, & McKibbin, 1983, p. 73). Roe and Drake (1974) established a similar theme and highlighted the principal's dilemma further by stating "the tasks are essentially

routine, managerial, and supervisory - operating by prescription from the central administration" (p. 13). In addition, they also recognized that in spite of the instructional mandate inherent within the principalship, the historical realities of the position indicate that ". . . efforts by school superintendents to encourage principals to side with them as part of their 'management team' have tended to swing the principalship away from the idea of 'principal teacher' to principal administrator" (p. 11). Under this development, the principal reacts more as a manager with little time left to devote to the instructional program. Superintendents have, therefore, inadvertently created a traditional role for the principal that is largely administrative-managerial (p. 13). Cuban (1988) agreed and states clearly that "job descriptions for principals invariably lean heavily upon managerial duties . . ." (p. 57).

The fact that the principal concentrates on the managerial aspects of the school should come as no surprise to those interested in the position. Pierce (1935) decided that the principal had "become the directing manager rather than the 'presiding teacher' of the school." Thirty-four years later, Nolte (1968) concurred with that earlier assessment and said that the principal was still "an appendage (to the central office), holding a position like that of a manager and sharing little responsibility for policy or decision-making. He is caught between a multiplicity of unchallenging duties and the need to devote attention to the improvement of instruction" (p. 278). Cuban (1988) agreed. His view is that the principals

are "positioned between their superiors who want orders followed and the teachers who do the actual work in the classroom, . . . [and] are driven by imperatives over which they have little control. Their responsibility to act far exceeds their authority to command; their loyalties are dual: to their school and to headquarters; the professional and political expectations for what should occur in the school conflict; they are maintainers of stability and agents of change" (p. 61). The dilemma for the principal is excruciatingly apparent. On the one hand, he is charged with the responsibility of effectively operating the school; while on the other, he contends with the quality and improvement of curriculum and instruction. More often than not, the managerial role takes precedent and principals "are both drawn and pushed away from the instructional process. Their energy becomes directed more and more toward noncurricular matters" (Jones et al., 1983, p. 73).

As the complexity of the principal's role becomes more apparent, it is not difficult to envision the fact that "principals are sandwiched between what state and district policymakers intend, what the superintendent directs, what parents expect, what teachers need, and what students want" (Cuban, 1988, p. 76). Further, "principals . . . are not free agents. At least four groups of people hold expectations of the principal. These groups include the central office staff, the teachers in the school, the students in the school, and the parents of these students" (Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand, & Usdan, 1985, p. 228). Bredeson (1985) felt the influence

of the various forces upon the principalship creates a reactive management style characterized by a survival instinct. The principal's primary role is, therefore, to operate the school efficiently through luck or natural skills. As noted previously, the instructional program is apparently left up to the teachers, and the principal necessarily concentrates on other matters. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) viewed the principal's role as one of America's major focal points for educational improvement and accountability. They summarized the various conflicting roles as being based upon the fact that "principals frequently take the brunt of multiple and usually conflicting expectations over issues ranging from student discipline to the problems of personnel administration, compliance with increasing numbers of state and federal policy mandates, and maintaining a 'smooth running' educational program that serves the needs of a school community that has become less homogeneous in the character of students' abilities and parents' aspirations for themselves and their children" (p. 9).

Hughes and Ubben (1980) viewed the principalship as a complex world with the position playing "a crucial role on the education management team. The job is complex. It requires excellent management skills and a repertoire of proven leadership techniques" (Preface, xv). Further, they noted "the role of the school principal has never been simple, and it is increasing in complexity" (p. 3). Their study pointed out the differences between the principal as a person and the principalship as "a collection of

responsibilities" (p. 7) with emphasis on two major leadership functions: "the appropriate organization and development of personnel and the delegation of authority" (p. 7). Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, and Lee (1982) supported this concept and pointed to the complexities of the position with regard to instructional management. They argued that the behavior of the administrator is only one variable among many that stem from context, climate, and organization. In 1987, Deal agreed with both views and stated that an "analysis of school leadership paints a complex portrait of the principalship. Principals carry out their duties in ambiguously chaotic settings. They need to pay attention to instruction. But they also must attend to individual needs, power and conflict, symbols and ceremony" (p. 241).

The complexities of the modern school often inundate the principal with administrative tasks which are time consuming and perplexing. Benben (1968) recognized this fact and called for a reduction in the principal's "burden of duties in organization and management" and a shift to procedures which "free the principal for supervision" (p. 277). He also observed the principal to be "caught between a multiplicity of unchallenging duties and the need to devote attention to the improvement of instruction" (p. 278). Cuban (1988) supported Benben's earlier viewpoint by stating that "the wedge that pried principals out of classroom teaching was their superiors' growing expectations that they not only carry out orders, complete reports on time, look after the building, maintain decent

relations with adults and children, but that they also manage the curriculum and supervise instruction" (p. 54). Based upon the evolutionary nature of the office of the principal, multiple duties have combined to create a complexity that forces role dynamics. Roe and Drake (1974) responded to this dilemma by asking the simple question: "Do we really want the principal to be primarily an instructional leader or do we expect him to be primarily a manager of people and things? Under present circumstances it is expected that the principal be primarily an administrator and manager" (p. 10).

The complex nature of the principal's leadership roles continues to react as opposing forces. In 1978, Watson observed that various constraints hampered the true effectiveness of the principalship. The sheer number of complexities reacting on the principal's daily tasks seriously reduced the overall effectiveness of the position. Many principals, in fact, responded in frustration and complained that "they are blamed for situations that they did not create and that they have no power to ameliorate" (p. 43). Although somewhat pessimistic, Watson's study produced striking evidence which detailed the complex nature of the principal's position. Few principals would argue with the accuracy of Watson's next statement: "The popular picture of the urban school principal is that of the man caught in the middle, caught up in a storm of angry and frequently contradictory demands. Besieged by noisy delegations of students, parents, teachers, or community residents, he finds himself simultaneously to blame for poor facilities, too much homework,

insufficient time for faculty planning, and students' misconduct on the way to school. When he is finally able to close his office door, he is confronted by a desk full of forms to be filled out and telephone calls to be returned to the district superintendent, the curriculum office, and the personnel department. Should he ever venture from the comparative safety of his building, he is likely to run into representatives of the press or the local television station who are eager to record his views on the latest crises for those watching the evening news. Once he might have been the dignified scholar-statesman, presiding over serene classrooms of dutiful pupils. Today he often resembles the unfortunate victim of a pack of avenging furies" (p. 40). Within specific situations and communities the reality of Watson's viewpoint may or may not be relevant. It does, however, dramatically emphasize the complex nature of the position!

Salley (1978) presented a different picture of the principalship. The results of the study were significant in that principals of small schools were found to be more involved with students, e.g., "their personal adjustment problems . . . safety and the associated utilization of specialized staff" (p. 32). Principals of larger schools, however, "resemble managers in other institutions in dealing with staffing and . . . personnel issues" (p. 32). The implications of this study indicated that "professional educators appear to be more obsessed with management than with education. Thus, the job of a principal is increasingly defined in terms of administrative

rather than instructional functions" (p. 37). Once again the complexity of the position forces an administrative response pattern rather than one of instructional supervision. Even though "the principalship continues to be one of the most durable and critical positions in the administration of American schools" (p. 22), Salley admitted to administrative/management priorities which restrict the overall effectiveness of the position--with respect to the instructional/curricular aspects of the school.

Cuban (1988) takes an opposing position in that he views management as an effective tool that can be used to foster leadership opportunities. Rather than restrictive and negative, the administrative/management role, if executed correctly, can enhance the instructional role by "shaping the mission of the school, establishing a climate within the school that communicates a seriousness of purpose and a respect for the members of the school community, designing rituals and daily mechanisms that make tangible the mission and ethos. Through communication skills, personal example, and numerous other informal means, the principal invents a personal curriculum of improvements for the school community and teachers" (p. 70). If Cuban's view is appropriate for the modern principalship, then the individual's leadership skill development and training should be focused in that direction. After all, in 1984, The Committee of Correspondence issued its initial report entitled "Education for a Democratic Future" which stated: "Principals, other educational administrators, and superintendents are accustomed by experience and

and their professional training to conceive of their role as managers and are often unprepared to fulfill their leadership role in curriculum, evaluation, and teaching" (p. 379). Perhaps the principal's dilemma is one of direction rather than role selection. Boyer (1983) recommended that principals have the same preparation as teachers because principals cannot lead without classroom experience. He also wanted principals to move through a program designed to develop skills in decision-making, organization, planning, written and oral communications, with a year as an administrative intern, as well as two years as an assistant principal. Leadership training, therefore, may well prepare future principals for the complexities of the modern principalship.

Leadership

"Leadership is what gives an organization its vision and its ability to translate that vision into reality" (Bennis, 1989).

Leadership creates the direction and flow of an organization. The basis of leadership theory is, therefore, humanistic in context. The method by which the leader deals with the individuals that form the organization, however, is subject to individual interpretation as the literature is replete with various theories regarding human motivation. Maslow's Motivation and Personality (1954) is one of the initial efforts in that direction. Maslow suggested the force which causes people to stay and work within an organization is a hierarchy

of needs. Based upon the individual, this hierarchy moves in order of satisfaction from basic physiological requirements to security, to social needs, self-esteem, autonomy, to self-actualization. As needs are met at lower levels, higher level needs emerge and thus support the theory that man is an animal with continuing and increasing needs. A review of Maslow's theory indicates that if behavior is to be motivated, it must be at the level of a need that is currently unsatisfied. Stated differently, a need that is satisfied is no longer a need.

McGregor (1960) advanced two opposing leadership theories. Theory X posited that the individual dislikes work and avoids it if at all possible. He must be controlled and directed continuously in order for the organization to achieve its goals. This control, in turn, increases the individual's security and the response produces appropriate behaviors conducive to the organization's direction. Theory Y, on the other hand, posited the opposite in that work is satisfying. If the individual is committed to the organization's goals, the individual will direct and control himself. Self-actualization and ego satisfaction are, therefore, the rewards resulting from the attainment of organizational goals. Hersey and Blanchard (1969) discussed Frederick Herzberg's idea of motivation through his motivation-hygiene theory. Herzberg suggested that people tend to have only two levels of motivation: a) those hygiene concerns which maintain and protect, and b) those concerns which encourage activity at increasing levels of competency, contribution,

or boundaries. As the individual moves through the two levels, his productivity fluctuates accordingly. In the educational setting, an awareness of motivational theory is essential as principals constantly strive to develop relationships that support and encourage teachers.

Wood et al. (1979) presented Knezevich's 1975 leadership proposal in a favorable manner. Knezevich stated that leadership was to be thought of in three ways: "1) symbolic leadership (primarily an attribute of personality); 2) formal leadership (status, title, or position recognized in a formal organization); and 3) functional leadership (role performed in an organized group) (p. 34). Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) also discussed Knezevich and his complex views of the leadership capacity of the principalship. They specifically took issue with his statement regarding the principalship as being significant "in determining the direction of public education" (p. 17). Given the number of duties inherent within the position, Blumberg and Greenfield felt the principal would be fortunate just to maintain the "status quo" (p. 17).

In the past decade, leadership has been defined in a variety of ways. Hairman and Scott (1974) stated that "leadership is a process by which people are directed, guided, and influenced in choosing and achieving goals" (p. 349). Military leadership, however, is defined quite simply as "a process by which a soldier influences others to accomplish the mission" (USA Field Manual 22-100, 1983, p. 44). Leadership also "consists of efforts to shape the behavior

of groups of people, or individuals, within an organization or system in such a way that benefits will ensue and the purposes of the organization or system will be fulfilled" (Harling, 1984, p. 3).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) quoted Irwin Federman, president of Monolithic Memories, who believes that "the essence of leadership is the capacity to build and develop the self-esteem of the workers" (p. 225). They also noted that leadership brings with it a certain sense of power. In their view "power is the basic energy needed to initiate and sustain action or, to put it another way, the capacity to translate intention into reality and sustain it. Leadership is the wise use of this power . . ." (p. 17). Further, "an essential factor in leadership is the capacity to influence and organize meaning for the members of the organization" (p. 39). More importantly, "leadership, by communicating meaning, creates a commonwealth of learning, and that, in turn, is what effective organizations are" (p. 42). In the educational setting, leadership must be based upon the creation of a "commonwealth" of philosophy, i.e., the belief that all students have worth and can, therefore, be educated.

In February 1980, The Council for Basic Education issued a report which stated "a good principal needs to be a liberally educated person, preferably an experienced teacher, with a coherent philosophy of education that he can translate into defensible goals and realistic objectives for the teachers and students he is given to lead. He must have the authority that will encourage teachers and students to follow his leadership" (p. 5). Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) viewed

the leadership factor from a different perspective. They felt "the distinguishing features of assertive, achievement-oriented leadership lie not in the day-to-day tasks of the principal but rather in the principal's overall performance and the direction to which he or she is committed. Assertive leadership includes both what the principal does and what the principal allows to happen. The assertive principal 'runs the school.' Otherwise, 'the school runs itself.' Principals who are assertive see to it that their convictions and philosophies with regard to achievement are carried out. They are active, involved, and accepting of responsibility" (p. 180). In this case, the term "assertive" is not to be construed as a negative. Shoemaker and Fraser viewed "assertive" in the positive sense in that the leader has confidence in his ability to achieve the organization's goals.

In 1982, Mortimer Adler introduced his Paideia Proposal. Although he is best known for his support of the Great Books for adult liberal education, his Proposal contains sound advice for the leadership role of the principal. He proposed that principals be inherently competent and that they are, first and foremost, dedicated teachers with ample classroom experience. The principal should administer all school activities in such a manner as to facilitate the main business of education--teaching. Even though the principal does not have to teach, he must provide the educational leadership necessary to move the faculty/students through the educational process. Specifically, Adler felt "the principal should function as

the principal teacher . . . not just as the chief administrator performing clerical and other tasks completely external to teaching and learning. A school is a community and, like any other community, it needs leadership. Since its reason for existence is teaching and learning, educational leadership must be provided by its principal. If the burden of administrative duties and clerical tasks threatens to take too much of his or her time and energy, that burden must be shouldered by assistants who need not be educators, but who are responsible to the principal educator in carrying out their assigned tasks" (p. 193). Adler's position is quite clear--the principal is the primary leader of the school and should, therefore, assume responsibility for the total educational program.

In 1983, the Southern Region Education Board issued a document entitled Meeting the Need for Quality: Action in the South. Since 1981, the Board has been documenting educational progress and making regional recommendations for improvement. In this particular report, the Board agreed with Adler and recommended that the principal's role be redefined so that the principal could function as the instructional leader of the school. The Board also recognized the complexities of the principal's position and felt a more realistic interpretation of the role may be that of establishing school goals and climate rather than influencing classroom practices.

Also in 1983, the Education Commission of the States issued its report Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools. The report stressed the fact that principals

should be instructional leaders and that they should have the knowledge and management skills needed to be successful. A vital factor was the principal's ability to establish a vision as well as strategic goals for the school. In addition, principals should concentrate on building a climate of expectations for student achievement, staff relationships, and community recognition of teacher excellence.

As a summary background review for the complexities of the principal's position, Snyder and Anderson (1986) discussed the Institute for Development of Educational Activities and its sponsorship of the 1974 Chautauqua Conference series on the principalship. Public school administrators from all levels, state and federal agency representatives, and scholars were invited to analyze the growing problems facing the principalship. The outcome of the conference was a call for clearer role definitions for principals with accompanying changes in certification and training. The role definition that seemed to emerge was that of a catalyst in the school's growth process. Clerical work should be limited, and principals should have the autonomy and resources to accomplish their goals.

