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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION:

The nature of this study initially emerged from the researcher's interest in higher education administration at historically black colleges and universities. A rather comprehensive review of selected related literature provided the background for conceptualizing the direction of this study.

Supported by published documented evidence of a general concern for administrative processes at the departmental level in higher education, the decision was made to direct the focus of this study toward the departmental administrator's role expectations. Evidence of need and basic criteria for such a study emerged from the review of selected related literature.

In this century, authority in American college and university governance has been decentralized and generally is shared by faculty, administration, students, and alumni. With rapid growth in enrollments and in subject matter specialization, central administration has come to rely increasingly upon decentralized units. Departments have become sources of specialized information allowing for the exercising of initiative and the making of decisions. The departmental chairman as spokesman for his department, has become a key academic and administrative officer.¹

The decentralization of decision-making authority and the rising influence of faculty members in the formulation of institutional policy has led to arrangements in which department and department chairpersons have a more significant role to play. An estimated 80 percent of all

administrative decisions take place at a departmental level. Yet most chairpersons are selected for reasons other than demonstrated managerial skills. They rarely receive training, and only limited literature exists describing their functions and responsibilities.\(^2\)

The chairperson is usually, if not always, trained to teach and to research. These activities have little to do with departmental functions upon which he will be evaluated by the dean and the administration.\(^3\)

Nonetheless, definite responsibilities must be fulfilled and specific functions must be carried out.\(^4\)

Therefore, the problem is conceptualized as a task analysis of the role expectations of the departmental chairperson. More specifically, the administrator of physical education in higher education; as perceived by: (1) the immediate superior (such as a dean or divisional head), hereinafter referred to as the superordinate administrator, or dean; (2) by the departmental administrators themselves, hereinafter referred to as the departmental chairperson, or chairperson; and (3) the departmental professional personnel, hereinafter referred to as the departmental faculty or faculty.

The literature reflects a general agreement among educators that each individual member of an educational organization should have an understanding of the nature and the extent of his rights and responsibilities. As higher education expands in size, interpersonal contacts and


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 14.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 14.
relationships have increased in complexity and are so interwoven that clear lines of responsibilities and rights are not always distinguishable.

The academic department chairperson shifts from being a subject matter specialist to a developer of departmental programs and a partner in shaping the educational mission of the school.5

Frequently he or she is selected, given a copy of the budget, introduced to other chairpersons, the faculty members and a secretary. He may inherit a few fragmentary files from his predecessor. But who instructs him? Who gives him literature or a manual and training on pertinent aspects of the operations? How does he learn to become a "good" department chairperson? Today the academic department is the key to the successful achievement of the school's primary mission. The chairperson functions as chief academic planner and resource allocator in his role as administrator of all aspects of the department. His responsibility extends to those things not done, as well as those undertaken and achieved.6

Job descriptions, defined by codified role expectations, must be specific and definite enough to be properly interpreted if the members of an organization are to understand the perceived role expectations for the role which they occupy. The lack of understanding of role expectations may result in feelings of insecurity and dissatisfaction among faculty and administrators. The degree to which faculty agree with each other and with their department chairperson on role expectations will determine, in part, their ability to perform in an effective manner.

The quality of academic life depends upon the beliefs in the goal of a meaningful education. It is the chairperson's function to keep the balance between teaching, research, committee work, and service.7

5 Ibid., p. 13.
6 Ibid., p. 13.
7 Ibid., p. 14.
However, to a very large degree, what the chairperson does or fails to do concerning the departmental programs determines the success or lack of success of the department. Certainly its success is his responsibility.

The complexity of the traditional task assigned to department chairpersons, the vagueness of job descriptions, and the ambiguity of role expectations have left many individuals confused regarding their positions and purposes in the departmental organization.

Generally speaking the literature reflects that the misunderstanding of the role of the chairperson can create barriers to progress in developing an effective and efficient administrative unit.

The academic department chairperson is frequently compared to a blue collar foreman in a plant, because he is the person who sees that the job is done. While both jobs are difficult, the foreman usually has a well-defined job description, while the department chairperson's job is often ambiguous and ill-defined. Often there is no job description, and when a description does exist, it may be largely seen as a hodgepodge of duties described by some as a "laundry list" of undone duties and responsibilities pulled from throughout the school.

The problem created by the lack of understanding of the role of the department chairperson may be examined in terms of the basic concept of "role" in a society for an educational system is itself a social system and a formal organization in which individuals hold various positions and interact with many people.

Assumably, if there were high agreement among all individuals in a given social system regarding the rules of behavior for every situation and these rules were explicit, interpersonal and intergroup interaction would tend to be orderly. Conflict would be at a minimum. If on the other hand different notions

---

9 Ibid., p. 13.
as to what is correct behavior in given situations and the various rules were ambiguous one would expect stress and strains in social relations, difficulties in role performance, and a maximum of conflict.\textsuperscript{10}

From this idea it would follow that a great deal can be learned about a normative or role structure through an analysis of the stresses and strains in the situations.

In an examination of the stresses and strains in the role of the teacher, Bruce Biddle found that

Social stability depends on the accuracy with which roles are perceived.... Should people disagree, by chance, about what behaviors are appropriate, they must at least be aware of the others' thinking in order to plan intelligent activity with those others.\textsuperscript{11}

From the results of Biddle's research, it becomes apparent that a knowledge of the perceived role expectations of others is necessary for an individual to function effectively as a part of a group or team.

According to Secord and Backman,

On the level of the social system, role strain results not from the characteristics of the actors themselves, but from the characteristics of the relations among actors.... Role strain occurs when group members do not hold expectations in common or when they behave contrary to them....\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{flushleft}


\end{flushleft}
Therefore, if departmental chairpersons are to interact successfully with professional associates, they should be aware of the role of the chairperson and the perceived role expectations that members of the professional educational team have for this role. What is needed is suggested in the statement of Gross, McEachern and Mason:

The starting point for the resolution of conflicting role expectations and the resulting role conflict should begin with the actors' definitions of the situation and their definite role expectations.13

ADMINISTRATION

Griffiths developed a theory of administration on the basis that administration is a science—requiring a scientific approach. He viewed the efforts toward an adequate theory of administration as "a movement toward a more scientific approach to administration."14

Griffiths developed the scientific approach to administration in terms of objectivity, reliability, operational definitions, coherence or systematic structure, and comprehensiveness. He concluded that the practicing administrator should utilize the benefits of administration research. He is seen as "an applier of science in much the same sense as an engineer or doctor."15


15 Ibid., p. 24.
Getzels viewed administration in terms of structure and function. He referred to structure as "the hierarchy of subordinate-superordinate relationships within a social system." He described function as "a hierarchy of relationships ... for allocating and integrating roles and facilities in order to achieve the goals for the social system."16

Duryea reviewed the trend toward decentralization in academic affairs and concluded that "departments have emerged as the most influential units.17 Ikenberry affirmed that "colleges and universities are inherently decentralized organizations."

Either by formal delegation of authority or by informal tacit approval, academic departments and individual faculty members participate heavily, not only in setting institutional goals, but in determining the most effective means of achieving the goals.18

Ikenberry identified selection, retention, and promotion of staff as fundamental function of department rather than institutional action. Decisions about curriculum, faculty work loads, schedules, "and a host of other important organizational matters" likewise were viewed as belonging on the department level. He justified this position by the fact that "the intangible, complex, and variable nature of the task makes


precise central executive controls difficult if not impossible to achieve in an institution of any significant size and breadth of program."\textsuperscript{19}

**DECENTRALIZATION**

Decentralization becomes necessary when central administration personnel become so burdened with operational decision-making and supervision that inadequate attention is given to the planning function. Centralized procedures are normal and desirable in the early stages of a growing organization, but research consistently supports the trend toward decentralization with appropriate reservations and conditions.\textsuperscript{20}

The purpose of decentralization is manifold: to relieve overburdened executives, locate decision-making closer to the point of application, develop and utilize other human resources; and generally to increase effectiveness of the structure. Wickesberg summarized advantages:

Location of the decision function closer than formerly to the point of operation is believed not only to increase flexibility, reduce reaction time to environmental changes and provide a greater stimulus and incentive particularly to managerial employees, but it is also the hope that the end result will be a reduction in costs or an expansion in growth or both over what could have been expected had no such adjustment been made.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., p. 26.


Wickesberg observed that decentralization tends to involve informal structures more productively in pursuit of organizational objectives. He stated that, as a result of decentralization, individuals are able to observe and evaluate their own efforts and "take a greater interest in and greater responsibility for results."22

Corson reviewed the evolution of decentralization in American higher education over the last hundred years, and identified the increasing significance of the department with this trend.23 That which was originally a subject area in the very small college expanded into departmental status as the college grew. Then the department became a school or college within the emerging university, and the school, representing a single discipline or subject area, began to function through its departments. Corson commented that departments normally enjoy a significant degree of autonomy, and at the same time incorporate the highly specialized grasp of subject area which enables intelligent decision-making. He cited two studies involving forty-three institutions which support his position, and concluded:

As a result of institutional size and of this specialization, the initiative for a great deal of educational policy, for personnel appoints and evaluation, and for the budgeting of equipment and educational facilities, has shifted to departments.24

22 Ibid., p. 87.


24 Ibid., p. 87.
DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRPERSON:

Corson contended that "Too little attention has been devoted to the large importance of governance of colleges and universities of the department and its chairperson." He visualized the department chairperson in the typical American university as "a (if not the) key administrative officer." The chairperson not only plays an indispensable role in the effective administration of his own discipline; he fills the role of interpreter between superior administrative officers (vice president, dean, or division head) and his instructional colleagues.

Corson specified four categories of relationships which characterize the functioning of department chairperson:

1. Relations with other administrators;
2. Relations with departmental associates;
3. Relations with students;
4. Relations with faculty governing units.

Corson's research supports the general assumption that nearly all chairpersons are recruited from the ranks of their subject area. Parsons wrote that they are "almost always practicing academic men." They are, therefore, part-time administrators. The small financial incentive to

---

25 Ibid., pp. 84-85.
26 Ibid., p. 94.
27 Ibid., pp. 88-92.
assume such duties is compensated by the satisfactions of service and professional contribution.

Corson called attention to the unusually significant influence which the chairperson wields upon his colleagues, and through them the students enrolled in the department's instructional, research, and service functions. He affirmed that chairpersons "are able to establish the character of the department."29

In his relationship to students, the department chairperson has the opportunity of approving various student options which may constitute departure from or exception to stated requirements. Corson wrote that "this further emphasized that the chairperson is a key administrative person on the operating level."30

THE DEPARTMENT

Corson explained that the department can serve either as a creative force or as a stronghold of the status quo. He said the department structure can serve as a dynamic educational force if the chairperson will "effectively participate with deans, provosts, and presidents in considering educational issues and in formulating institutional policies and programs." Corson added that they must also accept the responsibility for "leading their department colleagues in putting such policies and programs into effect."31

29 Corson, Governance of Colleagues, p. 90.
30 Ibid., p. 91.
31 Ibid., p. 93.
Very little progress of the department or institution will be made without the consent and support of participants. This consent waits on leadership competence. Effective department chairpersons accomplish objectives by equitable and effective dispersion of authority and power.

Keeton identified three characteristics of such a leader:

a. Its leaders have the confidence of their principal constituencies;

b. Its administrators can work effectively with other leaders who differ sharply from them in priorities, background, ways of working, and types of effectiveness; and

c. Its administrative leaders give priority to overall institutional effectiveness and carry out their consulting and managing in ways that serve the major needs of the different constituencies.32

Havighurst described these functions as those of "The Social Engineer," he said that "successful educational administrators are men and women of action, who lead the way to improved concerted action by people who participate in educational systems."33 He called for wise and skillful administrators.

It is recognized, however, that this research effort is dependent upon the availability of "descriptive" data. Without adequate and appropriate basic information, valid assessments cannot be compiled.


It was decided, therefore, that the first objective of this study would be the development of an instrument capable of securing descriptive information concerning the perceived role expectation of the department chairperson of physical education at the collegiate level with resulting data, conclusions and recommendations made in light of the selected criteria.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This is a task analysis study of the role expectations of the departmental chairperson of physical education and their routine duties and responsibilities, at historically black senior colleges and universities as perceived by: (1) the immediate superior (such as a dean or divisional head), hereinafter referred to as the superordinate administrator, or dean; (2) the departmental administrators themselves, hereinafter referred to as the departmental chairperson, or chairperson; (3) and the departmental professional personnel, hereinafter referred to as the departmental faculty or faculty.

The problem embraces several sub-problems:

1. To identify and define components of the administrative process at the departmental level and appropriate to this study.

2. To utilize identified and defined components of the administrative process as categories around which to develop a task statement inventory questionnaire instrument.
a. Design the instrument to provide appropriate means for securing perceptions of selected participants;
b. Design the instrument to provide a clear and usable description of the task responsibilities of the departmental chairperson.

3. To identify the study population for distributions in accordance with study limitations, and willingness to participate;

4. To administer the questionnaire to all participants;

5. To exercise followup procedures to secure at least 55 percent return.

OBJECTIVES

In order to sustain progress toward increased effectiveness of the higher educational processes in America, educational leaders need research data which will enable them to effectively examine and evaluate existing administrative roles and their needs.

