

**The Roles and Attributes of English Department Chairs:
An Examination of Leadership Perceptions**

Siabhan M. May-Washington
B.A., University of Missouri-Kansas City, 1988
M.A., University of Missouri-Kansas City, 1991
M.Ed., Admin., Park University, 2006

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty
of the School of Education of Baker University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education
in
Educational Leadership

November 20, 2014

Copyright 2014 by Siabhan May-Washington

Dissertation Committee

Major Advisor

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify the self-perceived roles and attributes of English department chairs, and to determine the extent to which they use the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) they view as important to their effectiveness as leaders. More specifically, the purpose of this study was to examine the extent of relationships between particular facets of KSAs and demographic characteristics, such as leadership style, school type, school size, and gender. Facets of KSAs included facilitation of conflict resolution, communication with department members, ability to delegate, supervision of staff, working collaboratively toward a common goal, implementation of department curriculum planning, and management of multiple roles. This study was conducted to explore the relationship among groups in the variables of leadership style, school type, gender, and school size.

The purpose of this quantitative non-experimental study was aimed to compare English department chairs' self-perceived roles and leadership styles in both public and private schools in the greater Missouri and Kansas metropolitan areas. In addition, the perceptions of English department chairs in the central states were explored. The sample for the study included 81 department chairs. Hypotheses were tested using an independent-samples *t* test, chi-square tests of independence, Pearson correlations, and Fisher's *z* tests. The results indicated differences in knowledge, skills, and abilities between those department chairs who lead in a democratic fashion versus a transformational style, and provided evidence that demographic variables such as gender, school size, and school type did not have relationships with several of the leadership responsibilities that department chairs have to manage. One test result, however,

indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies of department chairs' facilitation of conflict resolution activities. Public school department chairs facilitated conflict resolution less than what was expected; whereas, private school department chairs facilitated conflict resolution more than what was expected. The results indicated a difference in the relationship between English department chairs' perceived knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change between leadership styles, but not for school type, gender, or school size. The results showed that most of the department chairs implemented democratic leadership and engaged in collaborative practices to fulfill their objectives. These results indicate department chairs need professional development, quality mentoring, and relevant training for maximum efficiency, and department chairs must deliberately implement critical leadership elements to fulfill their desired goals. Schools can use the results of this study to help their leaders become more competent in their leadership roles.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my parents Floyd and Aritta May who taught me to cherish the importance of education. You have always been the wind beneath my wings.

Acknowledgements

I was so fortunate to have a village of wonderful supporters during my effort to complete this project. I want to thank the entire team of Baker University faculty members who taught me in the Cohort 9 doctoral program. I really appreciate the guidance I received from Dr. Susan Rogers, Dr. Patricia Bandre, and Dr. Elizabeth Sanders. I also especially want to thank my advisor Dr. Dennis King, along with research analysts Katie Hole, Peg Waterman, and Dr. Isabella Zaniletti, who supported me with their encouragement and feedback.

I wish to convey my heartfelt thanks and appreciation to members of my dissertation committee and my directed field experience mentors. My Baker University supervisors Dr. Ed King and Dr. Brad Tate provided invaluable guidance. I also have immense gratitude to my Pembroke Hill colleague and directed field internship Educational Administrative Mentor, Dr. Susan Leonard. I also thank Mr. Clarence Cole for giving me my first teaching job in the Kansas City, Missouri School District. In addition, I am forever indebted to my colleague and External Review Advisor, Dr. Jeff Loeb. His invaluable guidance has been an immense blessing for many years.

I am so appreciative, as well, to Pembroke Hill administrators Dr. Steve Bellis, Mr. Mike Hill, Mr. David Burke, and former principal, Ms. Sue Bloemer, for all of their well wishes and suggestions. I also thank the entire Pembroke Hill upper school faculty. On many occasions, the Pembroke faculty members took part in mock surveys and participated in interviews. Thanks to Mrs. Kathy Firestone, Ms. Anne Erickson, Dr. Barbara Judd, Dr. Bob Tostevin, and Dr. Carl Graves for being such loyal cheerleaders throughout my journey. Special thanks to my special friends and supporters from the

Pembroke Hill English department, both past and present: Dr. Jeff Loeb, Dr. Stephen Salinger, Ms. Lorraine Gordon, Mrs. Julie Lester, Mr. Ben Christian, Ms. Lauren Rosenfield, Dr. Matthew Clothier, Mr. Joel Causey, Dr. Kim Banion, Mrs. Piper Abernathy, Ms. Sarah Taber, Dr. Valerie Ostarch, and Mr. Justin Romick.

I want to close by acknowledging the most important people in my life. My late mother, Aritta May, has a loving spirit that still enfolds and sustains me. My father, Floyd May, has been an extraordinary rock of support and stability my entire life. I am grateful to be the youngest child born into a powerhouse family of amazing siblings: Mr. Floyd O. May, Jr., Mrs. LaVerta Lundy, Ms. Rita Shadeed, Ms. Teresa May, Mr. Michael May, and Mr. Merele May. I always tried to live up to the fine examples you set.

I am grateful to my beautiful children: Brandon Isaiah Washington, Lauren May Washington, and Taryn Rae Washington. You all are at the heart of everything I do and believe. I love you with all my heart and soul.

Finally, I wish to thank my loving husband, Rick Washington, Jr. Thank you for supporting my decision to go back to school and fulfill this dream. Together, I know we have many more dreams and memories to come.

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	viii
List of Tables	xii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Background	2
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose Statement	5
Significance of the Study	6
Delimitations	7
Assumptions	7
Research Questions	8
Definition of Terms	9
Overview of the Methodology	12
Organization of the Study	13
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature	14
History of Department Chairs	14
Department Chair Leadership Elements	17
Conflict Resolution	19
Interpersonal Communication	20
Managing Multiple Roles	20

Supervision of Staff	21
Ability to Delegate	22
Effective Communication with One’s Department.....	22
Effective Communication with Other Areas.....	23
Conducting Meetings	24
Motivational Skills.....	24
Managing Change	25
High School Department Chair Leadership.....	26
Private High School Department Chairs as Teacher Leaders.....	27
Collaboration in Private Schools	30
Curriculum in Private Schools	30
Evaluation and Hiring.....	31
Public High School Department Chairs as Teacher Leaders	33
Collaboration in Public Schools.....	33
Curriculum in Public Schools	36
Evaluation and Hiring.....	37
Leadership for the 21 st Century.....	38
Capacity Building	40
Effective Leadership Styles	42
Gender.....	45
Summary	46
Chapter Three: Methods	47
Research Design.....	48

Population and Sample	48
Sampling Procedures	48
Instrumentation	49
Measurement.....	50
Validity and Reliability.....	51
Data Collection Procedures.....	52
Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing	53
Limitations	57
Summary.....	57
Chapter Four: Results	58
Descriptive Statistics.....	58
Hypothesis Testing.....	63
Summary.....	73
Chapter Five: Interpretation and Recommendations	75
Study Summary.....	75
Overview of the Problem	76
Purpose Statement and Research Questions	76
Review of the Methodology.....	77
Major Findings.....	77
Findings Related to the Literature.....	81
Conclusions.....	88
Implications for Action.....	88
Recommendations for Future Research	89

Concluding Remarks.....	90
References.....	91
Appendices.....	106
Appendix A. Leadership Survey.....	107
Appendix B. Original Crowder (2010) KSA Instrument.....	115
Appendix C. Original Spaid and Parson (1999) Leadership Paradigm Instrument	117
Appendix D. Baker University IRB Request	119
Appendix E. Baker University IRB Approval	125
Appendix F. Letters of Consent	127
Appendix G. E-Mail Letter of Invitation	132
Appendix H. Reminder E-Mail.....	134

List of Tables

Table 1. Department-Level Chair Tasks & Time Demands	16
Table 2. Crowder’s Leadership Element Results.....	18
Table 3. School Size	60
Table 4. School Classification	61
Table 5. Location of Respondents	62
Table 6. Years Served as Department Chair.....	63
Table 7. Methods of Obtaining Department Chair Position	63
Table 8. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Conflict Resolution by School Type	65
Table 9. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Communication with Department Members by Gender.....	66
Table 10. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Delegating Tasks by School Size.....	67
Table 11. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Supervision of Staff Skill by Leadership Styles	68
Table 12. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Collaboration Use by School Type	69
Table 13. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Curriculum Planning by Gender.....	70
Table 14. Observed and Expected Frequencies of Managing Multiple Roles by School Size.....	71
Table 15. Results of Fisher’s z Tests for Correlations between Perceived KSAs and Perceived Use of Managing Change for RQ10.....	73

Chapter One

Introduction

Although there are multiple administrative positions in secondary-level schools, teacher leadership makes a tremendous difference in the efficiency of their operations (Childs-Bowen, 2006; Kruskamp, 2003). Teacher leadership occurs when highly competent teachers mentor their colleagues' classroom teaching efforts (Barth, 2013; Erkens & Twadell, 2012; Lieberman & Miller, 2005). Department chairs represent one type of teacher leadership, and these teacher leaders are highly essential to overall school quality (Independent School Management [ISM], 1999). Department chairs serve as model teachers and mentors for staff as well as students. In many cases, department chairs are responsible for curriculum development, curriculum plan implementation, instructor assessment, and teacher recruitment (Bensimon, Ward, & Sanders, 2000; Kinsella, 2011; Onukwugha, 2013; Siskin, 1997). Department chairs can also function in administrative capacities, providing disciplinary assistance to principals and vice-principals (Siskin, 1997). When Wettersten (1992) presented a paper to the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, she emphasized Siskin's (1997) research that highlighted the significant role of department chairs as administrative leaders. Wettersten (1992) pointed out:

Chairs have the closest administrative relationship with teachers in their quasi-administrative role. They are in a position not only to influence curriculum and instruction within their academic areas but also to suggest ideas for school improvements beyond departmental boundaries. Teachers may turn to them as "instructional leaders" more so than to principals or assistant principals. (p. 11)

Typically, department chairs are involved in scheduling meetings, mentoring new teachers, and observing teachers in their classrooms. Department chairs can have a greater role hiring new teachers, as well as attending more frequent meetings with administrators (Chu, 2006; Kinsella, 2011; National Association of Independent Schools [NAIS], 2011). Comparative analysis of the self-reported roles, leadership styles, and attributes of secondary-level English department chairs provides insight about the structure and governance of America's secondary-level educational institutions. The leadership efforts of department chairs are significant in mentoring department members and ensuring quality curriculum and instruction practices in secondary-level schools.

There does not seem to be a clear blueprint available that delineates what new, incoming department chairs need to do to lead departments, and concerted training should be made available (Crowder, 2010; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011). According to Seagren, Creswell, and Wheeler (1993), the resultant perplexity usually occurs because of inadequate administrative preparation or instruction about their roles. Moreover, there are few studies that have focused exclusively on the perceptions of secondary-level English department chairs, as most research has focused at the community college and university levels.

Background

The department chair position originated in higher education. Largely because of increased enrollment and expanded course offerings in early 19th century colleges, the need for knowledgeable people to serve as leaders of the respective disciplines emerged (Seagren et al., 1993). Gradually, secondary institutions emulated the same leadership model. A department chair's duties are vast and varied and numerous studies have

defined the department chair's specific roles. Seagren et al. (1993) advised "department chairs played three major roles: academic, administrative, and leadership" (p. 6). Strides have been made in cataloguing the department chair's role, ranging from clerical and managerial functions to program development and leadership (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Seagren et al., 1993). Similar to Gmelch and Miskin (2011) and Seagren et al. (1993), Chu's (2006) research yielded comparable results that suggested a large part of the role of department chairs consists of "bureaucratic grind and household tasks" (Chu, 2006, p. 20). Regardless of what role or function department chairs set out to perform, they are likely to exhibit several characteristics, one of which is leadership (Lucas, 2000).

Green (2005) and Lunenburg and Ornstein (2012) have attempted to define leadership in general, yet opinions vary on the essence of its meaning. Lunenburg and Ornstein (2012) clarified much of the ambiguity about the definition of leadership. Their studies corroborate Yukl's (2010) findings concerning the dispositions of leaders in that "leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives" (Yukl, 2010, p. 7). Lunenburg and Ornstein (2012) suggested the following definition of leadership:

Leadership involves influence; leadership involves goal attainments; and leadership requires followers. Leadership is an influence process. The influence is one in which a leader changes the actions or attitudes of several group members or subordinates. (p. 100)

Department chairs and teacher leaders need to have a leadership style to lead their respective departments and colleagues (Gmelch & Miskin, 2011). A department chair's

leadership style may vary, and the leadership style could affect school initiatives and departmental plans (Tucker, 1993). As Green (2005) explained, there are three prominent styles of behavior in leaders: autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire. According to Green (2005), “the democratic style was considered to be most effective and highly preferred by followers. The laissez-faire style was next, and the authoritarian style was the least preferred by followers” (p. 17). Lindholm (1999) emphasized that the democratic leadership style has been an important factor for department chairs in achieving their departmental goals. Effective democratic leadership has been shown as a successful method to motivate followers and achieve mutual goals (Green, 2005; Miller, 1999).

Statement of the Problem

Department chairs are highly important in motivating department members to attain school achievement goals (Crowder, 2010; DeRoche, Kujawa, & Hunsaker, 1988; King, 1991; Onukwugha, 2013). Ineffective department chair leadership establishes a poor example for colleagues and may thwart innovative curricular ideas. Furthermore, inept department chairs will foster a void in teacher leadership and impede the capacity building process (Crowder, 2010). According to the Teacher Leader Exploratory Consortium (TLEC, 2014), teacher leaders have an obligation to make the achievement of teachers and students a top priority. Department chairs should not be stagnant or complacent, but active leaders who motivate department members to achieve their goals (Chu, 2006). As Chu (2006) advised, “Department chairs are expected to administer department operations and lead the organization into the future” (p. 16). If a department

chair's leadership is not strong, the lack of that leadership will ultimately become a detriment to department and school initiatives.

Department members should be able to look to their department chairs for guidance on all facets of their duties related to the workplace, and the chairs themselves should be leaders who have expertise about the norms and expectations of the school community (Tucker, 1993). Ideally, department members should emulate their respective department chairs' work ethics and characteristics. Furthermore, anyone who assumes the role of department chair needs to have a clear indication of what the position entails. Far too often individuals are plunged into the job without a clear description of how to fulfill their duties (Crowder, 2010). Since there is limited research examining the leadership roles and styles of secondary-level English department chairs, the current study was conducted to provide insights that could benefit current and future leaders' training and professional development efforts.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this quantitative non-experimental study was to compare English department chairs' self-perceptions of their roles and leadership styles in the greater Missouri and Kansas metropolitan areas. In addition, the perceptions of English department chairs in the independent schools of the central states were explored. Teacher leadership is highly crucial in today's schools, and research indicates that effective department chairs are essential teacher leaders in secondary-level institutions (Wettersten, 1992). Competent department chair leadership facilitates collaborative practices to develop teams that will ultimately increase student performance levels. The current study explored the knowledge, skills, and abilities which department chairs find integral to their

roles as leaders. More specifically, the purpose of this study was to examine the extent of relationships between particular facets of KSAs and demographic characteristics, such as leadership style, school type, school size, and gender. Facets of KSAs included facilitation of conflict resolution, communication with department members, ability to delegate, supervision of staff, working collaboratively towards a common goal, implementation of department curriculum planning, and management of multiple roles. This study was conducted to explore the relationship between self-perceived KSAs and managing change, further comparing this relationship among groups in the variables of leadership style, school type, gender, and school size.

Significance of the Study

This study provides guidance to individuals who in the future might consider accepting the position of a department chair. The results will aid current teacher leaders and principals in selecting future teacher leaders. The research represents a compilation of self-reported perceptions that department chairs deemed successful in terms of their knowledge, skills, and abilities as leaders. The practices of these department chairs will yield helpful information for incoming leaders and future researchers alike to identify characteristics of effective teacher leaders and teacher leadership. Research confirms that department chairs generally fail to receive formalized training before assuming their posts (Aziz et al., 2005; Crowder, 2010; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Gmelch & Seedorf, 1989; Seagren et al., 1993). Administrators and professional development planners charged with the responsibility of educating future department chairs and teacher leaders can use the results of this study in developing their teacher education and teacher leadership programs. Gmelch and Miskin (2011) confirmed that department chairs desire

training in areas related to evaluation of staff and conflict resolution. The results of the current study may provide administrators and personnel charged with training teacher leaders with additional up-to-date information regarding the critical leadership training essentials needed of department chairs and teacher leaders. Information gleaned from the study will aid in the development of training programs not only for aspiring leaders but also for identifying on-going professional development needs for practicing department chairs and teacher leaders.

Delimitations

This study focused on secondary-level English department chairs only. It included public and private secondary schools in urban, suburban, and rural areas of Missouri and Kansas, as well as department chairs in schools in the central states of Michigan, Ohio, Minnesota, Arkansas, Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Iowa. Department chair leaders from the western, southern, and eastern areas of the United States were excluded. In addition, the study allowed for self-reported perceptions instead of prolonged observations and shadowing of the study's participants, which may have affected the validity of the responses. Since the information was self-reported, the potential for dishonesty or misrepresentations by participants was possible.

Assumptions

It was assumed that participants responded in an honest and truthful manner to the survey questions without aid from any other parties. Additionally, it was assumed that participants had some expertise about the departmental leadership position since they

were already designated as department chairs. Accordingly, it was also assumed that the respondents understood all of the terminology and concepts associated with the survey.

Research Questions

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) explained that research questions “become a directional beam for the study” (p. 126). Ten research questions directed the focus of this study to determine the roles and leadership styles of department chairs and teacher leaders.

RQ1. To what extent is there a difference in the knowledge, skills, and abilities among English department chairs’ leadership styles?

RQ2. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs’ facilitation of conflict resolution and school type?

RQ3. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs’ communication with department members and gender?

RQ4. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs’ ability to delegate and school size?

RQ5. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs’ supervision of staff and leadership style?

RQ6. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs’ working collaboratively towards a common goal and school type?

RQ7. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs’ implementation of department curriculum planning and gender?

RQ8. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs’ management of multiple roles and school size?

RQ9. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and accepting compromise as a means of achieving organizational goals?

RQ10. To what extent are the relationships between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change different between groups in the following variables: leadership style, school type, gender, and school size?

Definition of Terms

Terminology specific to this study have been identified and defined to assist in the interpretation and understanding of the findings. For these purposes, the following operational terms are defined:

Abilities. Abilities are traits identified to perform a job function with competence (Aziz et al., 2005; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012).