The Chautauqua series also reviewed the accountability factor and concluded that it had adversely affected the role of the principalship. As a response to the public's expressed concern for quality education, legislative mandates for change filtered to the schools as programs in minimum competency testing, end-of-course testing, exceptional children's programs, and teacher evaluation. Rather than reduce the amount of clerical work placed on the principal, the forms

and work increased, and the principal was adversely caught in this reform movement. Snyder and Anderson (1986) supported previous authors by noting "while all administrative roles have been altered significantly in the past decade, the principalship has undergone perhaps the most dramatic role change of all. The role shift for principals has been a movement away from priority attention to administration toward an emphasis on managing instructional and organizational growth" (p. 14).

Richard Andrews (1987) agreed with the 1983 Education Commission of the States' report and emphasized the fact that principals should be instructional leaders. Instructional leadership from the faculty perspective means the principal should a) be visible, b) set a vision for the school, and c) get resources to help the teachers deliver quality in the classroom. "The leaders we are talking about know how to empower people and yell 'charge'" (pp. 7-16). Empowerment to Tom Peters (1985) is "Ownership" (p. 213). His view is that people work best and are self-motivated when they feel a part of the organization. Max DePree of Herman Miller summed this position up when he referred to leadership as "the liberation of talent" (p. 205) with relationships based upon "shared commitments to ideals, values and goals" (p. 205).

Faidley and Musser (1989) viewed the principal's dilemma to be the conceptual basis for the term leadership in that school boards, administrations, parents and students all see leadership as "the effective administration of budgets, personnel, facilities, and

equipment" (p. 11). They expect principals to keep things running smoothly and, as a result, principals have become "agents for stability rather than visionaries, adapters as opposed to transformers, and maintainers rather than champions" (p. 11). School leaders must, therefore, become visionary enough to provide teachers and students with the programs necessary to meet the demands of contemporary society.

Even though traditional leadership theory presents the principal with a variety of role selections, Clemens and Mayer (1987) took issue with the various concepts and preferred instead to offer the wisdom of the ages. After a review of classical literature, specifically Chaucer, they concluded "real people, unlike simplified theoretical constructs, are anything but binary, 'either-or' beings. They are infinitely complex. The crucial point is that reductionist leadership theories do not work; people cannot be stereotyped and neatly categorized" (p. 80). Warren Bennis (1989) agreed and stated clearly that "having a clearly enunciated, easily understood vision is the single most important characteristic of all successful leaders--from high school principals to the president of the United States" (p. 2). Father Theodore Hesburgh (1987) shared similar feelings in that he felt "the very essence of leadership is [that] you have to have a vision. It has got to be a vision you articulate clearly and forcefully on every occasion. You can not blow an uncertain trumpet" (p. 399).

Even with a firmly established "vision," the principal will encounter negative attitudes regarding "change." "All leaders," Bennis (1989) said, "face the challenge of overcoming resistance to change. Some try to do this by the simple exercise of power and control, but others learn better ways. This involves the achievement of voluntary commitment to shared values. When we asked the leaders about the personal qualities they needed to run their organizations, they never mentioned charisma, or dressing for success, or time management, or any of the other glib formulas that pass for wisdom in the popular press. Instead, they talked about persistence and self-knowledge, about willingness to take risks and accept losses; about commitment, consistency, and challenge. But above all, they talked about learning" (p. 2).

Richard DuFour (1986) summarizes the principal's leadership situation very nicely when he states ". . . one cannot read the effective schools literature without visualizing strong, dynamic, aggressive principals who roam their schools with a clear vision of what they want to achieve and determination to achieve it regardless of the obstacles" (p. 35).

Effective Principals/Effective Schools

"Principals are unquestionably the catalyst in effective school change" (Albrecht, 1989).

Ronald Edmonds (1979) is credited by many as setting the tone for the effective schools research. His study of urban poor and the

educational process remains a beacon for others to follow. His initial effort allowed him to carefully examine several schools and their organizational structure. To Edmonds, equity was a primary consideration, and he stated quite clearly that "equity will be the focus of my discussion. By equity I mean a simple sense of fairness in the distribution of the primary goods and services that characterize our social order" (p. 15). His goal was to identify those factors which either enhanced or restricted the quality of educational services to children of the urban districts. To that end, he stated ". . . I require that an effective school bring the children of the poor to those minimal masteries of basic skills that now describe minimally successful pupil performance for the children of the middle class" (p. 16). What Edmonds discovered and what is pertinent to this study is the fact that "all four schools had 'strong leadership' in that their principal was instrumental in setting the tone of the school; helping decide on instructional strategies, and organizing and distributing the schools' resources" (p. 16). He also observed "the principal is more likely to be an instructional leader, more assertive in his/her instructional leadership role, more of a disciplinarian, and perhaps most of all, assumes responsibility for the evaluation of the achievement of basic objectives" (p. 18). In conclusion, Edmonds wrote "they [effective schools] have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together" (p. 22). If accepted as fact, it would seem apparent that Edmonds' study

suggests that principals concentrate on the instructional aspects of the position.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) studied effective school principals and inferred that while each had a particular style of managing, there was a functional equivalence of style that featured tolerance for ambiguity, expressive abilities, skill at collecting and analyzing data, vision and initiative, physical energy, and psychological strength. Lightfoot (1983) agreed with this listing of characteristics, as she came to many of the same conclusions in her portraiture of six high schools and their principals. She, like many others before her, observed that "leadership is never wholly unidirectional" (p. 327) and "the tone and culture of the schools is said to be defined by the vision and purposeful action of the principal" (p. 323). As an example, Norris Hogans, principal of George Washington Carver High School in Atlanta, is driven by a "clarity of vision and purpose" (p. 39) as he moves to "create more options and more choices for expanded [student] futures" (p. 39).

Cohen (1981) reviewed the research conducted by Ronald Edmonds and noted that his studies suggested that differences in effectiveness among schools can be accounted for by the following five factors:

- 1) Strong administrative leadership by the school principal, especially with regard to instructional matters.
- 2) A school climate conducive to learning; that is, a safe and orderly school relatively free of discipline and vandalism problems.

- 3) School-wide emphasis on basic skills instruction (which entails acceptance among the professional staff that instruction in the basic skills is the primary goal of the school).
- 4) Teacher expectations that all students, regardless of family background, can reach appropriate levels of achievement.
- 5) A system for monitoring and assessing pupil performance which is tied to instructional objectives.

Cohen summarized by stating "the principal must be willing to clearly set the direction for the school and to hold the staff accountable for following that direction" (pp. 58-61).

Following Cohen's (1981) viewpoint, Bossert et al. (1982) noted that the more effective principals displayed instructional leadership styles which allowed them to observe teachers more regularly than those in schools considered to be not as effective. The effective schools principals talked with teachers about instruction and were supportive as well as more active in initiating evaluations of teaching. In this regard, Cohen (1982) continued his earlier study and concluded that strong instructional leadership by the principal was, indeed, a force in the effective schools. Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) conducted an in-depth study for factors influencing effectiveness and found "principal behaviors are increasingly 'effective' to the extent that they facilitate necessary teacher growth and thereby indirectly influence student learning or impinge

on other factors known to effect such learning" (p. 310). The instructional leadership concept was further reinforced by Leithwood and Montgomery as they concluded the following:

- 1) "Effective principals . . . are concerned to establish clear priorities . . . concerned about influencing several aspects of instructional strategies" (p. 323).
- 2) "Effective principals work toward their goals by attempting to influence a complex set of classroom-based and school-wide factors" (p. 334).
- 3) "In sum, effective principals are able to define priorities focused on the central mission of the school and gain support for those priorities from all stakeholders" (p. 335).

Little (1982) supported the "active principal principle" (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; DuFour, 1986) by observing that "principals associated with effective schools or projects actively exploit the resources of their positions: they seize the initiative" (p. 39). In another study, she stated "the principal is the key . . . the gatekeeper to school effectiveness" (p. 340).

Of the many characteristics displayed by effective school principals, decision-making is frequently overlooked by effective schools research. Hoy and Miskel (1982) examined this aspect of the principalship and documented the fact that "principals who are effective decision makers engage in a large amount of preliminary work: they seek more information; they differentiate between fact and

opinion; and they frequently obtain the views of others. On the other hand, principals who make quick yes or no decisions without preparation tend to be less effective" (p. 278).

In High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America (1983), Ernest L. Boyer summarized the panel's work by stating: "In schools where achievement was high and where there was a clear sense of community, we found, invariably, that the principal made the difference" (p. 219). Purkey and Smith (1983) agreed and stated ". . . it seems clear that leadership is necessary to initiate and maintain the improvement process . . . the principal is uniquely positioned to fill this role, and certainly his or her support is essential . . ." (p. 443). Keefe (1987) also supported this viewpoint as he stressed instructional leadership from the position that "a growing body of evidence on effective instruction, school productivity, school learning, climate, and learning styles emphasizes the view that leadership is critical to initiate and sustain any process of school improvement" (p. 49). In addition, "more and more research converges directly on the principalship arguing that certain behaviors are necessary for effective leadership" (p. 49). Keefe's key statement, however, summarizes the dilemma principals face on a daily basis: "the principalship emerges in much of the research of the last decade as the pivotal role in the schools, but the job is still ill-defined and much misunderstood" (p. 54).

Finn (1987) continued the quest for effective principal characteristics and documented the following:

- 1) ". . . effective principals are leaders who command attention, inspire respect, set clear goals, and motivate teachers and students to meet them" (p. 21).
- 2) "Effective principals are seldom paragons, but they do possess a fierce determination that 'what should be shall be' and they radiate an infectious enthusiasm for excellence" (p. 21).
- 3) "Effective school leaders have clear, active, ambitious, performance-oriented visions" (p. 21).

In summary, "the principalship is probably the single most powerful fulcrum for improving school effectiveness" (p. 22).

Several case studies have been documented (Jackson, 1981; Lightfoot, 1983) which discuss schools within urban and rural districts. The descriptions of the administrations of these schools leave the reader with the impression of the principalship as a powerful position (Griffiths, 1988, pp. 27-51). Herman and Stevens (1989) concurred with this view and then clarified their position: "Effective schools research has clearly established the importance of the principal's instructional leadership role. However, recent discussions . . . have not dealt with the tools the principal needs to bring about school improvement" (p. 55). They concluded their study by noting "principals must have a great degree of autonomy, have the responsibility for the operation of their building, have the

authority commensurate with their responsibility, and have central office and board support" (p. 55).

Jacobson (1987) observed that "effective principals establish the tone and the direction of their schools" (p. 57) and they "create situations that firmly convey the appropriate values to the subconscious minds of all those involved in the school" (p. 62). In order to "create situations," however, the principal needs the ability, the autonomy, and the time to make a difference. "Principals need the time to be instructional leaders. If they are assigned district coordinating responsibilities for the transportation program, cafeterias, special education, or other such duties, they will have difficulty devoting the attention they should to classrooms, teachers, and students" (Herman & Stevens, 1989, pp. 58-59). Earlier, Hall (1984) presented this same picture by stating "High school principals are often so busy and laden with administrative duties that they have no time to be facilitators of change" (p. 61). Anders et al. (1987) supported this contention by noting the principal's position to be burdened with problems, not the least of which is the time to adequately address instructional needs of the school.

Cunningham (1969) experienced a unique setting when he exchanged seats with an urban principal for a short period of time. What he saw prompted him to write the following: "I would argue for complete building-level autonomy. The principal and faculty should run the show without concern for other places. They should be allowed to organize the program of studies without adherence to

district-wide curriculum guides and the like. The principal should be free to select his own faculty without reference to certification. He should look for talented people anywhere and everywhere. They could be found across the street or across the nation. The principal should build his own budget and make internal allocations in terms of the faculty and staff's definition of need. More radically, I would ask that the principal be given complete control over time. That is, he should be able to open and close the school at will. If in his judgment events are getting out of hand, he should have the power--indeed be expected--to close the school down for a day, a week, or a month. During the time the building is closed, all of the adults in the school, in cooperation with students and community leaders, should focus on the problems that are overwhelming them. They should develop a problem-solving ethos" (pp. 127-128). Even though his views are admittedly radical, the frustration experienced in the principal's office is readily apparent.

Despite an accumulation of evidence to the contrary, the bureaucracy of school governance seems intent on increasing the non-instructional duties of the principalship. Even though there seems to be universal agreement as to the importance of the instructional role, outside forces continue to fix unreasonable expectations on the position. Maeroff (1982) highlighted a major problem by indicating "leadership requires making the best of circumstances, but a principal unable to select any of his staff may be without a built-in source of support for his programs" (p. 162). Maeroff continued this

theme by quoting AFT president Albert Shanker as he observed "the typical high school principal with 70 to 75 teachers does not have time to supervise them" (p. 168). DuFour (1989) expressed the identical view as he indicated that "time is one of the most precious resources available to us as principals. What teachers see us spending time on is what they will perceive as important" (p. 6). Theodore Sizer (1984) agreed and felt the principal should be the lead teacher. The business manager should be another individual as this would allow the principal to spend time with students and faculty and, therefore, make decisions that affect the life of the school. Because of this same viewpoint, Willower (1986) wrote: "Principals spend more time on managerial than instructional duties . . ." (p. 33). In spite of the magnitude of the administrative tasks of the principalship, effective schools do exist and quality programs produce learning. Mistretta and Phillips (1987) observed, however, that "education excellence depends on a principal's use of a unique blend of analysis, creativity, and 'people-smarts' to solve the problems of a complex organization" (p. 117).

During the 73rd annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, one of the speakers was Dr. Herb Sang, superintendent of the Duval County, Florida, public school system. Dr. Sang (1989) believes in school-based management and stated repeatedly that "only two people are responsible for what takes place at a school: the superintendent and the principal" (p. 8). Further, Sang cited the following as advantages to this

approach to the complexities of modern education:

- 1) It provides direct communication between the principal and superintendent by telephone or appointment.
- 2) Decisions are made fast, eliminating layers of bureaucracy.
- 3) Students receive better instruction through decisions emanating from specific needs of the school and its students.
- 4) Direct accountability is achieved, with only two people responsible--the principal and the superintendent.

Dr. Sang expressed concern for the instructional role of the principal and stresses "the key to educational excellence lies in the role and effectiveness of the school principal. Just as the superintendent must be the instructional leader of the district, so must the principal be the instructional leader of the school" (p. 8).

The concept of school-based management is not a new phenomenon. In 1859, John Stuart Mill wrote a treatise entitled "On Liberty" and argued extensively for participatory leadership. Clements and Mayer (1987) quoted Mill's discourse and noted that they considered his work to be "the best argument for participative management that has ever been written" (p. 153). Lewis (1986) expounded on the value of the team concept in education and stated: "When superintendents give principals increased autonomy, which leads to individual and team management, the superintendents are saying in essence that they believe school people can manage themselves; they will perform their jobs in a satisfactory manner even if they are

not closely supervised while they work, and they do not need to have their functions, responsibilities, and duties explained on a step-by-step basis" (p. 165). Maeroff (1989) lobbied vigorously for this leadership style as "access to decision-making will be enhanced by getting teachers and principals to see each other as collaborators in making schools work effectively for students . . ." (p. 7). He cautioned, however, that "unfortunately, the history of principal-teacher relationships is so paternal and hierarchial that principals frequently end up in dominating roles . . ." (p. 8). Be that as it may, the team approach to school management offers an excellent opportunity for principals to capitalize on competent assistance and, thereby, reduce mounting administrative pressures. If successful, the process would free the principal for concentrated instructional supervision, since "the principal is the person who has primary responsibility for monitoring outcomes" (DuFour, 1989, p. 6).

Roe and Drake (1974) put the principal's dilemma in proper perspective when they observed "it is virtually impossible to assume that the principal can be a real instructional leader and at the same time be held strictly accountable for the general operational and management detail required by the central office" (p. 14). They argued convincingly that the instructional and management duties should be separate. For example, "should the principal be held responsible for the accomplishment of management tasks if he is primarily expected to exert educational leadership?" (p. 119). Given the nature of the conflicting roles within the principal's position,

it is clear that the situation calls for immediate and appropriate assistance.