Thus the objective of this research is to conduct an empirical study of the prevalent task responsibilities and practices of the departmental chairperson at historically black institutions of higher education in the United States, as perceived by the superordinate administrators (deans or divisional heads), the departmental faculties, and the departmental chairpersons themselves. A research instrument was designed to collect the data for statistical analysis.
In approaching the development of an adequately comprehensive instrument, it was necessary to consider which administrative task responsibilities are pertinent to such a description. Also, how many of these designated task inventory statements were necessary to a worthwhile description of the collegiate chairperson's role?

The problem embraces the following sub-problem objectives:

1. To identify the specific tasks that chairpersons of physical education departments perform in colleges and universities.

2. To identify the specific tasks that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black colleges and universities.

3. To utilize the identified tasks to develop a research instrument for collecting descriptive data concerning the perceived role expectations of chairpersons of physical education departments at historically black colleges and universities.

4. To identify specific tasks that chairpersons of physical education departments perform, at historically black colleges and universities, as perceived by the superordinate administrator.

5. To identify specific tasks that chairpersons of physical education departments perform, at historically black colleges and universities, as perceived by the chairpersons themselves.

6. To identify specific tasks that chairpersons of physical education departments perform, at historically black colleges and universities, as perceived by the departmental faculty.

7. To identify the importance of the tasks that chairpersons of physical education departments perform, at historically black colleges and universities, as perceived by the superordinate administration.

8. To identify the importance of the tasks that chairpersons of physical education departments perform, at historically black colleges and universities, as perceived by the chairpersons themselves.
9. To identify the importance of the tasks that chairpersons of physical education departments perform, at historically black colleges and universities, as perceived by department faculty.

10. To identify the relationships between the perceived role expectation responses of the chairperson of physical education departments and those of the superordinate administrator at the historically black colleges and universities.

11. To identify the relationships between the perceived role expectation responses of the chairperson of physical education departments and those of the department faculties at the historically black colleges and universities.

12. To identify the relationships between the perceived role expectation responses of the superordinate administrator and those of the department faculty at the historically black colleges and universities.

HYPOTHESES

The study will be designed and conducted to examine the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference among the deans, chairpersons and faculty respondents in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairperson.

2. There is no significant difference between the deans and the chairpersons in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairpersons.

3. There is no significant difference between the deans and the faculty in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairpersons.

4. There is no significant difference between the chairpersons and the faculty in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairpersons.
5. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the deans and chairpersons.

6. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the deans and the faculty.

7. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the chairpersons and the faculty.

8. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, of the total population (all three subpopulations combined) and the deans.

9. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the total population and the chairpersons.

10. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the total population and the faculty.

11. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the occupational position of respondents.

12. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the academic rank of respondents.

13. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the tenure status of respondents.
14. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of the task expectations and the sex of the respondents.

15. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of the task expectations and the age of the respondents.

16. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of task expectations and the degree of education of respondents.

17. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of task expectations and the years of service in present position of respondents.

18. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of the task expectations and the years of employment of respondents.

**BASIC ASSUMPTIONS**

Underlying this investigation are certain basic assumptions made by the researcher in planning the design for this study. The following assumptions were made as foundations of this study:

1. That vice presidents, presidents, deans, and other higher education administrators need descriptive information about the department chairpersons which this study could provide.

2. That self-study committees, accrediting teams, and state agencies for higher education institutions need information concerning the administrative tasks of the department chairperson which this study could provide.
3. That a significant number of the historically black colleges and universities have professional preparation programs in physical education leading to the bachelor's degree.

4. That the basic task elements of the collegiate department chairperson's administrative role can be identified and described.

5. That the instrument used in this study will properly represent the task of the department chairperson of physical education programs in historically black colleges and universities.

6. That the answers reported by the respondents will accurately reflect their honest and forthright appraisal of the importance of tasks for department chairpersons of physical education at historically black colleges and universities.

7. That the respondents will receive adequate explanation of the purpose of the study; the procedures for completing the instrument and a clear understanding of what is expected of them.

8. That departmental chairpersons of historically black colleges and universities desire to improve their role image with their immediate superordinate administrator and their immediate departmental faculty.

9. That departmental chairpersons at historically black colleges and universities desire to improve their professional competence.

10. That the immediate superordinate administrators and the departmental faculty will agree that the departmental chairperson
does occupy a significant role in the administrative hierarchy at institutions of higher education.

11. That the immediate superordinate administrators and the departmental faculty are capable and willing to identify their perceptions of the departmental chairperson's role.

12. That the perceptions may or may not be accurate, but in either case they affect the situation in which they work together.

13. That the role of the departmental chairperson may be expressed in terms of the behavior patterns of the departmental chairperson and the task performed by this group of professionals.

14. That immediate superordinate administrators and departmental faculty in their working relationships have had opportunities to have direct and indirect contact with the departmental chairperson or to obtain information on this professional administrator either through written or oral communications and can thus form their own expectations for the role of the departmental chairperson.

15. That all the participants in this study will be able to understand the vocabulary used in the questionnaire and to interpret the questions in generally the same way allowing for reasonable variability within acceptable limits.

16. That knowledge of the role expectations held by professional personnel for the departmental chairperson is critical in the smooth operations of an educational program and institution.
17. That the participants' responses to the questionnaire were made voluntarily and with objectivity, frankness, and fairness.

18. That knowledge of the varying role expectations for the departmental chairperson will be a first step toward eliminating any conflicts which might exist.

19. That in historically black institutions of higher education, including both private and public, intermediate hierarchical figures would be present in sufficient number to be representative.

20. That the role of the departmental chairperson, as defined by expectations derived from both immediate superior and departmental faculty and the implicit expectations, would be sufficiently dissimilar to that of other higher education administrative roles to justify limiting the study to the departmental chairperson.

21. That colleges and universities are bureaucracies and that departmental chairpersons perform in an hierarchical structure of superordinate-subordinate relationships.

22. That each member of a bureaucratic organization has some understanding of the nature and extent of his responsibilities and rights.

23. That there is a need for research of problems related to the role of the departmental chairperson.
SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

New concepts useful to educational administrators have emerged as a result of research in the behavioral sciences. One such concept deals with role theory. The emergence of this theory has been noted by Sarbin:

The concept of role, until recently was no more than armchair abstraction and made little, if any, impression on the currents of American psychological thought. In the last decade, under the influence of the sociometrics and group dynamic workers, and as a result of interdisciplinary work with sociologist, role has been accepted as a concept with research possibilities. . . 34

This concept has additional meaning to educational administrators when further investigations are made to expand knowledge in this area, and when such knowledge is applied to improve the educational process.

Education administrators hold central positions in the educational system, and society is dependent upon the effectiveness of this social institution. Administrators must understand their roles as interpreted by educational and professional associates if they are to perform in an effective manner.

It is imperative that administrators understand how educational and professional associates view the role expectations which define their jobs and determine the amount of conflict faced by administrators in the many and often contradictory demands made upon them.

The findings from research pertaining to role expectations have the potential of providing educational administrators with information urgently needed if they are to be successful in coping with the demands being made upon them by faculty groups for more representation in decision making. The seriousness and magnitude of this problem have been emphasized by Saunders:

Perhaps no current movement in education poses more questions and problems for the educational administrator than does the emergence of professional negotiations. 35

One level which would benefit from an analysis of the role expectations held for the departmental chairperson would be the higher education community. Ralph W. Tyler has suggested that:

The usefulness of this analysis of role perceptions and their congruity has become widely recognized among social scientists. In many cases, the effectiveness of a professional person is related to the way in which he perceives his role and the similarity between his perception and the way in which the public perceives his role.36

Keith Davis has taken this idea a step further to include not only role perceptions but also expectations, and has stated that:

An individual cannot meet the needs of others unless he knows what they expect of him. Where role expectations for a position are unknown or where there is a variation between the expectations of the individual and his superior, there tends to be poor motivation, inefficiency and difficulty in communicating.37


Thus if a departmental chairperson is to interact efficiently with the other educational personnel in the university agency, this person must know what expectations others hold for his role and how closely these expectations match his own expectations. Incongruency of role expectations can cause friction and misunderstanding which will work to undermine the effectiveness of the departmental program in the university.

Another benefit of a task analysis of the role expectations held for the departmental chairperson is the very important implication which such an analysis holds for the training of the higher education administrative specialist as well as for other professional education personnel.

Kimbrough discussed the current pressures in America to develop "an adequate system of formal education." He acknowledged the "important responsibility" of educators to lead in developing and administering improvements to meet the challenge.

Yet, Kimbrough pointed out, many educational administrators "have not been given systematic empirical knowledge" by which to attack the problems and achieve needed innovations. He lamented the fact that many educational leaders face their administrative tasks "without the benefit of research data as a guide to meeting the behavioral problems involved."

Heyns discussed the stresses currently imposed upon administrators in higher education and the demand for incentives and creativity in leadership of higher education institutions and programs. He appealed

---

39 Ibid.
for criteria by which to evaluate administrators and administrative processes and emphasized the need for techniques for securing information necessary for such evaluation. 40

Bolman called for greater utilization of related research in the preparation of college and university administrators. He also stressed the need for workshops and institutes to upgrade the skills of incumbents in various capacities of collegiate administration. 41

Bolman stated that "four critical problems face our campuses today for which many different officers should be prepared if they are to bring real leadership and statesmanship to their work." He identified these four problems as follows:

The first is the emerging ethos of student involvement in the educational direction of our institutions.

Second, the administrator today faces some new relationships to the faculty for which he must be more adequately prepared.

A third area for which today's administrator needs preparation concerns the matter of state, regional and national planning.

Fourth, and finally, accountability in financial matters now has become more critical than heretofore and yet another set of insights and abilities must be possessed by administrators. 42


42 Ibid., pp. 180-183.
Livingston called for greater communication and cooperation between administration and faculty in the decision-making processes of college governance. 43 He discussed the problems which arise when faculty and administrators neglect or refuse to demonstrate interdependence and mutual respect. Administrators were seen as primarily responsible for breaking through barriers of fear and distrust and initiating appropriate interaction with faculty personnel.

Heyns acknowledged elements of crisis of both external and internal character and stated:

"The upshot of this complexity is that people in positions of responsibility and leadership in higher education have been subjected to the greatest challenge in their history, and correspondingly enormous amount of inventiveness and creative leadership is now being demanded of them."44

Heyns called for criteria for evaluation of the administrator and the administrative process. He indicated that the weight of his concern was "to maximize the capacity for authoritative mobilization for change."45

Heyns concluded:

"It is time for the pendulum to swing, and for us to turn the creation of leaders—and a structure for leadership—that can introduce the qualitative changes in higher education that correspond in magnitude to the quantitative revolution we have witnessed in the past quarter of a century."46

46 Ibid.
There is a need, through the use of scientific research, to identify those codified expectations for departmental chairpersons, both written and unwritten, which are dysfunctional to their performance. There is also an urgent need to discover methods of implementing the desired changes in the perception of departmental faculty and superordinate administrators concerning the role of the departmental chairperson.

This study has been designed to provide an insight into the general role expectations of the departmental chairperson of physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities. Furthermore, this study seeks to provide information which can be used in increasing the effectiveness of communication among higher education personnel, deans or divisional heads and departmental faculty and chairpersons.

Therefore, the significance of this study is perceived as follows:

1. A review of research revealed no completed research study dealing with an analysis of the role of the collegiate departmental chairperson of physical education at historically black institutions of higher education with a program leading toward the baccalaureate degree in physical education.

2. The identification of appropriate task statements for analyzing the role of the collegiate administrator at the departmental level would be of considerable value inasmuch as it would provide an agreed-upon list of specific departmental tasks and responsibilities for which department chairpersons could be held accountable.
3. The application of identified task statements to higher education administrators would be helpful in providing guidelines for department chairpersons and insure a broad base of approach and involvement in programs operations.

4. Criteria for developing individualized programs for management by objectives (MBO) would emerge.

5. Data for self-assessment by specific observable and measurable criteria would be provided.

6. Conclusions and recommendations drawn from statistically treated data would be made available.

7. Suggestions for further needed and related research concerning the departmental chairperson in higher education would be made.

LIMITATIONS

This study has been designed to analyze the role of the administrator at the departmental level in American higher education. It is limited to the perceived role expectations of the department chairperson as perceived by: the superordinate administrator; by the department chairpersons themselves; and by the department faculty. The American higher education institutions are limited to four-year historically black colleges and universities. The study is further limited to those historically black institutions of higher education which offer professional preparation programs in physical education, leading to a baccalaureate degree in teacher education.
The role expectations of the departmental chairperson, as described by the task inventory statements of the questionnaire, are naturally dependent upon the nature of the criteria developed for analysis, and the basic assumptions made by the researcher.

The study data are limited to information collected during the academic year 1979-80 through the use of a mailed questionnaire. It is apparent that by using a questionnaire to collect data the probability of non-response is great. However, a followup questionnaire and telephone contact will be used to secure at least 55 percent response.

The data collected in this study will be limited by the participants' expressed expectations for the role of the departmental chairperson of physical education at historically black institutions of higher education. Any conclusions, therefore, depend on the ability of these people to express, honestly and openly, their expectations. Any inferences from the findings of this study may be applied only to the population studied.

It will be impossible to control the general social climate of the individual institutions of the study population for this study; this climate may affect the role expectations held by participants.

The study is limited by the instrument used, and by the extent to which the respondents are able to interpret accurately all items in the questionnaire. Though care will be taken in the development of the instrument, it is new and previously untested.
METHODS, PROCEDURES AND DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

The major purpose of this research was to conduct a task analysis study of the role expectations of the departmental chairpersons of physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities as perceived by the superordinate administrator, the departmental chairpersons themselves, and the departmental faculty. This section identifies the study population institutions, the respondents, the methods and procedures for collecting the data, and the statistical analysis techniques.