Attributes. Attributes are the identifiable traits or characteristics that exemplify strong, effective leadership (Bass, 1990; Green, 2005).

Curriculum. Curriculum is “a plan for action, or a written document, which includes strategies for achieving desired goals or ends” (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012, p. 367).

Department. A department is an academic unit comprised of faculty and support staff that engages in the multifaceted activities of an institution, such as providing courses for students, enhancing and developing scholarly knowledge, and providing service to the campus and the communities external to the institution (Chu, 2006; Seagren et al., 1993).

Department chair. The department chair is an individual who is part of a school's overall leadership team responsible for guiding the department and making key decisions (Seagren et al., 1993; Wheeler et al., 2008).

Independent schools. Independent schools are private schools that do not have religious affiliation. Their funding depends upon tuition sources and alumni endowments for operation (Johnson, 2014; NAIS, 2009).

Leadership. "Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives" (Yukl, 2010, p. 7). Leadership entails the methods a leader employs to manage and influence other people (Bass, 1990; Green, 2005; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). The following are subsets of the types of leadership:

Authoritarian. The authoritarian method is a style where leaders take full charge and do not allow participants to have a role or voice in decision-making. Leaders do not allow their followers to make any decisions (Bass, 1990; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012).

Democratic. Democratic leadership is a style where leaders invite and fully encourage participants to share their views to aid in decision-making. Followers are apprised of key information and fully encouraged to share recommendations (Green, 2005; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012).

Laissez-faire. Laissez-faire leadership is a governance style where the leaders do not provide direction whatsoever, so participants are free to make their own decisions (Bass, 1990; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012).

Transactional. Transactional leadership is a leadership style where employees receive rewards for achieving mutual goals (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012; Yukl, 2012).

Transformational. Transformational leadership entails leaders inspiring their employees to attain goals by appealing to their subordinates' consciences to work hard for the organization's improvement (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012; Yukl, 2012).

Perceptions. Perceptions refer to the judgments and understandings an individual develops by observing a person, situation, or issue. In terms of leaders' judgments of themselves, perceptions are self-descriptions (Bass, 1990).

Private schools. Private schools are funded by sources other than the federal government. They may or may not have a religious affiliation. Their operations depend upon tuition sources (Johnson, 2014; NAIS, 2000).

Professional growth. Professional development growth is the process of encouraging greater individual development and motivation for department members (Chu, 2006; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012).

Public schools. Public schools are school systems that provide free education for children. Funding for public schools depends on state and local tax revenues (Johnson, 2014; Stadler, 2012).

Recruitment. Recruitment refers to the department chair's efforts and involvement in increasing the membership of the department (Bensimon et al., 2000; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011).

Retention. Retention is the department chair's role in retaining current department members (Bensimon et al., 2000; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011).

Skills. Skills are the actions deemed important for successful job performance (Aziz et al., 2005; Yukl, 2012).

Teacher leadership. Teacher leadership is when “teachers take on responsibilities once reserved for others in the administrative hierarchy in a variety of ways as part of their expanding roles” (Darling-Hammond, Bullmaster, & Cobb, 1995, p. 94).

Overview of the Methodology

This quantitative non-experimental study included 1,324 secondary-level English department chairs from 13 states. One survey was used to collect the data, which was modified from Crowder's (2010) Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSA) instrument and Spaid and Parson's (1999) Leadership Paradigm. This modified survey measured the self-perceptions of the roles and leadership styles of secondary-level English department chairs, including the leadership aspects they implemented in their work. The survey consisted of 53 items: 46 multiple-choice questions related to leadership practices; four multiple-mark areas for the identification of gender, school setting, years of department chair service, and type of school; and three open-ended response items for participants to identify their specific states, discuss how they were chosen for the role, and share any special training and qualifications held. An independent-samples *t* tests, chi-square tests of independence, Pearson correlations, and Fisher's *z* tests were used for data analysis.

Organization of the Study

Introduced in this chapter was the study's focus on examining self-perceptions of secondary-level English department chairs, specifically on their roles and leadership styles. Chapter one included a description of the historical background of department chairs evolving from the college and university realms. This chapter included the statement of the problem, purpose and significance of the study, delimitations, and assumptions. In addition, the chapter contained the study's research questions, included essential terms, and included an overview of the quantitative non-experimental research design. Chapter two includes a review of literature on teacher leadership including the leadership and managerial duties of department chairs. It includes information and established practices from department chairs, teachers, and educational researchers in the field. Chapter three contains many facets of the study: the study's research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, measurement, reliability and validity, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations. The results of the data collected for the study are shared in chapter four, while chapter five includes the study summary, findings related to literature, implications, recommendations for future studies, and concluding remarks.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Department chair studies indicate that superintendents or heads of schools, as well as principals, have increasingly recognized the benefits of training teachers as leaders. One way these leaders achieve their goals is by actively employing department chairs as intervening mentors since they have significant relationships with both teachers and administrators. The current study focused on department chairs as the teacher leaders in secondary schools since they function as the top leaders in many school settings (Kruskamp, 2003). Department chairs perform several long-recognized administrative functions, for example, serving as mentors (or even role models); practicing effective parental and public relations; leading in curriculum and instruction; managing faculty team-building; and providing training for future leaders (Wettersten, 1992). Capacity building by both the administration and departmental leaders is necessary to fulfill the long-term initiatives of school improvement (Wise & Usdan, 2013). The history of department chairs evolved from universities and community colleges. These responsibilities manifest themselves differently in public and private schools; thus, the following analysis describes each separately, beginning with the history of the department chair position.

History of Department Chairs

Historically, virtually the only teachers who served as leaders were department chairs that gradually over time absorbed various managerial duties (Dyer & Miller, 1999). Universities and colleges, for instance, were the first to appoint department chairs to carry out specific managerial tasks, but by 1910, secondary schools had adopted

structures comparable to those of colleges (Church & Sedlak, 1976; Dyer & Miller, 1999). Though the existence of department chairs in some schools today is largely taken for granted, ironically, the emergence of the position has an interesting history. The departmental chair position, at least in secondary schools, arose as a perceived necessity to enhance school efficiency in the face of flourishing enrollments and expanded, specialized course offerings (Bennett, 1983; Hecht, Higerson, Gmelch, & Tucker, 1999). The early pre- and post-Civil War colleges, in light of the increased number of students and staff, featured college presidents serving in multiple roles; thus, they needed additional help to sustain their missions and visions (Hecht et al., 1999). Bennett's (1983) research in education provides an excellent history of this process:

It was the advent of the land-grant university at Cornell in 1868, the Harvard administrative reforms of 1870, and the founding of graduate schools at Johns Hopkins and later at Clark University in the period of 1870 to 1880 that the department really began to come into its own. (p. vi)

Following World War II, higher education enrollment once again increased. Higher education enrollment substantially rose because of the Government Issued (G.I.) Bill that paved the way for 10 million post-World War II soldiers to seek post-secondary education (Lucas, 2000). The division of faculty according to similar content-area subjects arose into specialized departments between 1870 and 1925 (Dyer & Miller, 1999). Colleges had internal and external demands that necessitated the rise of department leadership. According to Dyer and Miller (1999), "department chairs, or division chairs were hired or appointed to oversee the newly developed academic units or departments in institutions" (p. 6). The technique of appointing departmental leaders to

manage burgeoning enrollments became essential. Department chairs in higher education helped manage tasks connected with the “bureaucratic grind” (Chu, 2006, p. 20). Chu (2006) discovered the overall tasks that department chairs had to manage, which are identified in Table 1.

Table 1

Department-Level Chair Tasks & Time Demands

Rank	Tasks	Lot of Time (%)	Little Time (%)
1	Responding to memos	55	5
2	Writing reports	50	10
3	Administrative reading	38	11
4	Scheduling classes	37	21
5	Budget planning	34	19
6	Managing staff	33	21
7	Representing department	32	16
8	Leading department meetings	30	11
9	Requesting repairs	6	71
10	Large repair replacement	5	71

Note. Adapted from “The Department Chair Primer: Leading and Managing Academic Departments,” by D. Chu, 2006, pp. 18-20.

Tasks were classified as involving “little time” if the matters were time-sensitive and required rapid response, or a “lot of time” if work required deeper reading, interpretation, and outreach (Chu, 2006, p. 18).

Department Chair Leadership Elements

Department chair leadership elements were also pertinent in the emergence of community colleges, originally known as junior colleges until 1970, in the early 20th century. These schools developed in response to heightened societal needs to make education beyond high school more accessible and affordable for the greater population, and their departmental structures came to mirror the configurations of colleges and universities (Cohen, Brawer, & Kisker, 2003).

The rise of community colleges necessitated the need for department chairs of those institutions. Spaid and Parson's (1999) study of community college administrators uncovered key leadership elements that emphasized the importance of interpersonal skills and flexibility as core competencies. Spaid and Parson's (1999) study found the top six essential elements of leadership for credit administrators included: "(a) admitting mistakes, (b) learning from mistakes, (c) breaking down communication barriers, (d) being open to different ways of accomplishing old tasks, (e) listening, and (f) promoting teamwork" (p. 16). Credit administrators involved those leaders who taught courses for degree seeking students; whereas, non-credit administrators instructed community interest courses that did not lead to college credit. Non-credit administrators' elements included the following aspects: "(a) honesty, (b) serving as a change agent, (c) promoting teamwork, (d) admitting and learning from mistakes, and (e) listening" (Spaid & Parson, 1999, p. 16).

Many of the university-level department chair tasks identified by Chu (2006) provided an important analysis of the time-consuming duties institutional department chairs have come to perform. Brookdale Community College biology professor

Crowder's (2010) research is similar to Chu's (2006) findings; however, Crowder, in his study of 30 community college department chairs, found the most pivotal leadership elements included 10 knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) that are most crucial to the role. KSAs are core competencies that are required for efficient job performance (Aziz et al., 2005). The leadership elements that department chairs deem crucial for their positions are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Crowder's Leadership Element Results

Top Leadership Elements	Mean
Conflict Resolution	3.39
Interpersonal Communication	3.67
Managing Multiple Roles	3.52
Supervising Staff	2.41
Ability to Delegate	3.34
Effective Communication with One's Department	3.67
Effective Communication with Other Areas	3.09
Conducting Meetings	3.06
Motivational Skills	2.82
Managing Change	3.06

Note. Adapted from "Transition into the Department Chair Role:

The Manager-Leader Continuum," by J. Crowder, 2010, p. 157.

Crowder's (2010) survey of department chairs rated the importance of each KSA on a scale of a one to four: (1) *Not Important*, (2) *Somewhat Important*, (3) *Important*, and (4) *Very Important* (Crowder, 2010). Within his study, "Ratings varied from 2.27 to 3.76.

Sixteen out of the 20 listed KSAs were ranked as, on average, being either “important” or “very important,” receiving means of 3 or more” (Crowder, 2010, p. 89). Crowder’s (2010) leadership elements can serve as a foundation in understanding the experiences of community college department chairs. Crowder’s (2010) framework thus provides an effective cornerstone in which all department chairs, from university to secondary, can apply to all levels of teacher leadership. The following section addresses each of the 10 KSAs in greater detail.

Conflict resolution. It is unrealistic to assume that teachers within a department will function in perfect harmony on all matters; differences in opinion and various conflicts are bound to arise, and leaders use effective communication abilities to address these matters and foster a sense of consensus (Lindholm, 1999). It is important to consider that conflict is an important part of departmental functioning, and research indicates that department chairs must be proficient in addressing conflict in their departments to attain desired goals (Von Frank, 2012; Garmston, 2008; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Hickson & Stacks, 1992). The department chair is pivotal in orchestrating the necessary dynamics of departmental conversations to attain desired goals. The ability to resolve conflicts is an essential leadership quality for department chairs (Hickson & Stacks, 1992). In a study of public university department chairs, Aziz et al. (2005) found the mean score of department chairs who perceived conflict resolution to be important ranked 3.34. The surveyed department chairs reported that the ability to resolve conflict among faculty members is an important skill for successful leadership (Aziz et al., 2005). Conflict resolution was also a top leadership skill (3.39) found in Crowder’s (2010) survey results. Thus, the literature suggests that a department leader’s conflict resolution

ability leads to productive problem-solving and departmental growth (Von Frank, 2012). Moreover, department chairs must accept that conflicts are to be expected, so they should devise procedures to help manage and resolve the conflicts that will eventually emerge (Buller, 2012).

Interpersonal communication. The ability to develop interpersonal communication proficiency is an important skill for department chairs. Leaming (2007) proposed that a department chair's interpersonal communication abilities are essential to recruit students to electives and sustain attendance. The department chair must also make every effort to communicate using their interpersonal skills in the best way possible. Research by Aziz et al. (2005) yielded a mean result of 3.49 for the importance of interpersonal communication. Crowder's (2010) research showed a mean rank of 3.67 for interpersonal communication results, which indicated how essential communication ability is for effective leadership. Department leaders need to exude a caring and supportive disposition as they interact with multiple individuals. Such interactions include meetings with students, representatives of other departments, administrators, the general public, alumni, and the media (Czech, 2008; Hecht et al., 1999; Leaming, 2007). Communicating with many varying groups can involve much time and effort; however, Leaming (2007) found that such interaction is of paramount importance in the managing of department chairs' several duties.

Managing multiple roles. Both academic research and the experience of chairs themselves indicated that managing multiple roles is an essential quality in achieving departmental goals. The workload for a department chair is extensive, as it involves myriad tasks related to a number of discrete areas including leadership, managerial and

clerical work, and curriculum and instructional design activities (Gmelch & Seedorf, 1989; Seagren et al., 1993; Wheeler et al., 2008). Gmelch and Schuh (2004) studied 2,000 university department chairs in the United States and Australia and their results indicated that managing multiple tasks ranging from managerial to clerical business is a primary source of aggravation for most chairs. Managing varied duties has the potential to require a lot of time management, and chairs are bombarded with too many deadlines and activities simultaneously (Gmelch & Schuh, 2004). Comparatively, Aziz et al. (2005) reported a mean of 3.50 for the leadership element of managing multiple roles. This high result indicated that department chairs view this leadership element as very important for effectual leadership. Crowder's (2010) study of community college department chairs found that the ability to manage multiple roles is essential for effective leadership. Crowder (2010) reported a mean of 3.52 for managing multiple roles. The position of the department chair includes overseeing many functions integral to the operation of the departments such as supervising staff and overseeing budgets.

Supervision of staff. Aziz et al. (2005) found a mean result of 3.32 for supervision of staff as a critical element for departmental leaders. The results of Chu's (2006) study showed that chairs devote 37% of their time to scheduling classes, with 34% focused on budgetary oversight. Crowder's (2010) survey reported staff supervision as an important element in department chair leadership. Crowder (2010) reported a mean of 2.41 for supervising staff. Such oversight entails interpreting and advising department members of various policy particulars. For instance, department chairs have to supervise their department members' schedules, and they generally oversee the departmental budget (Chu, 2006). The majority of research has confirmed that department chairs

perceive supervision of staff as an important leadership element; therefore, department leaders must make their management activities, as well as delegation of tasks a top priority (Buller, 2012; Kruskamp, 2003; Tucker, 1993).

Ability to delegate. Aziz et al. (2005) found a mean result of 3.38 for the department leader's ability to foster delegation of tasks in accordance with department members' talents and interests, demonstrating the importance of delegating tasks for productive leadership. Crowder (2010) also found the ability to delegate responsibility as a fundamental leadership skill and reported a mean of 3.34 for this leadership element. When others participate in the workload, much time and energy is saved. Especially in this area, where much potential chafing takes place, leaders should endeavor to place their egos in the background and possess a willingness to delegate tasks based on the strengths and abilities of teachers to perform (Cullen, Ewing, Marshall, & Rice, 2007). In his study of department chair leadership, Buller (2012) discussed how delegating tasks should occur in all departments, regardless of their composition. In delegating tasks, department leaders must designate specific, meaningful duties for their members to complete. Department chairs should remain involved in the process, yet they must be cautious not to micromanage their members' efforts because no one enjoys such close oversight (Buller, 2012). Both task delegation and departmental intercommunication should thus be extremely high on any department chair's agenda.

Effective communication with one's department. Perhaps no other skill is as important as the department chair's ability to communicate (Crowder, 2010; Czech, 2008; Leaming, 2007). Department chairs must especially foster strong communication with their department members. This communication should have a high priority because

both parties share mutual goals. Department chairs certainly need to be able to directly and effectively communicate ideas with their department members, in order to achieve mutually desired goals. The mean result of 3.38 reported by Aziz et al. (2005) emphasized the crucial nature of interdepartmental communication. The high mean result from Crowder's (2010) study (3.67) illustrated the importance of effective communication within the department. The methods used by department chairs to facilitate such communication are bound to bring about various results. According to Czech (2008), "Chairs who use supportive communication behaviors are seen as more effective in their job [sic]" (p. 4). Most department chairs should strive to be as supportive as possible and conduct their communication efforts in a respectful fashion.

Effective communication with other areas. Department chairs have a responsibility not only to communicate with their own members but also to engage in interdepartmental communication. Clear articulation of plans and priorities, effective communication with a variety of constituencies, and development of skills for reaching consensus in problem solving are qualities ranking high on the skills needed by department chairs (Leaming, 2007). Other groups to which department chairs must communicate effectively include representatives from other disciplines, community groups, and administrative entities within their institutions. Chu's (2006) study identified that department chairs spend 32% of their time communicating and representing on behalf of their departments. Such external communication is deemed essential by both Aziz et al. (2005) and Crowder (2010), the former finding a mean result of 3.50. Crowder's (2010) survey results identified a mean of 3.09 for effective communication with other areas such as meetings with the general public, alumni, and the media.

Outreach to other departments can be extremely beneficial in potentially discovering ideas for problem solving, realizing financial gains, and finding greater shared resources that can ultimately benefit and enhance departmental goals (Leaming, 2007).

Conducting meetings. Aziz et al. (2005) found that facilitating meetings related to student issues was important, as their study yielded a mean result of 3.33. Chu (2006) found that facilitating meetings consumes about 30% of a department chair's time. Crowder's (2010) study showed that the ability to facilitate meetings was an essential skill for departmental leadership; he reported a mean of 3.06 for the leadership element of conducting meetings. According to Leaming (2007), "Well-run meetings are essential. They provide invaluable feedback, opportunities to lay out planned scenarios, and a forum to share information with others" (p. 3). At the college level, most department chairs will only convene meetings when important issues warrant substantial discussion (Chu, 2012). At the secondary level, department meetings occur according to established norms. Maintaining some kind of record keeping of items discussed and decisions agreed upon is important for all involved. Although meetings may be time-consuming, taxing, and even contentious, the department chair must work assiduously to maximize this valuable communication opportunity to achieve the departmental vision (Leaming, 2007).