Instructional Assistance: The
Department Chairperson

Stedman and Smith (1985) carefully reviewed the various effective schools reports and observed that "what is ignored is the growing conviction among effective schools researchers that leadership must come from school-site management (Finn, 1987; Purkey & Smith, 1983). The staff of schools must be given the responsibility to construct their own reform programs, albeit within a framework established by local, state, and federal government" (p. 96). Snyder and Anderson (1986) promote the concept of a "team leader" with the "daily classroom teaching load . . . reduced at least slightly, so that he can more easily attend to administrative/supervisory functions." The designated leader would need a "slight degree of authority" as well as "a stipend above base salary" in order to compensate for an increased responsibility (p. 206). More importantly and vital to this study, they noted that "the major organizational invention in secondary schools, borrowed from universities, was departmental organization. Each teacher was responsible for being the master of only one or two disciplines, except in the very small schools where such a luxury was less possible. Departmental organization also led to a highly desirable invention, the department chairperson, which greatly increased the number of

persons within the secondary school charged with various leadership and coordinating functions. The grade-level chairperson in elementary schools was and is a version of the secondary school departmental leader, but the pattern rarely developed to a point where sufficient leadership time and energy became available" (pp. 158-159).

Even though the effective schools literature strongly supports the principal's direct involvement in the instructional program, the literature presented in this study indicates that principals are torn between two specific roles--that of manager and that of instructional leader. Based upon this research, it would appear that principals serve the instructional role best by supportive functions rather than by direct involvement. Anderson (1987) reviewed eight comprehensive high schools in a large Southwestern public school district and concluded the administrations shared instructional duties even though the principalship was the position primarily responsible. The department heads, however, had duties ranging from the allocation of personnel to the interpretation of school goals. The department head's position clearly provided much needed administrative assistance to the principals (pp. 115-123).

The team approach concept works well in secondary schools. Glatthorn and Newberg (1984) provided supporting documentation for the studies of Maeroff (1989) and Lewis (1986) when they indicated that it was possible for principals to delegate responsibility for the instructional program to trusted subordinates such as department

heads. In a similar study, Lucy (1986) argued for a more significant role for the department heads as they are already involved in the curriculum, have classroom experience, and subject area competence. Lucy's thesis was based upon the observation that principals have restricted time and limited subject expertise as instructional leaders. With appropriate role development, the department head's position is ideal for curriculum/instructional supervision (pp. 85-87). Marcial (1984) presented a corresponding view of the department head and noted the position to be locked in role conflict. The department head's perception of the role is administrative whereas teachers consider it a staff position with no supervisory authority. The role may, therefore, be considered supportive and Marcial soundly rejected this concept. While it may be true that principals maintain direct responsibility for the instructional program, well-trained department heads can assist with formative faculty evaluations and school objectives. Rather than compound the existing confusion by creating extra evaluators or additional principal duties, Marcial concluded the department head's position to be ideal for both line and staff functions.

Hord and Murphy's (1985) research regarding the department head involved 30 high schools and three years of study. At the conclusion, their data supported that of Marcial (1984) and confirmed the inconsistency of the role. The duties assigned to the department head were specific to the administration of the school, and faculty perceptions varied from that of a colleague to a supervisor. Most

often, however, the department head was seen as responding to change rather than initiating such change. For the department head to have an instructional leadership role, Hord and Murphy (1985) argued for a distinct authority pattern with responsibility assigned in the areas of faculty in-service and evaluation.

Goodlad (1984) disagreed with the effective schools research and argued for the "head teacher" concept. Moreover, he stated emphatically that he took issue "with the more extended definition of the modeling and evaluating role of the principal" (p. 302) and proceeded to list three reasons for his stand: First, the development and maintenance of a first-rate school is a full-time job as are being a role model and monitoring teaching. For the principal, one or the other of the two roles will obviously suffer. Second, Goodlad felt it is naive and arrogant to assume principals have achieved a higher level of teaching expertise than the faculty. Third, the importance of trust in the principal/teacher relationship is critical to the development of the overall educational program. If the principal is to be both evaluator and judge of the faculty, what are the chances of developing that bond of trust between the two? "Very little I fear" (p. 302). In summary, Goodlad's image of the principal is, therefore, that of the head administrator with someone else as head teacher to provide instructional leadership. Turner (1983) noted that principals who want assistance with the instructional/curriculum role should first consider the department head.

Conclusions

Genck and Klingenberg (1978) examined the mounting pressures of the principalship and added to the increasing effective schools research emphasis by noting "the principal's job should be redefined with a reduction in administrative responsibilities and an expansion in managerial, staff development, and educational leadership roles. A principal should be free to directly supervise teachers' work with children, and should understand that he has responsibility for children's learning" (p. 51). Previously, Bailey (1973) argued that the growth of the large comprehensive school stretched the principal's abilities to effectively accomplish all the tasks required. This administrative emphasis on management "will often result in heavier responsibilities for department heads. Their responsibility will shift from clerical or administrative duties to those of supervisory and managerial nature. They will be responsible for the performance and the competence of the staff in their departments. The development of this role, usually in the form of team leaders, also is taking place in elementary and junior high schools" (p. 50). With the expansion of the school program and the resulting increase in administrative requirements, the department chairperson/lead teacher's position offers the principal ideal instructional assistance.

Based upon our review of the literature, the following expectations were developed regarding the perceptions of department

chairpersons with respect to the role of the principal.

1. There is a significant difference between the role desired for principals by department chairpersons and the actual role as perceived by the department chairperson.
2. Secondary school department chairpersons perceive the role of the principal as being primarily that of a general manager.
3. Male and female department chairpersons tend to view the principal's role differently.
4. Department chairpersons within the sciences tend to perceive the principal's role as being that of a general manager whereas those within the liberal arts tend to view the role as administrative/instructional leader.
5. Department chairpersons with varying levels of experience tend to view the role of the principal differently.
6. Department chairpersons with advanced degrees tend to perceive the principal's role as being that of a general manager.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study was designed to assess the secondary school department chairperson's perceptions of the leadership role of the secondary school principal according to a five-part conceptual framework proposed and adopted by Brubaker and Simon (1986). Based upon this writer's concerns and interests, a survey was developed which requested that the secondary school department chairpersons within Guilford County, North Carolina, select the conceptual leadership role which best described their perception of the actual role of the high school principal as well as the ideal or desired role of the high school principals throughout the survey area.

With the 93 responses received from the secondary department chairpersons, a summary was composed in order to provide a composite of the various roles of the high school principal as perceived by the department chairperson. The specific principal leadership role identified as being preferred by the survey population was compared to the actual principal role as perceived by those same department chairpersons. Further, a response analysis was conducted in order to determine relationships between the dependent variable--the leadership role of the high school principal as perceived by the

department chairperson--and the four independent variables: 1) the highest degree earned; 2) the number of years experience as a department chairperson; 3) the gender of the chairperson; and 4) the subject area of the department chairperson.

Additional information obtained from the free response question provided valuable insight as to the chairperson's perceptions of both personal and administrative leadership roles within the school organization.

The continuation of this chapter provides a description of research methodology, the survey instrument employed for the study, and the secondary school population participating in the study.

Research Methodology

In order to develop data pertinent to this study, the secondary school department chairpersons within Guilford County, North Carolina, were surveyed to determine how they perceived the leadership role of the high school principal. Since three public school systems operate within Guilford County, North Carolina, the three assistant superintendents responsible for secondary education were personally contacted with a request for secondary school information as well as permission to conduct the study. Each responded favorably, and 17 county schools were identified as offering traditional secondary educational programs (grades 9-12). Each high school principal was personally contacted for permission to survey and also to verify his/her use of the department chair organization model. Of the 17

schools, 16 responded positively. The one exception was an alternate school with a small faculty and no apparent use of departmentalization.

The 16 identified schools had a combined total of 142 department chairpersons. The surveys were personally delivered to the selected schools during the last two weeks of April 1988. The department chairperson's envelope contained a cover letter which explained the study (Appendix A), a sheet which explained the five leadership roles of the principal (Appendix B), the survey instrument (Appendix C) itself, and a preaddressed, stamped envelope for return of the completed survey. Department chairs wishing to receive a copy of the study were requested to include a name and address with their response. No further identifying information was used for the individual. Nonrespondents were, however, identified by a school coded colored mark placed on the rear of each respondent envelope. A major limitation of the study was the dependence on the school secretary or principal to deliver the survey to the department chairperson. A secondary limitation involved the willingness of the department chairperson to respond to the survey instrument. Attempts to overcome both limitations were limited to main office school contacts, as individual respondents remained anonymous.

Although a respondent record was compiled, accuracy was difficult, as four schools failed to deliver the surveys until the first week of May 1988. A reminder was, therefore, necessary and a

personal contact with the principal was made with extra copies of the survey delivered. Because of the time of the academic year, many department chairpersons failed to respond until after the examination period and school had closed. Spring appears not to be an optimum time for secondary school research.

Of the 142 surveys delivered, 93 (66%) were received between May and August 1988. All surveys were considered for data analysis in that individual nonresponse areas are reported statistically.

The data obtained from the survey analysis produced a distinct picture of the leadership role of the secondary school principal as perceived by the responding survey population. From this information, response patterns developed which provide perceptual contrasts with regard to the actual role of the principal and the desired role of the principal. Further analysis also revealed the department chairperson's perceptions of the leadership role of the principals throughout Guilford County, North Carolina.

Given the expectation that an individual's perception is influenced by multiple variables, this study measured four specific variables and their relationship to the perception of the department chairperson. The four identified independent variables--degree, subject area, number of years experience as a department chairperson, and gender--were compared with the dependent variable--the department chairperson's perception of the role of the principal--in order to determine relationship.

In order to develop summary information, a free response question encouraged the respondent to provide additional details regarding the enhancement of the department chairperson's position. The individual's response to this question was then compared to other survey answers to determine consistency. Related responses for all surveys were grouped and prioritized by frequency and/or percentages.

Description of the Instrument

The survey instrument developed by Brubaker and Simon (1987) was used as the basis for this study. Although the original instrument was modified to fit the department chairperson's specific job description, the conceptual basis remained essentially the same. A modification of the original instrument was also employed by Briggs (1986) to survey the perceptions of central office personnel regarding the principal's leadership role. Williams (1987) also utilized the same conceptual framework in order to survey teacher perceptions regarding the leadership roles of principals. Multiple applications of the original instrument will, therefore, enable future studies to compare and analyze data.

In November 1987, three former department chairpersons at Grimsley Senior High School in Greensboro, North Carolina, were requested to review and comment on two instruments. Although both surveys were based on the five principal leadership concepts developed by Brubaker and Simon (1987), one contained questions

directed specifically to instructional duties whereas the other contained questions of a generalized nature. All three responded with comments and answers which were compared and individually discussed. Even though both surveys included similar responses, all three teachers were emphatic on two points: 1) teachers will not take the time to complete an extensive questionnaire, and 2) they preferred general information over that of a specific nature. Based upon their advice, the shorter version of the general survey was selected for this study.

The selected instrument was designed to obtain detailed information regarding the current status of department chairpersons in Guilford County, North Carolina, as well as their role perceptions of the principalship. The survey specifically requested that the department chairperson identify one of the five leadership concepts in each of the following:

- the leadership concept that best describes the principals with whom you have worked in the past (actual role);
- the leadership concept that most accurately describes the Guilford County principals in general (actual role);
- the leadership concept that most accurately describes where you think principals should be (desired role);
- the leadership concept that best describes the role currently played by you as a department chairperson (actual role); and

- the leadership concept that most accurately describes the role a department chairperson should play (desired role).

The survey also requested responses to questions regarding personal information such as:

- 1) number of years as a department chairperson
- 2) current teaching assignment or support position
- 3) number of years as a teacher
- 4) highest degree completed
- 5) gender
- 6) number of years with current principal
- 7) extracurricular duties:
 - a) supervise homeroom
 - b) activity
 - c) performance appraisal process
- 8) supplement

A free response question was also used in order to obtain further information regarding the individual's perceptions of the department chairperson's position. The following question allowed the individual to respond in an open-ended fashion.

- In your opinion, what should be done to enhance the position of the department chairperson?

The free response question provided the individual with an opportunity to express opinions not previously addressed within the conceptual framework instrument.

Reliability

Instrument reliability was determined by applying a test-retest procedure in order to measure response consistency over a specific period of time. The instrument was administered on two different dates to the Grimsley Senior High School Leadership Team with notation that the team would not be included in this study.

Sixteen Grimsley High School department chairpersons completed the initial survey on 23 March 1988. During the survey administration, the purpose of the process was explained and the fact that the instrument would be administered at a later date was not mentioned. At the conclusion of the meeting, each individual was requested to personally mark the instrument with an identifying code for "future return."

Two weeks later on 6 April 1988, the leadership team again met and completed an identical second survey instrument. At this point, the team received an explanation regarding the nature of the test-retest process and the significance of their cooperation. As in the initial survey administration, each individual was requested to mark the second instrument with the identical code used on the first instrument.

Of the 16 survey instruments initially tested, only 12 were available for final analysis. Four of the department chairpersons were unable to attend the second meeting and, therefore, were not able to complete the process. The remaining surveys were summarized

by percent agreement per item between the first and second test administrations. In addition, the percentage was also calculated for the total instrument in order to verify reliability.

A comparative analysis of the 12 leadership team survey instruments revealed a 79% agreement between the first and second test administrations for the total instrument (Table 1). A review of each individual item, however, provided significant preliminary information. The fourth item on the survey--Question D--received a much higher response agreement than did any other item. Since the question requests the individual to make a judgment about the appropriate leadership role of the principal, it is interesting to note that the question is the only one of six to maintain a 100% response agreement between test administrations. In this particular case, it is clear the department chairs have identified the role they want their principal to play.

In addition, the sixth item on the conceptual framework questionnaire received a 92% response agreement between test administrations. Here again, the question asks for judgment as the individual is requested to identify the leadership role the department chair should play. As in Question D, the department chairs clearly agreed as to the preferred role of their position.

The lowest response agreement received was for the fifth item on the questionnaire--Question E. Only 50% agreement was recorded between the two test administrations. Since the item requested an identification of the role currently played by department chairs, it

Table 1

Item Agreement From Test-Retest Administration of Survey to Grimsley High School Department Chairpersons

Subject Agreement	Item Agreement						Percent
Question	A	B	C	D	E	F	
A	0	1	1	1	1	1	83
B	1	1	1	1	1	1	100
C			n/a				
D	1	1	1	1	0	1	83
E			n/a				
F	1	1	md	1	1	1	83
G	1	0	1	1	1	0	67
H	0	1	1	1	0	1	67
I	1	0	1	1	0	1	67
J	0	1	0	1	1	1	67
K	1	1	1	1	0	1	83
L			n/a				
M			n/a				
N	0	1	1	1	0	1	67
O	1	1	1	1	1	1	100
P	1	1	1	1	0	1	83
Item							
% Agreement	67	83	83	100	50	92	79

Key: 0 = Nonagreement of responses between test administrations
 1 = Agreement of responses between test administrations
 m/d = Missing data. Subject failed to answer the question
 n/a = Subject failed to complete one or more of the test administrations

Note: Response agreement indicates identical answers between test administrations for the subject. Nonagreement indicates a variation of answers between the two test administrations.

is clear that the individual remains unsure as to the role he/she is to play within the organization.

An overall review of the percentage of consistent item responses indicated an acceptable reliability level of 79% for the survey instrument. The fact that the consistency level is not higher may be attributed to the length of the instrument. Table 1 presents the item analysis summary for the instrument.