The study population institutions consist of all the black senior colleges and universities in the United States with professional preparation programs leading to the baccalaureate degree in physical education in teacher education.

The study population respondents consist of two immediate reference groups, superordinate administrator or dean of teacher education, and the departmental faculty, and the departmental chairpersons themselves.

The research design employed necessitated the use of a mailed questionnaire, consisting of a biographical and demographical data and information section and a task inventory response section. The items in the biographical and demographical data and information section were selected to provide descriptive data on study population institutions and respondents. The items in the task inventory statement response section are used to define the role expectations for departmental chairpersons of higher education in the United States and were derived from existing research and other current and related literature.
A task inventory technique was developed by Marsh, Madden and Christal (1961) of the United States Air Force Personnel Research Laboratory. They used a list of task inventory statements to be rated on a Likert-Type Scale. They found this technique to be a reliable and valid procedure for collecting extensive job descriptions for thousands of Air Force Personnel and developed computerized procedures for analyzing such data. This Likert-Type Scale was adopted as the basic format for the research instrument in this study.

There are six possible responses for each question on a six point (6) Likert Scale. These responses are (0) Should Not Perform; (1) Not Important, But Should Perform; (2) Below Average Importance; (3) Average Importance; (4) Above Average Importance; (5) Maximum Importance for the actual role task performed.

The task inventory statements were validated by a jury of experts. The tasks were stated in behavioral terms. Care was taken to consider professional subrole items. The subroles included administrator and supervisor, program planner and developer, teacher and counselor and research and service.

Mean scores were computed on each item rated by the jury of experts. Only those task inventory statements with a mean score rating of 3.0 or better were retained for further consideration. The mean rating procedure was repeated until the jury of experts were satisfied that the research task inventory statement instrument had reached an efficient and effective stage of development, in terms of questions asked and the number of questions.
The returned questionnaires were statistically analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, and the results are reported in table form for greater understanding and clarity. This research design has used mean scores, Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient and phi coefficient descriptive statistics; t-tests, analysis of variance, Scheffe multiple comparison test and chi-square inferential statistics to treat the data.

Charters indicates two basic purposes of comparing responses of groups in role analysis. The first is to determine the existence of conflict or disagreement in expectations. The second is to establish the existence of some level of agreement in expectations. 47

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

In view of an absence of consensus on a taxonomy of educational terminology, there exists a need to define some terms used in this study. Other definitions may be found in the educational literature, but for the discussions of this study the investigator has chosen these definitions for the purpose of giving clarification of understanding for this research.

1. Perception - Human reality according to the individual mental image.

2. Role - Is conceived as the organized actions or expected behaviors of an incumbent of a given position within a social system; as defined in terms of rights and obligations; for the purposes of this study one's position as an administrator.

3. Role Expectation - The role as it is anticipated. The prescription for a particular position in a social system. A concept held about a behavior likely to be exhibited by a person or a standard held for the behavior of a person.

4. Role Conflict - Denotes the incompatibility of expectations of an incumbent of a position. Role conflicts include two general types: intra-role conflict and inter-role conflict. Intra-role conflict refers to (1) a situation in which a person's self-expectations are different from those that others hold for him as the occupant of a given position sometimes referred to as self-role conflict; and (2) a situation in which different groups (e.g. faculty and superordinate administrators) hold conflicting expectations of the role incumbent. Inter-role conflict refers to a situation in which an individual perceives that others hold different expectations for him as the incumbent of two or more positions. For example, the expectations held
by a faculty for a "departmental chairperson" may be different for the chairperson in his role as the implementer of the "university" policy on the one hand and as representative of the faculty in influencing policy determination on the other hand.

5. Need-dispositions - individual tendencies to orient and act with respect to objects in certain manners and to expect certain consequences from those actions.

6. Organization - A social system or subsystem for accomplishing stated purposes and objectives; for the purposes of this study organization is identified as collegiate department.

7. Administrator - An individual in an organizational structure, whose duties come under the functional elements of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting, for the purposes of this study the departmental chairperson.

8. Administration - Directing, guiding and managing an organization or an organizational unit toward effective realization of stated goals and objectives; for the express purposes of this study the organizational unit is identified as a collegiate department.

9. Higher Education - For the purposes of this study the definition is limited to four-year senior colleges and universities.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION:

A review of the literature on the collegiate department chairperson of physical education must, of necessity, concern itself with two major topics. First, some attention must be given to the historical background of role concept studies, to "role," role theory, role perceptions, role expectations, role conflict, and especially literature relating to role theory in education. Secondly, an examination of related literature on the role of the collegiate department chairperson.

It would be impossible, in the brief space of this review of the literature, to explore all of the concepts and to clarify all of the terms which exist in role theory. Rather, this review will point out some general features of role theory as related to research.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

Although the concept of "role" existed before the 1930's, it was not until the 1930's that many social scientists as well as psychologists became interested in the study of roles. George Mead, Jacob Moreno,

and Ralph Linton were among the first to study roles systematically. These early researchers concentrated on descriptive studies and stressed the ways in which incomplete articulation of roles can cause personal and organizational strains. Linton pointed out that:

The behavior of the individual must be studied not simply in relation to the total culture of his society but also in relation to the particular cultural demands which his society makes upon him because of his place in it.  

More recent research has dealt with the sudden existence of similar roles in different informal groups and with role specialization in "task and social emotional behavior." In education, one of the leading studies on role expectations and role consensus is that by Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern. They indicated the existence of and increasing tendency to view role consensus as an important variable in any study of cultural organizations, social systems or social behavior. 

---


ROLE:

Role is an indication of what an incumbent in a given position does or is expected to do because of his position. As Edwin J. Thomas and Bruce J. Biddle describe the concept of role:

Individuals in society occupy positions, and their role performance in these positions is determined by social norms, demands and rules; by the role performances of others in their respective positions; by those who observe and react to the performance; and by the individual's particular capabilities and personality.

Each individual performs a role in society. What he or she does or does not do in this role depends not only on his or her own expectations and desires but also on the expectations of others. Conformity to the expectations of others brings approval and positive sanctions while deviations from these expectations bring disapproval and negative sanctions from the group. Role conflict occurs when an individual is faced with contradictory role expectations either from different group members or between the individual and the rest of the group. The result is a compromise between the role expectations, a physical or psychological withdrawal from both sets of role expectations, or a selection of one set while ignoring the other.

---


Thus,

A person cannot be indifferent to how others perceive him when he must interact with them in order to attain his goals ... To maximize the predictability of the environment not only must he strive for accuracy in discerning how others view him and the situation but he must be willing to conform to some degree to the expectations that others have of him.  

Within each role is some form of internal organization which orders the expectations applied to a given individual in a given position. Therefore, the breakdown of a role into sets of expectations or role segments is important in role analysis. Role segmentation is "concerned with the classifications of a group or set of expectations that individuals may hold for an incumbent of a specified position." The role segments studied in this research on the role of the collegiate chairperson of the department of physical education will be those of the chief administrator of teacher education, the chairperson himself and the departmental faculty.

ROLE THEORY:

The twentieth century has seen the growth of the study of the concept of "role" as social scientists seek to provide a basis for identifying and placing individuals in a social situation.

Studies dealing with role theory from a social psychological and a sociological frame of reference abounds in the literature. However, the literature concerning role theory, as it relates to educational

11 Gross, Mason, and McEachern, p. 61.
institutions, is limited. Efforts to explore systematically the heuristic value of role theory in education are noticeably lacking and even fewer studies concerning role expectations have been reported.

In a general sense, role theory indicates that an individual may be seen as conforming with or in opposition to the expectation of his role as viewed by various reference groups. Expectations may include not only the individual's own concept of his role, but also the conceptions of others, related to the role he is to perform.

Social psychology developed a framework for conceptualizing role theory with the view that expectations are products of group interaction, that different groups may define expectations in different ways, and that a person's perception of the expectations in even his own group are not necessarily veridical. 12

The concept of role inherent in all role theory stresses the influence of contemporaneous forces arising in the person's immediate social environment to impress his behavior. It designates, in particular, the forces exerted on a person by expectations which are held by significant others in his milieu. 13 In broad perspective, contemporary role theory regards human conduct as the product of the interaction of self and role. 14


All societies (defined as aggregations of persons with common goals) are organized around positions, and the persons who occupy these positions perform specialized actions or roles. These roles are linked with the position and not with the person who is temporarily occupying the position.  

In sociologically oriented role theories, the expectations are regarded as culturally patterned and as attached to the statuses, or positions, that a person occupies rather than immutably to the person himself. The force of expectations is transmitted to the person during interaction between himself and the significant others. The force is effective only as the person perceives, or cognizes the expectations. Individualized role definitions are structured by particular role incumbents in terms of their need-dispositions, and they determine the degree or congruence between institutional expectations and perceived expectations on the part of the role incumbents.

Roles are complementary-interdependent in that each role derives its meaning from its relation with other roles in the organization. The expectations for one role in a bureaucratic organization will in some instances dictate the sanctions for another related role. The

15 Ibid., p. 224.
complementary relations of tasks, in the hierarchical arrangement of roles in the bureaucratic institutions, are determined by a system of rules which define the institutional expectations for a particular role and which govern the interpersonal relationships of the role incumbent.

The behavior of an individual can be viewed as goal-directed and congruent when he performs the enactment of his role in such a manner as to satisfy the institutional expectations and at the same time not perceive such performance as being incongruent with the satisfaction of his personal need-dispositions. There is never complete congruence between expectations and need dispositions because individuals bring with them into the organization needs which are incongruent with organizational membership. According to Linton, "Life in an organization is a compromise between the needs of the individual and the needs of the group and it has the indefiniteness and instability of all compromise situations."\(^{18}\)

Roles are defined by role expectations. An individual is said to be performing his role when the role incumbent puts these obligations and responsibilities into effect.\(^{19}\)

Role performance is regulated by the institutional expectations established for that role and the personality of the role incumbent as defined by his need-dispositions.


\(^{19}\)Campbell, p. 184.
According to Sarbin, two general kinds of expectations are found: \textit{rights} and \textit{obligations}. Rights are role expectations in which the actor of the role anticipates certain performances from the actor of the reciprocal role. Obligations are role expectations in which the actor of the reciprocal role anticipates certain performance directed toward the actor of the reciprocal role. \ldots

The role then may be defined as the rights and obligations of a person who occupies a particular position in a social system.

In their work on social structure, Bredemeier and Stephenson concur:

A role is not all the "Behavioral enacting," of the status it is only the behavioral enacting of a part of the status—the part which prescribes how the status-occupant should act toward one of the persons with whom his status rights and obligations put them in contact.\footnote{Bredemeier and Stephenson, The Analysis of Social Systems (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 30}

In his study Johnson states,

A person is said to "occupy" a social position if he has a certain cluster of obligations and enjoys a certain cluster of associated rights within a social system. These two parts of a social position we shall call its role and its status, "role" referring to obligations and "status" referring to rights. Thus, every social position is a status-role. When the context would prevent misunderstanding, however, we may use either "role" or "status" to mean the entire social position. The role structure of a group is the same thing as its status structure, because what is role from the point of view of one member is status from the point of view of the other.\footnote{Johnson, Sociology: A Systematic Introduction (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1960), p. 16.}
Status is a position within a division of labor. One should understand that status is not a physical position, but a set of cultural definitions, specifying how an actor is supposed to perceive and respond to objects and people when he is in a particular relationship with them.  

Johnson views role and status as quite inseparable. There can be no status without role and no role without status. Furthermore, status is simply a collection of rights and duties.  

In Linton's view,  

A role represents the dynamic aspect of a status. When he (the actor) puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing a role... The more perfectly the members of any society are adjusted to their statuses and roles the more smoothly the society will function.  

Parsons describes a social system as a system of processes of interaction between actors. Interaction implies behavior. This requires a concept to explain why and how individuals so behave as well as how they should behave as incumbents of positions.  

... there is the processual aspect, that of what the actor does in his relations with others seen in the context of its functional significance for the social system. It is this which we shall call his role.  

---

23 Ibid.  
24 Ibid.  
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Gross, Mason and McEachern have a similar conception of role:

A role is a set of expectations applied to an incumbent of a particular position. We have defined role as that it can be used as a concept at any of the various levels of relational and situational specificity which can be applied to position. 28

Role is a pattern of activity: what a person has to do (or thinks he has to do) in order to validate his occupation of the position.

ROLE PERCEPTION:

Generally the view of role theorists in education is that perceived expectations constitute the behaviorally influential environment for the person. 29

Role perception may be thought of as a sequence of behaviors in which the perceptual response is the first part of a social act: the silent naming or locating of the position of the other which serves to locate the position of the self. The second part of the social act is the motoric response, the role enactment, in which the actor performs actions appropriate to his location of the position of self and others. 30 To the degree that one's perception is inaccurate, then his locating the position of the other will be invalid, and his role enactment inappropriate.

Because of selective perception, each individual within a formal organization may be conceived to be functioning in two separate situations.

28 Gross, Mason and McEachern, p. 61.
30 Sarbin, p. 229.
The first consists of the institutionalized role definitions and is structured by the organization in terms of rationality. The second consist of the individualized role definitions and is structured by the individual in terms of his need-dispositions. The interaction of these two situations, as perceived by the member, leads to his cognitive orientation to roles.  