Motivational skills. A significant trait of leadership entails possessing the ability to inspire others. Department chairs must be able to spark their members into action (Leaming, 2007). Leaders of departments must help galvanize members to work towards immediate and long-range objectives (Buller, 2012; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Leaming, 2007). Aziz et al.'s (2005) results yielded a mean of 3.63 for the department chair's ability to motivate department members and promote morale. This high result in Aziz et

al.'s (2005) study indicated that the university department chairs really valued their roles in motivating department members and viewed their efforts as highly crucial for effective leadership. The results of Crowder's (2010) survey showed motivational skills as somewhat important for a department chair's leadership success with a mean of 2.82 for this element, yet effectively motivating members to accept change requires department chairs to be more vigilant.

Managing change. A final leadership element essential in guiding department members through change requires department chairs to implement systematic plans to attain success (Leaming, 2007). Negotiating change can be a very disconcerting and disagreeable process, so department chairs must be adept in handling the resultant challenges that lie ahead. Leaders should embark upon change initiatives by examining the urgencies that require immediate attention (Ermeling, 2012). According to Leaming (2007) and Chu (2012), it is important for department chairs to have a willingness to really be open to change in order to motivate their department members. Aziz et al. (2005) found a mean score of 3.48 illustrating how important this ability is for effective chair leadership. Similarly, the results of Crowder's (2010) study cited that the ability to manage change was an essential part of effective department chair leadership. Crowder's study reported a mean of 3.06 for the leadership element of managing change. Department chairs must be able to anticipate and manage change, or their departments will not thrive.

The principles of leadership are not just applicable for college and universities. High school department chairs approach all of Crowder's (2010) leadership elements in very distinct ways, a reality discussed in the next section.

High School Department Chair Leadership

The present high school department chair structure evolved from necessity, and this framework led to the managerial and supervisory roles high schools have adopted. America's one-room schoolhouse population increased to group students according to models employed by colleges and universities (Cohen, Brawer, & Kisker 2003; Mirel, 2006). In 1893, the National Education Association (NEA) appointed Harvard University President Charles Elliot to lead the so-called Committee of Ten, and this panel made significant recommendations that affected the curriculum and governance of high schools (Mirel, 2006). According to Mirel (2006), "the Committee of Ten did suggest different programs of study for high schools and introduced the concept of electives to American high schools; its guiding principle is that all students should receive high-quality liberal arts education" (p. 2). Expanded course offerings increased the staffing needs of colleges and universities; thus, this population boom became a reality for high schools with the university model becoming a template in empowering teachers as leaders (Brosnan, 2003).

Many of the managerial tasks and supervisory roles of university and community college department chairs do apply to high school department chairs, yet for most the required duties have varied and have not always been made obvious (Kruskamp, 2003). A study by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD, 1948) reported a solid checklist of 11 general tasks that department chairs needed to perform and manage:

- Selecting textbooks;
- Scheduling department meetings;

- Initiating new teachers;
- Surveying instructional materials;
- Appraising and reorganizing courses;
- Requisitioning instructional supplies;
- Planning for efficient use of supplies and equipment;
- Preparing instructional materials;
- Planning for efficient use of supplies and equipment;
- Planning remedial instruction;
- Requisitioning repair or replacement of equipment; and
- Developing new courses. (p. 10)

These general tasks are consistent with Crowder's (2010) leadership elements, specifically scheduling meetings and organizing courses and supplies; however, absent from the list are the duties of facilitating meetings, the importance of communication, and the supervision of staff. Department chairs in both private and public schools approach all of the Crowder (2010) leadership elements and the ASCD (1948) general tasks in very distinct ways. In attempt to discuss these variances, addressed in the next section are individual private and public school nuances. The discussion begins with a review of the research concerning private school department chairs who serve in teacher leadership roles.

Private High School Department Chairs as Teacher Leaders

Private school is a term that can include both religious-based parochial schools and non-religious, independent ones. The terms "private" and "parochial," as used in the following, refer most often to Catholic schools but can also comprise any school with a

religious affiliation (Johnson, 2014). For the purposes of this discussion, private learning communities will be referred to generically as private schools. Private schools have separate governance and finances aside from public schools, plus they have the liberty to design their own missions, curricula, assessment protocols, and hiring standards without state interference (NAIS, 2014).

NAIS (2011) delineated seven crucial roles that department chairs in private schools should establish. These guidelines include the following:

1. The department chair serves as a communication liaison between faculty and administration.
2. The department chair serves as a leader in curriculum and pedagogy in his or her respective department.
3. In order to stay in “front of the curve” of new developments and the most current with local, regional, and national associations of teachers in their respective subjects, the chair attends local, regional, or national conferences in the discipline.
4. The department chair assists in hiring, training, evaluating, and supporting the faculty members in their respective department.
5. During meetings with the other department chairs and with administrators, the department chair serves as an advocate for one’s own department, while at the same time supporting the wider mission of the school.
6. The department chair facilitates department meetings that promote participation from all department members.

7. The department chair should have a purposeful approach to developing his or her own leadership and collaboration skills. (NAIS, 2011, para. 1-7)

Private schools often promote their most stellar teachers, individuals who have demonstrated expertise in their subjects, to department chair leadership positions so that they can assist colleagues in improving in both content and pedagogy (Hawley, 2007; Jones, 2002). The importance of promoting the right teachers to facilitate such work cannot be emphasized enough since ineffective department leaders can thwart departmental progress toward reaching desired goals. Private schools do not require department leaders to hold state certifications, and department chairs do not have to participate in any formal leadership preparation. The requirements generally desired in teaching and department chair applicants include advanced degrees in their content areas (Coleman, 2010; Kinsella, 2011). Private schools include 1,400 schools of varying sizes in the United States. Small school populations include 250 students or fewer; medium schools serve approximately 500 to 1,000; and large populations can include 1,000 or more students (NAIS, 2014).

The most suitable individuals to lead in department chair positions need effective communication skills in order to motivate their department members. Hofer's (2001) study of independent private school leaders, from schools of all sizes, uncovered that over 96% of the administrative and department leaders perceived that the ability to communicate was an imperative, along with 78% valuing the skill of management of change and innovation without bureaucratic interference. Kinsella's (2011) study of small, medium, and large independent schools showed that English department chairs had a mean score of 2.97 in terms of encouraging attendance and motivating department

members to participate in professional development. Kinsella's (2011) finding indicates that most chairs believed their effective communication skills were an essential element for their leadership roles.

Collaboration in private schools. The NAIS (2011) guidelines insist that department chairs promote collaborative practices within their departments. Kinsella's (2011) survey results of small, medium, and large independent school department chairs in four core subjects determined that "department heads are actively engaging in mentoring, observing, and working with the teachers in their departments" (p. 109). Hofer's (2001) study of independent schools of differing sizes revealed that over 89% of the leaders perceived that the ability to collaborate and delegate tasks was crucial for effective leadership. In grappling with any conflicts that might emerge, 72% in Hofer's (2001) study perceived that empathy was an important leadership trait that could resolve differences. Kinsella's (2011) survey required department chairs to rate their leadership participation levels on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 equating to high implementation and 1 designating no implementation. The survey results showed a mean score of 3.23 with regard to the feedback from English department chairs. English department leaders were highly involved in collaborating with their colleagues and were very contented with their duties (Kinsella, 2011).

Curriculum in private schools. There is no specific curriculum mandate for department chairs and their members in private schools to work together to make curricula decisions. Hofer's (2001) study of private school leaders showed that 89.4% of private school leaders valued the freedom to develop curriculum without administrative oversight. Kinsella's (2011) study of northeastern private school department chairs

yielded high mean scores of department chairs working together with their colleagues to develop curriculum. The survey results of the English department chairs in all northeastern private schools showed a mean score result of 3.51, which indicated that department chairs viewed their involvement with curriculum as an essential leadership responsibility (Kinsella, 2011). Scores of 3 or higher suggest greater importance. Kinsella (2011) found a mean score of 2.89 for the department chair's role in advancing innovative curriculum ideas, meaning that department leaders found their involvement as somewhat important.

The onus is on department chairs to work with colleagues in maintaining curriculum standards (Hawley, 2007). Private school curriculum varies from school to school since NAIS does not mandate a specific curriculum; however, NAIS (2014) encourages member schools to possibly explore curricula emphasizing global education, environmental studies, community service initiatives, and international baccalaureate studies. Educators in private schools often tend not to follow curricula that adhere as strictly to the subjects and standards of state tests since their students are not compelled to take such exams. The autonomy that private school department chairs and other leaders have can be detrimental in fostering too much teacher sovereignty. The consequence for students can be a disparate learning experience between teachers at the same level or subject area (Wiggins, 2011; Wirtz, 2007). Another leadership aspect for private school department chairs includes the ongoing expectation that they should be involved in evaluating classroom teachers.

Evaluation and hiring. Evaluating and supervising teachers' classroom performance is a major responsibility for private school department chairs (Kinsella,

2011; NAIS, 2011). Kinsella's (2011) survey results showed that English department chairs' involvement in supervising and evaluating department members was highly important. There is no universal evaluation model in private schools; however, many private schools have adopted evaluation models based on the characteristics of good teaching - a Charlotte Danielson framework (Hamlin, 2013). Danielson (1996) developed a "framework for professional practice" and posited an organized plan for teachers to use in their classrooms (p. 2). Danielson (1996) defined four domains of professional practice: "Planning and Preparation; The Classroom Environment; Instruction; and Professional Responsibilities" (pp. 3-4).

Additional responsibilities of private school chairs are hiring and recruiting (NAIS, 2011). The chance to hire members gives department chairs the opportunity to diversify their faculty and add more talented members (Bensimon et al., 2000). There are some negatives in regards to the hiring practices of private schools. Hofer's (2001) study revealed that 84% of surveyed leaders valued the importance of hiring diverse, multi-talented employees. Savini (2010) found evidence that some private schools exhibit unconscious bias and reject efforts to diversify their departments by failing to interview and hire teachers of color. Private schools have failed to shed their historical exclusivity and failed to adopt systematic hiring protocols (Savini, 2010). Effective department chair leadership requires leaders to be more open-minded and inclusive.

The preceding discussion highlighted the leadership roles of private school department chairs. In the following section, a review of the literature concerning the work of public school department chairs as teacher leaders is addressed.

Public High School Department Chairs as Teacher Leaders

Local school districts and their boards are responsible for governing public schools in the United States including determining the curricula and procedures that their schools must follow. Typically, schools within the same district abide by the same policies but regulations often differ between districts in the same state. Public school teachers and leaders must nearly universally hold state certifications, as determined by each individual state board of education (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). In response to state and federal mandates, public school teacher leaders generally collaborate to fulfill their multiple tasks, varied school missions, and curricular objectives (Marzano & Waters, 2009). Teacher leaders, such as department chairs, have come to understand the role they have in collaboration, and they find the practice is a valuable method to acquire solutions for achieving standards-based reforms and other school goals (Barth, 2013; Buffum et al., 2008; DuFour & Marzano, 2011; Sparks & Hursh, 2000). Marzano and Waters (2009) discussed how the standards movement in the 1990s led to greater collaboration because of the heightened focus on achievement and test scores. Since test scores became more publicly promulgated, schools sought better ways to engage teachers in the teaching and learning process, in order to help students achieve desired benchmarks. Many schools have turned to collaboration models to fulfill their organizational goals.

Collaboration in public schools. Collaboration in some public schools takes place in professional learning communities (PLCs) which are found in schools and districts that promote the concept of educators, not single individuals, working together to increase student learning (DuFour & Marzano, 2011). Collaboration is one of the three

big ideas of a PLC school. DuFour and Eaker (1998) provided “three big ideas that drive the PLC process” (p. 15). These ideas represent the following respective convictions about the purpose of collaboration: “to ensure that all students learn at high levels; to work collaboratively in a collective effort to meet the needs of each student; and to create a results orientation in order to know if students are learning” (DuFour & Marzano, 2009, p. 22).

Public schools that do not function as PLCs may still engage in collaborative practices, but the work is not as organized and continuous, resulting in inconsistent implementation; thus, such schools fail to achieve their goals (Mattos, 2008). According to DuFour and Eaker (1998), all teaching and learning in PLCs focuses on important tasks and issues designed to foster higher achievement levels. To build successful collaboration, the conditions required involve norms, trust, candid dialogues, transparent targets, and administrative backing (DuFour & Eaker, 1998; Wald & Castleberry, 2000).

Multiple case studies indicate that public school communities across the nation are systematically collaborating to implement PLC practices, and these efforts have been shown to increase student achievement levels (Crow, 2009; Eaker & Keating, 2012; Erkens & Twadell, 2012; Learning Forward, 2011; Wald & Castleberry, 2000). The Blue Valley Public School District, a district with 20,000 students in suburban Overland Park, Kansas, saw student proficiency on state assessments increase from a combined average of 76% in math and science in 2005 to over 95% by 2011, because of collaborative teacher leaders and their colleagues participating in PLC practices (Von Frank, 2009). A non-profit organization’s (American Productivity & Quality Center [APQC], 2008) study of 70 school districts in 25 states indicated that school leaders are collaborating and

utilizing data to alter their teaching practices to raise student achievement. The findings of the APQC study suggested that when school leaders promote a collaborative, data-driven culture focused on unceasing improvement, greater student achievement occurs (Sanchez, Kline, & Laird, 2009).

Leaders within a PLC understand that the majority of their time should center on four questions vital in fostering student improvement:

1. What is it we expect students to learn?
2. How will we know if our students are learning?
3. How will we respond when students don't learn?
4. How will we respond when students have learned? (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, & Many, 2006, p. 119)

These collaborative questions are important toward guiding teams in ensuring student attainment, regardless of the outside circumstances.

Several studies reveal that collaboration is essential to such improvement.

Burnette's (1988) survey results of large suburban Fairfax, Virginia schools comprised of student populations in which each school had 1,000 or more students demonstrated that 66.7% of department chairs collaborate and facilitate curriculum leadership. Wettersten's (1992) study of department chairs from large urban and suburban Midwestern public high schools of more than 1,000 students found that 69% of the department chairs engaged in collaborative, collegial practices in their leadership roles. This high percentage result indicates that department chairs perceive that collaboration has tremendous value.

Kruskamp's (2003) qualitative study of Georgia department chairs from three large high schools with student populations greater than 1,000 revealed that department

chairs are highly involved in collaborating with teachers as they manage multiple tasks. Onukwugha's (2013) study of a large public New Jersey high school of over 1,000 students demonstrated that when one department implements collaborative departmental practices and another fails to do so, the result is high achievement for the students of the collaborative teachers versus lower results for those whose teachers do not function in a collaborative fashion. Public school leaders who promote collaboration and operate as PLCs are more likely to achieve successful results (DuFour & Marzano, 2011). To acquire an in-depth understanding of the collaboration practices of public school department chairs, a discussion of curriculum has relevance.

Curriculum in public schools. Efforts to achieve accountability through standardization have affected the role of department chairs in public schools, resulting in measures that have produced better student achievement and higher test scores (Barth, 2013). These initiatives are important, as they have heightened focus on key aspects students must learn. The Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSS) is such an example. Common Core is the dominant curriculum focus for today's public schools (ASCD, 2012). Common Core is a states' initiative that originated from the 2009 National Governor's Association meeting and the Council of Chief State School Officers (ASCD, 2012). The initiative is an improvement strategy stemming from No Child Left Behind (NCLB) designed to assist teachers and leaders in their efforts to increase student achievement (ASCD, 2012; Phillips & Wong, 2013). In addition, the principal goal of CCSS is to ensure that students are successful in obtaining the skills they need for college and beyond (Rothman, 2012). The Common Core creates a higher level of learning of the standards and entails greater focus on essential English and math skills that students

should know for each grade level (ASCD, 2012; Rothman, 2012). A top priority for the U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, is to ensure that all states adopt CCSS (ASCD, 2012). As of 2014, 45 states adopted the new Common Core standards (Common Core, 2014).

To implement CCSS effectively, school leaders will need to ensure that teachers implement instruction that will promote the success of all students. Department chairs can play a role in evaluating and hiring teachers to accomplish such goals.

Evaluation and hiring. Allowing teacher leaders to participate in the evaluation and hiring process would bring full circle the intent of collaborative practices that support the work of teachers (Marshall, 2013). Although public school chairs have managerial oversight over department members, rarely have they participated in evaluations in the way that private school chairs do for a number of reasons (Kruskamp, 2003). In most public high schools, department chairs have a very limited role because organizational barriers such as teachers' unions have prevented both department chairs and other teacher leaders from participating in this process (Toch, 2008). Licensed administrators conduct teacher evaluations in most public schools (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Johnson & Fiarman, 2012; Toch, 2008). In 2012, some progressive districts managed to reach agreements with their teachers' unions and started to implement successful peer review and teacher leader evaluation processes, but the number of schools with such programs is limited (Johnson & Fiarman, 2012). An emerging Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) structure is gaining momentum in 13 states (Darling-Hammond, 2013). The PAR evaluation structure encourages teacher leaders to serve as mentors who participate with administrators in executing some aspects of the mentees' evaluations (Darling-

Hammond, 2013; Marshall, 2013). Additionally, teacher hiring is a necessary function for private school department chairs, but public schools may exempt chairs from the process, a fact leading to a certain disconnection between leaders and new hires (Clement, 2013; Stronge & Hindman, 2003). Most public school districts rely on their human resource departments and school administrators to handle the process from start to finish, although some districts are beginning to rethink their practices and are involving department chairs and members in the hiring (Clement, 2013). Teacher involvement in the hiring process is another significant way to value the expertise of teachers and promote teacher leadership (Clement, 2013). Effective leadership in the 21st century can foster an improved school climate and greater student achievement results (TLEC, 2014). School leaders must keep this objective in mind when making hiring decisions and evaluating staff to ensure that the best educators are in place.

Leadership for the 21st Century

Department chairs in both public and private schools are leading in 21st century schools, but the new focus for administrators also includes the leadership efforts of an expanded network of other teachers who are leaders. Twenty-first century school leaders will not govern in the same way as their predecessors. All schools, both public and private, need innovative leadership to prepare students for their educational goals. According to renowned educational researchers and the National Education Commission, school improvement can only be accomplished by embracing new leadership structures (Copland & Boatright, 2006). New leadership structures will help school leaders achieve wide-ranging, instructional objectives that allow teachers to serve as leaders, instead of constantly relying on administrators alone to initiate school goals (Copland & Boatright,

2006; Curtis, 2009; DuFour, DuFour, & Eaker, 2008; Fraser, 2008; TLEC, 2014).