Validity

"The validity of a measure is how well it fulfills the function for which it is being used" (Hopkins & Stanley, 1981, p. 76). In addition, Gay (1987) put the definition simply by stating "that it is the degree to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure" (p. 128). Since Brubaker and Simon's (1987) original survey instrument has remained essentially the same throughout two subsequent studies--Williams (1987) and McRae (1987)--the validity of the instrument has not only been substantiated by literature but also by repeated application. The five conception framework for the role of the principal has, therefore, been clearly enhanced by the literature reviews of all three studies. With numerous authors citing role orientations for the principal similar to that of the original study (Brubaker & Simon, 1987), the semantics may be at issue, but the duties are clearly identical. For purposes of this study, however, the historical evolution of the principal's duties creates a blending of responsibilities which combine to adversely

influence the total effectiveness of the position. The literature in chapter two supports this contention, and the validity of the instrument selected for this study is, therefore, confirmed by the data collected.

With Gay (1987) as a reference, content validity is defined as "the degree to which a test measures an intended content area" (p. 129). Since content validity includes item and sampling validity, both areas were considered carefully when the modified instrument was initially designed and tested. Item validity was verified as the selected instrument was applicable only to the role of the principal as viewed from the department chairperson's perspective. Sampling validity was viewed as significant in that all identified secondary school department chairpersons within Guilford County, North Carolina were requested to participate in the study. This method assured the study of data relating specifically to educators operating within the multifunctional position of secondary school department chair.

Specific validation of the instrument has been provided by McRae (1987) and Williams (1987). The Williams' (1987) study noted specifically that "the validity of the instrument was strengthened by a comparison of the teachers' responses to the conception selected" (p. 54). She compared response patterns from the free response questions to those marked on the instrument "to see if similar responses with similar qualities were chosen" (p. 54). With a 50% response consistency, the instrument was considered to be valid and functional for her study.

Based upon the Williams' data, as well as that of Brubaker and Simon (1987) and McRae (1987), the modified instrument was considered valid for this study.

Description of the Population

The teachers selected for this study were those serving as secondary school department chairpersons within Guilford County, North Carolina, during the 1987-1988 academic year. Of the 142 department chairpersons within the county, 93 responded for a 66% return rate. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were female and 23% were male. Of the department chairpersons surveyed, 35.5% held Bachelors degrees, 61.3% held Master's degrees, 1.1% held Sixth-Year certificates, and 1.1% held Doctorates. In addition, 1.1% failed to respond to the question regarding degree status and were, therefore, coded as "missing data" responses.

Since the middle school concept is altering the organizational structure of America's schools, the grade level organization of the respondent's school was deemed important. Accordingly, item analysis indicates 96.8% of the respondents work in a 9-12 school setting. Of these respondents, 2.2% work in a senior high setting, grades 10-12, where grade nine is still a part of a separate junior high organizational concept. One respondent (1.1%) reported an organizational structure with only grades 11 and 12 present.

In the sample population, 40.2% of the department chairs reported they had less than five years experience in that position;

59.8% reported six or more years experience with a small portion of that percentage (eight respondents) indicating 20 or more years experience. The following table reveals the experience levels of the sample population.

Table 2

Number of Years Experience as a Secondary School Department
Chairperson

Category	Frequency	Percent
One year of experience	5	5.4
Two to five years experience	32	34.8
Six to 10 years experience	28	30.4
11 to 30 years experience	27	29.4
Missing data	1	n/a
Total	93	100.0

In addition to assuming the responsibilities of department chairperson, the teachers within the sample population also continue to function as classroom teachers or support personnel, i.e., media specialists and guidance counselors. In order to fully appreciate their perspective, it was vital that information be obtained which would provide a picture of their total responsibilities. Accordingly, while 54.9% reported having homeroom duties, 45.1% indicated

that they were free of the traditional morning attendance/records responsibility. More importantly, 72% reported that they continued to teach five classes per day in addition to having departmental responsibilities. Only 2.2% reported they were responsible for teaching three classes per day or less.

For teachers, extracurricular duties are frequently a part of administrative expectations. For the sample population, 70.7% reported responsibility for some form of extra duty whereas 29.3% indicated they were free of this responsibility. Table 3 lists the various activities provided by the respondents.

In the sample population, 16 secondary school curriculum areas were represented. Response analysis revealed the greater number of respondents to represent two disciplines--health/physical education (11.8%) and social studies (10.8%). A thorough review of the survey responses indicated all major secondary school curriculum areas to be represented. The data, therefore, not only provides information regarding the department chairperson's area of expertise, it also further enhances the validity of the study. Table 4 provides evidence that all secondary school curriculum areas are represented in this study.

Summary

For the purposes of this study, 142 secondary school department chairpersons in Guilford County, North Carolina, were requested to respond to a survey regarding their perceptions of the principal's

Table 3

Extracurricular Activities as Reported by Department Chairpersons

Activity	Frequency	Percent
Academic Club	1	1.1
Art Club	3	3.3
Attendance Office	2	2.2
Basketball	1	1.1
SBAC Chair	2	2.2
Coach, Multiple Sports	6	6.6
Cheerleader Advisor	2	2.2
Civinettes	1	1.1
Close-up	1	1.1
Color Guard, JROTC	2	2.2
Coordinating Council	1	1.1
Detention Hall Supervisor	1	1.1
Environmental Club	1	1.1
Fellowship of Christian Athletes	1	1.1
Foreign Language Club	1	1.1
French Club	2	2.2
Future Business Leaders of America	4	4.4
Future Farmers of America	1	1.1
Future Homemakers of America	4	4.4
High IQ	2	2.2
History Club	1	1.1
Homecoming Committee	1	1.1
Hunter Safety Club	1	1.1
International Club	1	1.1
Math Contest Chair	1	1.1
Musical Director/Drama	2	2.2
National Honor Society	6	6.6
Newspaper Advisor	2	2.2
Junior/Senior Prom	2	2.2
Science Fair Advisor	1	1.1
SECME	1	1.1
Senior Class Sponsor	1	1.1
Scoreboard Operator	1	1.1
Student Council	1	1.1
Tennis Coach	1	1.1
Volleyball	3	3.3
Not Applicable	26	28.6
Missing Data	2	0.0
Total	93	100.0

Table 4

Representative Subject Areas for Department Chairpersons

Area	Frequency	Percent
Art	2	2.2
Business	7	7.5
Driver's Education	2	2.2
English	5	5.4
Foreign Language	6	6.5
Guidance	6	6.5
Health/Physical Education	11	11.8
Home Economics	5	5.4
JROTC	2	2.2
Math	9	9.7
Media	6	6.5
Music Education	3	3.2
Science	9	9.7
Social Studies	10	10.8
Special Education	6	6.5
Vocational Education	4	4.3
Total	93	100.0

role. The survey was based upon a five-part conceptual leadership framework developed by Brubaker and Simon (1987) and modified for the department chairperson's position.

The instrument selected for use in this survey was adapted from an original study conducted by Brubaker and Simon in 1985-1986 and reported in 1987. By using a similar methodology, subsequent

studies by Briggs (1986), Williams (1987), and McRae (1987) examined the perceptions of central office personnel, teachers, and superintendents regarding the role of the principal. The reliability of the basic instrument has, therefore, been firmly established through repeated application.

Ninety-three acceptable surveys were received and analyzed for this study. The results of the five conception section were collated and summarized in order to determine the frequency of responses. A comparative process contrasted the department chairperson's perceptions regarding the past and present leadership roles of the principal versus the chairperson's desired role for the principal. Analysis determined the relationship between the dependent variable--the department chairperson's perception of the role of the principal--and the independent variables--the number of years experience, the subject area, the degree, and the gender of the chairperson. The free response section of the survey provided additional information regarding the department chairperson's views of the position itself.

Reliability of the instrument was established through a test-retest procedure with a group of department chairpersons not included in the sample. There was a 79% item agreement between the first and second survey administrations indicating an acceptable level of reliability. Validity was previously established by researchers (McRae, 1987; Williams, 1987) using similar survey instruments and by a review of the various conceptual frameworks in the literature.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the Guilford County, North Carolina, high school department chairpersons' perceptions of the role of the high school principal. Since the situation of chairpersons is unique in that they occupy both teaching and administrative positions simultaneously (Marcial, 1984), their views of the principalship are vital to an assessment of that position. In addition, knowing their perceptions will enable principals to establish better communication patterns with this position and, therefore, organize to utilize the chairpersons' expertise. Accordingly, all identified high school department chairpersons within the survey area were requested to respond to a questionnaire which asked for their perceptions regarding the actual and desired leadership roles for the principal. The questions were designed to measure the department chairperson's perceptions on a conceptual framework initially developed by Brubaker and Simon (1987). The framework delineated the role of the principal into five designated leadership styles. The five conceptions used as a basis for this survey were:

- Principal Teacher

- General Manager
- Professional and Scientific Manager
- Administrator and Instructional Leader
- Curriculum Leader

In addition, the study also examined the relationship between the chairperson's conceptual categorization of the role of the principal with four independent variables: the respondent's number of years of experience as a department chairperson, his/her subject area, the highest degree earned, and gender.

Since time and experience working with principals might well alter initial expectations and perceptions, the length of service as a department chairperson could influence the individual's view of the role of the principal. The analysis will, therefore, explore the relationship between a department chairperson's length of service and his/her orientation toward the desired role of the principal.

The subject area of the department chairperson is another variable which could influence the chairperson's perspective. A person's curriculum background tends to shape his orientation toward a variety of factors and, thus, could influence the chairperson's orientation toward a certain type of leadership style. For example, faculty members in the math/science areas tend to prefer a more ordered and structured environment than might faculty members in the liberal arts. The subject area of the chairperson could have a direct bearing on the individual's expectation for the role of the principal and, therefore, has been included for investigation.

As department chairpersons expand professional development through advanced degree programs and staff development, new knowledge and innovative instructional techniques may alter their view of the proper role of the principal. The highest degree earned may well be an important factor within this relationship and has been included in the study as a variable.

The fourth independent variable is the gender of the department chairperson. Although Williams (1987) reported no significant differences in teacher perceptions regarding the role of the principal according to gender, Brubaker and Simon's (1987) study of principals discovered perceptual variations regarding the principal's leadership role that were based on gender. Since contrasting data were reported by both studies, the department chairperson's gender perceptions were considered to be vital to this investigation.

In sum, it is hypothesized that a department chairperson forms his/her perceptions of the principal's leadership role based upon a variety of influences. Knowing and understanding what effect these influences have on a chairperson's perception should be beneficial to the principal. By knowing what impacts a chairperson's perception of the principalship, principals will be better able to utilize the potential of a key member of the school faculty.

In the Spring of 1988, surveys were distributed to 142 identified secondary school department chairpersons within Guilford County, North Carolina. A total of 93 surveys (66%) were returned

and analyzed. The resulting data answered the following research questions:

1. What is the most desirable principalship role as determined by the Guilford County, North Carolina, public secondary school department chairperson?
2. Is there a correlation between the desired role of the principal and the actual role of the principal as perceived by the secondary school department chairpersons within Guilford County, North Carolina?
3. Does the highest degree earned by a Guilford County, North Carolina, department chairperson influence his/her perception of the role of the principal?
4. Does the subject area influence the Guilford County, North Carolina, department chairperson's perception of the principal's role?
5. Does the number of years experience as a department chairperson influence the chairperson's perception of the principal's role?
6. Will gender influence the department chairperson's perception of the role of the principal?

To answer the research questions posed in this study, the analysis proceeded in four steps. First, the actual role of the principal was examined from the perspective of the department chairperson. Secondly, an analysis of the chairperson's desired role for a principal was undertaken. Thirdly, an analysis of each of the key

background characteristics thought to be potentially important in explaining variations in the chairperson's perceptions of principals was achieved. Finally, the relationship between the chairperson's perception of the actual role of the principal and that of the desired role was analyzed and then compared with potentially explanatory variables.

Discussion of Results

Findings

Actual role. The analysis first seeks to evaluate the chairperson's perception of the leadership role principals actually exhibit. To investigate this issue, two questions were asked on the survey. The first question sought from chairpersons their assessment of their personal experience with principals. A second question sought to determine what role they thought principals in general throughout the county actually play. In both questions, chairpersons were requested to use the Brubaker and Simon (1987) classification of principals in their responses. These two questions may, in fact, be measuring the same thing. The experience that a chairperson has personally may influence his perception of principals in general.

Indeed, that is what the data suggests. A comparison of responses for the two questions revealed 80 chairpersons to have answered both questions. Of that group, 62 respondents (78%) selected identical role concepts in both questions. While a

significant majority answered the same way, it is worth noting that there was not complete congruence; 22% of the respondents answered the two questions differently.

Table 5

Department Chairperson's Perceptions of the Actual Leadership Role of Principals

Concept	Personal Experience With Principals	Perceptions of Principals in General
Principal Teacher	3%	1%
General Manager	52%	55%
Professional/Scientific Manager	8%	5%
Administrative/Instructional Leader	36%	37%
Curriculum Leader	0%	2%
	100%	100%
	<u>n=88</u>	<u>n=82</u>
No Response	5	11
Total	93	93

The data in Table 5 shows that the department chairpersons believe the role actually played by principals to be either that of a general manager or an administrative/instructional leader. A majority of chairpersons selected the general manager's role concept across both questions (52% and 55%). Another 36%, however,

felt that the administrative/instructional leader's role concept was the characteristic most often displayed by principals. It is interesting to note that no department chairpersons felt they had worked with a curriculum leader and only 2% believed that the curriculum leader's role was played by any principal in the county. Thus, it appears that principals in Guilford County are perceived by chairpersons to be, by and large, either a general manager or an administrative/instructional leader.

The analysis of the chairperson's perception of how principals actually lead can be compared to previous research employing similar methodology with different populations. Chairpersons and other educators differ in their perceptions of what leadership role is actually played by principals. In the McRae (1987) survey of superintendents, 32% selected the general manager's concept and another 36% selected the administrative/instructional leader's role for how principals actually performed their job. In Williams' (1987) research on teacher perceptions, she reported that a large percentage of her population (54%) viewed the actual principal's role as that of an administrative/instructional leader. With over 50% of the department chairpersons perceiving the actual role of principals to be that of a general manager, they clearly disagreed with the superintendent's and teacher's assessment. Based upon the reported perceptual differences, department chairpersons view principals in a very different light than other reported professionals. They see

the principal as operating more as a manager and facilitator rather than an administrative/instructional leader.

Desired role. Within the survey population, each respondent identified one of the Brubaker-Simon leadership concepts which most accurately described the role he/she felt the principal should play. Table 6 indicates a summary of the responses received.

Table 6

Department Chairperson's Perception of the Most Desirable Principal Leadership Role

Concept	Frequency	Percentage
Principal Teacher	3	4
General Manager	3	3
Professional/Scientific Manager	6	7
Administrative/Instructional Leader	74	84
Curriculum Leader	2	2
Sub-Total	88	100
No Response	5	
Total	93	

Based upon the analysis of data, it is clear that the Guilford County, North Carolina, department chairpersons view the administrative/instructional leadership style as the more desirable role concept. These results were not completely unexpected and confirmed

earlier research by Brubaker and Simon (1987). In their study, 64% of the principals preferred the administrative/instructional leadership style. In this study, more than four out of every five department chairpersons (84%) selected the administrative/instructional leader's style.

The fact that in both studies there was a clear preference for the administrative/instructional role concept for principals is particularly noteworthy. Further enhancing the dominance of the administrative/instructional leadership concept are two additional studies. Williams' (1987) study of teachers found that 75% of her respondents selected the administrative/instructional leader concept as the desired principal's role. McRae (1987) reported stronger preferences in his study of North Carolina superintendents. Over 85% of his respondents selected the administrative/instructional leader's concept as the proper role for principals; this is very similar to the results reported here for the department chairpersons.