Viewed this way, the cognitive orientation to roles has to do with the rational aspects of an employee's understanding of (a) his own role, (b) the roles of the others with whom he must interact, (c) the interrelationships of these roles, and (d) the relationships of the role definitions to the goals of the organization. Thus, an individual's cognitive orientation defines for him the position he occupies the way he is expected to relate to the incumbents of complimentary positions, and the behaviors that are prescribed and proscribed by the organization.  

The nature of the role incumbent's personality and need-dispositions serves or inhibits acceptable role performance in terms of the level of congruence between the perceived role expectations and the personal need-dispositions by the person occupying a particular role.

At the same time an individual is coming to a rational understanding of his position in an organization he is also developing feeling and attitudes regarding the position. Thus as he achieves a cognitive orientation to roles, he also acquires effective responses to roles.  

It is necessary to know the established role expectations and perceived need-dispositions of a role incumbent in order to understand his role performance or behavior. Needs may be conceived as related to

---
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personalistic factors and expectations derived from institutional obligations as defined by codified or noncodified rules and regulations.

Role expectations and need-dispositions both have a quality of demand. The one is derived from the sanctions of legitimate authority within the institution, and the other is associated with tension reduction with the individual. Behavior is a product of the two sets of demands varying in relative magnitude from one role to another and from one personality to another. 34

The role incumbent's perception of the way in which significant others affect his behavior will in large part determine the amount of satisfaction he derives from his job; it will also determine the amount of conflict which he will experience.

ROLE EXPECTATIONS:

In any role it is important for the incumbent to realize the expectations which others hold for him. Every position involves the role expectations of other individuals besides the role incumbent, for members of all groups have general expectations which apply to all of the members of the group; i.e., to each individual who occupies a position within the group. In a study of role conflict, Robert Kahn and others found that

Role pressures are assumed to originate in the expectations held by members of the role set. Role senders have expectations regarding the way in which the focal person is actually performing. They correlate the two, and exert pressures to make his performance congruent with their expectation. These pressures induce in the

34 Charters, "Role Analysis," p. 798.
focal person an experience which has both perceptual and
cognitive properties, and which leads in turn to certain
adjustive (or maladjustive) responses.  

The importance of role expectations has been indicated by writers
like F. A. Stancato who states that:

Social psychologists and role theorists seem to agree
that the expectations associated with . . . roles are essential
for predicting behavior and that any item of behavior must
always be placed in some self-other contest.

Role consensus assumes that members of a population agree completely
on the expectations they hold for a role incumbent. Agreement is de-
determined by measuring the expectations held by each member of a given
population and then showing a low degree of variation or a high degree
of correlation in the population expectations. An analysis of the
variation of expectations within each group of role definers will be
used in this study of collegiate department chairpersons of departments
of physical education to determine the existence of intraposition consen-
sus of role expectations. Also, the study will analyze interposition consen-
sus of expectations to determine agreement between pairs of role de-
fining groups.

---

35 Robert L. Kahn et al., "Adjustment to Role Conflict and Ambiguity
in Organizations," in Role Theory, ed.: Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas

36 F. A. Stancato, "Administration of Teaching Personnel: Implications
of a Theory of Role Conflict Resolution," Contemporary Education 45

Success in a given situation has been found to relate to congruency of role expectations. Jacob Getzels, studying conflict in educational systems, found that:

When the perceptions of expectations overlap, the participants in the relationship feel satisfied with the work achieved, no matter what the actual behavior or accomplishments. 38

In order for agreement of role expectations to exist between a role incumbent and role definers, open channels of communication must exist and the role incumbent must realize what is expected of him. When role expectations are unknown due to poor communication or insufficient role definitions, role ambiguity results. In an ambiguous role situation, it is difficult to predict how an individual will act. The resulting confusion is perhaps even more damaging than the known existence of greatly different of opposite expectations. 39

Role expectations play an important part in most forms of role analysis. Charters has found that "role analysis nearly always entails a measure of the extent to which two sets of parallel data are somehow alike or different." 40 Thus Gross, Mason, and McEachern looked at the expectations of role incumbents and role definers in their study of the


39 Davis, Human Behavior at Work, pp. 28–29.

role of the school superintendent. Also, Bruce Biddle and others found that an expression of expectations form both subject and object persons (role definers and role incumbents) is necessary in judging norm attributes.

ROLE CONFLICT:

Expectations associated with roles vary in clarity and in the degree of agreement or consensus among persons. Within limits, the more explicit and specific an expectation is, the easier it is for a person to conform to it and the more smoothly the system functions. When expectations are unclear, conflict is produced by individual uncertainty about what is expected and by various conflicting interpretations of what role-behavior would be appropriate.

Secord and Backman have reported that there are five important forms of disagreement on expectations:

1. What expectations are included in a given role
2. The range of permitted or prohibited behavior
3. Situations to which the role applies
4. Whether the expected behavior is mandatory or simply preferred

---

41 Gross, Mason, and McEachern, Explorations in Role Analysis, p. 61.
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5. Which should be honored first when one expectation conflicts
with another.\footnote{Ibid., p. 472.}

According to one national research project, the sources of pressure
and conflict for a person can be expressed rather fully in terms of his
interpersonal relations. Perhaps the greatest pressure directed to a
person is from other people who are in the same department, who are his
superiors in the hierarchy, who are sufficiently dependent on his per-
formance to care about his adequacy without being completely dependent
and not inhibited in making their demands known. Probably the people who
are least likely to apply such pressures are a person's peers and role
senders outside his own department. The kinds of influence techniques
which people are prepared to apply, as well as the degree of pressure
they exert, vary with their formal relationship to the potential target
of their pressures.\footnote{Robert L. Kahn, Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, J. Diedrick
Snoek and Robert A. Rosenthal, Organizational Stress: Studies in Role
Conflict and Ambiguity (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964),
pp. 382-383.}

A role cannot be defined in isolation of other roles. Each role
can only be defined in terms of its relationship to other roles as de-
termined by assigned expectations and expected behavior. There would be
little significance in attempting to define the role of the collegiate
administrator outside of the context of superordinate and subordinate
relationships or reference groups.

The very stress in modern organizations upon the formal, legal rules
means that the explicit acknowledgement of an expectation frequently
becomes the criterion of its legitimacy. Expectations which have not been given explicit acknowledgement, through contractual or other legal enactments, tend to become regarded as liberties which are permissive or even preferred but are not seen fully obligatory. 46

In education, there exists an abundance of implicit rules which govern the behavior of administrators and which establish administrator expectations. These rules have been legitimatized through the process of acknowledgement rather than by legal enactment of administrative rules or regulations.

In an educational institution, the degree of congruence in the interpretation of role expectation by superordinates and subordinates occupying complimentary roles determine to a large extent the amount of acceptable role performance by the department chairperson.

According to Getzels and Guba, a unique feature of all roles is that expectations are not prescribed in minute detail and a certain range of flexibility in meeting them is considered legitimate. This range of freedom makes it possible for actors with different personalities to fulfill the expectations held for a single role. 47


ROLE THEORY IN EDUCATION:

The hierarchy in educational organization establishes the role and gives interpersonal definition to role expectations. Roles have been referred to by Linton as the "dynamic aspects" of the positions, offices and statuses within an institution, and they define the behavior of the incumbent or actors. 48

The role players in modern organizations must, in some measure, derive their mutual expectations from sources other than the codified rules. Consequently, the stability of their relationship is to some extent contingent upon the extent to which they conform with one another's informal, traditional and implicit expectations. 49

Roles are defined on a rational basis, usually by codified rules which serve to establish the rights and obligations of the role incumbent. These rules may be considered rational in that they define the role of the persons who may occupy the role either in the past, present or the future. This rational approach permits general agreement on the acceptable behavior or performance expected and permits prediction of behavior in the institution. This predictability of behavior of role incumbents permits rather complete understanding of what people in an organization do without observing them in the actual performance of their task.

Since roles are occupied by individuals with varying personalistic characteristics, different individuals will perform their roles in a

49 Goulder, p. 418.
unique way, peculiar to their interpretation of the role expectations and their personality. The nature of the roles and expectations limits and restricts the behavior of the role incumbent for the purpose of guaranteeing conformity of behavior with what has been defined as acceptable institutional performance. Each individual inhabiting a role, however, will perform to some degree in terms of his individual personality and need-dispositions.

The individual dimension of the organizational behavior can be analyzed in terms of personality and need-dispositions and the institutional dimensions analyzed in terms of roles and role expectations. Personality is defined by Getzels as the dynamic organization within the individual of those need-dispositions that govern his unique reactions to the environment. Need-dispositions have been defined by Parsons and Shils as "individual tendencies to orient and act with respect to objects in certain manners and to expect certain consequences from those actions." Getzels and Guba suggested, "a pervasive problem in any institution is that of integrating the demands of the institutions and the demands of the staff members in a way that is at once organizationally productive and individually fulfilling."

In a social system, such as an educational organization, roles do not present a single set of behavioral expectations but rather expectations

---

50 Getzels and Guba, pp. 423-441.
52 Getzels and Guba, pp. 423-441.
assigned or associated with an array of roles or positions. Merton has termed this situation in which an individual occupies more than one role simultaneously as multiple roles. 53

An administrator may simultaneously occupy the role of counselor, advisor, disciplinarian, classroom teacher and public relations agent. At the same time the administrator is occupying these roles, he may simultaneously occupy other roles, such as parent, church member, civic club member and professional organization member.

Solley and Murphy contend that for perception to occur a physical stimulus must be present because these factors have a direct influence upon perception. 54 On the other hand, Allport 55 does not believe that motivation should be considered among those factors that have direct effect on perceptions. The direct or indirect effect of motivation to perception is of little importance to the research objectives of this study. The most important thing to consider is that motivation influences perception and perception is the reality.

Charles C. Davis completed a dissertation study entitled, An Analysis of the Duties Performed by the Administrative Head of Health, Physical Education and Recreation in State Supported Colleges and Universities in the United States, at The Ohio State University, 1972.


The purpose of this study was twofold: one, to conduct a modified job analysis to determine what the duties of the administrative head in health, physical education and recreation are; and two, to examine the possible relationship of certain selected variables such as sex, age, experience, program size, and academic preparation in administration to the performance of specific duties.56

The result of the analysis of the data revealed that several significant associations were found to exist between the background variables and the performance of specific duties.57

The duties were distributed among the following eight broad classifications of duties: General Administrative Duties, Supervisory Duties, Instructional Program, Personnel, Purchase and Care of Equipment and Supplies, Professional Growth and Contributions, Special Services and Activities, and Community Activities and Public Relations.58

The term "job analysis" had begun to appear in vocational and general education literature during World War I. In the early 1920's the term "job analysis" continued to be all inclusive, and according to Lytle, "it covered every kind of job study."59 Fryklund has stated that the job analysis technique "has caught the attention of people who are interested in curriculum procedures in all subject-matter fields in education.60

57 Ibid., p. 128
58 Ibid.
Fryklund further states that "From its World War I beginnings, it has come to be one of the most important and lasting contributions in the improvement of curriculum procedures in all areas of education."

Job analysis became defined as "an investigation and analysis of a work assignment, and the conditions surrounding it, to determine its requirements from an organizational standpoint."

Lytle points to the acceptance of the job analysis technique when he wrote that "job analysis had at least taken its place everywhere as a review study of duties . . . with the definite purpose of procuring all data on the . . . job . . . which the personnel staff needed."

The Nineteenth National Conference on Higher Education stated that three allied types of information, which would be of value to college or university administrators can be obtained by employing the job analysis technique. The conference reported that job analysis:

1. Presents the characteristics, duties, and responsibilities of a particular position.

2. Specifies in a written record certain desirable requirements or standards preferred for a job holder.

3. Shows relationships to other positions . . . lines of authority become evident.
A job analysis also has worth in that it helps eliminate the confusion and tension which often results when the duties and responsibilities of the various administrators are not clearly defined and understood by all staff members. A systematic job analysis eliminate some of the tension and confusion by yielding information.

As the literature reveals, job analysis begins in industry and the professions and was later adopted by the educational field. Over twenty years ago Mackey explained this transition as follows:

Industrial management has found that analysis of jobs in industry can improve hiring techniques, training and rating methods, job descriptions and job performance. Following industry's lead, education too, is making use of job analysis to obtain more specific knowledge of school job functions with the aim of improving training and supervisory practices, and of pointing the way to better job performance.

Monroe, Myers, and Weidemann were among the early investigators of the duties required of personnel in physical education. Dorice Myers summarized the situation in the 1920's relative to the lack of available information in these words: "Relative to the literature dealing with
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the topic there is practically none available which deals directly with specific duties of a head of a high school department of physical education. 70

In 1930 N. P. Neilson attacked the problem of what preparation was required of practitioners who were to assume professional positions in the public schools as physical educators. The specific purpose of the study was to determine what the duties of physical education practitioners in California high schools were, and what future training should be given future practitioners to prepare them to perform these duties. 71

Shepard researched the duties performed by physical education department heads in senior high schools of Los Angeles. He held interviews and developed a checklist which contained 40 items pertaining to professional preparation and experience. The checklist also contained 206 items which dealt with administrative and supervisory duties. He submitted the checklist to 27 department heads. He found that of the 206 items which were classified as administrative and supervisory duties were performed by more than 51 percent of the respondents. 72


LaPorte\textsuperscript{73} and Cox\textsuperscript{74} conducted research similar to Shepard's to determine what the functions of the physical education teacher were. The data collected by Cox was used to identify material useful to teacher preparation institutions, and for educational and vocational guidance of men contemplating careers in physical education.