According to TLEC (2014), harnessing teacher leadership is essential in maximizing the talents of teachers and the capacities of students. TLEC (2014) emerged from a cadre of diverse, committed educators who ultimately developed quintessential requirements to frame the vision for teacher leadership. TLEC's (2014) standards include seven domains emphasizing the extent of teacher leadership:

- Domain I: Fostering a Collaborative Culture to Support Educator Development and Student Learning
- Domain II: Accessing and Using Research to Improve Practice and Student Learning
- Domain III: Promoting Professional Learning for Continuous Improvement
- Domain IV: Facilitating Improvements in Instruction and Student Learning
- Domain V: Promoting the Use of Assessment and Data for School and District Improvement
- Domain VI: Improving Outreach and Collaboration with Families and Community
- Domain VII: Advocating for Student Learning and Profession (p. 9)

These domains provide powerful guidance to frame the work of teacher leaders, and they align with the philosophical tenets of schools that function as PLCs. The parameters can serve as a concrete, strategic roadmap to empower and assist teacher leaders towards achieving school improvement goals, and such efforts will lead to teachers serving in other realms beyond their classrooms (TLEC, 2014).

Teachers want to be empowered as leaders, and a majority of teachers feel valued to serve in such a capacity (Barth, 2013; Fraser, 2008). The number of teachers who are currently leading in schools and desiring to lead is impressive. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company (MetLife) (2013) showed “51% of teachers have a formal leadership role in their schools such as department chair or teacher mentor, and 51% of teachers are interested in teaching part-time and combining with another responsibility” (p. 8). According to Sacks (2013), teachers are achieving “real-time” results by advancing teacher-led ideas to reform their school communities. Teacher leadership can improve instruction and student achievement in all schools (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2013; Barth, 2013; Collay, 2013; Jaquith, 2013). Over a 5-year period from 2006 to 2011, Collay (2013) studied the successful leadership efforts of 50 teacher leaders in difficult urban school settings. The results of her findings validated that teachers are indeed taking on leadership roles by modeling lessons and collaborating with their colleagues to strengthen student learning.

Capacity building. In spite of all these leadership gains discussed in the previous sections, there is still a need to ensure that schools are developing future department chairs and other teacher leaders. Administrative leaders have to help cultivate the right people to fulfill the roles of chairs and achieve desired reforms (Erkens & Twadell, 2012; Fullan, 2008; TLEC, 2014; Wald & Castleberry, 2000). To improve teaching and learning, leaders must recognize the benefits of using a broad range of talents to achieve those goals. According to Wald and Castleberry (2000), “Through capacity-building activities, a school begins to close the gap between its current abilities and needed capabilities” (p. 24). Administrators must foster capacity-building in others, plus they

must model the fact that continuous professional growth matters, and facilitate opportunities for colleagues to learn needed skills to accomplish their responsibilities (Erkens & Twadell, 2012; Jaquith, 2013).

Principals should encourage professional growth to cultivate a community of potential leaders (Childs-Bowen, 2006; Jaquith, 2013; TLEC, 2014; Wald & Castleberry, 2000). Jaquith (2013) identified five core practices that leaders need to implement in building instructional capacity: “(a) create the right structures, (b) create the right conditions, (c) create the right expectations, (d) create the right kind of teams, and (e) create a learning focus” (p. 58). Leaders must set good examples and not set poor ones for their followers as they prepare them to assume leadership roles, and teachers need to witness their leaders participating with them in professional development trainings, conferences, and dialogues (Erkens & Twadell, 2012). The capacity-building process must be an ongoing commitment by many to reach shared visions.

Training is important because an inadequately trained department chair can harm a department’s capacity building (Crowder, 2010). Unfortunately, there is limited systematic, district-sponsored department chair training to assist and support leadership needs at the secondary level (Bliss, Fahrney, & Steffy, 1996; Feeney, 2009). However, school districts are developing coaching academies to encourage teachers’ capacities as leaders (Mayer, 2013). According to Mayer’s (2013) description of the formal program, “Coaching Academy’s goal is to build a cadre of instructional coaches who can promote increased support for teachers to navigate twenty-first century educational demands” (p. 31). The goal of Coaching Academy is to help teachers understand how they can share their talents with their colleagues by sharing model lessons and providing increased

support and contact with novice teachers. The extensive tasks associated with the role may indeed overwhelm teacher leaders and department chairs, but training and professional development can make a tremendous difference in their leaders' effectiveness. Professional development may include shadowing opportunities with experienced department chairs and simulation experiences (Crowder, 2010). Finally, leaders should continually possess the ardent desire to expand their capacities for growth, as well as support the advancement of their colleagues (Jaquith, 2013). Such efforts will ultimately yield achievement dividends for educators and their students.

Effective leadership styles. As indicated previously, the importance of leadership is a critical factor, thus leadership style is of special interest. The two leadership styles shown to be most effective among teacher leaders are democratic and transformational, but between these the most successful chairs employ a democratic style, allowing for participatory decision-making (Elmore, 2000; Green, 2005; King, 1991; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Lindholm, 1999). According to Choi (2007), democratic leadership, also known as distributed leadership, is a style of governance where leaders seek to involve participants in coming up with solutions to solve shared problems. Democratic leadership embodies "sacrifice, courage, symbolism, participation, and vision" (Choi, 2007, p. 244). Comparatively, transformational leadership is a style of leadership where "followers feel trust, admiration, and respect toward the leader, and they are motivated to do more than they originally expected to do" (Yukl, 2012, p. 322).

Effective leaders recognize the benefits of listening to diverse viewpoints, employ a democratic style, encourage collaboration, and are not condescending to their subordinates (Crowder, 2010; Green, 2005). The work that departments must accomplish

is extensive, so it is only logical to distribute the tasks among members to reach common goals (Feeney, 2009). Leaders must not rely on their own talents and ideas to complete the work at hand. Research indicates that a democratic style of governance is highly endorsed because participants feel their opinions are respected in decision-making (Choi, 2007; Green, 2005; Ryan, 2014). Notable leadership programs such as those offered at North Carolina State University, The Chair Academy, and the Administrative Leadership Institute, all highlight democratic leadership as one of the best practices (Lindholm, 1999).

Ryan (2014) endorsed the benefits of democratic leadership asserting that the style fosters problem-solving and positive relationships among colleagues. When subordinates are involved participants in decision-making, they feel a greater sense of commitment, overall job satisfaction, and are less resistant to change (Green, 2005; Lucas, 2000; Miller 1999). A study of 140 teams of teachers from public schools of varying sizes in Israel showed a positive correlation between teacher inventiveness, empowerment, and satisfaction when leaders employed democratic leadership styles (Somech, 2005). Democratic leadership does promote elevated levels of morale for most employees (Choi, 2007). Lambert-Knowles' (2013) study of 136 small and medium charter schools in the United States revealed that instructional leaders viewed democratic-style distributed leadership practices of the highest importance in inspiring team efficiency. Lambert-Knowles (2013) defined public charter schools with 600 or fewer students as small, and those with 600 to 1,300 students as medium. Larger schools were not considered in the Lambert-Knowles (2013) study, though Curtis' (2009)

examination of four large California schools indicated that distributed practices were essential to sustain continuation of learning goals supported by school communities.

The transformational leadership style is also an efficient way to lead (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). Transformational leaders are able to appeal to the morals and ethics of their followers in motivating performance (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). Transformational leaders articulate high-quality missions and are savvy in inspiring followers to contribute their best efforts (Leithwood & Louis, 2012). They are also gifted in making employees feel valued and integral to the organization's success (Geijsel, Slegers, Leithwood, & Jantzi, 2003; Lucas, 1994). Transformational leadership can be a successful way to lead, though it is not an easy method (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). Case studies of four large, urban Wisconsin high schools with student populations greater than 1,000 illustrated that schools thrived under the guidance of transformational principals who inspired greater teacher satisfaction levels, productivity, and teacher leadership (Klar, 2008). The principals also successfully guided the leadership efforts of their department chairs (Klar, 2008). Lunenburg and Ornstein (2012) discussed large-scale studies of transformational leadership and found that followers were extremely satisfied and highly motivated by leaders who employed such governance. Transformational leadership is valuable because it inspires employees to achieve greater personal goals for themselves and their workplaces (Bass, 1990; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012; Yukl, 2012). To provide insight about the differences in leadership styles between genders, the next section provides a review of the current literature.

Gender. In virtually all work spheres, including education, business, and politics, the percentage of men in leadership positions exceeds those of women (Chinn, 2011). In leadership positions, most women prefer a democratic or transformational style; whereas, men are more prone to be aggressive and autocratic (Chinn, 2011; Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Studies by Czech (2008) and Baal (2011) established that more female than male leaders govern in transformational ways. Women over the age of 50 with at least seven years of leadership experience governed in more transformational ways than males (Baal, 2011). Czech's (2008) results confirmed that female leaders had greater nurturing personalities versus males. Baal's (2011) study of science department chairs in large Chicago public schools with 1,000 or more students uncovered that although both genders serve as transformational leaders, females presented greater transformational traits such as "encouraging with the heart" and "enabling others to act" (p. 128). In reference to a study of the leadership preferences of 100 women, Chinn (2011) found that most women wanted to be more collaborative and transformational leaders but worried about how such qualities might diminish their authority in the workplace. In contrast, studies by Lipman-Blumen (2000) and Robinson (2008) indicate there are no significant differences in the leadership styles between male and female leaders' perceptions of their leadership styles between males and females. Boone's (1997) study of 1,048 superintendents from small rural schools detected statistically significant differences between male and female leaders' perceptions of their leadership practices. The results of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) showed that women engaged in behaviors of "challenging the process" and "modeling the way" more than men (Boone, 1997, p. 10). A study of 564 principals from secondary-level schools of varying sizes affirmed that

male and females generally lead in a comparable fashion; however, females emphasized interpersonal relationship strategies more than men (Eckman, 2004). Notably, there are no differences between men and women leaders when examining their managerial and relational styles (Chinn, 2011). With both genders, a principal focal point is the emphasis on the tasks at hand. In terms of perceptions regarding leadership styles and gender, some female leaders might be judged as weak for leading in a participative style or deemed too audacious if they lead in an autocratic fashion (Bass, 1990; Chinn, 2011). Neither men nor women want to be regarded as soft leaders but instead want to be viewed as assertive managers (Hanson, 1995). Effective school leaders want to facilitate the best leadership techniques possible, in order to accomplish highly desired school goals.

Summary

This chapter contained literature related to the leadership styles and roles of secondary department chairs including how the department chair position originated at the university level. Furthermore, this chapter included a description of leadership elements and how department chairs in public and private schools implement their roles. The chapter included a review of teacher leadership in the 21st century and how reform mandates and national tests have influenced teacher leaders' functions. This chapter provided a review of curriculum, collaborative practices, and the essential knowledge, skills, and abilities department chairs should possess. Finally, the chapter concluded with a discussion of leadership styles and gender differences in leadership. Chapter three includes an explanation of the methods used to address the research questions outlined in chapter one.

Chapter Three

Methods

The purpose of this quantitative non-experimental study was to compare English department chairs' self-perceptions of their roles and leadership styles in the greater Missouri and Kansas metropolitan areas. In addition, the perceptions of English department chairs in schools of the central states were explored. The purpose of this study was to identify the self-perceived roles and attributes of English department chairs and the extent to which they use the knowledge, skills, and abilities they view as important to their effectiveness as leaders. More specifically, the purpose of this study was to examine the extent of relationships between particular facets of KSAs and demographic characteristics, such as leadership style, school type, school size, and gender. Facets of KSAs included facilitation of conflict resolution, communication with department members, ability to delegate, supervision of staff, working collaboratively towards a common goal, implementation of department curriculum planning, and management of multiple roles. This study was conducted to explore the relationship between self-perceived KSAs and managing change, further comparing this relationship among groups in the variables of leadership style, school type, gender, and school size.

Presented in this chapter is a review of the study's research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, and the measurement, validity and reliability of the instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations.

Research Design

A quantitative non-experimental research design was used for the study to analyze department chairs' self-perceived views of their roles and leadership styles. According to Creswell (2014), "quantitative research is an approach for testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables. These variables, in turn, can be measured, typically on instruments, so that numbered data can be analyzed using statistical procedures" (p. 4). Data were collected via an electronic survey. The variables included the department chairs' self-perceived abilities and uses of the KSAs and leadership elements, leadership styles, school type, gender, and school size.

Population and Sample

The population consisted of 1,324 English department chairs in 13 Midwestern states (Michigan, Ohio, Minnesota, Arkansas, Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Kentucky, West Virginia, Kansas, Missouri, and Iowa). The schools varied in size and location, with populations ranging from as small as 50 students to as large as 1,400. There is variance in terms of diversity, socioeconomic status, and graduation rates among the schools. The sample included department chairs who responded to the survey.

Sampling Procedures

Purposive sampling was used in this study. There were 1,324 department chairs identified in 13 states from the greatschools.org website and the *Independent Schools Association Directory*. English department chairs were subsequently located on their respective schools' websites. Regarding purposive sampling, Lunenburg and Irby (2008) proposed:

Purposive sampling involves selecting a sample based on the researcher's experience or knowledge of the group to be sampled. ...Clear criteria provide a basis for describing and defending purposive samples. (p. 175)

The sample for this study included those department chairs who completed the survey in its entirety ($n = 81$).

Instrumentation

One survey was used to collect data from the participants concerning perceptions of their KSAs and leadership practices (see Appendix A). The survey included a combination of modified versions of Crowder's (2010) Knowledge, Skill, or Ability (KSA) survey (see Appendix B) and Spaid and Parson's (1999) Leadership Paradigm Instrument (see Appendix C). The final survey included 53 items.

Crowder's (2010) KSA instrument was appropriate for use in the present study. The instrument measured the KSAs that department chairs may implement for effective work with teams, which aligned with a purpose of the current study to examine the roles and responsibilities of department chairs and their capacities for participative leadership (Stevens & Campion, 1999). The original KSA instrument included 20 items on which participants ranked their philosophical beliefs about key leadership skills, as well as their personal implementation levels. The KSA instrument's 20 items were modified so that respondents did not make value judgments about the KSAs important for the role; yet, as an alternative, they were invited to comment about the extent to which they implemented KSAs in their leadership roles. The modified KSA items include questions 2 through 21 of the survey (see Appendix A).

Spaid and Parson's (1999) Leadership Paradigm was used in the current study to obtain empirical data about the leadership practices self-perceived by department chairs. The original instrument contained 13 items that required participants to rank their leadership beliefs and actions. Spaid and Parson's (1999) Leadership Paradigm measured the leadership actions that department chairs may implement for collaborative work with their department members, which aligned with a purpose of the current study to examine the leadership dispositions of chairs and their capacities to be compromising, flexible, and democratic in their governance. The items were modified to focus on the department chairs' implementation of leadership practices, not their assumptions. The modified leadership items include questions 22 through 34 of the survey (see Appendix A).

Measurement. The survey was divided into two sections and contained 53 items total. Respondents were required to identify their leadership styles as autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, or transformational. The remainder of the first section included 46 multiple-choice questions about leadership practices to measure the KSAs of English department chairs. The format for the first section of items 2 through 21 contained Likert-type scale items for respondents to indicate self-perceptions of their leadership actions and abilities: 1 = *Do not*, 2 = *Somewhat*, and 3 = *Definitely*. Items 22 through 40 required respondents to indicate their levels of agreement with leadership practices. The second section of items 41 through 53 contained seven items that included a combination of multiple-mark and open-response options to collect demographic information from the participants concerning their gender, school location, years of experience, school type, and special training qualifications.

Validity and reliability. Lunenburg and Irby (2008) defined validity as “the degree to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure” (p. 181), and reliability as “the degree to which an instrument consistently measures whatever it is measuring” (p. 182). Crowder (2010) found the KSA instrument to be valid and reliable to examine department chairs’ perceptions. He proposed the following:

The input gathered from my subset Chairs and Deans, who were chosen to capture as many demographics as I felt I could muster, dictated the criteria discussed in the KSA study used by all the Deans and Chairs. So the KSA instrument was reliable and valid because it was developed using the input of institution Chairs and Deans that were in multiple ways applicable to the diversity of the Chair and Dean population. (J. Crowder, personal communication, September 27, 2012)

Crowder’s (2010) study included a sample of 30 Academic Division Deans and Department Chairs at Riverside Community College. Crowder (2010) obtained evidence of content validity by gathering input from department leaders of four academic divisions: English and reading, math, science and health, and the business and technologies divisions. He used maximum variation purposeful sampling to identify the interview participants and conducted semi-structured interviews to obtain their input and perceptions of the KSA. Furthermore, to ensure the validity of the KSA, Crowder employed “critique checklist,” triangulation member checking, and peer examination techniques (Crowder, 2010). In effort to secure validity, Crowder (2010) performed triangulation methods by examining public documents pertaining to the published duties for Riverside Community College department chairs. His member checking procedures

involved continuous correspondence with interview participants concerning the interview data's coding and analysis. Moreover, fellow peers in Crowder's (2010) doctoral cohort functioned as peer examiners to ensure internal validity.

Spaid and Parson's (1999) Leadership Paradigm is a Situational Leadership Model constructed to learn more about leadership practices of community college leaders. To establish the validity of the Spaid and Parson (1999) Leadership Paradigm, Spaid and Parson utilized triangulation member checking involving content experts and peer examination techniques. According to Spaid, the Leadership Paradigm co-creator, "when I developed this instrument, I had a panel of experts review the items, so you can say it has content validity" (R. Spaid, personal communication, November 20, 2012). Spaid and Parson (1999) surveyed 39 community college administrators to learn more about their leadership dispositions. The instrument yielded results and she concluded, overall, the Leadership Paradigm was a valid predictor of specific leadership behaviors (Spaid & Parson, 1999). Reliability analysis of the survey data obtained for this study was conducted prior to data analysis.

Data Collection Procedures

The initial step before data collection commenced was approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Baker University (see Appendix D). The approved IRB to grant permission to conduct this study is located in Appendix E. Following IRB approval, direct e-mail requests were sent to Crowder (2010) and Spaid and Parson (1999) and obtained permissions to use their instruments (see Appendix F).