Since there was considerable agreement on the administrative/instructional leader's role as the preferred principal's leadership style, it was difficult to glean much from the choices made by the remaining respondents in the four studies. For example, Brubaker and Simon (1987) noted that the principal's second choice ended in a tie between the curriculum leader's concept and that of the professional/scientific manager. In the current research, the department chairperson's second choice was that of the professional/scientific manager, but this style was selected by only 7% of the chairpersons.

Degree. An analysis of the data received indicates that all chairpersons have at least a bachelors degree. In contrast, however, Table 7 reveals some of the professional educators (1%) within Guilford County hold less than a bachelors degree. Table 7 also shows a majority of the educators (55%) within the county have only a bachelors degree whereas a far smaller percentage of chairpersons (36%) fit into this category. This appears to be a result of the fact that a large percentage of the chairpersons (61%) hold master's degrees at a rate that is one and one-half times that of their colleagues within the three Guilford County public school systems. At the more advanced degree levels, the respondents were equally divided at 1% each for the sixth year and doctoral degrees.

According to the North Carolina Public Schools Statistical Profile for 1988, 2% of the total Guilford County teaching population hold doctorates, 3% hold the sixth-year degree, 39% hold master's degrees, and 55% hold the bachelors degree. In sum, the respondents more than favorably compare to their colleagues within Guilford County with regard to level of education.

With the degree of the department chairperson as an independent variable, a comparative analysis between actual principal's role and desired principal's role was undertaken. Since earlier analysis indicated that very few department chairpersons selected the principal teacher's concept--the professional/scientific manager's concept, and the curriculum leader's concept--these three

Table 7

Degree Distribution for Secondary School Department Chairpersons and Other Professional Educators Within Guilford County, North Carolina
(Data Reported by Percentages)

Degree	Chairperson	Other Professionals
Less than Bachelors	0%	1%
Bachelors	36%	55%
Master's	62%	39%
Sixth Year	1%	3%
Doctoral	1%	2%
Total	100%	100%
	<u>n=92</u>	<u>n=3803</u>

Note: The 1988 North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction statistical profile report was referenced for this table as the survey data was compiled in the spring of that year.

were combined for ease of assessment. Table 8, therefore, reports the relationship between the chairperson's level of education and perception of principal's leadership role.

An analysis of the response data indicated 54% of the survey population with master's degrees selected the general manager's concept as the leadership characteristic most often displayed by the Guilford County principals in general. For the respondents with bachelors degrees, 52% selected the general manager's concept as

Table 8
 Secondary School Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual
 Role of the Principal According to Degree

Concept	Degree			
	Bachelor	Sixth-Year	Master's	Doctor
Administrative/Instructional Leader	41%	0%	36%	0%
General Manager	52%	100%	54%	100%
Professional/Scientific- Principal Teacher- Curriculum Leader	7%	0%	10%	0%
Total	100% <u>n=29</u>	100% <u>n=1</u>	100% <u>n=50</u>	100% <u>n=1</u>
Sub-Total	81			
No Response	12			
Total	93			

the primary role characteristic displayed by principals. The two respondents with sixth year and doctoral degrees also identified that same concept as the principal's role. With respect to the total response population of 81 chairpersons, 44 (54%) respondents identified the general manager's concept as being the actual role displayed by principals.

The administrative/instructional leader's concept was also identified by 41% of those with bachelors degrees and 36% of those with master's degrees. The principal teacher concept was identified by only one respondent within the master's category. No other

respondents from any other degree category selected that concept. The curriculum leader's concept was identified by only two respondents (7%), both from within the bachelors category. In sum, analysis of the data indicated very little difference existed between degree categories with respect to the perceptual selections of the department chairpersons.

The analysis now turns to the department chairperson's perception of the leadership role concept that principals should emulate. Table 9, therefore, reports the percentages for the most desirable principal leadership concept as selected by the department chairpersons.

Data analysis for the desired role indicated a majority response in all degree categories for the administrative/instructional leader's role concept. The department chairpersons within the bachelors degree and master's degree categories were equal in agreement in that 83% selected the administrative/instructional leader's role concept as the desired principal's model. The principal teacher concept received a 6% selection rate from respondents within the master's category. Respondents within the bachelors category also selected the general manager (10%) and the professional/scientific manager (7%). Both respondents in the sixth year and the doctoral degree categories agreed and selected the administrative/instructional leader's concept as the preferred principal's conceptual model. In sum, the degree level of the individual did not affect the chairperson's perception of either the actual or desired role of the principal.

Table 9

Secondary School Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Desired Principal's Role According to Degree

Concept	Degree			
	Bachelor	Master's	Sixth-Year	Doctor
Administrative/Instructional Leader	84%	83%	100%	100%
General Manager	10%	0%	0%	0%
Professional/Scientific-Principal Teacher-Curriculum Leader	6%	17%	0%	0%
Total	100% <u>n=31</u>	100% <u>n=54</u>	100% <u>n=1</u>	100% <u>n=1</u>
Sub-Total	87			
No Response	12			
Total	93			

Subject area. An analysis of data from the survey population indicated the department chairpersons responded in 14 subject areas and two support categories. Table 10 reports the percentages for the recorded subject areas.

As noted in chapter three, there were 16 high schools used in the analysis. Thus, the maximum number of chairperson responses for any subject would have been 16. A review of the data by subject area revealed a greater response rate by health/physical education (69%) and science (50%) chairpersons. Business, math and social

Table 10

Department Chairpersons Responding by Recorded Subject/Support Areas
for the Guilford County, North Carolina Secondary Schools

Area	Frequency	Percent
Art	2	13
Business	7	44
Driver's Education	2	13
English	5	31
Foreign Language	6	38
Guidance	6	38
Health/Physical Education	11	69
Home Economics	5	31
JROTC	2	13
Math	7	44
Media	5	31
Music Education	2	13
Science	8	50
Social Studies	7	44
Special Education	6	38
Vocational Education	1	6

n = 16 high schools

Note: The percentage for Table 10 was calculated on the basis of 16 possible department chairperson responses from the participating high schools.

studies followed with identical numbers (44%) while foreign language, guidance and special education were represented with 38% of possible responses. The area of least representation was vocational education with only 6% of the possible response.

To assist in the analysis, the 16 subject areas were regrouped into three categories commonly employed in secondary education. This reclassification allowed for a better analysis of the relationship between subject area and chairperson's perception. For the data on actual role, Table 11 indicates the combined categories by percentages.

Table 11

Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual Role of the Principal According to Subject Area

Concept	Guidance/ Media	Liberal Arts	Math/ Science
Principal Teacher	0%	2%	0%
General Manager	55%	54%	60%
Professional/Scientific Manager	18%	3%	0%
Administrative/Instructional Leader	27%	39%	33%
Curriculum Leader	0%	2%	7%
Total	100% <u>n=11</u>	100% <u>n=56</u>	100% <u>n=15</u>
Sub-Total	82		
No Response	11		
Total	93		

An examination of the results indicated that the responses of the department chairpersons were similar regardless of the teaching area. A majority (over 50%) in each category perceived the role of the Guilford County principals in general as that of a general manager. While 27% of the support staff (guidance and media) selected the administrative/instructional leader concept as representative of principals in general, over 30% of the respondents within the other two categories classified principals in the same manner. Unlike their colleagues, however, none of the support staff perceived principals to be curriculum leaders. While there are some minor variations across subject area and actual principal's role, the differences are relatively small and do not provide any significant insight.

In Table 12, the data are summarized with regard to the desired principal's role by subject area of respondents. Like the preceding actual role analysis (Table 11), the percentages resulting from the combined categories for the desired principal's role also indicated the responses of the chairpersons to be similar regardless of the subject area. In the data analysis for the desired role, however, a majority (over 80%) of the categorized respondents selected the administrative/instructional leader's concept as the more desirable role for principals. Two of the category areas-- support staff (guidance and media) and math/science--overwhelmingly (92% and 94%) identified the administrative/instructional leader's concept as the more desirable principal's role. Unlike the other

Table 12

Department Chairperson's Perceptions of the Desired Role of the
Principal According to Subject Area

Concept	Guidance/ Media	Liberal Arts	Math/ Science
Principal Teacher	0%	5%	0%
General Manager	0%	3%	6%
Professional/Scientific Manager	8%	8%	0%
Administrative/Instructional Leader	92%	80%	94%
Curriculum Leader	0%	4%	0%
Total	100% <u>n=12</u>	100% <u>n=59</u>	100% <u>n=17</u>
Sub-Total	88		
No Response	5		
Total	93		

areas, only the data in the liberal arts category indicated selections in all five leadership concepts. Within this category, five of the chairpersons (9%) expressed a desire for principals with characteristics similar to those of the principal teacher and curriculum leader. Of the total number of responses received for this particular question (88), no other chairpersons indicated a preference for these role concepts. This perceptual variation may be explained by the heterogeneous nature of the liberal arts category.

Whereas math/science and media/guidance are specifically oriented, the liberal arts category covers a wider variety of subject material.

Number of years experience as a department chairperson.

Department chairpersons within the survey population had experience levels ranging from one year's experience to that of 39 years experience. Of the 93 chairpersons comprising the survey population, 5% had one year of experience, 35% had two to five years experience, 30% had six to 10 years experience, and 29% had 11 to 30 years experience. Only one respondent failed to answer the experience question.

In order to clarify the analysis process, four categories for years of experience as a secondary school department chairperson were devised. Table 13 reports the percentages for experience levels of the respondents.

Table 13

Number of Years Experience as a Secondary School Department Chairperson

Category	Frequency	Percent
One year of experience	5	5
Two to five years experience	32	35
Six to 10 years experience	28	30
11 to 30 years experience	27	30
Total	92	100
No response	1	

Summary data indicates 40% of the respondents to have held the department chairperson's position for fewer than five years. A majority (60%), however, have held the position for six years or more. With only five of the respondents reporting as first-year department chairpersons, it appears that experience is considered to be a desirable criterion for the appointment of department chairpersons.

Table 14 reports the percentages for the conceptions which the department chairpersons selected for the actual role of the principal according to the number of years experience as a department chairperson.

An analysis of data for the actual role of the principal as perceived by the department chairpersons indicated a majority of the chairpersons at all four experience levels (55%) to perceive the actual role of the principal to be that of a general manager. Of the first-year chairpersons, three of the five (60%) perceive principals as general managers with the remaining two individuals equally split between principal teacher and administrative/instructional leader. Of the chairpersons in the second category, two to five years experience, 69% perceive principals to act as general managers whereas another 28% selected the administrative/instructional leader. On the other hand, in the six to 10 years experience category, only 44% of the chairpersons selected the general manager's role for principals. The administrative/instructional leader's concept was selected as a more desirable

Table 14

Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual Role of the Principal According to the Number of Years Experience

Concept	Number of Years Experience as a Department Chairperson			
	1 Year	2-5 Years	6-10 Years	11-30 Years
Principal Teacher	20%	0%	0%	0%
General Manager	60%	69%	44%	48%
Professional/Scientific Manager	0%	3%	13%	0%
Administrative/ Instructional Leader	20%	28%	39%	48%
Curriculum Leader	0%	0%	4%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
	<u>n</u> =5	<u>n</u> =29	<u>n</u> =23	<u>n</u> =25

principal's role by the experienced chairpersons than it was by the less experienced chairpersons. In sum, the length of service does appear to have some effect on the department chairperson's perception of the role of the principal.

Table 15 indicates the percentage of responses to the desired role of the principal. As in the previous table, the percentages are reported in categories of experience as a secondary school department chairperson.

All four experience categories selected the administrative/instructional leader role concept as the preferred role model for

Table 15

Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Desired Role of the Principal According to the Number of Years Experience

Concept	Number of Years Experience as a Department Chairperson			
	1 Year	2-5 Years	6-10 Years	11-30 Years
Principal Teacher	20%	0%	4%	4%
General Manager	0%	3%	0%	8%
Professional/Scientific Manager	0%	6%	12%	4%
Administrative/ Instructional Leader	80%	88%	84%	80%
Curriculum Leader	0%	3%	0%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
	<u>n=5</u>	<u>n=32</u>	<u>n=25</u>	<u>n=25</u>
Sub-Total	87			
No Response	6			
Total	93			

principals. Specifically, over 80% of the respondents in each category indicated a preference for the instructional principal's role whereas the role of curriculum leader was selected by only 7% of the respondents. Two role concepts--principal teacher and general manager--each received 28% of the responses with the professional/scientific manager at 22%. In this case, the number of years experience did not make a difference in the conceptual perception the department chairperson held for the principal.

In sum, when considering the chairperson's perception of the actual role of the principal (Table 14), the data suggests that the individual's years of experience in that position affects his views toward the actual leadership role but not toward the desired role. Over 60% of the respondents with fewer than six years experience as a department chairperson perceived the principal as a general manager whereas the more experienced respondents, six to 30 years experience, split between the concepts of general manager and administrative/instructional leader. In contrast, when considering data regarding the desired role (Table 15), over 80% of the respondents in all experience categories selected the administrative/instructional leader's concept as the preferred principal's role.

Gender. The survey population was 77% female and 23% male. Table 16 indicates the percentage of responses according to gender for the five leadership role concepts requested as perceived by the department chairpersons.

Within the total survey population, 55% of the respondents selected the general manager's role as the leadership characteristic displayed by the Guilford County secondary school principals while only 37% of the respondents indicated the administrative/instructional leader role concept to be displayed by those same principals. Within the specific gender categories, however, 73% of the males and 49% of the females selected the general manager's concept as the perceived role played by the secondary school principals. Even though data analysis indicated the males to favor the general manager's role

Table 16

Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual Role of the
Principal According to Gender

Concept	Males	Females
Principal Teacher	7%	0%
General Manager	73%	49%
Professional/Scientific Manager	0%	4%
Administrative/Instructional Leader	20%	43%
Curriculum Leader	0%	4%
Total	100%	100%
	<u>n=15</u>	<u>n=47</u>
Sub-Total	62	
No Response	31	
Total	93	

concept, the female respondents were fairly evenly split between that of the general manager (49%) and the administrative/instructional leader (43%).

It is interesting to note that the males did not select either the professional/scientific manager or the curriculum leader's concept as a perceived actual role for the principal. In contrast, however, two females selected each of those concepts as perceived roles played by principals.

In summary, 98% of the respondents perceived the role of the secondary school principal in reality to be either that of a general manager or administrative/instructional leader. By a narrow margin of only five percentage points, the administrative/instructional leader's concept was selected as the dominant actual principal's role.

Table 17 indicates the percentage of responses regarding the desired role of the principal according to the gender of the department chairperson. Data analysis indicated 90% of the responding females selected the administrative/instructional leader concept as the ideal principal's role model. With the responding males, however, 73% selected the administrative/instructional leader concept, 13% selected principal teacher, and 7% were equally split between the concepts of curriculum leader and general manager. None of the responding females selected either the principal teacher concept or the curriculum leader concept. Of the five leadership concepts, however, only the role of professional/scientific manager was not selected by any of the responding male population.

When the total survey population is considered, 86% of the respondents selected the administrative/instructional leader's role concept as the preferred principal's model. It is, therefore, readily apparent that a majority of both males and females selected the administrative/instructional leader's concept as the preferred role model for principals.

Table 17

Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Desired Role of the Principal According to Gender

Concept	Males	Females
Principal Teacher	13%	0%
General Manager	7%	2%
Professional/Scientific Manager	0%	8%
Administrative/Instructional Leader	73%	90%
Curriculum Leader	7%	0%
Total	100%	100%
	<u>n=15</u>	<u>n=51</u>
Sub-Total	66	
No Response	27	
Total	93	

Actual Versus Desired Role

A major focus of this research was the relationship between the actual and desired conceptual leadership role orientation for the principal as perceived by the department chairperson. The analysis, thus far, has indicated that one should expect little relationship. Additional analysis, however, was employed to further explore this question.