In 1975 Hoffer\textsuperscript{75} and Jackson\textsuperscript{76} conducted extensive studies of personnel in recreation and physical education. Hoffer attempted to find what activities were performed by supervisors and leaders in the field of recreation and informal education. Part one of this study consisted of compiling the activities thought to be performed by recreation supervisors and leaders. Hoffer utilized text books, daily diaries kept by the supervisors, and annual reports to compile the list of duties. The activities were combined into a list of 309 activities. The activities were then combined into 20 categories. The resulting master list contained 69 items which were classified into 10 categories. Part two of Hoffer's study consisted of submitting the final master list to a group of selected judges to be rated for importance.


\textsuperscript{74}Robert Cox, "Job Analysis of Male Directors of Physical Education in the Class A High Schools of Ohio" (unpublished M.A. thesis, The Ohio State University, 1939).

\textsuperscript{75}J. R. Hoffer, "An Activity Analysis of the Duties of Recreation and Informal Education Leaders and Supervisors" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1942).

C. O. Jackson conducted a study to find out what the existing situation was relative to the activities engaged in by teachers of physical education in the high schools of Illinois. The major purposes of this study were to secure information concerning the curriculum in physical education, the preparation of teachers, and self-evaluation of the adequacy of the training. Jackson concluded that the physical education teacher must be a master of all trades. Jackson's study also revealed deficiencies in the professional preparation of personnel in health, physical education, and safety. Jackson commented on the value of the study by stating "that the data were most revealing in indicating gaps and weaknesses . . . both in the curriculum in physical education and in the teacher-training curricula."  

The research conducted by Humphrey in 1951 helped to identify the functions of directors of physical education. Part One of his study consisted of developing a list of 127 duties performed by the directors of physical education. The duties were noted on index cards and organized into eight categories. A pilot study was conducted utilizing 17 graduate students and 20 administrators of the College of Education at Boston University. Part Two of the study consisted of sending a questionnaire to 350 public school directors of physical education throughout the United States. After analyzing the findings of the study, Humphrey recommended that more attention be given to program coordination, budgeting and
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accounting, and programs for the handicapped in both the undergraduate and graduate curriculum. He further emphasized the need for graduate level courses pertaining to supervision.\footnote{James H. Humphrey, "A Job Analysis of Selected Public School Physical Education Directors" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1959), p. 8.}

In 1953 Loveless investigated the duties of state directors of health and physical education. Loveless divided his questionnaire into three parts. Part one consisted of general background information of the directors. Part two dealt directly with the duties of the state director. The duties were divided into the following categories:\footnote{James C. Loveless, "Duties of the State Directors of Health and Physical Education," \textit{Research Quarterly}, Vol. 24, No. 2 (May, 1953).}

1. Administrative Tasks
2. Program Planning
3. Work with Staff Associates, Teachers, and Administrators
4. Clerical Activities
5. Publications
6. Professional Advancement
7. Management.\footnote{Ibid., p. 193.}

Part three of the study investigated the degree of responsibility involved in carrying out the specific duties. The criteria used to measure the degree of responsibility were as follows:

1. Absolute—having independent and complete authority.
2. Advisory—having power to advise, counsel, recommend or support.

3. Cooperative—having responsibilities for decisions shared with personnel in other departments.  

Jaeger, Slocum and Kelliher published their research findings in 1956. Kelliher used the job analysis technique to investigate the duties of athletic directors. Kelliher tried to ascertain what the duties of an athletic director entailed. He evaluated the duties in terms of frequency, importance and difficulty, to determine which duties were characteristically practiced by successful athletic directors. Delliher approached the problem by developing a master list of duties in questionnaire form. The duties of the master listed were divided into six categories:

1. Administrative Duties
2. Financial Duties
3. Duties Relating to Property and Equipment
4. Public Relations Duties
5. Duties Relating to Coaches and Contests
6. Athletics.

Kelliher divided his sample of athletic directors into two groups:

1. Athletic directors in institutions whose enrollments ranged from 1,000 to 10,000.

---
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2. Athletic directors who represented specific athletic conferences.

A jury of 23 experts evaluated a prepared list of duties for successful management of the athletic program. Kelliher's analysis revealed that athletic directors were most concerned with duties relating to financial soundness, departmental organization, personnel, public relations, and care of property and equipment.

In 1955 Helen Mackey used a modified job analysis technique to investigate the duties performed by women supervisors of physical education. The study was undertaken to secure information which might prove to be of value to state departments of education in developing and evaluating the duties performed by women supervisors of physical education. Mackey notes that:

... it was felt that through the identification and analysis, administrators might procure a better understanding of what the women physical education supervisor's job involves. Implications might also be discovered based upon current needs, and for the purpose of improving training of women physical education supervisors.

Mackey identified 157 duties performed by women supervisors of physical education in small, medium, and large elementary and secondary schools of the United States. She developed a checklist through a review of the literature and personal interviews with ten women physical educators in five states. The duties were then combined, deleted, and classified into the following categories:
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1. Administrative Duties
2. Instructional Duties
3. Community Activities
4. Co-curricular and Extra Class Duties
5. Plant, Facilities and Supplies
6. Special Services and Activities
7. Athletics
8. Supervisory Duties

A five-point rating scale was used to analyze the criteria of frequency, difficulty, importance, and time devoted to each of the nine categories. If a duty rated high in importance and difficulty but was infrequently performed then the factors affecting performance were enumerated as follows:

1. Administrative policy
2. Lack of space or facilities
3. Inadequate training
4. Financial
5. Time limitations
6. Personal preference
7. Other staff members
8. Lack of understanding by parents or pupils
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9. Pressure for interschool competition
10. Other

Mackey's study revealed a need for more preparation dealing with effective personnel relations. She also found that the three most often listed factors affecting performance were administrative policy, time element, and education and training.

Hanson's job analysis investigation in 1969 centered around the duties performed by male physical education administrators in secondary schools. He investigated 557 state high school administrators and interviewed 50 high school administrators using a constructed job analysis instrument. Hanson identified 119 duties distributed throughout 10 categories. The categories utilized by Hanson included the following:

1. Office Management
2. Professional Growth and Contributions
3. Finances
4. Facilities
5. Public Relations
6. Personnel
7. Purchase and Care of Equipment and Supplies
8. Intramurals
9. Interscholastic Athletics
10. Instructional Program

87. Ibid., p. 33.

Sam Howe Shout, Jr. believed that there is general agreement among educators that each member of a school organization should have an understanding of the nature and the extent of his rights and responsibilities. As school systems have increased in size, interpersonal contacts and relationships have increased in complexity and are so interwoven that clear lines of responsibilities and rights are not always distinguishable.

Shout thinks that job descriptions, defined by codified role expectations, must be specific and definite enough to be properly interpreted if the members of an organization are to understand the institutional expectations for the roles which they occupy. The lack of understanding of role expectations may result in feelings of insecurity and dissatisfaction among teachers. The degree to which teachers agree with each other and with their school leaders on role expectations will determine, in part, their ability to perform in an effective manner.

Shout's dissertation was designed to analyze the influence of the perceptions of teachers regarding selected role expectations for teacher behavior in regard to selected policies and administrative procedures.

Katherine Toth Bucher felt the problems created by the changing role of the school library media specialist may be examined in terms of
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the basic concept of "role" in a society; for an educational system is itself a social system and a formal organization in which individuals hold various positions and interact with many people.\footnote{Katherine T. Bucher, "Role Expectations Held by Professional School Personnel for the Role of the School Library Media Specialist," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1976), p. 4.}

The basic purpose of Bucher's study was to examine the expectations held by professional school personnel for the role of the school library media specialist. More specifically, the study was designed to examine the role expectations held for the school library media specialist by school library media specialists, teachers, principals, and superintendents in accredited secondary schools of Alabama. For analysis, the role of the library media specialist was broken into seven subroles including the following: administrator, technical processor, teacher, materials specialist, instructional designer, library media professional, and clerk.\footnote{Ibid., p. 6.}

Bucher's findings can be divided into two groups. First are those which relate directly to the hypotheses of the study. Second are the findings which go beyond the hypotheses to indicate the existence of intraposition consensus and disensus and interposition consensus and disensus in role segments.\footnote{Ibid., p. 130.}

The foregoing survey of pioneer research on job analysis for the library media specialist provides a valuable background and basis for research inquiries and interpretations. There is, for example, significant

\footnote{Ibid., p. 6.}
\footnote{Ibid., p. 130.}
agreement indicated in expectations held within each of the groups of professional school personnel for all of the role segments which comprise the role of the school library media specialist with the exception of the role segment of clerk.\textsuperscript{95}

Recently James Thomas Ford conducted a study designed to develop an instrument for describing administrative processes at the department level in higher education. The instrument, comprising sixty-four, forced-choice items was designed to secure perceptions of department chairmen and staff concerning three dimensions of department administrative process.\textsuperscript{96}

Ford believes that in order to proceed toward increased effectiveness of educational processes in America, educational leaders need instruments which will enable them to effectively examine and evaluate existing administrative processes. His purpose was to develop an instrument for use at the departmental level of college administration, designed to describe the department process as perceived by participants in that process—the Chairperson and staff.\textsuperscript{97}

As a result of the statistical procedures the instrument was shown to correlate significantly with four other designated instruments.\textsuperscript{98}

The instrument was shown to produce data demonstrating a significant degree of relationship among the three categories of administrative processes.

\textsuperscript{95}Ibid., p. 138.
\textsuperscript{97}Ibid., p. 39.
\textsuperscript{98}Ibid., p. 103.
process—climate, leadership and interaction appropriate to the objective of this study. The instrument's ability to indicate differences between perceptions of the department chairpersons and those of the staff was also demonstrated. 99

Clifford N. England completed a research study to analyze the role expectations of the school principal as it affects the professional growth of the teachers and principals of the Clayton County, Georgia, School System and to draw conclusions and make recommendations on the basis of the analysis of ways by which the professional growth program could be improved. 100

Donald Martin reported that the manner in which an adult educator perceives his role is an important consideration in any discussion of the role of the adult educator. Many things impinge upon the individual as he progresses through life. More often than not, it may be hypothesized that the adult educator will view his role according to his educational preparation for and experience in the role. Other factors represented in this individual himself are important in the determination of perception, such as age, tenure and social status. 101

99 Ibid.


101 Donald Martin, "An Analysis of Role Perceptions of Adult Education in Model Cities" (unpublished dissertation, The Ohio State University, June 1973), p. 44.
Bartley's work in perception indicates that the influence of facts represented in the individual himself is important in the determination of perception. 102

Johnson, writing about the "Black Administrators and Higher Education," suggested the existence of a false perception of power on the part of black administrators at predominantly white institutions of higher education. 103

In a position paper Black Admission Officers and Financial Aid Officers in Ivy League Colleges reported that the role of the black administrator on predominantly white campuses was an enigma. The report referred to the tokenism of the black administrative positions for the most part owing their existence to the voices of black students. Duties often required or performed diluted their effectiveness at one assigned task. 104

Egerton's research points out the role of the black administrator as a key recruiter of black students in predominantly white institutions:

Referring to a black man's position on the staff of the Dean of Administration, and his principal job is seeing that more blacks get into and through UNC (University of North Carolina). It is the sort of job that arouses some suspicion among prospective students, some animosity among educators at black colleges, fears among white alumni, and some misgiving among white trustees, administrators and faculty. 105


The black student in turn becomes the responsibility of the black administrator.

Mitchell, in addressing the subject of the black employment in predominantly white institutions of higher education, indirectly touches upon another role problem of the black administrator in predominantly white institutions of higher education. He states:

... Some institutions have hired a single black to work part-time in several offices as a way of appeasing black students. A black person who works part-time in admissions, financial aid and some other office cannot possibly devote enough time to solving problems of any one area, and, therefore, is ineffective in all of them.  

The literature related to role theory and the role of an individual appears to point out the importance of effectiveness in the working situation.

Coles has indicated that one of the major role problems blacks in managerial positions encounter is that too often their abilities are not used to the maximum. They are not provided opportunities to participate in the decision-making processes even at the level called for by the position the individual may hold.

The literature further indicated that a person who is dysfunctional in his job may have become this way because of the role ambiguity and role conflict. Rizzo, et al., pointed out the following:

---


The principle of unity of command states that for any action an employee should receive orders from one superior only, and that there should be only one leader and one plan for a group of activities having the same objectives.\textsuperscript{108}

This protects members from the crossfire of incompatible expectations from more than one superordinate administrator. Heydrick, writing on the subject of the principles of organization, listed the following points as being of importance to the "Span of Control:"

Every job in the organization must have an objective; jobs must be coordinated through clear-cut channels of communication; every job must include clearly defined authority; every job should have a written description; a manager is responsible for the performance of his subordinates; a manager's job should have a reasonable span of control; no employee should be accountable to more than one boss in the same key result area; and decisions should be delegated to the lowest point in the organization where they can be made effectively.\textsuperscript{109}

Newman, et al., asserted that an individual should be carefully "matched" with position. In selecting individuals to fill positions, employers should remember that some jobs call for knowledge in depth, whereas others demand only a general acquaintance with a field.\textsuperscript{110}

Sales indicates that role overload and role underload were relatively common features of organizational life. He also points out:

The data suggest that extremely high objective work loads may have strong, diverse, and pervasive effects upon individuals exposed to them, and that some of these effects


may be observed in biochemical and physiological variables. Increased work loads may improve system performance on some levels—such as productivity—but that these increased work loads may also exert deleterious influences both upon system performance and upon individuals involved.