English department chairs in each of the high schools received an e-mail invitation with a survey link for participation. Using the Google Docs platform, an e-

mail letter of invitation was sent to the population of 1,324 secondary-level English department chairs (see Appendix G). The letter delineated the purpose of the study and assurance of confidentiality. Respondents were advised that by clicking the link to the survey, they were indicating their consent to participate. The participants had one week to complete the survey. In addition to the initial invitation, within the 1-week span to submit responses, the group received a second reminder e-mail (see Appendix H). To collect additional responses, the population was sent an additional e-mail advising that the survey window would remain open for two more weeks. After the 2-week survey window was closed the data was downloaded and entered into IBM® SPSS® Statistics Faculty Pack 22 for analyses.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

This study used a quantitative non-experimental research design for data collection and analysis. The following research questions and hypotheses guided the data analysis for this study:

RQ1. To what extent is there a difference in the knowledge, skills, and abilities among English department chairs' leadership styles?

H1. There is a difference in the knowledge, skills, and abilities among English department chairs' leadership styles.

An independent-samples *t* test was conducted to test H1. The analysis was used to examine differences in the knowledge, skills, and abilities among leadership styles. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ2. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' facilitation of conflict resolution and school type?

H2. There is a relationship between English department chairs' facilitation of conflict resolution and school type.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted to test H2. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ3. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' communication with department members and gender?

H3. There is a relationship between English department chairs' communication with department members and gender.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted to test H3. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ4. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' ability to delegate and school size?

H4. There is a relationship between English department chairs' ability to delegate and school size.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted to test H4. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ5. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' supervision of staff and leadership style?

H5. There is a relationship between English department chairs' supervision of staff and leadership style.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted to test H5. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ6. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' working collaboratively towards a common goal and school type?

H6. There is a relationship between English department chairs' working collaboratively towards a common goal and school type.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted to test H6. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ7. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' implementation of department curriculum planning and gender?

H7. There is a relationship between English department chairs' implementation of department curriculum planning and gender.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted to test H7. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ8. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' management of multiple roles and school size?

H8. There is a relationship between English department chairs' management of multiple roles and school size.

A chi-square test of independence was conducted to test H8. The observed frequencies were compared to those expected by chance. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ9. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and accepting compromise as a means of achieving organizational goals?

H9. There is a relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and accepting compromise as a means of achieving organizational goals.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and perceived use of accepting compromise as a means to achieve organizational goals. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance of the correlation coefficient. The level of significance was set at .05.

RQ10. To what extent are the relationships between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change different between groups in the following variables: leadership style, school type, gender, and school size?

H10. The relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change differs by leadership style.

H11. The relationship between English department chairs' perceived knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change differs by school type.

H12. The relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change differs by gender.

H13. The relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change differs by school size.

Fisher's z tests were conducted to examine hypotheses 10-13. The two sample correlations for each of the four hypotheses were compared between groups of each demographic variable. The level of significance was set at .05.

Limitations

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) reported, "Limitations are factors that may have an effect on the interpretation of the findings or on the generalizability of the results" (p. 133). This study has the following limitations:

1. Some invitations were sent to principals to invite their department chairs to participate. Possibly not all department chairs were contacted or notified of the survey opportunity.
2. The survey respondents self-reported their information, so their responses may or may not be truthful.

Summary

Provided in this chapter was an overview of this quantitative non-experimental study. This chapter included a review of the study's research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, measurement, validity, and reliability of the instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations. Chapter four includes the results of the study that came forth from the completed surveys of the purposive sample.

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this study was to identify the self-perceived roles and attributes of English department chairs, and to determine the extent to which they use the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) they view as important to their effectiveness as leaders. More specifically, the purpose of this study was to examine the extent of relationships between particular facets of KSAs and demographic characteristics, such as leadership style, school type, school size, and gender. The following tests were used to investigate the research hypotheses: an independent-samples *t* test, chi-square tests of independence, Pearson correlations, and Fisher's *z* tests. This chapter consists of the descriptive statistics of the sample and the hypothesis testing results.

The results of the reliability analyses of the 20 modified items from Crowder's (2010) Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities instrument, and the 19 modified items from Spaid and Parson's (1999) Leadership Paradigm were .915 and .806, respectively. The leadership survey demonstrated strong internal consistency for the sample of participants in this study.

Descriptive Statistics

A Google Docs survey link was sent to 1,324 department chairs. Not only did the survey include department chairs in the states of Missouri and Kansas, but central states including Michigan, Ohio, Minnesota, Arkansas, Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Iowa. Eighty-one surveys were fully completed for the study, resulting in a response rate of 6.1%.

The preferred leadership style of the department chairs who responded included 81.5% who indicated a preference for democratic style, while 18.5% of the department chairs selected a transformational style. Eighty-one department chairs reported on the types of schools where they lead. The majority of respondents (55.6%) reported working in public schools. The remaining (44.4%) indicated leading in private schools. The gender of the participating department chairs included more female than male department chairs, with 69.1% identifying themselves as women and 30.9% indicating they were males. The sizes of the participating schools are illustrated in Table 3. Of the 81 department chairs who participated, the majority (37%) reported working in schools with populations less than 250 students.

Table 3

School Size

Student Population	<i>N</i>	%
Less than 250	30	37.0
251-500	24	29.6
501-1000	18	22.2
More than 1000	9	11.1
Total	81	100.0

The classifications of the schools are shown in Table 4. The majority (42%) of the respondents identified their schools as rural settings.

Table 4

School Classification

Type	<i>N</i>	%
Rural	34	42.0
Urban	24	29.6
Suburban	23	28.4
Total	81	100.0

Eighty-one department chairs from 11 states responded to the survey (see Table 5). The majority of department chairs (40.7%) were in Missouri, while 35.8% were in Kansas.

Table 5

Location of Respondents

State	<i>N</i>	%
Arkansas	1	1.2
Illinois	5	6.2
Indiana	2	2.5
Kansas	29	35.8
Kentucky	3	3.7
Michigan	1	1.2
Minnesota	1	1.2
Missouri	33	40.7
Nebraska	1	1.2
Ohio	4	4.9
Wisconsin	1	1.2
Total	81	100.0

Eighty-one respondents reported on the number of years they have worked as department chairs (see Table 6). Fifteen department chairs reported serving in the leadership role for one year or less. The majority of respondents (39.5%) reported working as department chairs for two to five years.

Table 6

Years Served as Department Chair

Number of Years	<i>N</i>	%
1 Year or Less	15	18.5
2 to 5 Years	32	39.5
6 to 10 Years	21	25.9
More than 10 Years	13	16.0
Total	81	100.0

Eighty-one department chairs responded to the item concerning how they obtained their department chair positions (see Table 7). The majority of respondents (59.3%) obtained their positions via administrative appointments.

Table 7

Methods of Obtaining Department Chair Position

Method	<i>N</i>	%
Principal/Administrator Selected	48	59.3
Volunteered/My Turn	25	30.9
Elected	8	9.9
Total	81	100.0

Most department chairs (59.3%) reported having no special training or qualifications prior to accepting the role. Thirty-three participants (40.7%) indicated having some special training and qualifications for their positions.

Hypothesis Testing

This section contains the results of the hypothesis testing to examine the 10 research questions of the study. The research questions are restated along with corresponding hypothesis statements. The level of significance was set at .05 for each analysis.

RQ1. To what extent is there a difference in the knowledge, skills, and abilities among English department chairs' leadership styles?

H1. There is a difference in the knowledge, skills, and abilities among English department chairs' leadership styles.

The results of the independent-samples *t* test indicated a statistically significant difference between the two values, $t = -1.692$, $df = 79$, $p = .095$. The sample mean for the democratic group ($M = 1.24$, $SD = .411$) was lower than the sample mean for the transformational group ($M = 1.44$, $SD = .423$). This marginally statistically significant difference suggests that the self-perceived KSAs were not equal within the two identified styles of democratic and transformational. This supports H1.

RQ2. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' facilitation of conflict resolution and school type?

H2. There is a relationship between English department chairs' facilitation of conflict resolution and school type?

The results of the chi-square test of independence indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 6.571$, $df = 2$, $p < .05$. See Table 8 for the observed and expected frequencies. This result suggests that more private school department chairs somewhat or definitely facilitate conflict

resolution than what was expected; by contrast, fewer public school department chairs somewhat or definitely facilitate conflict resolution than what was expected, which supports H2.

Table 8

Observed and Expected Frequencies of Conflict Resolution by School Type (n = 81)

School Type		Do Not Facilitate	Somewhat Facilitates	Definitely Facilitates
Public	Observed	16.0	14.0	15.0
	Expected	11.1	17.2	16.7
Private	Observed	4.0	17.0	15.0
	Expected	8.9	13.8	13.3

RQ3. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' communication with department members and gender?

H3. There is a relationship between English department chairs' communication with department members and gender.

The results of the chi-square test of independence indicated there is not a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 2.00$, $df = 1$, $p = .157$. See Table 9 for the observed and expected frequencies. This result suggests there is no difference from what was expected in how male and female department chairs communicate with department members, which does not support H3.

Table 9

*Observed and Expected Frequencies of Communication with
Department Members by Gender (n = 81)*

Gender		Somewhat Effectively Communicates	Definitely Effectively Communicates
Male	Observed	8.0	17.0
	Expected	5.6	19.4
Female	Observed	10.0	46.0
	Expected	12.4	43.6

RQ4. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' ability to delegate and school size?

H4. There is a relationship between English department chairs' ability to delegate and school size.

The results of the chi-square test of independence indicated there is not a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 4.62$, $df = 6$, $p = .593$. See Table 10 for the observed and expected frequencies. This result suggests there is no difference from what was expected in how department leaders delegate tasks among school sizes, which does not support H4.

Table 10

Observed and Expected Frequencies of Delegating Tasks by School Size (n = 81)

School Size		Does Not Delegate Tasks	Somewhat Delegate Tasks	Definitely Delegate Tasks
Less than 250	Observed	5.0	14.0	11.0
	Expected	4.1	11.5	14.4
251-500	Observed	4.0	6.0	14.0
	Expected	3.3	9.2	11.6
501-1000	Observed	1.0	8.0	9.0
	Expected	2.4	6.9	8.7
More than 1000	Observed	1.0	3.0	5.0
	Expected	1.2	3.4	4.3

RQ5. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' supervision of staff and leadership style?

H5. There is a relationship between English department chairs' supervision of staff and leadership style.

The results of the chi-square test of independence indicated there is not a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 2.132$, $df = 2$, $p = .344$. See Table 11 for the observed and expected frequencies. This result suggests no difference from what was expected in how department chairs, regardless of leadership style, supervise staff, which does not support H5.

Table 11

*Observed and Expected Frequencies of Supervision of Staff Skill
by Leadership Styles (n = 81)*

Leadership Style		Do Not Supervise	Somewhat Supervise	Definitely Supervise
Democratic	Observed	17.0	27.0	22.0
	Expected	16.3	25.3	24.4
Transformational	Observed	3.0	4.0	8.0
	Expected	3.7	5.7	5.6

RQ6. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs working collaboratively towards a common goal and school type?

H6. There is a relationship between English department chairs' working collaboratively towards a common goal and school type.

The results of the chi-square test of independence indicated there is not a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 1.539$, $df = 2$, $p = .463$. See Table 12 for the observed and expected frequencies. This result suggests no difference from what was expected in how public and private school English department chairs collaborate, which does not support H6.

Table 12

Observed and Expected Frequencies of Collaboration Use by School Type (n = 81)

School Type		Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree
Public	Observed	0.0	18.0	27.0
	Expected	0.6	16.7	27.8
Private	Observed	1.0	12.0	23.0
	Expected	0.4	13.3	22.2

RQ7. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' implementation of department curriculum planning and gender?

H7. There is a relationship between English department chairs' implementation of department curriculum planning and gender.

The results of the chi-square test of independence indicated no statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 2.923$, $df = 2$, $p = .232$. See Table 13 for the observed and expected frequencies. This result suggests no difference from what was expected in how male and female department chairs implement curriculum planning, which does not support H7.

Table 13

Observed and Expected Frequencies of Curriculum Planning by Gender (n = 81)

Gender		Does Not Implement	Somewhat Implements	Definitely Implements
Male	Observed	0.0	9.0	16.0
	Expected	1.9	8.6	14.5
Female	Observed	6.0	19.0	31.0
	Expected	4.1	19.4	32.5

RQ8. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' management of multiple roles and school size?

H8. There is a relationship between English department chairs' management of multiple roles and school size.

The results of the chi-square test of independence indicated there is not a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected values, $\chi^2 = 8.075$, $df = 6$, $p = .233$. See Table 14 for the observed and expected frequencies. This result suggests there is no difference from what was expected in how department chairs, regardless of school size, manage multiple roles, which does not support H8.

Table 14

Observed and Expected Frequencies of Managing Multiple Roles by School Size (n = 81)

School Size		Does Not Manage	Somewhat Manages	Definitely Manages
Less than 250	Observed	2.0	12.0	16.0
	Expected	2.2	9.6	18.1
251-500	Observed	3.0	7.0	14.0
	Expected	1.8	7.7	14.5
501-1000	Observed	1.0	7.0	10.0
	Expected	1.3	5.8	10.9
More than 1000	Observed	0.0	0.0	9.0
	Expected	0.7	2.9	5.4

RQ9. To what extent is there a relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and accepting compromise as a means of achieving organizational goals?

H9. There is a relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and accepting compromise as a means of achieving organizational goals.

The correlation coefficient ($r = .231$) provided evidence for a weak positive relationship between department chairs' perceived KSAs and perceived use of compromise to achieve organizational goals. The results of the one-sample t test indicated a statistically significant relationship between department chairs' perceived KSAs and perceived use of compromise to achieve organizational goals, $t = 2.106$, $p < .05$. This suggests there is a relationship between department chairs' perceived KSAs

and perceived use of accepting compromise as a means of achieving organizational goals, which supports H9.

RQ10. To what extent are the relationships between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change different between groups in the following variables: leadership style, school type, gender, and school size?

H10. The relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change differs by leadership style.

The results of the Fisher's z test for two correlations between KSAs and perceived use of managing change indicated a statistically significant difference between the two leadership styles, $z = -2.014$, $p < .05$ (see Table 15). The correlation for democratic style ($r = .560$) was statistically different from the correlation for transformational style ($r = .853$).

Table 15

Results of Fisher's z Tests for Correlations between Perceived KSAs and Perceived Use of Managing Change for RQ10

Variable	<i>r</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Leadership Style			
Democratic	.560	-2.014	.044
Transformational	.853		
School Type			
Private	.581	0.340	.734
Public	.631		
Gender			
Female	.607	-0.504	.614
Male	.520		
School Size			
Less than 250 Students	.745	0.076	.939
251-500 Students	.735		

H11. The relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change differs by school type.

The results of the Fisher's *z* test for two correlations between KSAs and perceived use of managing change of English department chairs indicated there is not a statistically significant difference between the two school types, $z = 0.340$, $p = .734$ (see Table 15).

The correlation for private department chairs ($r = .581$) was not statistically different from the correlation for public department chairs ($r = .631$).

H12. The relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change differs by gender.

The results of the Fisher's z test for two correlations between the perceived KSAs and perceived use of managing change of English department chairs indicated there is not a statistically significant difference between males and females, $z = -0.504$, $p = .614$ (see Table 15). The correlation for females ($r = .607$) was not statistically different from males ($r = .520$).

H13. The relationship between English department chairs' knowledge, skills, and abilities and managing change differs by school size.

The results of the Fisher's z test for two correlations between the perceived KSAs and perceived use of managing change of English department chairs indicated there is not a statistically significant difference between the two groups, $z = 0.076$, $p = .939$ (see Table 15). The correlation for schools with less than 250 students ($r = .745$) was not statistically different from the correlation for schools with 251-500 students ($r = .735$).

Summary

Presented in this chapter were the descriptive statistics and results of hypothesis testing. The results of the independent-samples t test indicated differences in KSAs between those department chairs who lead in a democratic fashion versus a transformational style. The results of chi-square tests provided evidence that demographic variables such as gender, school size, and school type did not have relationships with several of the leadership responsibilities that department chairs have to

manage. One chi-square test, however, indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies of department chairs' facilitation of conflict resolution activities. Public school department chairs facilitated conflict resolution less than what was expected; whereas, private school department chairs facilitated conflict resolution more than what was expected. The results indicated there is a relationship between English department chairs' perceived KSAs and perceived use of compromise to achieve organizational goals. Results of Fisher's z tests indicated there is a difference in the relationship of perceived KSAs and managing change between leadership styles, but not for school type, gender, and school size. Chapter five contains an overview of the study and major findings. Chapter five also includes findings related to literature and conclusions. The conclusions include implications for action and recommendations for future research.

Chapter Five

Interpretation and Recommendations

Research has shown that strong leadership in both public and private secondary schools is critical to ensuring students and staff members achieve their goals (NAIS, 2011; Wettersten, 1992). Department chairs and other teacher leaders serve an important role in providing essential leadership. The purpose of this study was to compare English department chairs' self-perceptions of their roles and leadership styles in the greater Missouri and Kansas metropolitan areas. In addition, the perceptions of English department chairs in the independent schools of the central states were explored. This chapter describes the overview of the problem, purpose statement and research questions, review of methodology, as well as major findings. The chapter culminates with a review of the findings related to literature, implications for action, recommendations for future research, and closing remarks.

Study Summary

To recapitulate, this study was concentrated on the roles and leadership traits of secondary-level English department chairs. Department chairs' self-perceptions of their KSAs and leadership practices were examined. The purpose of this study was to examine the extent of relationships between particular facets of KSAs and demographic characteristics, such as leadership style, school type, school size, and gender. Facets of KSAs included facilitation of conflict resolution, communication with department members, ability to delegate, supervision of staff, working collaboratively towards a common goal, implementation of department curriculum planning, and management of multiple roles. This study was conducted to explore the relationship between self-

perceived KSAs and managing change, further comparing this relationship among groups in the variables of leadership style, school type, gender, and school size. The next section includes a review of the purpose statement, research questions, review of the methodology, and major findings.

Overview of the problem. Ineffective leadership can serve as a hindrance to departmental growth (Crowder, 2010). Understanding the multi-faceted roles, responsibilities, and leadership styles of department chairs will assist school leaders in future capacity-building. The job description for secondary-level department chairs has been rather ambiguous, thus more transparent information will assist those who decide to accept these positions. This study was conducted to identify the effective leadership styles and KSAs that department chairs employ.