Table 18 reports the responses of department chairpersons with regard to their perceptions of the actual and desired leadership

Table 18

Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual and Desired Leadership Roles for Past Principals
(Data Reported by Frequency)

Concept	Department Chairpersons' Perceived Actual and Desired Roles of Past Principals					
	Principal Teacher	General Manager	Professional/ Scientific Manager	Administrative/ Instructional Leader	Curriculum Leader	Total
Principal Teacher	0	1	0	2	0	3
General Manager	1	2 ^a	0	42	1	46
Professional/ Scientific Manager	1	0	4 ^a	1	0	6
Administrative/ Instructional Leader	1	0	2	27 ^a	1	31
Curriculum Leader	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total	3	3	6	72	2	86
No Response	7					
Total	93					

^aData indicates identical answers for both actual and desired leadership role questions.

roles of principals. Of the 86 respondents, only 33 (38%) exhibited congruence between what they have personally experienced and what they desire. Of the 33, the greatest degree of congruency existed among those chairpersons (27 of the 33 or 82%) who now have an administrative/instructional leader and desire that role for their principal.

However, a substantial number of the chairpersons (53 or 62%) have not had the type of principal leadership they desire. This was not completely unexpected; the earlier analysis indicated most of the incongruency existent between those who have experienced the general manager but prefer an administrative/instructional leader (42 of the 53 respondents--79%--fell into this category).

When the department chairpersons' perceptions of the Guilford County principals were contrasted with his/her desired principal's role, the analysis indicated 82 responses could be used--they answered both questions. As in the preceding analysis, the general manager's role concept was again identified as being the most descriptive for the Guilford County principals in general. Again there is a lack of congruence between what the chairpersons desired and what they believed actually exists. A somewhat lower level of congruence was present (32% rather than 38%), but that was centered more on the administrative/instructional leader's concept than that of the general manager's.

Of the 26 (Table 19) who were in full agreement, 89% were chairpersons who desired an administrative/instructional leader and

Table 19

Department Chairpersons' Perceptions of the Actual and Desired Leadership Roles of Guilford County, North Carolina Principals in General (Data Reported by Frequency)

Concept	Department Chairpersons' Perceived Actual and Desired Leadership Roles of Guilford County Principals					Total
	Principal Teacher	General Manager	Professional/Scientific Manager	Administrative/Instructional Leader	Curriculum Leader	
Principal Teacher	1 ^a	0	0	0	0	1
General Manager	1	2 ^a	2	39	1	45
Professional/Scientific Manager	1	0	0	3	0	4
Administrative/Instructional Leader	0	1	4	23 ^a	1	29
Curriculum Leader	0	0	0	2	0	2
Sub-Total	3	3	6	67	2	81
No Response	12					
Total	93					

^aData indicates identical answers for both actual and desired leadership role questions.

thought this role existed among principals within Guilford County. Again, most of the incongruency existed among those who wanted an administrative/instructional leader but believed principals act as a general manager.

Thus, the analysis indicates little relationship between what department chairpersons want in their principal and what they think presently exists. The dissonance was largely among those who believe principals are general managers but who want an administrative/instructional leader. An understanding of the discrepancy between what they want and what they have in a principal was further complicated by their responses to the open-ended question regarding improvement of the chairperson's position. The comments received were largely devoted to issues that would be classified as managerial. Department chairpersons perceived principals as being responsible for providing ". . . one period each day to work on department business, equipment, observations, meetings, etc." and/or "time" for the chairperson "to do the many necessary functions" associated with the position. The respondents also mentioned budgets, clerical assistance, curriculum, empowerment, scheduling, and supplements. They neither mentioned the instructional program nor did they want the principal to assist with instructional techniques and methodology. Thus, the respondents may profess a desire for an administrative/instructional leader (both elements of the instructional leader), but their comments appear to reinforce the opposite viewpoint.

To try to understand this phenomenon further, one needed to undertake additional analysis. The length of time that an individual has served as a chairperson as well as the time served with his/her current principal were two variables used as possible explanations for the lack of congruency between the actual and desired principal roles. Length of service as a department chairperson was used because it was believed that the longer an individual served as a chairperson the better developed the conceptualization of the principalship. With this as a basic tenet for analysis, the question then became one of whether dissonance or congruence develops between what the individual has and what one wants as one gains experience as a chairperson. The analysis, unfortunately, did not allow for a clear answer to this question, as there was no relationship in either direction.

The time with one's current principal may have two different effects. On the one hand, one could hypothesize that the longer one serves with a particular leadership style the more accepting he may become of that style and, therefore, the more congruence in role perception. On the other hand, it is entirely possible that the longer one serves with a principal the more likely it is that the individual may find the principal lacking in the qualities he is personally seeking, resulting in greater dissonance in role perception. Analysis of the relationship between time with a principal and role dissonance also indicated no clear pattern--length of time

with principal does not lead to either congruence or dissonance with role perception.

In sum, the analysis indicated little congruence between actual and desired role of the principal. This lack of congruence centers on the chairperson's desire for an administrative/instructional leader and the individual's perception of having a general manager. The additional analysis undertaken to explain this lack of congruence proved inconclusive.

Summary of Open-Ended/Related Data

Although the structured survey requested that the department chairperson select one of the five Brubaker-Simon (1987) leadership role concepts, respondents were also requested to provide additional information regarding the enhancement of the department chair's position. The free response question was designed to provide the respondents with an opportunity to express individual opinions regarding their position within the school community.

A majority of the respondents (86%) took advantage of the opportunity and commented with suggestions for improvement of the chairperson's position. The respondents listed a total of 194 separate comments regarding the department chair's position and the relationship established with the principalship. The individual comments were analyzed, categorized by related qualities, and placed in rank order to designate the suggestions most frequently mentioned.

The six designated comment categories were: benefits, empowerment, job description, job satisfaction, staff development, and time. The most frequently mentioned category was benefits with 65% of the respondents indicating the position requires improvement in that area. Within the benefit category, the respondents mentioned five specific areas for improvement: 1) the department chairperson should have his personal classroom available during a planning period, 2) the department chairperson should have clerical assistance available at some point during the academic day, 3) the department chairperson should have an office with a telephone, 4) each school district should offer reimbursed expenses for courses leading to an advanced degree, and 5) the department chairperson should receive a supplement for the position.

Within the benefit category, supplements received the greater number of responses as 48 department chairpersons or 52% of the survey population mentioned that need. One respondent suggested that principals should "compensate department chairpersons for their work." Another stated: "I think receiving some sort of compensation would be appropriate whether outright pay or time off." In addition, the most frequently mentioned term was "supplement." Twenty-five of the respondents (52%) within this category used that term as a descriptor for extra compensation. One of the respondents wanted the principal to "pay the department chairperson an extra supplement just as you do coaches!" Another said the department chairperson should "receive a supplement for the added

responsibility." Another summarized the situation by stating, "I think that we qualify to get a supplement for all the work that is required; some extra duties are done after school and we do not get overtime pay."

In response to question 11, 99% of the survey population indicated that they do not receive additional compensation for the department chair's position. All respondents (100%) answered that particular question.

The four remaining areas within the benefit category received a minority of responses. Only five of the respondents mentioned a lack of clerical help with one stating clearly that the department chairperson requires "a typist for all of the paperwork." Three respondents suggested that schools should provide "space allocated for office with phone and appropriate storage" while only two requested renewal credits. One respondent stated the principal should "allow the chairperson to have his/her classroom during planning."

The comment category receiving the greater number of individual response patterns was "time." Of those responding, 69% mentioned at least one of the following areas: 1) extra planning period for department chairpersons, 2) a reduction of duties and/or responsibilities, 3) a reduction of instructional responsibilities, 4) no homeroom responsibilities, 5) release time or compensatory time, 6) better class assignments, 7) a reduction in paperwork, and 8) a substitute for specific duties/responsibilities.

Of the 64 department chairpersons responding in the "time" category, 24 (38%) mentioned the need for an extra planning period for those holding the position. One department chairperson noted that the position requires an "extra planning period for the extra duties of the chairperson." Another commented that the principal should "allow a period to work as department head. All teachers have a planning period - do not force the department head to do everything within one period." One of the department chairpersons was more explicit and stated: "Give the chairperson one period each day to work on department business, equipment, observations, meetings, etc." More to the point, the following reflects the collective opinion of those expressing feelings regarding this category: "In my area, I can justify an extra planning period. I serve also as remediation coordinator for the school, mentor teacher, and administrative assistant on scheduling, in addition to regular classroom teacher duties."

In addition to requesting that principals provide department chairpersons with an extra planning period, 14 of the responding department chairpersons (22%) specifically mentioned the term "time" and noted that it was a factor in their ability to adequately perform the responsibilities of the position. Two of the respondents stated that principals need to provide the department chairperson with "time to do the many necessary functions" and "time during the school day to carry out the duties of this position."

The instructional program was also a factor with the survey population in that 11 of the respondents (17%) indicated the department chairperson should have a reduced teaching schedule. Eight specifically referred to "no more than four classes per day," and one mentioned "the number of classes taught by this person should be three provided they are responsible for other activities. I am school based assessment chairperson also."

Homeroom was considered to be a factor, and eight of the respondents (13%) stated that department chairpersons should be relieved of that responsibility. Three of the department chairpersons (5%) requested release or compensatory time in some form. Others (3%) requested that the principal provide "a substitute for a number of days per year to allow freedom to perform duties" or "a substitute to cover class once a month or when needed." One department chairperson requested that the principal provide chairpersons with the "time to do the paperwork" and one asked that they receive better class assignments--"less dumping."

According to Gene I. Maeroff (1989), teacher empowerment refers to "working in an environment in which the teacher acts and is treated as a professional . . . with . . . three guiding principles . . . having to do with status, knowledge, and access to decision-making" (p. 6). Within this category, 50 department chairpersons (54%) responded with comments. Thirteen of the respondents (26%) wanted involvement with the performance appraisal process and one encouraged the principal to "use the expertise of the chairperson

in performance appraisal." Another wanted the administration to "make the chairperson responsible for one formal observation of department teachers." One succinctly stated, "I have served as mentor teacher and the process was very positive. Performance appraisal is a natural involvement for the department chairman because they are so in tune with the curriculum and methods appropriate to teaching."

Within the empowerment category, 11 department chairpersons referred to an increased administrative management team concept. They view the chairperson's position as a "go-between with the administration" and one specifically requested "better use of chairpersons by the principal." Another requested that the administration "have a functional school leadership team" whereas one wanted the principal to "develop the leadership of the department chairperson." Three respondents requested "a mutual planning period with other department chairpersons" and one noted the principal should "provide an extra planning period common to all department chairpersons." Additional comments worthy of note were: "more information on school finances, funding, and budgeting; consulted by principal on matters involving any aspect of the department; school structure should encourage principals to 'listen' closely to the chairpersons; and encourage open discussion among chairpersons."

Another aspect of teacher empowerment is curriculum planning. Eight respondents made comments in this area, and one clearly wanted the principal to "involve the chairperson in instructional planning

and implementation," and another wanted "responsibility for determining curriculum offerings." One appeared to express frustration in this area and stated the chairperson should "become more involved in planning thus using professional skills instead of just doing all the paperwork!" Although each expressed curriculum concerns in individual terms, all wanted more curriculum involvement for the chairperson's position.

Even though teacher empowerment is important, six of the respondents also expressed concerns for the authority level of the chairperson's position. From their collective statements, it is apparent that they feel the position lacks the power to be effective. For example, one noted the principal should "give more support and authority to act or command rather than just be a figurehead to relay messages or be a scapegoat!" Another stated the chairperson should be "given some measure of authority to direct programs." Three mentioned the term "authority" directly and felt it should be "clarified" and/or "added."

Empowerment involves decision-making, and four of the respondents wanted the chairperson's position to be improved in that area. One requested that chairpersons "have more input in decision-making," and one wanted the chairperson to "take an active part in any decision affecting the department." Another requested "more freedom in decisions that involve the department" whereas one wanted "inclusion in school-related decision-making committees."

For the department chairperson, the employment of teachers is considered to be a part of the empowerment process. Two of the respondents expressed the following opinions regarding this aspect of empowerment: "Department chairs should be able to give input as to the hiring of members of their departments" and "more input in hiring and making specific teaching assignments for the department. I become frustrated when my professional opinion is ignored and my principal continues to assign teachers who hold only an endorsement in this field rather than hiring a certified teacher."

Responsibility is a factor within the empowerment process, and five of the department chairpersons expressed opinions in this regard. Three commented on scheduling and wanted, in effect, "more input into scheduling courses." Supplies and equipment were also a concern, and two requested increased responsibility in that area. One summarized by noting the department chairperson's position ". . . could also be helpful in giving suggestions for the school as a whole.

The final three comment categories are: job description, staff development, and job satisfaction. Of the three, staff development received five comments with each individual expressing the feeling that the chairperson should function as a mentor and have the time to function effectively in that area. One requested that the school district provide an opportunity to have "workshops with other department chairpersons from different schools and/or systems."

In the area of job description, one respondent requested that the principal provide a "specific job description" whereas another wanted a "clear description of duties--standard for all departments." Job satisfaction received equal attention in that only two respondents expressed contentment with the position. One noted, "I am satisfied with the responsibility and position that I currently have," and the other stated "I like the role as it is not, not really a supervisory one, but someone who is just the voice of the department. We all work together on projects/responsibilities."

Summary of Analysis

The purpose of this study was to investigate the conceptual leadership role of the principal from the perception of the Guilford County, North Carolina secondary school department chairperson. In addition to a summary of the frequencies of each conception selected by the department chairpersons, the designated roles were studied in relation to four independent variables--the highest degree earned by the department chairperson, the gender of the department chairperson, the number of years experience as a department chairperson, and the subject area of the department chairperson.

The secondary school department chairpersons within Guilford County, North Carolina, indicated the more appropriate leadership role for the principal to be that of the administrative/instructional leader. A majority of the survey population (84%) selected the administrative/instructional leader concept with only a small

percentage of the respondents selecting any of the other four conceptual role models.

The department chairpersons within the survey population indicated that their principals function as either general managers or administrative/instructional leaders. Although they viewed the actual role of the principal to be that of a general manager, the department chairpersons clearly indicated the preferred role to be that of an administrative/instructional leader.

The highest degree earned by the department chairpersons does not appear to make a significant difference in their perception of the appropriate role of the principal. Even though over 50% of the respondents in all four degree categories considered the general manager's conceptual role model to be the actual role of the Guilford County, North Carolina, principals in general, a majority (over 80%) selected the administrative/instructional leader's role concept as the more appropriate leadership role for principals.

The subject area of the department chairperson does not appear to make a difference in the perceived actual role of the principal. Although minor variations were detected across subject areas, the differences were small and did not provide significant insight. All three subject categories identified the general manager's role concept as the actual principal's role with the administrative/instructional leader's concept as the next selection. With regard to the desired principal's role, all three subject categories were again in agreement as each category selected the administrative/instructional leader's role concept.

The number of years of experience as a department chairperson does appear to make a difference in the actual principal's role as perceived by the chairperson. Although the chairpersons in the various experience categories view the role of the principal differently, the primary role in three of the categories was that of general manager. Significantly, a large percentage of the chairpersons with five years experience or less indicated a clear preference for the general manager's role concept. The role of the administrative/instructional leader, however, was preferred to a lesser extent by chairpersons with six to 30 years experience.

There is not a significant difference in the role which department chairpersons desired for the principal when analysis was made according to years of experience. The percentages were similar in that over 80% of each category selected the administrative/instructional leader's concept as the desired principal's role.