The literature reveals that the black administrator often performs numerous diverse tasks. The nature of these assignments often necessitates coming in contact with many different segments of the university community.

Egerton commented:

The black administrator on the formerly all-white campus must maintain rapport, both among white colleagues and black students. Inevitably, they must contend with the "black every man" syndrome, a phenomenon marked by endless rounds of faculty teas and cocktail parties, too many expectations and responsibilities, and not enough time or authority.

Cox researched and compared "the self-perceived role of black and non-black administrators who had comparable institutional affiliation and who held similar positions in selected predominantly white institutions of higher education." His population included ninety-eight black administrators and 110 non-black administrators. Cox's research revealed:


There was no statistical difference between self-perceived power and authority of black and non-black administrators; Black administrators were found to have a significantly higher self-perception of role conflict than non-black administrators, and black administrators appeared to have proportionally more duties and made proportionally more decisions of an undesirable nature related to black students and faculty.114

Blake's position appears to indicate that in order to have any kind of effectiveness, an administrator must make certain that he is clearly aware of his administrative prerogatives and that he is not deprived of the opportunity to make an impact on the entire basic education program of the institution.115

In referring to clarity of role and job ambiguity, Blake makes the following comments:

If a person's job relates directly to black students, it should be clear what his relationship is to staff that are concerned with all students. Of particular importance is his relationship to the academic deans, the student affairs deans, and the financial aid officers. If, for example, a person works with black students and has no pool for financial aid earmarked for his use, he should question the seriousness of the institution in having him there to work with black students. The danger of these positions related directly to black students is that they divert an administrator from the impact he will ultimately have on the entire university structure.116

Rafky explored the attitudes on academic freedom of black scholars employed on integrated campuses. Specifically, he dealt with the case
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of Mr. John F. Hatcher, a black, who was dismissed from his assignment at New York University because of remarks attacking racist factions of the society. The main question raised in the study was: To what extent are black professionals in higher education protected through the concept of academic freedom? 117

Hause and Lazarsfeld conducted a study several years ago concerning the role of the admissions officer, revealing that institutions had moved toward hiring specialists for admissions functions. 118

In a report to the College Entrance Examination Board, Hause and Lazarsfeld had the participants of their study respond to a group of questions relating to the goals of admissions, such as how admissions officers perceived their roles and how they were perceived by other administrators and faculty. Their findings indicated that the admissions officers tended to perceive their role as being closer to that of the administration than to the faculty. Further, admissions officers felt they contributed greatly toward reducing dropouts and academic failures. In the selection process, they felt that they assisted the faculty and administration by admitting freshmen who could earn good grades and by reducing the number of inappropriate applications and rejections. Getting a very desirable applicant who had applied to other colleges and filling


all spaces in the college did not rank high as goals for the admission officers sampled.\(^{119}\)

In another study of about the same period as that of Hause and Lazarsfeld, Perry indicated 33 percent of the admissions officers sampled stated their first position was perceived by them as being administrative.\(^{120}\)

Wesley J. Strom completed a master's thesis entitled "A Comparison of Role Perception of a University Director of Physical Education and Athletics and His Reference Groups" at South Dakota State University, 1966.

The purpose of this study was to examine the self-role perception held by a university director of physical education and athletics and the expectations of the director's role as held by certain reference groups. An interview schedule containing twenty tasks was constructed by the author. The twenty tasks were hypothetical situations representative of some of the more important tasks involved in administering the department of physical education and athletics.\(^{121}\)

The findings indicated little role conflict for this position as determined by the results of this study. The conclusion was that it would, therefore, appear to be both possible and practical to organize a department of physical education and athletics in this manner.

Norman A. Jackson completed a doctor of philosophy dissertation entitled *Job Perceptions of the Members of "The Southern Association*

\(^{119}\)Ibid., pp. iv, 1-3.

\(^{120}\)Richard R. Perry, *The Admissions Officer* (1963-64), The University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio, pp. 22-46.

\(^{121}\)Wesley J. Strom, "A Comparison of Role Perception of a University Director of Physical Education and Athletics" (unpublished M.S. thesis, South Dakota State University, 1966), p. i.
of Black Administrative Personnel Who are Employed By Institutions that Hold Membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools" at Florida State University.

In this study the author sought to ascertain the job perceptions of the members of the Southern Association of Black Administrative Personnel (SABAP) as perceived by the members of SABAP, college administrators, faculty, black students, and white students. The study focused on those SABAP members working in predominately white institutions of higher education in the south.122

The author of the study stated the concern of the members of SABAP over the lack of clearly defined responsibilities and the need for minimizing the degree of job ambiguity which had been expressed at meetings of the Association.

Kahn, et al., described the seriousness of job ambiguity:

Role ambiguity—lack of the necessary information available to be given organization position—will result in copying behavior by the role incumbent, which may take the form of attempts to solve the problems to avoid the sources stress or to use defense mechanisms which distort the reality of the situation.123

Thus it is apparent that if the roles and functions of the administrator are not clearly defined, then anxiety emerges. The individual may experience anxiety, may distort reality, and may ultimately perform less effectively.

122. Norman A. Jackson, "Job Perceptions of the Members of the Southern Association of Black Administrative Personnel who are Employed by Institutions that Hold Membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation at Florida State University, 1972.)

Donald F. Martin completed a doctor of philosophy dissertation entitled *An Analysis of Role Perceptions of Adult Educators in Model Cities* at the Ohio State University, 1973.

The objectives of this study were to determine the manner in which Model Cities adult educator staff members perceive their role and the importance they attach to the tasks they perform.

One of the most perplexing problems that face many Model Cities today is the perception of roles the staffs believe they should play within the confines of the organization . . . Perhaps their perceptions of roles are justified on the basis of what they actually do as opposed to what the job description calls for.\(^\text{124}\)

. . . the job titles and descriptions reflect the ambiguous state of adult-education in Model Cities.\(^\text{125}\)

. . . It is both necessary and proper that an analysis of role perceptions of the adult educator in Model Cities be made at this time. This type of analysis can determine if adjustments should be made in job descriptions for and practices of the adult educator.\(^\text{126}\)

Dalton Hays McAfee completed a doctor of philosophy dissertation entitled *The Role of Adult Educators in Traditionally Black Public Colleges and Universities*, at the Ohio State University, 1974.

During recent years the role of the adult educator has become more complex and more significant and the character of his role has been gradually changing. The demands of the adult educator to prepare more carefully for performing the role has increased tremendously.\(^\text{127}\)

\(^\text{124}\) Donald Martin, p. 2.

\(^\text{125}\) Ibid., p. 3.

\(^\text{126}\) Ibid., p. 6.

Verhaalen believes that the role of the adult educator is to help adults meet their individual needs and the needs of a rapidly changing society. He suggests that the concept of adult education has undergone a change and no longer responds to the needs of society with such programs as education or survival, for immigrants and for occupations.  

Research conducted by Dobbs concerning the self-perceived educational needs of adults found the majority of adults interviewed in a declining community perceived their educational needs to be secondary to their economic needs.

Battle and Bagley studied the role of the specialist in the school program. They attempted to define the role of the specialist in school districts and to identify the relationships between development of specialists and school quality. It found that the titles of specialists were not descriptive of the task they performed. The specialist's time equivalent was found to be useful in providing the administrator with a method of some accuracy for measuring the degree to which particular services are provided within the school.

John W. Myers conducted a study on the status of the chief administrator of adult education. Status included personal characteristics, preferences, and other factors.

---

educational preparation, educational experience, salaries, and vocational experiences exclusive of education. 131

Houle and Buskey conducted a study on the doctorate in Adult Education. They were interested in finding out what holds the doctorate in adult education, what problems the holder had in securing the doctorate and where and what roles they performed. This study produced a great deal of valuable information on those individuals who hold the doctorate in adult education, as well as data concerning the institutions of higher education that offer the degree. They suggested that persons who hold doctorates in adult education perform teaching as well as administrative tasks. 132

SUMMARY:

The research and published literature on the role perceptions of black administrators working in historically black colleges and universities have been extremely limited. The only study of any significance concerning black administrators in historically black colleges and universities is that by Dalton H. McAfee, an unpublished doctoral dissertation (The Ohio State University) on "The Role of Adult Educators in Traditionally Black Public Colleges and Universities." Other reports and positions papers addressed themselves to the role of black administrators in higher education. The bulk of these dealt with hiring of black faculty and administrators in predominantly white colleges.


132 Ibid, John H. Burke and April O. Haule, "The Doctorate in Adult Education."
It is hoped this research can contribute eventually to a better understanding of the role of the departmental administrators at the historically black colleges and universities.

The literature reveals that job analysis techniques, with their early beginnings in the industrial field, could very easily be viewed as the forerunner to the conceptual framework adopted during the 1930's by social scientists and psychologists in their systematic approach to role concept studies as significantly viable and legitimate research fields of endeavor for research.

Job analysis techniques were instrumental in developing certain personnel management procedures, such as job descriptions, hiring guidelines, job classification, job ratings, and more clearly defined criteria for promotions and terminations. Also, lines of authority were more clearly delineated. Duties and responsibilities were identified in relation to other positions both vertically and horizontally.

A number of studies employed job analysis techniques to gather essential information relating to a number of physical education positions. Tasks were identified and studied against specifically predetermined criteria. Significant information was gathered which could be used to improve curricula offerings for professional preparation programs.

Role concept studies have emerged as a more comprehensive approach and a sophisticated medium for the twentieth century while social scientists and educators seek to provide that sophisticated medium for studying
the rights and obligations of an individual who occupies a particular position in a social system. Role studies have become accepted as creditable research endeavors.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN, METHODOLOGY, INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

INTRODUCTION

Several types of research problems are a part of the field of higher education. Each type has its own methods and techniques. There are, however, two methods common to most research problems; namely, the assembling and evaluating of the literature, and attacking the problem reflectively before attacking it scientifically.

This chapter describes the design and methodology procedures of the study as follows: preliminary preparation and review of literature for conceptualizing the problem; identifying and delimiting the general population; selecting specific research method and technique; review of descriptive research methodology and questionnaire development criteria and procedures; instrumentation-implementing questionnaire development criteria; identifying generally accepted departmental administrative task duties, responsibilities and practices; development and validating of questionnaire instrument; identifying and selecting specific population respondents; administration of questionnaire procedures; data analysis technique and rationale.
PRELIMINARY PREPARATION

The preliminary preparation involved an extensive review of textbooks, periodicals, bulletins, monographs, theses and dissertations to aid in conceptualizing the problem. The problem was then specifically defined by title as, "A Task Analysis Study of the Perceived Role Expectations of the Departmental Chairperson of Physical Education at Historically Black Senior Colleges and Universities."

GENERAL POPULATION

The general population consisted of all the historically black senior colleges and universities in the United States with professional preparation programs leading to the baccalaureate degree in physical education in teacher education.

RESEARCH METHOD AND TECHNIQUE

The problem was immediately recognized as a descriptive study. Descriptive research usually includes three different methods of securing data. The first is that of observation and fact recording; the second is that of the questionnaire; and third is the interview technique.

In each of these study techniques the data secured are usually analyzed by methods closely approaching the philosophical. Sometimes all that is required is to secure facts. Usually, however, these facts involve an interpretation, and this interpretation is reached by the process of logical, reflective thinking.¹

It was decided that the questionnaire method and techniques would best facilitate the data collection process for this research study. "The questionnaire, as a much used tool of research, has many limitations. First, its legitimate use is limited to either opinions, where opinions or individual preferences are desired, or to facts which are known to the individual answering the questionnaire. Secondly, the value of these opinions should not be confused, as some opinions, such as individual preferences are quite valid while many opinions about fact are utterly worthless. Thirdly, three additional limitations noted by McCloy are incomplete data, non-return, and unusable material."²

**QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES**

Facts can be elicited in many situations by the questionnaire. This has been illustrated in many studies of an administrative type where questions are asked of those directly involved, or responsible, or knowledgeable about the specific program or organization under study.³

After the decision regarding general information desired or needed, the next problem is to whom the questionnaire should be sent. This is quite important; first, in order to secure a sufficient number of returns, and secondly to be sure that the answers are representative of the whole population. Too much emphasis cannot be placed upon the importance of selecting a representative sample or population.⁴ It will have a profound effect on returns as well as the significance of the data and results.

³Ibid.
⁴Ibid.
It is very seldom that more than 50 percent of the questionnaires sent out are returned. This in itself presents a problem of interpretation. In controversial issues more of the dissatisfied individuals tend to make a return than do the satisfied individuals. This over balances the statistical summary. In some other kinds of questionnaire studies the better faculty are apt to be the ones making the returns. The poor faculty member fails to return a questionnaire either because of a guilty conscience as to what he can say, or simply because he is a poor administrator, or neglects it so long that he is ashamed to make the return. On the other hand, the busiest individuals are likely to consign the questionnaire to the waste basket. For the foregoing reasons, an attempt should be made both to diagnose the significance of a return and to present the appeal for cooperation of potential respondents in such way as to gather the largest percentage of returns possible.\(^5\)

The questionnaire should be sent at a time which will give it the best chance of consideration. A university faculty will pay little attention to questionnaires arriving at examination time. The faculty are exceedingly busy at these times, and immediately after the close of the spring semester they usually leave the campus. It is not well to time the questionnaire so that it will appear just at the opening of an academic session or near a holiday season. Common sense will suggest other items which will help in determining the best time of mailing.\(^6\)

The initial stage in preparing the questionnaire is to decide exactly what facts or opinions it is desired to secure, then frame the

\(^{5}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{6}\text{Ibid., p. 15.}\)
questions in tentative form. Where possible the questions should be worded in such a way that they can be answered with a check mark or similar short response mechanism. This makes tabulations easy and accurate. Questions which are answered by sentences frequently defy attempts to catalog them in any systematic manner. The questions should also be of such a nature as to relieve the recipient of as much thinking as possible. To illustrate, a question which asked: "What administrative task duties and responsibilities should a departmental chairperson perform and rank them in priority of importance?" requires that the respondent do some hard thinking and a great deal of work. Since the respondent has nothing at stake in this questionnaire he will probably not do it, or will put down a few answers which come easily.