Purpose statement and research questions. The purpose of this study was to compare English department chairs' self-perceived roles and leadership styles, and to investigate the type of leadership traits department chairs execute in their job duties. Data were collected and analyzed to determine how department chairs communicate, collaborate, compromise, delegate, supervise, manage multiple roles, implement curriculum, and manage change in their positions.

Ten research questions guided this study. The first research question sought to determine if there was a difference in the perceived KSAs among English department chairs' leadership styles. Research question two assessed the extent of the relationship between conflict resolution and school type. The third and fourth research questions investigated relationships in the perceived KSAs between male and female English department chairs' communication with department members as well as relationships

between delegating tasks and school size, respectively. Research questions five, six, and seven were examined to determine the relationships in the perceived use of supervision of staff skill and leadership style, use of collaboration towards a common goal and school type, and curriculum planning and gender, respectively. Research question eight investigated the extent of relationship between perceived use of managing multiple roles and school sizes. Research question nine sought to examine the relationship between English department chairs' perceived KSAs and perceived use of compromise as a means of achieving organizational goals. Research question ten aimed to determine to what extent the relationships between the perceived KSAs and perceived use of managing change differed between groups in the variables of leadership style, school type, gender, and school size.

Review of the methodology. A quantitative non-experimental design was used to conduct the study. A survey was created from Crowder's (2010) Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities instrument and Spaid and Parson's (1999) Leadership Paradigm. This modified survey was sent through a linked email to 1,324 secondary-level English department chairs in 13 Midwestern states. Data were input and downloaded into IBM® SPSS® Statistics Faculty Pack 22 for Windows. An independent-samples *t* test, chi-square tests of independence, Pearson correlations, and Fisher's *z* tests were used for data analyses.

Major findings. The descriptive statistics revealed that most of the department chairs utilized a democratic leadership style. The majority of the respondents were female department chairs. Most respondents were in rural schools. The preponderance of the leaders worked in public schools in Kansas and Missouri. More than half of the department chairs had no special training or qualifications, and, likewise, more than half

received their positions by administrative appointment. Approximately two-thirds of the department chairs had served in their role up to five years. For RQ1, an independent-samples t test was conducted to examine the differences in the KSAs among the department chairs' leadership styles. The results showed differences in leadership styles between the two groups on perceived KSAs. Leaders in the transformational group had a higher KSA average than those in the democratic group.

For RQ2, a chi-square test of independence was conducted to analyze the relationship between conflict resolution and school type. This analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies of department chairs' facilitation of conflict resolution activities. Public school department chairs facilitated conflict resolution less than what was expected; whereas, private school department chairs facilitated conflict resolution more than what was expected.

For RQ3, a chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine the relationship between communication with department members and gender. This analysis revealed no significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies of department chairs' communications with department members, suggesting that male and female department chairs communicate in a comparable fashion.

For RQ4, a chi-square test of independence was conducted to analyze the relationship between delegating tasks and size. This analysis revealed no significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies of department chairs delegating tasks, suggesting that department chairs delegate tasks at similar levels regardless of school size.

For RQ5, a chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine the relationship between supervision of staff skill and leadership style. This analysis revealed no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies of department chairs' supervision of staff, suggesting that department chairs supervise staff in an analogous fashion regardless of leadership style.

For RQ6, a chi-square test of independence was conducted to analyze the relationship between the perceived use of collaboration towards a common goal and school type. This analysis revealed no significant difference in the observed and expected frequencies of department chairs' facilitation of collaboration, suggesting that department leaders do collaborate in similar ways regardless of school type (private or public).

For RQ7, a chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine the relationship between the perceived use of curriculum planning and gender. This analysis revealed no significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies of department chairs' curriculum planning, suggesting that male and female department chairs have comparable involvement in leading curriculum initiatives.

For RQ8, a chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine the relationship between managing multiple roles and school size. This analysis revealed no significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies of how department chairs manage multiple roles, regardless of school size, suggesting that department chairs manage multiple roles at virtually equivalent rates.

For RQ9, a Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to examine the relationship between English department chairs' perceived KSAs and perceived use of

compromise to achieve organizational goals. This analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between department chairs' KSAs and use of compromise to achieve goals, which aligns with the traditional leadership traits associated with democratic and transformational leaders. Both styles of governance emphasize making concessions with department members in order to accomplish essential objectives.

In examining RQ10, Fisher's z tests were conducted to analyze the relationships between the perceived KSAs and perceived use of managing change of English department chairs between the groups in leadership style, school type, gender, and school size. The results of the Fisher's z tests indicated a difference between democratic and transformational leadership styles in the relationship between managing change and perceived KSAs. The democratic group had a moderate correlation, but the transformational group had a strong correlation. These results suggest that transformational department chairs' involvement in managing change is greater than democratic department chairs who govern in a participatory fashion. Those who are transformational leaders made a difference in managing change to a higher degree than those with a democratic style. The results of the Fisher's z test showed no difference in the relationships between KSAs and managing change for the two school types; this relationship was similar for both the public and private sector. The results of the Fisher's z test showed no difference in the relationships between KSAs and managing change for male and female department chairs. Lastly, the results of the Fisher's z test indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between school sizes in the relationship between managing change and perceived use of KSAs.

Findings Related to the Literature

The leadership of secondary-level department chairs evolved from colleges and universities, and this history is important because secondary schools emulated the department chair leadership structures of those institutions. Secondary-level department chairs are still leading in public and private schools; however, many recent studies indicated that their governance has transformed to include other teacher leaders. Research question 1 of the current study focused on the differences between leadership styles on perceived KSAs. According to Aziz et al. (2005), KSAs are important job competencies that department chairs must be able to perform. Kouzes and Posner (2002) and Lunenburg and Ornstein (2012) indicated that transformational leaders have the knowledge, skills, or abilities to absolutely positively inspire their followers to accomplish high-quality goals. Furthermore, Klar (2008) found that transformational leaders succeed in acting as catalytic agents to inspire greater leadership capacities of teachers and administrators. By contrast, democratic leaders espouse to a more participatory, team-oriented approach to fulfill desired goals (Green, 2005; Miller, 1999). The differences between the two leadership styles suggest that transformational leaders take on a more involved role in motivating followers to work. The results of RQ1 indicated that transformational leaders have a higher average for perceived KSAs than did the democratic leaders. The results were consistent with previous studies (Klar, 2008; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012).

Research question 2 focused on the extent of the relationship between English department chairs' facilitation of conflict resolution and school type. According to Hickson and Stacks (1992), department chairs must be highly involved in managing

conflicts that may arise. Aziz et al. (2005) and Crowder (2010) indicated that successful department chairs have high conflict resolution skills to resolve problems among faculty members. Aziz et al. (2005) reported department chairs perceiving conflict resolution to be important; Crowder (2010) also found conflict resolution skill to be significant in ranking the element 3.39. The results of RQ2 showed a statistically significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies of department chairs' facilitation of conflict resolution activities. Public school department chairs facilitated conflict resolution less than what was expected; whereas, private school department chairs facilitated conflict resolution more than what was expected. The results were consistent with earlier studies in finding that English department chairs perceived that managing conflict was a central leadership responsibility (Aziz et al., 2005; Crowder, 2010; Hickson & Stacks, 1992).

Research question 3 focused on the extent of the relationships between English department chairs' communication with department members and gender. Research affirmed that communication ability is highly important for department chair leaders, as they must interact with their department members and multiple constituents (Crowder, 2010; Czech, 2008). Aziz et al. (2005) and Crowder (2010) found department chairs ranked effective communication with department members as highly important. The results of RQ3 indicated no significant difference between the observed and expected frequencies of department chairs' communications with department members, suggesting that male and female department chairs communicate in a comparable fashion. The results are consistent with existing literature (Chinn, 2011; Lally, 2008; Lipman-Blumen, 2000; Robinson, 2008).

Research question 4 focused on the extent of the relationship between English department chairs' ability to delegate tasks and school size. Research has indicated that all department leaders must delegate meaningful tasks to their department members, regardless of their configuration (Buller, 2012; Cullen et al., 2007). The importance of task delegation supports the research of Wettersten (1992) who found that department chairs should delegate tasks to teachers because of their firsthand knowledge and expertise. This supports Aziz et al. (2005) who found the department leader's ability to delegate tasks was important. The results of RQ4 indicated no difference from what was expected in how department leaders, regardless of school size, delegate tasks. The results are consistent with the literature and previous studies (Cullen et al., 2007; Wettersten, 1992). All schools, large or small, have specific school goals to achieve.

Research question 5 focused on the relationship between English department chairs' supervision of staff and leadership style. The literature review supported that department chairs devote a great deal of their time supervising staff to ensure effective departmental functioning (Aziz et al., 2005). Chu (2006) found that department chairs spent 37% of their time engaged in supervisory duties. Tucker (1993) and Kruskamp (2003) established that department chairs have to manage and oversee many aspects such as budget and scheduling, and these supervisory roles will vary (Buller, 2012). The results of RQ5 indicated no relationship between department chairs' supervision of staff and leadership style. The results are supportive of previous studies that suggest all leaders, regardless of style, must be involved in supervising staff members (Buller, 2012; Kruskamp, 2003; Tucker, 1993).

Research question 6 focused on the relationship between English department chairs working collaboratively towards a common goal and school type. Numerous studies have explored the importance of collaborative teamwork practice, indicating that school leaders must facilitate collaboration to foster continuous student improvement (DuFour & Marzano, 2011; NAIS, 2011). The APQC (2008) found that 70 school districts in 25 states utilize collaboration and data analysis to raise student achievement. A critical finding of Lambert-Knowles (2013) and Barth (2013) was that department chairs facilitate continuous teamwork to achieve their school goals. The results of RQ6 showed no difference from what was expected between public and private school department chair collaboration practices. The results are supportive of previous studies (APQC, 2008; Barth, 2013; DuFour & Marzano, 2011; Lambert-Knowles, 2013; NAIS, 2011).

Research question 7 focused on the relationship between English department chairs' implementation of department curriculum planning and gender. Research affirmed that department chairs are highly involved with curriculum planning (Kinsella, 2011). Hofer (2001) found that 89.4% of independent school leaders greatly valued the importance of curriculum planning. The emergence of CCCS in public schools has especially heightened teacher leaders' involvement in all aspects of curriculum (ASCD, 2012). Burnette (1988) indicated that department chairs are integral in implementing short-term and long-term department curriculum planning. Likewise, according to Hawley (2007), department chairs must work with their colleagues to promote and maintain curriculum focus. The results of RQ7 showed no difference from what was expected between how male and female department chairs engage in curriculum

planning; more department leaders engage in the process of planning curriculum than expected. The results are supportive of previous studies (Burnette, 1988; Chinn, 2011).

Research question 8 focused on the relationship between English department chairs' management of multiple roles and school size. Research supported that managing multiple roles is a core competency for effectual leadership (Crowder, 2010; Gmelch & Schuh, 2004). Aziz et al. (2005) reported a mean of 3.50 for the leadership element of managing multiple roles. Similarly, Crowder (2010) found a mean result of 3.52 for this leadership element. According to Gmelch and Seedorf (1989), Seagren et al. (1993), and Wheeler et al. (2008), department chairs have to manage multiple tasks in their leadership positions. Likewise, several other studies confirmed that department chairs of large schools are expected to perform myriad duties (Burnette, 1988; Kruskamp, 2003; Mayer, 2013; Wettersten, 1992). The results of RQ8 indicated no difference in how department chairs, regardless of school sizes, manage multiple roles, and that more department leaders somewhat manage, or definitely manage multiple roles. The results are supportive of literature and previous studies (Burnette, 1988; Kruskamp, 2003; Mayer, 2013; Wettersten, 1992).

Research question 9 focused on the relationship between English department chairs' perceived KSAs and their use of compromise to achieve organizational goals. Research affirmed that an essential element of leadership included a willingness to be open to different ways of accomplishing tasks, with use of compromise as a central aspect of leadership (Spaid & Parson, 1999). According to Lindholm (1999), the department chair is crucial in facilitating compromise to foster consensus. The results of RQ9 showed a statistically significant relationship between department chairs' perceived

KSAs and perceived use of compromise to achieve goals. The higher scores on the KSA for this element indicated higher scores on use of compromise. The results are supportive of the literature (Lindholm, 1999; Spaid & Parson, 1999).

Research question 10 focused on the extent of the relationship between English department chairs' KSAs and managing change, and the differences between these relationships for the groups within leadership style, school type, gender, and school size. Research indicated that managing change is a key skill that department chairs must incorporate in their leadership (Aziz et al., 2005). Aziz et al. (2005) found a mean result of 3.48 for the leadership element of managing change; yet, Crowder (2010) reported a mean result of 3.06. According to Tucker (1993), all department chairs, regardless of leadership style, must be prepared to lead and manage change according to the needs of their communities. Research clearly shows that the two most effective leadership styles for teacher leaders include the democratic and transformational style, with most effective chairs employing the democratic method (Elmore, 2000; Green, 2005; King, 1991; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Lindholm, 1999). The results of RQ10 showed that the extent of relationships between the KSAs and perceived use of managing change is different between democratic and transformational leadership styles. The transformational group had a much stronger relationship, which suggests that transformational leaders take on a more involved role in motivating followers to perform; whereas, democratic leaders distribute the leadership more. The results are supportive of previous studies (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012).

Crowder (2010) cited that the ability to manage change was a requirement for successful department chair leadership, thus higher education chairs and secondary-level

department leaders of both public and private institutions must accept this responsibility. The results of RQ11 indicated that the extent of relationships between the KSAs and perceived use of managing change was not different between public and private school department chairs. The results are supportive of previous studies (Buffum et al., 2008; Crowder, 2010; Fullan, 2008; Tucker, 1993).

Research indicated that male and female department chairs generally govern and manage their responsibilities, such as facilitating change initiatives, in comparable ways (Chinn, 2011). According to Lipman-Blumen (2000) and Robinson (2008), there are no significant differences in the leadership styles between males and females. The results of RQ12 showed that the relationships between the perceived KSAs and perceived use of managing change were not statistically different between males and females. The results are supportive of previous studies (Chinn, 2011; Lipman-Blumen, 2000; Robinson, 2008).

Eckman's (2004) study of principals from secondary-level schools of varying sizes affirmed that there were no significant differences between schools of varying sizes in leadership and managing change. Similarly, Buffum et al. (2008) and Ermeling (2012) showed that department chairs are instrumental in managing change within their departments, regardless of size. The results of RQ13 showed no differences in the relationships between the KSAs and perceived use of managing change between schools with 251-500 students or 250 students or less. The results concur with the findings of existing literature (Buffum et al., 2008; Eckman, 2004; Ermeling, 2012).

Conclusions

This section provides conclusions from the current study. Implications for action, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks are presented in the following sections.

Implications for action. Multiple studies confirm that department chairs rarely receive special training before their appointments to the role (Aziz et al., 2005; Crowder, 2010; Gmelch & Miskin, 2011; Gmelch & Seedorf, 1989; Seagren et al., 1993). The current study's results can help frame how leadership training is taught in new and beginning teacher education and teacher professional development workshops, and provide guidance to individuals who in the future might be selected or volunteer for the role of a department chair. Without question, most administrators would prefer effective department chairs over ill-prepared ones. Thus, it is incumbent upon administrators to be instrumental in supporting their department chairs and other teacher leaders in acquiring the requisite KSAs to perform these duties. Specifically, administrators should require incoming department chairs to receive on-the-job training by engaging in apprenticeships with veteran leaders. Results of the current study affirmed that the majority of department chairs employ a democratic leadership style, delegate tasks, and use collaboration in their work. Leaders who lead in a democratic fashion make teachers feel greater ownership in coming up with remedies for shared problems (Choi, 2007). These results provide current teacher leaders, aspiring department leaders, and school administrators with more information concerning the critical KSAs needed for effective department chair leadership. These essential KSAs include having a leadership style, conflict resolution ability, communication skill, delegation of task ability, supervisory

skill, collaborative ability, curriculum planning skill, the ability to manage multiple roles, possessing the willingness to compromise, and the ability to manage change. The practices of the most successful department chairs can serve as a template in identifying the characteristics of effective leadership. The results of this study can provide administrators, as well as all personnel charged with training teacher leaders, current information regarding the significance of conflict resolution ability, the value of compromise, and the relevance of managing change. Information gleaned from the study can help guide training workshops not only for those seeking leadership positions, but also assist current department chairs and teacher leaders with their supervisory responsibilities and professional development needs.

Recommendations for future research. The sample size of the current study could be expanded to include schools in southern, western, and eastern states. Widening the scope of the study may strengthen the validity of the research to learn more about the leadership styles and roles of department chairs across the nation. In addition, investigated in this study were secondary-level English department chairs exclusively; therefore, the study could expand to include department chairs of other disciplines. Perhaps direct, qualitative interviews could occur to learn more about the perceptions of department chairs, as well as the perceptions of principals. An additional recommendation is to further the research by linking the perceptions of the department chairs to the achievement results of their students. Furthermore, a revised study could identify the specific professional development trainings that department chairs experience, in order to improve the quality of leadership training. Variables such as teacher retention rates, salaries, race, career goals, and age were not included in the

current study; thus, extending the study to include such factors would provide greater insight about the leadership roles and perceived KSAs of department chairs. The findings of such a study could help administrators in their capacity building efforts of empowering future leaders.

Concluding remarks. The purpose of this quantitative study was to compare English department chairs' self-perceived roles and leadership styles. The study was focused on leadership styles, democratic practices, curriculum initiatives, and various leadership elements that department chairs implement. Department chairs and other teacher leaders provide crucial leadership in secondary schools (Wettersten, 1992). In this study, most of the department chairs employed democratic leadership and engaged in collaborative practices to fulfill their desired goals. The findings of this study suggest that department chairs must implement critical leadership elements to ensure departmental growth and the fulfillment of their school missions.

Identifying strategies and leadership training programs to increase department chairs' effectiveness in leading their departments and managing multiple roles is crucial. Administrators and teacher leaders must facilitate quality professional development and support collaborative practices within their schools. Schools indeed have many organizational goals and face multiple challenges. It has been confirmed that quality leadership does not solely rest on the shoulders of school administrators. Notably, department chairs, as well as other teacher leaders, are extremely vital in outlining, facilitating, and achieving their school improvement goals in the 21st century and beyond.