With gender as an investigated factor, over 70% of the males selected the general manager's concept as the actual principal's role whereas the females split almost equally between the general manager and the administrative/instructional leader. For the desired principal's role, however, the selection process simply reversed itself. Ninety percent of the females selected the administrative/instructional leader's concept with the males reporting both the administrative/instructional leader's concept (73%) as well as the principal teacher's concept (13%). When the total population was collectively considered, 86% of the respondents selected the

administrative/instructional leader's concept as the preferred model for principals.

When a comparative process was applied to the actual and desired role concepts, a pattern of congruency developed which provided additional insight as to relationship. For past principals, 38% of the respondents recorded congruence between what they personally experienced and what they desired in a principal. Within that category, the greatest degree of congruence existed among those chairpersons who now have an administrative/instructional leader and desire that role to continue. An even larger number (62%), however, reported that they had not experienced the type of leadership they desired.

When considering the Guilford County principals in general, a lack of congruency was again noted in analysis. Most of the incongruency existed among those who wanted an administrative/instructional leader but perceived principals to act as general managers. In sum, analysis indicated little relationship between what the chairpersons want in their principal and what they think presently exists.

In responding to the open-ended question, the department chairpersons indicated benefits, empowerment, job description, job satisfaction, staff development, and time to be critical factors in the improvement of their position. The time category received the most attention in that the respondents want the principal to provide them with the time to perform their responsibilities adequately.

Benefits also received considerable attention in that 99% of the respondents requested a supplement for the extra duties assumed as a department chairperson.

The comments received were consistent with the conceptions selected on the survey in that managerial tasks were primarily identified as being vital to the improvement of the chairperson's position. With the chairperson's perception of the principal as that of a general manager, the comments were congruent with that perception. The comments did not, however, reflect the respondents' reported views of the desired role of the principal. Not once was the instructional program mentioned nor did any comment refer to the principal as a participant in the classroom process.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR FURTHER STUDY

Introduction

This study examined the secondary school department chairpersons' perceptions of the role of the principal according to a conceptual framework initially proposed and applied in research by Brubaker and Simon (1987). Within the secondary schools of Guilford County, North Carolina, 142 department chairpersons were identified and surveyed in order to determine their perceptions of the actual role of principals in general, the actual role of past principals, and the desired leadership role of principals. In addition, independent variables--the number of years experience as a department chairperson, the subject area of the chairperson, the highest degree earned by the chairperson, and gender--were analyzed to see if they made a difference in the chairperson's conceptual perceptions of the principal's role.

Because of the uniqueness of their position, the secondary school department chairpersons' perceptions of the principalship can either enhance or detract from the principal's efforts toward effective schooling. Because chairpersons play such an influential role in the school organization, their opinion of the principal's

leadership style is important. This chapter will present a summary of the study, conclusions, and implications for further research.

Summary

The Guilford County, North Carolina, secondary school department chairpersons were surveyed in order to determine their perceptions of the actual and desired leadership roles for principals. The chairpersons were also requested to respond to an open-ended question regarding improvements for the chairperson's position.

Instrument reliability was established by applying a test-retest procedure to determine the consistency of the perceptual responses over a specified period of time. The resulting response consistency percentage indicated an acceptable level of reliability for the overall instrument.

The validity of the instrument has been substantiated by literature and repeated application. Brubaker and Simon (1987) initiated the conceptual framework with Williams (1987) and McRae (1987) conducting similar research with similar findings by using modified forms of the original instrument. The results, therefore, continued to substantiate the validity of the framework and its application for future studies.

The summary data provided a wealth of information regarding the chairpersons' views of past principals and principals in general throughout Guilford County, North Carolina. An analysis of the data indicated a majority of the chairpersons selected the general

manager's concept as the role principals actually play. In that same context, a smaller percentage also selected the administrative/instructional leader's concept. The majority of the chairpersons, however, view the principal as more of a manager and facilitator than an administrative/instructional leader. Thus, it appears that principals in Guilford County are perceived by chairpersons to act more as a general manager than an administrative/instructional leader.

It is clear that the Guilford County, North Carolina, department chairpersons view the administrative/instructional leader's style as the more desirable principal's role concept. Four out of every five department chairpersons made this selection with the professional/scientific manager's concept indicated as their second choice. Their primary selection further enhanced data from previous studies in that both Williams (1987) and McRae (1987) developed similar conclusions using different populations.

A review of the independent variable analysis indicated no difference in the chairpersons' perceptions of the actual or desired principal's role according to degree. Very little perceptual difference existed between degree categories in that a majority of the chairpersons within each category selected the general manager's role concept as the actual principal's role. The administrative/instructional leader's concept was also selected as an actual role by a small percentage of respondents in the bachelor and master's degree categories. The desired principal's role concept, however,

was clearly that of the administrative/instructional leader, as a majority within all categories made that selection.

There was no difference in the respondents' perceptions of the actual or desired principal's role according to the subject area of the chairperson. A majority in each subject category perceived the actual role of principals in general to be that of a general manager; a majority selected the administrative/instructional leader as the desired role concept. While there were some minor variations across subject areas for both actual and desired principal's roles, the differences were relatively minor and did not provide significant insight.

There appeared to be a significant difference in the perception of the principal's role according to the chairpersons' number of years of experience in that position. The administrative/instructional leader's concept was selected as the actual principal's role by the more experienced chairpersons' group whereas the less experienced group perceived the actual role to be that of a general manager. In this instance, length of service did appear to have some effect on the chairpersons' perceptions of the role of the principal. With respect to the desired principal's role, however, a considerable majority of respondents within each category indicated a preference for the administrative/instructional leader's role concept. In this case, the number of years experience did not make a difference in the conceptual perception the chairperson held for the principal.

When gender was considered as an independent variable, both males and females desired the role of administrative/instructional leader for principals, but viewed either the administrative/instructional leader or general manager as the role actually played by principals. The males did not select either the professional/scientific manager or curriculum leader as actual principal roles whereas the females evenly split between those two role concepts. Even though a majority of both genders preferred that principals assume the administrative/instructional leader's role, a minority still held to the general manager's concept as an ideal. None of the males, however, desired a professional/scientific manager, and none of the females desired either a principal teacher or curriculum leader.

Since a major focus of this research was the relationship between the actual and desired role orientation for the principal as perceived by the department chairperson, congruence was considered to be an important factor for study. Analysis, however, revealed little relationship between what department chairpersons want in a principal and what they think actually exists. The dissonance was largely among those who viewed principals as general managers but who wanted an administrative/instructional leader. In contrast, the greatest degree of congruency existed among those chairpersons who now have an administrative/instructional leader and desire that role for principals.

When department chairpersons were requested to provide suggestions as to improvement for their position, they mentioned items within six specific categories. The categories were benefits, empowerment, job descriptions, job satisfaction, staff development, and time. Of those, benefits and time received a majority of the respondents' attention. Supplements were mentioned by all respondents as being essential for the responsibility inherent within the position. They also mentioned a need for adequate office space and clerical help. Time was considered critical in that the chairpersons felt they did not have enough flexibility to handle both classroom duties and departmental responsibilities.

Particularly noteworthy was the fact that the chairpersons' comments did not appear to support their leadership concept preferences. While they preferred that principals act as administrative/instructional leaders, their suggestions for improvement were almost all managerial in nature. None of the comments included instructional topics nor were any noted that suggested the principal might be of assistance with the instructional process.

Conclusions

The effective schools research pointed to the principal as the locus or hub for the creation of an effective school. Effective schools research has, in fact, ". . . clearly established the importance of the principal's instructional leadership role"

(Herman & Stephens, 1989, p. 55). This viewpoint requires a cooperative effort from all parties within the school in order to provide the principal with the time to become oriented toward the instructional program. In the secondary school setting, this cooperation and/or teamwork creates the culture of the school and is the direct result of the interaction of the principal, the department chairpersons, and the faculty/staff. Since the chairperson acts as a curriculum coordinator and a liaison between faculty and principal (Glatter, Preedy, Riches, & Masterton, 1988), the chairperson's perceptions are, therefore, vital to any review of the principalship.

This research was based upon the secondary school department chairpersons' perceptions of the role of the principal as defined by Brubaker and Simon's (1987) conceptual framework. Since perceptions are most certainly affected by a wide variety of factors, past experiences and present expectations interact to form the individual's unique view of the world. This perception, in turn, creates complex interpersonal relationships open to either negative or positive connotations. If one knows the perceptual viewpoint of the individual, however, the opportunity exists that the relationship will become more meaningful and effective. In this study, an attempt was made to determine the department chairpersons' perceptions regarding the actual and desired leadership roles of the principal as well as to determine if those perceptions could be influenced by four specific independent variables.

Based upon an analysis of data, the final conclusions of the study are:

1. A majority of the Guilford County, North Carolina public secondary school department chairpersons view the actual role of past principals to be that of a general manager. They also view the actual role of principals in the same manner.
2. A majority of the chairpersons prefer the administrative/instructional leader's concept as the more desirable role model for principals.
3. The actual and desired roles of the principal are viewed in the same manner by chairpersons regardless of the degree level of the individual.
4. The actual and desired roles of the principal are viewed in the same manner by chairpersons regardless of the subject area of the individual.
5. The number of years of experience as a department chairperson does make a difference in the chairperson's perception of the actual role of the principal, but does not make a difference in the chairperson's perception of the desired role of the principal.
6. The actual and desired roles of the principal are essentially viewed the same by both males and females.

In sum, while a large majority of department chairpersons believed principals should act as administrative/instructional leaders, they still saw many principals as general managers and even fewer as instructional leaders. Consistent with that view, they saw themselves acting primarily as general managers. They did not, however, view the preferred chairperson's role in the same manner in that 37% selected the administrative/instructional leader's concept and 27% preferred the curriculum leader's concept. With over 60% of the chairpersons split between those two leadership roles, it would appear that a role clarification process for the position of the chairperson is necessary.

Of the independent variables investigated, only one made a difference in the responses of the chairpersons. The selections of the actual and desired leadership roles by the department chairpersons were similar regardless of the subject area, the degree level, and gender. The number of years experience as a chairperson, however, did make a difference in the chairperson's perception of the actual role of the principal but did not make a difference in the desired role.

The department chairperson plays a key role in the school organization. In order for the principal to respond to the effective schools research and become instructionally oriented, the chairpersons' positions must be enhanced and recognized as a position of potential. They have the curriculum knowledge and the instructional

expertise necessary to become vital factors in building effective teaching within their departments. By recognizing this fact, the principal can become more than a facilitator and a manager. With support and encouragement, cooperative efforts, and an appreciation of the chairpersons' perceptions, the principal can provide effective leadership for a more effective school.

Recommendations for Further Study

The effective schools movement has documented the principal's role in the improvement of instruction (Clinton, 1986; Finn, 1987). In fact, "scratch the surface of any successful school . . . and what quickly appears is a good principal" (Maeroff, 1982, p. 86). As a result, the principalship has been under scrutiny with research examining all aspects of the position. What seems to be more clear is the fact that "principals need the time to be instructional leaders. If they are assigned district coordinating responsibilities--cafeterias, special education, or other such duties--they will have difficulty devoting the attention they should to classrooms, teachers, and students" (Herman & Stephens, 1989, pp. 58-59). Since this study noted that the department chairpersons prefer that principals operate as administrative/instructional leaders, the responsibilities of the contemporary secondary school principal require investigation in order to determine the extent of instructional involvement.

By combining this study with previously documented leadership research from the perspectives of the principal, teacher, and superintendent, the complexities of the principalship may become more apparent. In addition, the following suggestions may be of benefit.

1. Although future studies of a similar nature should include other populations such as parents, additional research should definitely be conducted with students, in that their perspectives of the principal may be the most important of all. How they view this position may, in turn, adversely affect his/her efforts regarding instructional improvement.
2. An aspect of this study that requires expansion is the qualitative research process. Additional insights not readily accessible by questionnaire and/or quantitative methods can be gained through interviews and case studies. By combining the quantitative and qualitative studies, an enhanced picture of the leadership complexities of the principalship should become readily apparent.
3. A noteworthy aspect of this study was the inherent conflict between the chairperson's role perspective versus that of the principal. Given this scenario, one may easily hypothesize the negative atmosphere that may develop when the chairperson desires a particular leadership style and the principal exhibits another. Conflicting expectations could easily give way to dissension or

subtle reservations which impede progress toward effective schooling. Since the department chairperson acts as a liaison between faculty and administration, perceptual differences require identification and resolution.

Although resolution may or may not be feasible, a principal operating from an informed basis has an enhanced opportunity to improve communications and move forward with program plans. Continued research in this area could, therefore, enable both parties to view the other in a different light as well as provide insight as to the complexities of both positions.

4. Within the state of North Carolina, the merger issue continues to dominate legislative/public attention. As a result, large consolidated high schools are rapidly becoming the norm. With this trend steadily increasing, perhaps the size of the school will become a factor not only in the principal's role, but also in the department chairpersons' perceptions of that role. In addition, the chairperson's role could also experience change. With an expanded faculty, the communication process becomes proportionally more difficult, and the chairperson's role becomes vital to the success of that process. Further study in this area will provide insight as to changing role concepts as well as the effectiveness of communication patterns within consolidated high schools.

Although the effective schools research indicated the role of the principal to be vital to the success of the school, other professionals play a critical role in this process as well. In the secondary school, department chairpersons occupy a crucial position in that they frequently assume responsibility for their faculty, resources, materials/supplies, and communications (Glatter, 1988). In the area of communications, they act as liaison between the principal and their department, interpret administrative regulations, and initiate change. To those skeptical of the chairperson's power to initiate change, those who succeed "say they use the patience and persuasion approach. Here the power is in the value or goodness of the change being introduced and in the carefully designed interventions that are supplied to facilitate and support its implementation" (Hord, 1989, p. 72). The perceptions of the department chairpersons are, therefore, valuable to the principal in that they hold the key to effective teaching at the secondary level. A high school principal with established, positive chairperson relationships is certain to have increased opportunities for effective leadership.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, M. (1982). The Paideia proposal: An educational manifesto. New York: Macmillan.
- Albrecht, J. (1989). Expect a lot from teachers. NASSP News Leader, 36(7), 6-7.
- Anders, L., Centofante, E., & Orr, J. (1987). Building the instructional team for effective leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 71 (502), 61-63.
- Anderson, C. (1987). Instructional leadership behaviors of high school principals, assistant principals, and department chairpersons: A comparison. High School Journal, 70(2), 115-123.
- Bailey, P. (1988). The functions of heads of departments in comprehensive schools. In Understanding school management. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Benben, J. (1968). The principalship: Its changing role. In M. Nolte (Ed.), An introduction to school administration: Selected readings. New York: Macmillan.
- Bennis, W. (1989). Leadership: Vision is single most important characteristic. NASSP News Leader, 36(7), 2.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berman, P., & Gjelten, T. (1982). Improvement, maintenance and decline: A progress report. Berkley: Berman Associates.
- Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1986). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional manager role of the principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 34-64.
- Boyer, E. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brandt, R. (1987). On leadership and student achievement. Educational Leadership, 45(1), 7-16.

- Bredeson, P. (1985). Toward a thicker description of the teacher selection process. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 19(2), 22-28.
- Briggs, M. (1986). Perceptions of the central office personnel on the role of the principal as a curriculum leader. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Brubaker, D. (1988, July 16). The traits of outstanding and effective leaders. Winston-Salem Journal, p. 15.
- Brubaker, D., & Simon, L. (1986). Emerging conceptions of the principalship. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 13(4), 2-26.
- Brubaker, D., & Simon, L. (1987). How do North Carolina principals view themselves, others? NASSP Bulletin, 71(495), 72-78.
- Campbell, R., Cunningham, L., Nystrand, R., & Usdan, M. (1985). The organization and control of America's schools. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the twenty-first century (Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession). New York: Carnegie Corporation.
- Clark, D., Lotto, L., & McCarthy, M. (1980). Factors associated with success in urban elementary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 61(7), 467-470.
- Clemens, J., & Mayer, D. (1987). The classic touch. Homewood: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Clinton, W. (1986). Who will manage the schools? Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), 208-210.
- Cohen, M. (1981). Effective schools: What the research says. Today's Education, 70(2), 58-61.
- Cohen, M. (1982). Effective principals. School Administrator, 30(10), 14-16.
- Committee of Correspondence. (1984). Education for a democratic future. St. Louis: Harold Berlak.