The maker of the questionnaire could, however, develop a comprehensive list of task duties and responsibilities of the departmental chairperson and arrange a response mechanism in such a way that the respondent completing the questionnaire could simply rank or rate by circling or checking a numerical value. Extra lines or spaces should be provided to care for additional task duties and responsibilities considered significant by the respondents. Such a set of questions would require too much thinking if such a check-list or rating scale were not provided. 7

Great care should be used in excluding questions which resort too much to the memory of the respondent. Impossible questions should also be rigidly excluded. By this is meant questions which the respondent of the questionnaire can by no means answer authoritatively. If

7 Ibid.
only the beliefs or perceptions of the recipient are required and it is realized that only an opinion is solicited, such a question may be justified. It should be stated however, in such way that the recipients will realize that the investigator is requesting only a belief, opinion or perception. 8

In questions concerning administrative activities, space should always be provided for recording the fact that any given activity is not conducted by an agency or should not be conducted by an agency. 9

In the preparation of the questionnaire it is usually wise to formulate a preliminary draft and to secure as much expert criticism as possible of its makeup. If possible about a dozen copies of the questionnaire should be submitted to individuals similar to those who will eventually receive it, and these persons should discuss it with the researcher while it is fresh in their minds. In this way ambiguous questions, those that are not clear, and any that use unfamiliar words, will be brought to the attention of the researcher. 10

To illustrate the value of this process, another descriptive study researcher found that on a questionnaire sent to a random sample population, there appeared preliminary criticisms stating that the questionnaire was too long. However, out of 55 preliminary copies sent out, 52 copies, filled out some with notations on the back, were returned. This confirmed the idea that though the questionnaire was indeed long.

8Ibid., p. 17.
9Ibid., p. 18.
10Ibid.
it was sufficiently challenging to bring replies. In such a preliminary tryout inadequate directions can also be detected and care taken to make these complete. 11

It is obvious that the short questionnaire stands a better chance of being answered than the long one: if, however, it seems essential to have a longer questionnaire in order to secure adequate data on which to base conclusions, it should be developed to the length needed. It should be remembered however, that this will probably reduce the percentage of returns. 12

In many cases it is desirable that questionnaire respondents be anonymous. This is particularly true when extremely personal information is requested or when such information may be construed as a criticism of another individual. In either of these cases it is usually desirable to enclose a stamped self-addressed envelope in order that questionnaires may be returned directly to the author. Another reason for sending a stamped self-addressed envelope is the frequent practice in organizations or agencies of sending all questionnaires to the director who gives them out to the members, receives them, and then sends them in one batch to the author. When the individuals know that the questionnaire may be read by the director, they frequently hesitate to express any criticism of the director of the department. A further difficulty may be encountered when the questionnaires returned to the directors prove to be of so much interest they keep them. 13

11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
The format of the questionnaire should be such that all parts are easy on the eyes and that they should offer a minimum of difficulty in passing from one question to another and in checking the appropriate answers. A little experimenting will enable one to produce a questionnaire that will insure a larger return of answers than would be the case if it were badly arranged. 14

Finally, in the preparation of the questionnaire the method of tabulation should be planned in advance. If a computer is to be used, then a coding system should be established for each question and response. If they are to be anonymous, this coding should be done after the questionnaires are returned. Otherwise the respondents might fear that a number identifies him. 15

In case the researcher desires to know who has returned questionnaires (to check sampling, and to enable a further follow-up), and yet wishes to preserve the anonymity of the subjects, this can be accomplished by enclosing a postal card which the individual mails at the same time as the questionnaire. It should be stated in the letter accompanying the questionnaire that this is an endeavor to check the adequacy of the sampling, not an attempt to identify the respondent. This method enables the researcher to follow-up those who do not return the questionnaire within a reasonable time. 16

14 Ibid., p. 19.
15 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
Individuals expecting to use the questionnaire in research will do well to accumulate sample questionnaires of all descriptions.

**INSTRUMENTATION**

The research method and technique for this descriptive study necessitated the use of a questionnaire consisting of a biographical data section of 14 questions, a two-part task inventory statement response and rating section with 30 questions each for a total of 60, and an additional task inventory statement listing and rating section with 36 line spaces.

During the early conceptualization and delimiting process it was recognized that certain specific variables of a biographical nature existed which could have an effect on individual perceptions. Thus, in addition to the scalar data obtained, demographic information was obtained, such as position, academic rank, tenure status, sex, age, degree of education, years of service, previous occupational position and prior professional experience. This information was collected in the biographical data section for descriptive information on respondents and for statistical analysis.

A comprehensive review of research and literature was made to identify administrative task duties and responsibilities, generally accepted in practice, which could be used as a basis for defining the departmental chairperson's role. Administrative practices derived from existing research and other related literature which had a high degree of acceptance were developed for use in the data collection process.
These task statements were used to define the role expectations of the physical education departmental chairpersons in higher education in the United States, as perceived by two immediate reference groups. Appropriate task questions were then designed to measure their degree of importance as perceived by the respondents.

An extensive search of the literature revealed a Task Inventory technique developed by Marsh, Madden, and Christal (1961) of the United States Air Force Personnel Research Laboratory. They used a list of task statements to be checked if done and rated on a Likert-Type Scale. They found this technique to be a reliable and valid procedure for collecting extensive job descriptions for thousands of Air Force Personnel and developed computerized procedures for analyzing such data.

This task inventory and Likert-Type rating scale technique was adopted as the basic format for the research instrument of this study. A research instrument package entitled, "A Differentiated Staffing Pattern for Vocational-Technical Education," prepared by The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, was located. This research package presents an education task statement inventory, identifying 282 general pedagogical tasks. It included task statements which administrators, teachers, and/or their assistants might be expected to perform, as part of their routine duties and responsibilities. The Ohio State University Center for Vocational and Technical Education in another research instrument identified more than 2000 task inventory statements, "Most Significant Tasks Performed by Personnel in State Vocational Educational Agencies." These research instruments, personal interviews on
departmental chairpersons' task duties and responsibilities, those of former deans or superordinate administrators of teacher education, and chairpersons of physical education programs at historically black senior institutions of higher education as a panel of experts, and selected Professional Publications, provided the guidance in identifying, selecting and re-wording the task statements to be included in the research study questionnaire instrument.

In determining the membership of the jury of experts, two criteria were used:

1. Each individual member must have at least five years of administrative experience as a dean or division head of teacher education or as a departmental chairperson of physical education in higher education.

2. The individual must not be eligible for participation in the study.

The next step was to present the initial listing of task inventory statements to the jury of experts for review.

The jury of experts presented alphabetically were:

Dr. Sam Barnes, retired, 1412 Geranium Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. Previously chairperson, Department of Physical Education, D.C. Teacher's College, Washington, D.C.; formerly chairperson, department of Physical Education, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Mildred M. Brown, retired, 206 Bibb Street, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama. Previously faculty member, department of Physical Education, University of Nevada at Reno; formerly faculty member, department of Physical Education, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama.

Dr. Charles D. Henry, Assistant Commissioner of Athletics, Big Ten Inter-Collegiate Conference, 1111 Plaza Drive, Schaumburg, IL. Previously chairperson of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Grambling College, Grambling, LA; formerly research assistant to Dr. C. H. McClory, State University of Iowa.
Dr. Lewis A. Hess, retired, advisor and chairperson for this research study; previously Director of the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Dr. William A. Hunter, Director, Research Institute, College of Education, Iowa State University, Ames, IA; previously President of The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; formerly Dean of the School of Education, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama.

Dr. Edward L. Jackson, Assistant Vice President for Research, Howard University, Washington, D.C.; previously Vice President for Academic Affairs, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, AL; formerly Director of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, AL.

Dr. Nell Jackson, Assistant Director of Athletics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI; previously faculty member, Department of Physical Education, University of Illinois; formerly faculty member, Department of Physical Education, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, AL.

Dr. Paul Mohr, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Norfolk State College, Norfolk, Virginia; previously Dean of the School of Education, Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, FL; formerly Departmental Chairperson, Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, FL.

Dr. James R. Neal, Dean, College of Education, Sacramento State University, Sacramento, California; previously, Dean of the School of Education, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, AL; formerly Associate Dean of the College of Education, University of Minnesota, Duluth, MN.

Dr. Jesse L. Parks, Coordinator Graduate Studies in Physical Education and Recreation, Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts; previously Chairperson of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics, South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, South Carolina; formerly departmental faculty member.

Dr. Herman Tyrance, retired, 1519 Underwood Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.; previously Chairperson of Physical Education, Howard University, Washington, D.C.; formerly faculty member, Department of Physical Education, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Dr. LeRoy Walker, Vice President for Public Relations, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina; previously President of the American Alliance of Health, Physical Education; Recreation and Dance, Washington, D.C.; Chairman of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina.
These twelve experts were identified and requested to serve on the jury of experts to assist in validating the research study task inventory statement questionnaire instrument. Each jury member was provided with a statement of the problem, significance of the study and the objectives of the study. The researcher called and talked personally with each member of the jury to insure that there was a clear understanding of the study and what was expected of each member of the jury of experts. The jury was encouraged to make suggestions concerning the wording, the items or additional items.

The jury members were provided copies of the previously mentioned research instruments for review and consideration. Care was taken to include additional professional items from the administrative, teaching and coaching fields, and from related research and literature. This initial review and selection process produced a reduced list of over 300 task inventory statements. This primary list was resubmitted to the jury to reduce the length of the research instrument while retaining essential questions. This primary review and selection process produced a list of over fifty task inventory statements. The final list of task inventory statements was again submitted to the jury to be critically examined for any vague, ambiguous, repetitive or poorly stated questions.

For each review and selection process above, the jury received the task inventory statements in the six point zero to five (0-5) Likert-type rating format adopted for the study. They were asked to rate the questions for elimination or inclusion. Mean scores were used to reduce each review and selection process.
A final proposed research questionnaire instrument containing a biographical data section, task inventory statement section and an additional listing section was submitted to the reading committee for review, suggestions and approval. This final review and selection process completed the 14-item biographical data section, a two-part 30-item section each containing a total 60-item task inventory statement response section, with an additional task inventory statement listing section of 36 line spaces.

There are six possible response variables for each task statement on a six-point, zero to five (0-5), Likert scale. These responses are: (0) should not perform; (1) not important, but should perform; (2) below average importance; (3) average importance; (4) above average importance; (5) maximum importance for the actual tasks performed.

Individual discussions with the jury of experts gave rise to the possibility of some degree of "set-response" on the part of respondents. The "set-response" was judged to be possible due to the arrangement of items in the response sections which permitted the respondents to answer related or similar questions of a like nature in a highly consistent manner before proceeding to the next group of items.

In order to reduce the degree of potential "set-response" the final questionnaire was designed to not group similar questions intentionally. It was not deemed necessary to change the biographical data section.

**RESPONDENT POPULATION**

The research population consisted of three immediate reference groups, identified as population respondents—the physical education
departmental chairperson himself and two immediate scaler reference
groups, the immediate superordinate administrator (dean or divisional
head of teacher education) and the departmental faculty of physical
education.

The questionnaire designed for use in the final study was color-
coded for the selected specific population respondents, (gold for super-
ordinate administrators of teacher education, deans, or divisional heads;
ivory for the departmental chairpersons of physical education; and white
for the departmental faculty of physical education). By recording the
number of questionnaires sent to each institution and requesting the re-
respondent to indicate the name of his institution and its private or
public status enabled the researcher to keep track of population re-
sponse and enabled further followup to be more specific. Furthermore,
all responses were made by either a check (✓), single word, number or
circling action on the part of the respondent.

All sections of the questionnaire were identical for the three
reference groups of respondents. The study questionnaire was designed
to have each respondent indicate his or her individually perceived im-
portance of each of the 60 selected task inventory statements concerning
the duties and responsibilities of the departmental chairperson of physi-
cal education at historically black senior colleges and universities in
the United States.

The biographical data section designed was sufficient for the pur-
pose of collecting biographical information pertinent to this study. The
design of the questionnaire response section facilitated measuring the perceptions of respondents.

The administrative procedure for the questionnaire was as follows:

1. A letter was sent to the office of the registrars of all historically black senior colleges and universities in the United States requesting the name of the administrative head or dean of teacher education and the name of the head of the department of physical education. The information was placed on a three-by-five, self-addressed stamped post card. Also requested, on the post card, was a check to indicate whether or not the college or university offers a baccalaureate degree program in physical education in teacher education. Those not responding by mail were called and asked by telephone.