References

- American Productivity & Quality Center. (2008). *Over 70 school districts to collaborate and identify best practices in “data-driven decision making” research study*. Retrieved from <http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20080331006081/en/70-School-Districts-Collaborate-Identify-Practices-Data-Driven#Data-Driven#.VGuGITTF-Sp>
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1948). *The department head and instructional improvement*. Washington, DC: ASCD Publications.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (2012). *Fulfilling the promise of the Common Core State Standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/siteASCD/commoncore/CCSSSummitReport.pdf>
- Aziz, S., Mullins, M. E., Balzer, W. K., Grauer, E., Burnfield, J. L., Lodato, M. A., & Cohen-Powless, M. A. (2005). Understanding the training needs of department chairs. *Studies in Higher Education, 30*(5), 571-593.
- Baal, K. M. (2011). *Leadership practices of science department chairs in secondary public schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3469944)
- Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2013, October). Stone soup: The teacher leader's contribution. *Educational Leadership, 71*(2), 46-49.
- Barth, R. S. (2013, October 13). The time is ripe (again). *Educational Leadership, 71*(2), 10-16.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research & managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.

- Bensimon, E. M., Ward, K., & Sanders, K. (2000). *The department chair's role in developing new faculty into teachers and scholars*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Bennett, J. B. (1983). *Managing the academic department*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Bliss, T., Fahrney, C., & Steffy, B. (1996). Secondary department chair roles: Ambiguity and change in systemic reform. *Journal of School Leadership*, 6(1), 30-46.
- Boone, M. (1997). *Perceived leadership practices of rural superintendents: Men and women who lead*. Paper presented at the proceedings of the annual convention of National Rural Education Association, Tucson, AZ. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED413147).
- Brosnan, M. (2003, Winter). At the heart of the matter: Interview with Roland S. Barth. *Independent School*. Retrieved from <http://www.nais.org/Magazines-Newsletters/ISMagazine/Pages/At-the-Heart-of-the-Heart-of-the-Matter-Interview-with-Roland-S.-Barth.aspx>
- Buffum, A., Erkens, C., Hinman, C., Huff, S., Jessie, L. G., Martin, T. L. ... Williams, K. (2008). *The collaborative administrator*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Buller, J. L. (2012). *The essential department chair: A comprehensive desk reference* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Burnette, O. (1988). *The role of high school department chairs in a large suburban school system* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8907517)
- Childs-Bowen, D. (2006). School leadership: If you build teacher leadership, they will come. *Journal of Staff Development-The Learning Forward Journal*, 2(3), 1-8.

- Chinn, J. L. (2011). *Women and leadership: transforming visions and current contexts*. Retrieved from <http://forumonpublicpolicy.com/vol2011.no2/archivevol2011.no2/chin.rev.pdf>
- Choi, S. (2007). Democratic leadership: The lessons of exemplary models for democratic governance. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(3), 243-262.
- Chu, D. (2006). *The department chair primer: Leading and managing academic departments*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Chu, D. (2012). *The department chair primer: What chairs need to know and do to make a difference* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Church, R., & Sedlak, M. (1976). *Education in the United States: An interpretive history*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Clement, M. C. (2013, October). Teachers hiring teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 71(2), 1-4.
- Cohen, A., Brawer, F., & Kisker, C. (2003). *The American community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Collay, M. (2013, October). Teaching is leading. *Educational Leadership*, 71(2), 72-76.
- Coleman, S. (2010, Fall). Core truths and cultural norms: Aligning daily practice with diversity goals. *Independent School*. Retrieved from <http://www.nais.org/Magazines-Newsletters/ISMagazine/Pages/Core-Truths-and-Cultural-Norms.aspx>
- Common Core. (2014). *The Common Core State Standards Initiative*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/development-process/>
- Copland, M., & Boatright, E. (2006). *Leadership for transforming high schools*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Crow, T. (2009). Lock in the power of collaboration: Higher student literacy scores show Iowa district the benefits of teacher learning teams. *The Learning System*, 5(3). Retrieved from <http://learningforward.org/docs/learning-system/system11-09.pdf?sfvrsn=2>
- Crowder, J. (2010). *Transition into the department chair role: The manager-leader continuum* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3413205)
- Cullen, M., Ewing, M., Marshall, K., & Rice, M. (2007, September). Readers' round table: Voices of leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 65(1), 90-92.
- Curtis, R. (2009). *Distributing leadership and creating new leadership rules in the context of school redesign* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3367711)
- Czech, K. (2008). *A communication perspective on leadership: Faculty perceptions of the department chair*. North Charleston, SC: Book Surge.
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2013, October). When teachers support and evaluate their peers. *Educational Leadership*, 71(2), 24-29.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Bullmaster, M., & Cobb, V. (1995). Rethinking teacher leadership through professional development schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96(1), 87-106.

- DeRoche, E. F., Kujawa, E., & Hunsaker, J. S. (1988). Department chairs: A school's untapped resource. *The High School Journal*, 71(3), 135-137.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional learning communities at work: New insights for improving schools*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2006). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- DuFour, R., & Marzano, R. J. (2009, February). High-leverage strategies for principal leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 66(5), 62-68.
- DuFour, R., & Marzano, R. J. (2011). *Leaders of learning: How district, school, and classroom leaders improve student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Dyer, B. G., & Miller, M. (1999). *A critical review of literature related to the department chair position*. Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. (ED 432 193)
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Are women evaluated more favorably than men? *American Psychologist*, 54, 408-423.
- Eaker, R., & Keating, J. (2012). *Every school, every team, every classroom*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

- Eckman, E. W. (2004). Does gender make a difference? Voices of male and female high school principals. *Planning and Changing*, 35(3 & 4), 192-208.
- Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Boston, MA: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Erkens, C., & Twadell, E. (2012). *Leading by design: An action framework for PLC at work leaders*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Ermeling, B. A. (2012). Breathe new life into collaboration: 5 principles for reviving problematic groups. *The Learning Principal*, 8(1), 1-5.
- Feeney, E. J. (2009, June). Taking a look at a school's leadership capacity: The role and function of high school department chairs. *Clearing House Journal*, 82(5), 212-218.
- Fraser, R. J. (2008). *Demystifying teacher leadership in comprehensive high schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3311546)
- Fullan, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change: What the best leaders do help their organizations survive and thrive*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Garmston, R. J. (2008, Fall). Collaborative culture. *Journal of Staff Development-The Learning Forward Journal*, 29(4), 49-50.
- Geijsel, F., Slegers, P., Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2003). Transformational leadership effects on teachers' commitment and effort toward school reform. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(3), 228-256.
- Gmelch, W. H., & Miskin, V. D. (2011). *Department chair leadership skills* (2nd ed.). Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing.

- Gmelch, W. H., & Schuh, J. H. (2004). The life cycle of a department chair. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 126, 1-93.
- Gmelch, W. H., & Seedorf, R. G. (1989). *The department chair: A descriptive study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Convention, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED309713).
- Green, R. L. (2005). *Practicing the art of leadership: A problem-based approach to implementing the ISLLC standards*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hamlin, E. (2013, Fall). The individualized teacher improvement plan. *Independent School*. Retrieved from [http://www.nais.org/Magazines- Newsletters/ISMagazine/Pages/The-Individualized-Teacher-Improvement-Plan.aspx](http://www.nais.org/Magazines-Newsletters/ISMagazine/Pages/The-Individualized-Teacher-Improvement-Plan.aspx)
- Hanson, T. (1995). *A comparison of leadership practices used by male and female communication department chairpersons*. Paper presented at annual meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED384946).
- Hawley, W. (2007, Fall). Mentoring new department chairs. *Independent School*. Retrieved from [http://www.nais.org/Magazines- Newsletters/ITMagazine/Pages/Mentoring-New-Department-Chairs.aspx](http://www.nais.org/Magazines-Newsletters/ITMagazine/Pages/Mentoring-New-Department-Chairs.aspx)
- Hecht, I. W. D., Higgerson, M. L., Gmelch, W. H., & Tucker, A. (1999). *The department chair as academic leader*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Hickson, M., III, & Stacks, D. W. (1992). *Effective communication for academic chairs*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Hofer, M. (2001). *Salient components of successful independent private high schools: A Delphi study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest and Theses database. (UMI No. 3032551)
- Independent School Management. (1999). Seven critical characteristics of the department chair. *Ideas and Perspectives*, 24(13), 49-50.
- Jaquith, A. (2013, October). Instructional capacity: How to build it right. *Educational Leadership*, 71(2), 56-61.
- Johnson, S. (2014). *The differences between private and parochial*. Retrieved from http://www.ehow.com/info_8478672_differences-between-private-parochial.html
- Johnson, S. M., & Fiarman, S. E. (2012, November). The potential of peer review. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 20-25.
- Jones, F. (2002). *Endowed teaching chairs at independent schools: Two case studies* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3107309)
- King, B. M. (1991). *Leadership efforts that facilitate classroom thoughtfulness in social studies*. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED340643).
- Kinsella, S. (2011). *Independent school department heads: The influence of role ambiguity, relationships, and professional development on career aspirations* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3490815)

- Klar, H. W. (2008). *Laying the groundwork for distributed leadership in urban high schools: How principals foster department chair instructional leadership capacity* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3424041)
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (8th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kruskamp, W. H. (2003). *Instructional supervision and the role of high school department chairs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 0805527)
- Lally, P. A. (2008). *The relationship between gender and leadership styles in the Massachusetts high school principalship* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3311260)
- Lambert-Knowles, P. (2013). *Impact of instructional leaders' distributed leadership practices on student achievement in charter high schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3587820)
- Leaming, D. R. (2007). *Academic leadership: A practical guide to chairing the department* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Anker.
- Learning Forward. (2011, February). *Learning Forward: The professional learning association*. Retrieved from <http://learningforward.org/publications/blog-landing/pd-in-the-news/2011/02/01/february-2011#.VGv9FTTF-rk>
- Leithwood, K., & Louis, K. (2012). *Linking leadership to student learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (2005, Winter). Teachers as leaders. *The Educational Forum*, 69, 151-162.
- Lindholm, J. A. (1999). Preparing department chairs for their leadership roles. *ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges Digest*. Los Angeles, CA: Eric Digest Press.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2000). *Connective Leadership: Managing in a changing world*. New York, NY: Oxford Press.
- Lucas, A. F. (1994). *Strengthening departmental leadership: A team-building guide for chairs in colleges and universities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lucas, A. F. (2000). *Leading academic change: Essential roles for department chairs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation: Tips and strategies for students in the social and behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2012). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Marshall, K. (2013). *Rethinking teacher supervision and evaluation: How to work smart, build collaboration and close the achievement gap* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Marzano, R. J., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

- Mattos, M. (2008). Walking the 'lign. In R. Eaker (Ed.), *The collaborative administrator: Working together as a professional learning community* (pp. 13-35).
Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Mayer, L. (2013, December). Empowerment zone: Coaching academy primes teachers to become instructional leaders. *Journal of Staff Development-Learning Forward Journal*, 34(6), 30-32.
- Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. (2013). Numbers of note: The MetLife survey of the American teacher. *Educational Leadership*, 71(2), 8.
- Miller, M. (1999). The department chair as speaker of the house: Shared authority in the community college department. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 23(8), 739-746.
- Mirel, J. (2006, Winter). The traditional high school: Historical debates over its nature and function. *Education Next*, 6(1), 14-15, 17-21.
- National Association of Independent Schools. (2009). *NAIS fact sheet: NAIS and independent schools fact sheet* Retrieved from
http://www.nais.org/Articles/Documents/05.13.09_NAIS_Education_Opportunity_Fact_Sheet.pdf
- National Association of Independent Schools. (2011). *NAIS guidelines of professional practice for department chairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.nais.org/Series/Pages/NAIS-Guidelines-of-Professional-Practice-for-Department-Chairs.aspx>
- National Association of Independent Schools. (2014). *NAIS curriculum and instruction*. Retrieved from <http://www.nais.org/Pages/Learn/KnowledgeCenter/Curriculum-and-Instruction.aspx?src=footer>

- Onukwugha, P. I. (2013). *Distributed leadership in schools: Teacher practices, and student learning* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3562449)
- Phillips, V., & Wong, C. (2013, January). High expectations: High supports. *Educational Leadership*, 70(4), 1-5.
- Robinson, D. (2008). *Unconditional leadership: A values driven approach to developing people, building teams, and maximizing results*. Moor Park, CA: Community Links.
- Rothman, R. (2012, April). A common core of readiness. *Educational Leadership*, 69(7), 10-15.
- Ryan, J. (2014). *Democratic leadership style*. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/1320375/Democratic_Leadership_Style
- Sacks, A. (2013, October). The problem-solving power of teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 71(2), 18-22.
- Sanchez, E., Kline, D., & Laird, E. (2009). *Data-driven districts: Building the culture and capacity to improve student achievement*. Retrieved from http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/files/events/resources/DQCbrief_Fall08.pdf
- Savini, C. (2010, Winter). Bias among the well-intentioned. *Independent School*. Retrieved from <http://www.nais.org/Magazines-Newsletters/ISMagazine/Pages/Bias-Among-the-Well-Intentioned.aspx>
- Seagren, A. T., Creswell, J. W., & Wheeler, D. W. (1993). *The department chair: New roles, responsibilities and challenges*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

- Siskin, L. S. (1997, December). The challenge of leadership in comprehensive high schools: School vision and departmental divisions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33(1), 604-623. doi: 10.1177/0013161X970331005
- Somech, A. (2005). Directive versus participative leadership: Two complementary approaches to managing school effectiveness. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 41(5), 777-800. doi: 10.1177/0013161X05279448
- Spaid, R. L., & Parson, M. H. (1999). Meeting the millennium's challenge: Leading from where you are. *New Directions for Community Colleges Journal*, 27(1), 2-28.
- Sparks, D., & Hursh, S. (2011). *A national plan for improving professional development*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED442779.pdf>
- Stadler, D. (2012). *Law and ethics in educational leadership* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Stevens, M. J. & Champion, M. A. (1999). Staffing work teams: Development and validation of a selection test for teamwork settings. *Journal of Management*, 25(2), 207-228.
- Stronge, J., & Hindman, J. (2003, May). Hiring the best teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 48-52.
- Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium. (2014). *Teacher leader model standards*. Retrieved from http://teacherleaderstandards.org/the_standards_domain_1
- Toch, T. (2008, October). Fixing teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 66(3), 32-37.
- Tucker, A. (1993). *Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

- U.S. Department of Education. (2008). *Structure of the U.S. education: Curriculum and content standards*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/international/usnei/us/edlite-structure-us.html>
- Von Frank, V. (2009, April). District pulls together in pursuit of excellence. *The Learning System*, 4(7), 1, 4-7.
- Von Frank, V. (2012, Winter). Experts agree: Conflict creates better teams. *Tools for Learning Schools*, 15(2), 1-3.
- Wald, P., & Castleberry, M. (2000). *Educators as learners: Creating a professional learning community in your school*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD Publications.
- Wettersten, J. (1992, April 20). *High school department chairs as department leaders: Four case studies*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED353207).
- Wheeler, D., Seagren, A., Becker, L., Kinley, E., Mlinek, D., & Robson, K. (2008). *The academic chair's handbook* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wiggins, A. (2011, Summer). Doors open: How independent schools can improve through encouraging a culture of collaboration. *Independent School*. Retrieved from <http://www.nais.org/Magazines-Newsletters/ISMagazine/Pages/Doors-Open.aspx>
- Wirtz, M. C. (2007, Fall). Managing curricular change in a group dynamic. *Independent School*. Retrieved from <http://www.nais.org/Magazines-Newsletters/ITMagazine/Pages/Managing-Curricular-Change-in-a-Group-Dynamic.aspx>

Wise, A. E., & Usdan, M. D. (2013, October). The teaching profession at the crossroads.

Educational Leadership, 71(2), 30-34.

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson

Education, Inc.

Yukl, G. (2012). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson

Education, Inc.

Appendices

Appendix A: Leadership Survey

Leadership Survey

1. Which of the following best describes your leadership style?
 - Autocratic (very direct style; no participation by followers)
 - Democratic (shared decision making style; followers as equals)
 - Laissez-faire (complete freedom for followers to make decisions)
 - Transformational (leader motivates followers to accomplish more than they expected)
2. Do you use budget management?
 - Do not use
 - Somewhat use
 - Definitely use
3. Do you evaluate department faculty members?
 - Do not evaluate
 - Somewhat evaluate
 - Definitely evaluate
4. Do you supervise English department staff members' compliance with teaching required curricula?
 - Do not supervise
 - Somewhat supervise
 - Definitely supervise
5. Do you implement short-term and long-range department curriculum planning?
 - Do not implement
 - Somewhat implement
 - Definitely implement
6. Do you delegate various departmental tasks?
 - Do not delegate
 - Somewhat delegate
 - Definitely delegate
7. Do you establish hiring procedures?
 - Do not establish
 - Somewhat establish
 - Definitely establish
8. Do you effectively communicate with department members?
 - Do not effectively communicate
 - Somewhat effectively communicate
 - Definitely effectively communicate

9. Do you effectively communicate with other departments?
- Not at all
 - Somewhat
 - Definitely
10. Do you communicate interpersonally (one-on-one)?
- Do not communicate interpersonally
 - Somewhat communicate interpersonally
 - Definitely communicate interpersonally
11. Do you manage scheduling procedures?
- Do not manage
 - Somewhat manage
 - Definitely manage
12. Do you oversee assessment procedures?
- Do not oversee
 - Somewhat oversee
 - Definitely oversee
13. Do you use time management?
- Do not use
 - Somewhat use
 - Definitely use
14. Do you facilitate conflict resolution?
- Do not facilitate
 - Somewhat facilitate
 - Definitely facilitate
15. Do you conduct meetings?
- Do not conduct
 - Somewhat conduct
 - Definitely conduct
16. Do you use motivational skills?
- Do not use
 - Somewhat use
 - Definitely use
17. Do you have involvement in adhering to or implementing legal issues?
- Not at all
 - Somewhat
 - Definitely
18. Do you manage multiple roles as chair?
- Do not manage multiple roles

- Somewhat manage multiple roles
- Definitely manage multiple roles

19. Do you identify funding sources?

- Not at all
- Somewhat
- Definitely

20. Do you manage change?

- Do not manage
- Somewhat manage
- Definitely manage

21. Do you recognize your awareness of institutional knowledge?

- Do not recognize
- Somewhat recognize
- Definitely recognize

22. I effectively serve as a democratic change agent.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

23. I am accessible to my department.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

24. I accept the role of being a follower in my position.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

25. I serve as a catalyst for consensus.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

26. I am open to different ways of accomplishing tasks.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

27. I effectively promote teamwork in my position.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

28. I break down communication barriers and allow for group discussion.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

29. I routinely convince others that my point of view is correct.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

30. I effectively use compromise as a means of achieving department goals.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

31. I am honest in my leadership role.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

32. I take risks in my position of leadership.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree

- Strongly agree
33. I admit mistakes in my leadership role.
- Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neutral/No opinion
 - Somewhat agree
 - Strongly agree
34. I listen to all points of view in my leadership role.
- Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neutral/No opinion
 - Somewhat agree
 - Strongly agree
35. The English department work collaboratively (interdependently) towards a common goal.
- Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neutral/No opinion
 - Somewhat agree
 - Strongly agree
36. The English department has team norms.
- Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neutral/No opinion
 - Somewhat agree
 - Strongly agree
37. The English department unpacks (reveals) standards.
- Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neutral/No opinion
 - Somewhat agree
 - Strongly agree
38. The English department develops common formative assessments as a team.
- Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Neutral/No opinion
 - Somewhat agree
 - Strongly agree
39. The English department utilizes student performance data.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

40. I am accessible to my department.

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/No opinion
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

41. What is the retention rate in 9th grade English?

- Less than 1%
- 1-5%
- 6-10%
- More than 10%

42. What is the retention rate in 10th grade English?

- Less than 1%
- 1-5%
- 6-10%
- More than 10%

43. What is the retention rate in 11th grade English?

- Less than 1%
- 1-5%
- 6-10%
- More than 10%

44. What is the retention rate in 12th grade English?

- Less than 1%
- 1-5%
- 6-10%
- More than 10%

45. What is the size of your school?

- Less than 250
- 251-500
- 501-1000
- More than 1000

46. Would you like to possibly be contacted for an interview? If so, please indicate your preferred method of contact (i.e., phone, e-mail).