- Council for Basic Education. (1980). Basic education. Washington, DC: Graham Down.
- Cronin, J. (1967). School board and principals: Before and after negotiations. Phi Delta Kappan, 49(3), 123-127.
- Cuban, L. (1988). The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Cunningham, L. (1969). Hey man, you our principal: Urban Education as I saw it. Phi Delta Kappan, 51(3), 123-128.
- Deal, T. (1987). Effective school principals: Counselors, engineers, pawnbrokers, poets . . . or instructional leaders? In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues and controversies (pp. 232-241). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- DuFour, R. (1986). Must principals choose between teacher morale and an effective school? NASSP Bulletin, 70(490), 33-37.
- DuFour, R. (1989). Principal offers advice on curriculum monitoring. NASSP News Leader, 39(7), 5-6.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37(1), 15-23.
- Education Commission of the States. (1983). Action for excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools. Denver: Author.
- Eisner, J. (1981). What makes an effective school? In D. Brundage (Ed.), The journalism research fellows report (pp. 57-67). Washington: George Washington University's Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Faidley, R., & Musser, S. (1989). Vision of school leaders must focus on excellence, dispel popular myths. NASSP Bulletin, 73(514), 9-13.
- Felt, M. (1985). Improving our schools: Thirty-three studies that inform local action. Newton: Educational Development Center.
- Fink, L., & Ducharme, R. (1971). Crisis in urban education. Waltham: Xerox College Publishing.
- Finn, C. (1987). How to spot an effective principal. Principal, 67(1), 20-22.

- Free, R. (1982). A method for the selection of department chairmen. NASSP Bulletin, 66(455), 123-125.
- Fuhr, D. (1989). Elements of good administrative leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 73(515), 53-54.
- Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Gay, L. (1987). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application. Columbus: Merrill.
- Genck, F., & Klingenberg, A. (1978). Effective schools through effective management. Springfield: Illinois Association of School Boards.
- Glaathorn, A., & Newberg, N. (1984). A team approach to instructional leadership. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 60-63.
- Glasman, N. (1985). Student achievement and the school principal. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(2), 283-296.
- Glatter, R., Preedy, M., Riches, C., & Masterton, M. (1988). Understanding school management. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1985). School effects (Occasional Paper No. 77). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Griffiths, D. (1988). Administrative theory. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration. White Plains: Longman.
- Gross, B., & Gross, R. (1985). The great school debate. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Haiman, T., & Scott, W. (1974). Management in the modern organization. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Hall, G. (1984). A change in high schools: Rolling stone or asleep at the wheel? Educational Leadership, 41(6), 59-62.
- Harling, P. (1984). New directions in educational leadership. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

- Herman, J., & Stephens, G. (1989). The four keys necessary for instructional leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 73(515), 55-59.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1969). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Hopkins, K., & Stanley, J. (1981). Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Hord, S. (1989). Facilitating change in secondary schools: Myths and management. NASSP Bulletin, 73(516), 68-73.
- Hord, S., & Murphy, S. (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.
- Howe, H. (1986). The prospects for children in the United States. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), 191-196.
- Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (1982). Educational administration, theory, research and practice. New York: Random House.
- Huddle, G. (1984). How complex is the principal's job? NASSP Bulletin, 68(476), 62-67.
- Hughes, L., & Ubben, G. (1980). The secondary principal's handbook: A guide to executive action. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Jackson, P. (1981). Comprehending a well-run comprehensive: A report on a visit to a large suburban high school. Daedalus, America's Schools: Portraits and Perspectives, 110(4), 81-96.
- Jacobson, W. (1987). Meeting the challenge: The reward of instructional leadership for principals. NASSP Bulletin, 71(498), 57-66.
- Johnson, J. (1987). Values, culture and the effective school. NASSP Bulletin, 71(497), 79-88.
- Jones, B., Hersh, R., & McKibbin, M. (1983). The structure of school improvement. New York: Longman.
- Keefe, J. (1987). The critical question of instructional leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 71(498), 49-56.

- Leithwood, K., & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 309-339.
- Levin, H. (1983). Reclaiming the urban schools. Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, 4(1), 1-13.
- Lewis, A. (1986). The search continues for effective schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), 187-188.
- Lewis, J. (1986). Achieving excellence in our schools. Westbury: J. L. Wilkerson.
- Lightfoot, S. (1983). The good high school: Portraits of character and culture. New York: Basic Books.
- Little, J. (1982). The effective principal. American Education, 18(7), 38-40.
- Little, J. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19(3), 325-340.
- Lucy, J. (1986). Curriculum revision: Who will provide the leadership? NASSP Bulletin, 70(6), 85-87.
- Maeroff, G. (1982). Don't blame the kids. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Maeroff, G. (1989). The principles of teacher empowerment. Education Digest, 54(6), 6-9.
- Marcial, G. (1984). Department supervisors: Are they line or staff administrators? NASSP Bulletin, 68(472), 87-90.
- Maslow, A. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.
- McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McRae, R. (1987). The role of the principal as viewed by North Carolina superintendents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Mistretta, A., & Phillips, P. (1987). Profile of a principal: Blending multiple roles for success. NASSP Bulletin, 71(498), 117-122.

- Moehlman, A. (1940). School administration: Its development, principles and future in the United States. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Naisbitt, J. (1982). Megatrends. New York: Warner.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- National Governors' Commission on Education. (1986). Time for results: The governors' 1991 report on education. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.
- Nolte, M. (1986). An introduction to school administration: Selected readings. New York: Macmillan.
- North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. (1988). North Carolina public schools statistical profile. Raleigh: Author.
- Peters, T., & Austin, N. (1985). A passion for excellence. New York: Random House.
- Pierce, P. (1935). The origin and development of the public school principalship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Preston, L., & Post, J. (1973). The third managerial revolution. Academy of Management Journal, 17(3), 476-486.
- Purkey, S., & Smith, M. (1983). Effective schools: A review. Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 427-452.
- Richardson, J., & Barbe, R. (1987). Fairness: An important attribute of principals in excellent schools. NASSP Bulletin, 71(500), 99-103.
- Roe, W., & Drake, T. (1974). The principalship. New York: Macmillan.
- Salley, C. (1978). What principals do: A preliminary occupational analysis. In D. A. Erickson & T. L. Reller (Eds.), The principal in metropolitan schools (pp. 22, 32 & 37). Berkley: McCutchan.
- Sang, H. (1989). School-site management: The key to educational excellence. NASSP News Leader, 36(7), 8.
- Scribner, H., & Stevens, L. (1975). Make your schools work. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Sergiovanni, T. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 4-13.
- Shanker, A. (1989). Restructuring leadership. Education Digest, 54(6), 3-5.
- Shoemaker, J., & Fraser, H. (1981). What principals can do: Some implications from studies of school effectiveness. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(3), 178-182.
- Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Snyder, K., & Anderson, R. (1986). Managing productive schools: Toward an ecology. Orlando: Academic Press College Division.
- Southern Region Education Board. (1983). Meeting the need for quality: Action in the south. Atlanta: Author.
- Stedman, L., & Smith, M. (1985). Weak arguments, poor data, simplistic recommendations. In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds.), The great school debate. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Thomas, D. (1965). Which organization--department or division--for your school? NASSP Bulletin, 49(303), 49-57.
- Toffler, A. (1970). Future shock. New York: Random House.
- Turner, H. (1983). The department head: An untapped source of instructional leadership. NASSP Bulletin, 67(464), 25-28.
- United States Army. (1983). Military leadership (Field Manual 22-100). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Watson, B. (1978). The principal against the system. In D. Erickson & T. Reller (Eds.), The principal in metropolitan schools. Berkley: McCutchan.
- Wellisch, J., MacQueen, A., Carrievie, R., & Duck, G. (1978). School management and organization in successful schools. Sociology of Education, 51(3), 211-226.
- Williams, J. (1987). The role of the principal as verified by North Carolina teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Willower, D. (1986). Organizational theory and the management of schools. In E. Hoyle (Ed.), The management of schools. London: Kogan Page Ltd.

- Wood, F., Freeland, R., & Szabo, J. (1985). School improvement is more than school improvement. Educational Leadership, 42(6). 63-66.
- Wood, C., Nicholson, E., & Findley, D. (1979). The secondary school principal: Manager and supervisor. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Zweibach, S. (1952). Problems of new high school principals. NASSP Bulletin, 36(188), 69-84.

APPENDIX A
LETTER TO THE GUILFORD COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

===== Grimsley Senior High School =====

801 WESTOVER TERRACE
GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA 27408
VPI 470 NINE

JULIUS A. CROWELL
PRINCIPAL
JAMES E. HOWELL
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR ADMINISTRATION



JOSIANE L. LAUMANN
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR INSTRUCTION
WILLIAM H. WHITES
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR STUDENT ACTIVITIES

February 1988

Dear Principal:

I am presently at the dissertation stage of my doctoral program at UNC-Greensboro and will investigate the various conceptual views of the principalship as held by senior high teachers designated as "department chairs." In order to survey the Greensboro City department chairs, I am requesting the assistance of each senior high principal in the following regard. Please review the enclosed faculty list and designate your department chairs by asterisk (*) to the immediate left of the name.

In addition, I respectfully request your permission to survey your department chairs through individual mailings directed to your school address. Please indicate your permission by checking the appropriate box provided at the bottom of your faculty list.

In order to assist you with the return of the enclosed, I have included a self-addressed envelope for your convenience.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Julius Crowell

s

APPENDIX B
LETTER TO THE GUILFORD COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
SECONDARY SCHOOL DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS

===== Grimsley Senior High School =====

801 WESTOVER TERRACE
GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA 27408

919 370 8180

JULIUS A. CROWELL
PRINCIPAL

JAMES E. HOWELL
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR ADMINISTRATION



JOSLANE L. LAUMANN
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR INSTRUCTION

WILLIAM H. WHITES
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR STUDENT ACTIVITIES

April 1988

Dear Colleague:

I am currently conducting a study of the principalship based upon the perceptions of the department chairperson. Even though the principal has been identified as a key figure in the establishment of an effective learning environment, modern schools have become so complex that the traditional high school principal's position cannot possibly cover all aspects of school management. The department chairperson is, therefore, a natural extension of the modern administrative requirement for a liaison position. The perceptions of this position are valuable and your assistance in that regard would be greatly appreciated.

Please review the conceptions of the role of the principal and complete the enclosed survey. Neither you nor your school will be identified in the study, and all responses are confidential.

After completing the survey, please place your response in the enclosed stamped envelope and return by June 1, 1988. If you would like a copy of the results of the survey, please indicate that fact at the bottom of page two.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

J. A. Crowell
Principal

j

Enclosures

APPENDIX C
CONCEPTIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL

1. Principal Teacher: Engages in classroom teaching for a portion of each school day; also responsible for daily school routine and clerical duties; does not believe special training is needed to be an effective school principal.
2. General Manager: Is the official liaison between the school and the central office; spends a majority of time on clerical duties; relies upon common sense and reacts to problems as they arise; has the right to give and enforce orders to teachers; implements the curriculum as mandated by the state and local school board.
3. Professional and Scientific Manager: Spends more time in classroom supervision than routine administrative duties; uses test data as a basis for planning, implementing, and evaluating instruction; is accustomed to the bureaucratic command-compliance organizational system; is interested in efficiency and the use of time to meet management goals and objectives.
4. Administrator and Instructional Leader: Recognizes that his/her role encompasses both governance functions and instructional leadership functions; handles governance functions through the bureaucratic organizational structure; expects and accepts some friction between governance and instructional leadership functions; treats teachers as professionals, giving them significant input into staff hiring, scheduling, evaluation, procurement of materials, selection of objectives, methods, etc.
5. Curriculum Leader: Views the curriculum in very broad terms (more than a course of study) to mean: what each person experiences in cooperatively creating learning settings; believes that the role of the principal is too complex to reduce to simple technical procedures; does not attempt to dichotomize administrative and instructional functions, realizing that all tasks impact on what is learned; believes that the learning of adult educators is as important as the learning of children and youth.

(Adapted from "Five Conceptions of the Principalship" by Lawrence Simon and Dale Brubaker, 1985, p. 73.)

APPENDIX D
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

GUILFORD COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
Senior High School
Department Chairperson Survey

Perceptions of the Principalsip

Note: Please provide the following information with 1987-1988 included.

1. Number of years you have served as a department chairperson:

2. Subject area: (Example: Math, Science, etc.)

3. Grade levels within your school: (Please check)

9-12 _____	10-12 _____
7-12 _____	Other _____
4. As a department chairperson, were you: (Please check)
 - a. Appointed by a principal _____
 - b. Elected by department heads _____
 - c. Elected by faculty-at-large _____
 - d. Other (explain) _____
5. Number of years as a teacher: _____
6. Highest degree completed: (Please check)

Bachelors _____	Master's _____
Sixth Year _____	Doctorate _____
7. Gender: Male _____ Female _____
8. Number of years with current principal: _____
9. As a department chairperson, do you: (Please check)

Teach five classes per academic day	_____
Teach three class periods per academic day	_____
Teach two class periods per academic day	_____
Other	_____

10. As a department chairperson, do you: (Please check)
- a. Supervise a homeroom: Yes _____ No _____
- b. Supervise an extracurricular activity such as drama, basketball, etc. Yes _____ No _____

If "yes," please indicate the activity below:

11. As a department chairperson, do you: (Please check)
- Receive a supplement for your position: Yes _____ No _____
12. In your opinion, should the department chairperson be actively involved in the performance appraisal process: (Please check)
- Yes _____ No _____
13. In your opinion, what should be done to enhance the position of the department chairperson?

GUILFORD COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
Senior High School
Department Chair

Perceptions of the Principalship

Instructions:

1. In column A, please indicate the number of principals with whom you have worked that fit the description of each conception, i.e., you have worked with five (5) principals: two (2) may fit conception #2 - General Manager; one (1) may fit conception #4 - Administrator and Instructional Leader, etc.
2. In column B, please place a check beside the conception that most accurately describes where you think those principals should be.
3. In column C, please place a check beside the conception that you feel most accurately describes Guilford County principals in general.
4. In column D, please place a check beside the conception that most accurately describes where you think principals in general should be.
5. In column E, please place a check beside the conception that most accurately describes what you personally are doing in your role as department chair, i.e., principal (lead) teacher, general manager, professional manager, etc.
6. In column F, please place a check beside the conception that most accurately describes what you think your role in the operation of your school should be.

A	B	C	D	E	F	
						1. Principal Teacher
						2. General Manager
						3. Professional/Scientific Manager
						4. Administrator/Instructional Leader
						5. Curriculum Leader

APPENDIX E
FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

===== Grimsley Senior High School =====

801 WESTOVER TERRACE
GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA 27408
910-370-8100

JULIUS A. CROWELL
PRINCIPAL

JAMES E. HOWELL
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR ADMINISTRATION



JOSLANE L. LAUMANN
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR INSTRUCTION

WILLIAM H. WHITES
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL FOR STUDENT ACTIVITIES

TO: Principal

FROM: J. A. Crowell *J. A. Crowell*

DATE: May 1988

RE: Dissertation Research

Several weeks ago I delivered a survey to be distributed to each of your department chairs. If, by chance, you have already distributed the surveys, please disregard this reminder. If you have yet to distribute the surveys, please assist me by encouraging your chairs to participate.

All responses are anonymous unless the individual decides otherwise.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

s