If you reply yes, your survey responses will no longer be anonymous to the researcher; however, your responses will remain anonymous in the published study. Please share your contact information; you will be contacted to discuss your survey responses.

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

How would you classify your school?

- Urban
- Rural
- Suburban

How long have you been a department chair?

- 1 year or less
- 2 to 5 years
- 6-10 years
- More than 10 years

Is your school public or private?

- Public
- Private
- Other

In which state is your school located? _____

How were you selected or chosen as a chair or teacher leader?

Do you have any special training or qualifications as a chair or teacher leader?

Thank you for your participation! If there is anything else you would like to share, please provide your comments. For example, perhaps share an example, or two, of how you function as a leader.

Appendix B: Original Crowder (2010) KSA Instrument

<i>Knowledge, Skill, or Ability (KSA)</i>	<i>Importance for Chair Success</i> 1. <i>not important</i> 2. <i>somewhat important</i> 3. <i>important</i> 4. <i>very important</i>	<i>Training needed, on average?</i> 1. <i>not needed</i> 2. <i>needed</i> 3. <i>critically needed</i>
Budget management	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Evaluation of adjunct faculty	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Supervision of staff	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Generating and implementing department plans	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Ability to delegate	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Hiring procedures (including adjunct faculty)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Effective communication with department	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Effective communication with other college areas (including administration)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Interpersonal (i.e. one on one) communication	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Scheduling procedures	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Assessment procedures	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Time management	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Conflict resolution (e.g., faculty/student, faculty/admin.)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Conducting meetings	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Motivational skills	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Legal issues (e.g., confidentiality, disabilities, harassment)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Managing multiple roles as chair (e.g., faculty member, administrator)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Identifying funding sources	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Managing change	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3
Institutional knowledge (i.e., which persons/areas handle specific duties)	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3

Appendix C: Original Spaid and Parson (1999) Leadership Paradigm Instrument

Very important Important Neutral Less important Not important					This behavior is an essential element of leadership.	Very important Important Neutral Less Important Not Important					I am able to use this element in my position.
1	2	3	4	5	Serving as a change agent	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Being accessible to my constituents	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Accepting the role of a follower	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Serving as a catalyst for consensus	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Being open to different ways of accomplishing old tasks	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Promoting teamwork	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Breaking down communication barriers	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Convincing others that my point of view is correct	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Accepting compromise as a means of achieving organizational goals	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Being honest	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Taking risks	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Admitting mistakes	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Learning from mistakes	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5	Listening to all points of view	1	2	3	4	5	
1	2	3	4	5							

Figure 2. Leadership Paradigm. Adapted from "Meeting the Millennium's Challenge: Leading from Where You Are," by R. L. Spaid and M. H. Parsons, 1999, *New Directions for Community Colleges Journal*, 27(1), p. 15.

Appendix D: Baker University IRB Request



Date: September 5, 2013

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

IRB PROTOCOL NUMBER _____

GRADUATE DEPARTMENT

(IRB USE ONLY)

IRB Request

Proposal for Research

Submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board

I. Research Investigator(s) (Students must list faculty sponsor first)

II.

Department(s) School of Education Graduate Department

Name

Signature

- | | | | |
|----|-------------|-------|-----------------------------|
| 1. | Dennis King | _____ | Major Advisor |
| 2. | Katie Hole | _____ | Research Analyst |
| 3. | | | University Committee Member |
| 4. | | | External Committee Member |

Principal Investigator:

Siabhan May-Washington

Phone:

(816) 918-8776

Email:

smaywash@gmail.com

Mailing address:

12908 E. 57th Terrace, Kansas City, Mo. 64133

Faculty sponsor:

Phone:

Email: Expected Category of Review: ___ Exempt Expedited ___ Full

II: Protocol: (Type the title of your study)

The Roles and Attributes of English Department Chairs: A Mixed-Methods Examination of Leadership Perceptions

Summary

In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

The purpose of this mixed-methods study is to compare English department chairs' perceived roles and leadership styles in both public and private schools in the greater Missouri and Kansas metropolitan areas. In addition, the perceptions of English department chairs in the independent schools of the central states of Michigan, Ohio, Minnesota, Arkansas, Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Iowa will be explored. The study will focus on the following: leadership styles, democratic practices, curriculum initiatives, and teacher recruitment and retention practices. A goal of this study is to ascertain if chairs employ democratic methods in all or some aspects of their roles. Moreover, this study seeks to discover if there are differences in leadership among the demographic characteristics of gender and school size. Furthermore, the results of this study will help identify strategies to increase department chairs' effectiveness in leading their departments and empowering other teacher leaders.

Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

There are no conditions or manipulations within this study.

What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.

Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.

Chairs' roles and perceptions will be measured using an adaptation of the Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities survey (KSA) (Crowder, 2010). This survey addresses the roles and perceived abilities of chairs, including chairs' perceptions of both public and private schools. In the survey, chairs will gauge and self-report on the leadership activities and skills they implement in their work. The modified KSA instrument contains items that examine the skills and abilities of English department chairs and includes Likert-type scales where respondents can rank their levels of actual implementation or use of their skills.

The leadership observations will be measured using an adaptation of the Leadership Paradigm (Spaid & Parson, 1999). Spaid and Parson (1999) Leadership Paradigm contains 14 items that examine the democratic leadership practices of English department chairs. The adapted Spaid and Parson (1999) Leadership Paradigm uses a Likert-type scale allowing respondents to rank their leadership practices. In addition, the researcher will conduct personal interviews to measure chairs' perceptions and opinions of leadership (Feeney, 2009). This interview will be conducted with 12 survey respondents, selected randomly from those who volunteer to participate in the interview. The adapted (2009) Feeney interview instrument contains eight open-ended items and one closed-

response item allowing respondents to share their views about collaboration and other leadership practices. The instrument is designed to capture department chairs' opinions about their leadership styles, curriculum initiatives, and teacher recruitment and retention strategies. The interview instrument solicits information about how department leaders use departmental meeting time, whether they use student data to inform decision-making, and questions about whether student achievement levels are increasing, decreasing, or remaining the same. In addition, the researcher's instrument solicits information about chairs' length of tenure, education level, self-perception, leadership style methodologies, and examples of curriculum initiatives and teacher recruitment and retention strategies. Copies of all instruments are attached.

Subjects will encounter no psychological, social, physical, or legal risks.

Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.

The subjects will not encounter any stress in this study.

Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

The subjects will not be deceived or misled in any way.

Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

The subjects will have to classify their school locations as urban, suburban, or rural, and identify gender, years of experience, and personal perceptions related to their roles and leadership efforts as English department chairs. Some participants might consider these items to be personal, but the data will remain anonymous.

Will the subjects be presented with materials which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

The subjects will not encounter any offensive, threatening, or degrading materials.

Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

Each participant will be asked to complete a survey via e-mail that will take approximately 15 minutes. In addition, the respondents who volunteer and are selected to participate in the interview phase of the study will spend approximately 20 minutes on the telephone with the researcher answering a pre-determined list of questions.

Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

The subjects in this study will be Kansas and Missouri secondary level public and private school English department chairs, as well as department chairs in the independent schools of the central states of Michigan, Ohio, Minnesota, Arkansas, Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, Wisconsin, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Iowa. The researcher will use the list of Kansas and Missouri high schools from the greatschools.org website and contact secondary English chairs via email to participate in the study. Additionally, the researcher will utilize the Independent Schools Association of the Central States' directory to contact English department chairs in the aforementioned central states. For those English chairs whose contact information is not available on the greatschools.org website or from published school websites, the researcher will send the invitation to their school principals with a request that they forward it to their respective English department chairs. Of those participants who are willing to be interviewed, 12 will be randomly selected. A copy of the written solicitation is included at the end of this form.

What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

All communication to the subjects will underscore the voluntary nature of their participation. No inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation.

How will you insure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.

The survey will include an area verifying participants' consent to participate. Before submitting the survey, there will be an area on the electronic Google form where the participants will click to acknowledge their consent. Those who agree to consent for interviews will sign their consent acknowledgement in the survey and provide contact information. At the onset of the oral interviews, participants will be reminded that they consented to freely participate.

Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.

No data will be made part of any permanent record.

Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? If so, explain.

The fact that a subject did or did not participate in the study will not be made part of any permanent record to a supervisor, teacher, or employer.

What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data? Where will it be stored? How long will it be stored? What will be done with it after the study is completed?

All data will be coded in such a way to insure that no direct identification of the subjects will be possible. The data will be stored in the researcher's password protected Google account files during the study which will not be made public. The Google Docs survey is designed to ensure anonymity and will not collect personal e-mail or IP addresses of participants. Three years after the study is complete, the researcher will destroy the collected survey data. The researcher will also protect the information obtained from the interview phase participants. The data will be stored in the researcher's locked file cabinet safely secured in the researcher's locked office. The data will only be accessible to the researcher. For those who volunteered for the interview but who were not selected, the researcher will protect their information in a locked file cabinet. Three years after the study is completed, the data will be destroyed.

If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?

No risks are involved in this study.

Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.

No data from files or archival data will be used in this study.

Appendix E: Baker University IRB Approval



Sept. 26, 2013

Dear Ms. Washington,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your research project application and approved this project under Expedited Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

The Baker University IRB requires that your consent form must include the date of approval and expiration date (one year from today). Please be aware of the following:

1. At designated intervals (usually annually) until the project is completed, a Project Status Report must be returned to the IRB.
2. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
3. Notify the OIR about any new investigators not named in original application.
4. Any injury to a subject because of the research procedure must be reported to the IRB Chair or representative immediately.
5. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents for at least three years past completion of the research activity. If you use a signed consent form, provide a copy of the consent form to subjects at the time of consent.
6. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.

Please inform Office of Institutional Research (OIR) or myself when this project is terminated. As noted above, you must also provide OIR with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If your project receives funding which requests an annual update approval, you must request this from the IRB one month prior to the annual update. Thanks for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Thomas Peard
Chair, Baker University IRB

Appendix F: Letters of Consent



Feb. 24, 2011

Dear Dr. James Crowder:

My name is Siabhan May-Washington, and I am a department chair of a private, independent high school in Kansas City. I have just recently started doctoral studies at Baker University in Overland Park, Kansas. My dissertation topic aims to examine the roles and attributes of high school level department chairs-public and private.

I have been fortunate to come across your dissertation: "Transition Into The Department Chair Role/The Manager Leader Continuum." In addition to enjoying reading your work, I am particularly impressed by your appendices which include interview questions, a training survey, and the mean perceived importance of KSA's. I am writing to seek your permission to use your appendix materials as part of my upcoming research. I will certainly properly document and attribute these materials to you within my work, if I am fortunate enough to receive your permission.

I eagerly look forward to your response. If I can answer any additional questions regarding my plans, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Siabhan May-Washington

Ms. May-Washington,

If you think that my appendix materials regarding the department chair role will be of service to you, feel free to use them. Please cite me properly.

Good luck in your doctoral studies, and please feel free to consider me a resource regarding the roles, needs, and attributes of department chairs. There's also a new periodical that focuses just on chair-related issues (albeit in higher ed) simply called The Department Chair, which you may find useful.

Take care.

- Jim

James Crowder, Ed. D.

Professor, Biology/Brookdale Community College

Hi Dr. Crowder,

Hello again! I'm still plugging away on my research project. It's changed slightly since I last wrote you. I'm still examining department chairs' roles, but instead of perceptions of chairs and their members, I'm now examining the duties and perceptions of democratic leadership as perceived by chairs and their principals. Consequently, I am writing to let you know of my plans to slightly modify your original KSA instrument to fit my study. Instead of including the portion that says, "Training Needed," I will need to modify it to assess if the "chair's implementation" of the particular skill is in evidence.

I will still certainly cite you properly and indicate the modifications that I've put in place.

Thank you again for your assistance, and I hope you still authorize my use of your instrument with the new changes.

I look forward to hearing from you. Hope you're having a bit of summer fun!

Sincerely,
Siabhan

Hi, Siabhan

Nice to hear from you. Thank you for the notice regarding modifying the KSA - it sounds very interesting.

Take care and good luck.

- Jim

James Crowder, Ed. D.

Professor, Biology

Brookdale Community College

Feb. 24, 2011

Dear Dr. Robin Spaid:

My name is Siabhan May-Washington, and I am a department chair of a private, independent high school in Kansas City. I have just recently started doctoral studies at Baker University in Overland Park, Kansas. My dissertation topic aims to examine the roles and attributes of high school level department chairs-public and private.

I have been fortunate to come across the work that you co-authored with Parsons entitled, "Meeting the Millennium's Challenge." In addition to enjoying the prose, I am particularly impressed by the leadership paradigm instrument which assessed the critical incidents necessary for today's leaders, based on Hersey's and Blanchard's leadership design. I am writing to seek your permission to use your instrument as part of my upcoming research. I will certainly properly document and attribute these materials

within my work, if I am fortunate enough to receive your permission.

I eagerly look forward to your response. If I can answer any additional questions regarding my plans, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,
Siabhan May-Washington



Yes, you can use my instrument if you let me know how your study goes and share the results of your dissertation study with me. Good luck.

Robin L. Spaid, Associate Professor
Morgan State University

Hi Dr. Spaid,

Hello again! Thank you again for allowing me to use your instrument in my study. I hope you don't mind an additional request. If possible, I want to slightly modify most of the questions in your paradigm to include the word "democratic," as now part of my study is assessing democratic leadership practices. I hope I still have your permission to use your instrument with the aforementioned modifications.

I look forward to your reply. Thank you so very much and I hope you are enjoying a blissful summer.

Very Truly,
Siabhan May-Washington

Dr. Spaid,

I just wanted to add that in no way will my modification of including the word "democratic" or "participative leadership" misrepresent the situational leadership essence of your model. My study just plans to expound on the supportive style of Hersey and Blanchard's model more. I sincerely hope your permission is still granted.

Thanks,
Siabhan

Please modify it and let me know what your results are when you complete your research and I can call you Dr. May-Washington.

Robin L. Spaid, Ed.D.
Associate Professor, Community College Leadership Doctoral Program

Appendix G: E-Mail Letter of Invitation

Date: September 27, 2013

Dear English Department Chair:

My name is Siabhan May-Washington, and I am currently an assistant principal and English teacher. I am also a doctoral student at Baker University conducting a dissertation study titled *Roles and Attributes of English Department Chairs: A Mixed Methods Examination of Leadership Perceptions*.

I am writing to solicit your participation in my study, since you are an English department chair and/or teacher leader in the English discipline. By clicking on the survey link below, you are providing your consent to participate. The survey will take approximately fifteen minutes or less to complete. Please complete the survey by October 7, 2013. The survey is completely anonymous; all data will be reported in aggregate form.

The leadership of English department chairs is very dear to my heart. I served as the department chair of English at Pembroke Hill School for eight years. I also served as English chair in the Kansas City, Missouri School District at Lincoln College Preparatory Academy and at Anderson Alternative Middle and High School. By participating in this study, you will greatly assist me in understanding the roles of English chairs, and the results will assist other chairs in becoming more effective leaders. I know your time is valuable, and I do appreciate your support.

If you have any questions or concerns, or would like to obtain a copy of the results or study, please contact me at swashington@pembrokehill.org.

<https://docs.google.com/a/pembrokehill.org/forms/d/18olTmO3FIY8g7Nf0n3uoizi7zBqfdy9mA55xNKunfVk/viewform>

Sincerely,

Siabhan May-Washington

Appendix H: Reminder E-Mail

Reminder Notification

Dear English Department Chair:

My name is Siabhan May-Washington, and I am currently an assistant principal and English teacher. I am also a doctoral student at Baker University conducting a dissertation study titled *Roles and Attributes of English Department Chairs: A Mixed Methods Examination of Leadership Perceptions*. A week ago, I wrote you about participating in my clinical research study. If you have already completed the questionnaire, I thank you. If not, please know there is still time to take part. Your participation is needed.

I am writing to solicit your participation in my study, since you are an English department chair and/or teacher leader in the English discipline. By clicking on the survey link below, you are providing your consent to participate. The survey will take approximately fifteen minutes or less to complete. Please complete the survey by October 14, 2013. The survey is completely anonymous; all data will be reported in aggregate form.

The leadership of English department chairs is very dear to my heart. I served as the department chair of English at Pembroke Hill School for eight years. I also served as English chair in the Kansas City, Missouri School District at Lincoln College Preparatory Academy and at Anderson Alternative Middle and High School. By participating in this study, you will greatly assist me in understanding the roles of English chairs, and the results will assist other chairs in becoming more effective leaders. I know your time is valuable, and I do appreciate your support.

<https://docs.google.com/a/pembrokehill.org/forms/d/18oITmO3FIY8g7Nf0n3uoizi7zBqfdy9mA55xNKunfVk/viewform>

If you have any questions or concerns, or would like to obtain a copy of the results or study, please contact me at swashington@pembrokehill.org.

Sincerely,

Siabhan May-Washington