2. A telephone call was made asking all superordinate administrators and departmental chairpersons if they and their departments would cooperate in completing a questionnaire concerning the role of the departmental chairperson. Also, the call stressed the fact that the study is not an evaluation but strictly a study of the task duties and responsibilities of the departmental chairperson of physical education.

3. An accompanying letter detailing the nature of the study and the reasons why assistance was needed, was enclosed with the questionnaire.
4. The form of the questionnaire was serious in tone and thoroughly prepared. It was submitted to the Tuskegee Institute Printing Press for final preparation for mailing. The accompanying letters and envelopes were individually addressed and typed on the IBM Selectric Magnetic Card Automatic typewriter to give each the quality and dignity of an original letter.

Upon the completion and return of the questionnaire by the respondents the information was transferred to IBM 1230 document No. 511 (answer sheet), which can be used in lieu of IBM 805 Form No. 1000 A 445. The answer sheets were fed into the IBM 1232 Optical Mark Page Reader which works in conjunction with the IBM 534 Card Punch to punch the IBM punch cards. The cards were fed into the Digital CR04 Card Reader and then into a PDP 11/40 computer data file. An SPSS Program (Statistical Package for Social Science) was applied to the data and results were transmitted by the LP05 Line Printer. The SPSS instructions were transmitted to the computer via the Decwriter II Terminal.

The PDP 11/40 is a 96K computer manufactured by the Digital Equipment Corporation. SPSS is a computer-based package comprising a wide variety of statistical procedures and data transformation utilities. This study program used the SPSS/C (Carleton College Version), for the DEC PDP - 11.

All of the data were statistically treated at the Data Processing and Computer Center, Morehouse College, Atlanta University Center, Atlanta, Georgia.
DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

This particular descriptive research study has employed a systematic collection, organization and mathematical analysis using descriptive and inferential statistics non-parametrically. These statistical procedures are basically methods of handling quantitative information in such a way as to make that information meaningful.

These procedures have two principal advantages for the researcher. First, they enable the researcher to describe and summarize the observations employing descriptive statistics. Second, they determine how reliably the phenomena observed in the limited group can be inferred in the unobserved larger population of concern, from which the sample was drawn. In other words, it answers the question: How well can inductive reasoning infer that what is observed in the part will be observed in the whole, employing inferential statistics?

The principal statistical research design for this study has used the following statistical structures to treat the scalar data and demographic information obtained: mean scores, Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient and phi coefficient, descriptive statistics one-way analysis of variance, Scheffe multiple comparisons tests, t-tests and chi-square inferential statistics.

The results are reported in table form for greater clarity and assurance of ready understanding. All these statistical treatments are housed in a computer research program termed SPSS (Statistical Package

---

for Social Science). The descriptive techniques employed were selected according to the purpose the statistic was to serve and the scale of measurement used in recording the data.

Scales of measurement are means of quantifying observations. There are four types of such scales: nominal scales classify observations into categories which are mutually exclusive; ordinal scales sort objects or classes of objects on the basis of their relative standing; interval scales use equal intervals for measurement and indicate the degree to which a person or an object possesses a certain quality; ratio scales use equal intervals for measurement and are characterized by having an absolute zero point.\(^{18}\)

Once observations are quantified, they can be arranged into frequency distributions and shown graphically. This can be done with either raw data or grouped data.

Measures of central tendency—the mode, the median, and the mean—provide a single index to represent a whole set of measures. The mode, which is a nominal statistic, is the least stable and least useful measure in educational research. The median is an ordinal statistic and does not take into account the size of scores but only their ranks within the distribution. The mean, which is an interval (or ratio) statistic, is the most stable and most widely used of central tendency.\(^{19}\)

\(^{18}\)Ibid., p. 122.

\(^{19}\)Ibid.
Mean scores were computed on all task statements reported by total population (faculty, chairpersons and deans combined) and sub-populations (faculty, chairpersons, and deans by individual groups), and on composite and individual questions to determine the perceived importance of these tasks. The individual question mean score ratings are presented in rank-order table form so relationships or differences between the mean scores for the individual tasks inventory statements for the total population and the three sub-populations can be shown with greater clarity.

To determine the degree of relationship between the ranking of the task statements, based on mean scores for the total population and three sub-populations, the Spearman rank order correlation coefficients was employed.

Correlation techniques enable the researcher to describe the relationship between two sets of measures. Product moment correlation (Pearson r) and rank correlation (Spearman rho) are two widely used indices of relationship. Pearson r is used with interval (or ratio) data and the ordinal data. Spearman rho is used to find the relationship between two sets of ranks.20

Rho for ranks based on scores for two normally distributed variables tends to be slightly (less than .02) lower than the product moment r computed from the scores; hence rho is comparable with r as a measure of the strength of relationship.21

20 Ibid., p. 123.

Occasionally sets of data are reported by their rank-orders only; alternately it is desirable to assign ranks to them and work with the ranks rather than the raw scores. In these cases, one measure of relationship between two sets of variables which are ranked is given by \( p \) (rho), the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient, a useful index frequently employed.

Glass and Stanley state, "By using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient, raw data may be converted to ranks or may be fathered as the original data." "Rank in graduating class" is an example of the conversion of ordered scores to ranks; grade-point averages are computed for each of 500 students, say a rank of one is assigned to the highest grade point average, two to the next highest . . . , 500 to the lowest. This correlation coefficient is a method used to describe the relationship between the two sets of ranks, X and Y. It is defined as the product moment correlation coefficient computed on two sets of the \( n \) consecutive untied ranks 1 . . . , \( n \). The coefficient is symbolized by \( r_s \).

To test the significance of rho, for \( N \) of 10 or more, it is safe to use t-values which approximate the t-distribution with \( N - 2 \) degrees of freedom. This t-value may now be compared to the tabled value

---


23 McNemar, p. 203.


25 McNemar, p. 204.
of \( t \) with \( N - 2 \) degrees of freedom to test whether these variables are independent . . \(^{26}\) The null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between \( X \) and \( Y \) can either be accepted or rejected. \(^{27}\)

Rho does not possess the mathematical advantages inherent in \( r \), and therefore has merit only when the observations on one or both variables are ranks instead of measures. Because of judgemental difficulties in assigning ranks for \( N \) large, rank-order data are apt to be confined to small samples, but for \( N \) less than ten (10) the \( t \)-test of the significance of rho is not satisfactory. Kendall has proposed another measure, designated \( T \) (tau), for use with ranks which is superior to rho insofar as testing significance is concerned when \( N \) is very small. \(^{28}\)

When ranking individuals or objects for the purpose of finding a correlation between two sets of ranks, it is likely that two or more will have been assigned to the same rank. For example, when two are tied for third rank, they are in fact the third (3) and fourth (4) in the series and the next will be assigned to position five. Since it is not possible to say which should take third and which should take fourth place, it is necessary to assign both to the average position, in this case, 3.5. \(^{29}\)


\(^{27}\) Ibid.

\(^{28}\) McNemar, p. 204.

\(^{29}\) Ary, p. 122.
Rank correlation is part of the same statistical family as the median. It is an ordinal statistic designed for use with ordinal data. No special interpretation can be given to $r_2$ over and above the statement that it equals the product-moment correlation calculated on ranks. Like the product moment correlation coefficient it ranges from $-1$ to $+1$. The value of $r_s$ can never be less than $-1$ nor greater than $+1$. When the rankings are all identical, that is, when each person has exactly the same ranks on both $X$ and $Y$, the rank correlation will be $+1$ and when they are exactly reversed it will be $-1$. If there is no relationship at all between the rankings, the rank correlation coefficient will be zero ($0$). The Spearman rho is interpreted in the same way as the Pearson $r$.

The Spearman rank order correlation coefficient on the paired task statement mean score rankings, between the total population and each subpopulation, was computed to determine the rho value ($r_s$). The student's $t$-value distribution was used to determine whether a significant relationship exists between the mean score rankings of each of the paired groups (total, deans, chairpersons, faculty) at the .05 level. If the $t$-value is equal to or larger than the value in the $t$-table at .05 level, then there is a significant relationship between the two ranked variables at the .05 level. If the $t$-value is smaller than the value listed in the $t$-table at .05 level, then there is no significant relationship between the two ranked variables at the .05 level.  

\[r_{Spearman} = \frac{\sum (r_x - \bar{r}_x)(r_y - \bar{r}_y)}{\sqrt{\sum (r_x - \bar{r}_x)^2 \sum (r_y - \bar{r}_y)^2}}\]

\[r_{Pearson} = \frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \sum (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}\]

---

30 Ibid.
31 Glass, p. 317.
When a significant chi square was obtained, the null hypothesis was rejected, the conclusion being made that there is a relationship. (Chi square statistics and its use will be discussed later in this chapter under inferential statistics.) In those cases of a significant chi square, the phi coefficient was used to describe the degree of relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The phi coefficient must lie between zero (0) (reflecting complete independence) and one (1) (reflecting complete dependence or association, between the variables).

The phi coefficient ($\phi$) is an appropriate statistic to use when both the X and Y data are measured on a nominal scale. This means that both variables can be dichotomized in one of two categories. The phi coefficient normally assumes that both X and Y represent genuine dichotomies (normal scale) characteristics of both variables. Data of this sort are quite often organized into a two-by-two bivariate frequency table. If X and Y represent artificial dichotomies, the phi coefficient is not appropriate.

To schematize the discussion of the phi coefficient consider the example of degree of education. The Y variable is the rating of importance (more or less) and X variable is the degree of education (masters and doctorate).

---

32 Weber, p. 86.

### Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( X_0 )</th>
<th>( X_1 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Important</td>
<td>( Y_0 )</td>
<td>( A )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( AB )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Important</td>
<td>( Y_1 )</td>
<td>( C )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( CD )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( AC )</td>
<td>( BD )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let \( Y_0 \) equal more important, \( Y_1 \) equal less important, \( X_0 \) equal masters, and \( X_1 \) equal doctorate. In the case of phi coefficient, or fourfold point coefficient as it is sometimes called, the general model is shown below:\(^{34}\)

\[
\phi = \frac{BC - AD}{(A+C)(B+D)}(\frac{A+B}{A+C} \div \frac{B+D}{B+D})
\]

The end result of the correlational statistical treatments is a coefficient of correlation, a decimal number representing the degree of the observed relationship between the variables. Interpretation of this value can be approached: (1) by considering the strength of a relationship, and (2) by considering the statistical significance of the relationship.

The strength of the relationship can be inferred from the numerical value of the correlation coefficient. Values near zero imply a weak relationship whereas values closer to either +1 or −1 indicate a stronger relationship.\(^ {35}\)

---

\(^{34}\) Weber, p. 86.

\(^{35}\) Ary, p. 300.
The coefficients of correlation are like other statistical terms, of little value unless they can be adequately interpreted. The first and least meaningful interpretation is simply to label the value of $r$ weak, moderate or strong.

Simply by describing a correlation as weak or strong is not really considered to be a very worthwhile research conclusion. Any variables we correlate are the sum of a large number of contributing factors. It would be advantageous to be able to determine what percentage of the factors contributing to two variables are associated.

The coefficients of determination and nondetermination are used to more fully interpret $r$. The coefficient of determination is obtained by squaring $r$, and the coefficient of nondetermination is $1 - r^2$. This is interpreted to mean that $A$ percentage of the variance in $Y$ is related to the variance in $X$ and that $B$ percentage of the variance in $Y$ is not related to the variance in $X$.  

Note that the coefficients of determination and nondetermination are not affected by the sign that precedes $r$ (i.e., whether the correlation is positive or negative), since the value is squared. Thus two variables with the same $r$ value would have precisely the same relationship as any other two variables with the same $r$ value.

The predictive index (P.I.) is also a useful interpretation of $r$ value. The predictive index tells how predictive $Y$ is if $X$ is known rather than if $X$ is unknown and our prediction based solely on chance.

---

37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
To use correlation coefficients derived from a sample to make inferences about the population from which it was taken requires consideration of the statistical significance of the correlation which has been obtained. The statistical significance indicates whether or not the coefficient obtained is different from zero at a given level of confidence. A statistically significant correlation represents evidence of an actual relationship rather than one due simply to chance.\textsuperscript{39}

The null hypothesis in this descriptive research study is to statistically test to determine if the correlation in the population is equal to zero and that any correlation observed in the sample is a function of chance. Statistical significance is related both to the strength of the observed correlation and to the number of paired scores in the sample.\textsuperscript{40}

With a reasonably large number of cases, a coefficient of correlation may be low in value and yet statistically significant. It is the value of the correlation that indicates the degree of relationship between the variables; a low correlation always indicates a low relationship even when the correlation is statistically significant. Also, it is possible for a low correlation to suggest that a prediction can be made at greater than chance level with a weak relationship.\textsuperscript{41}

Table values indicate the size of $r$ required for rejecting the null hypothesis at the various levels of confidence for given sample

\textsuperscript{39}Ary, p. 300.

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., p. 301.
sizes. As for a question concerning the extent of relationship between the variables in the population from which the sample came, then inferential statistics will be employed to test the significance of the correlation coefficient. To determine if this r value represents a significant relationship between X and Y, the chi square statistic is used.\(^{43}\)

\[ x^2 = N \phi^2. \]

The chi square value is compared with the table value at the .05 level.

The preceding statistics were used to organize, summarize and describe the data. In research, however, we often need to go further than describing data. After making observations of a sample, it is desirable to employ induction or inference to generalize the findings to the entire population from which the sample was drawn. To do this statistical techniques are needed that allow the making of valid inferences from sample to whole populations.

Inferential statistics provide tools by means of which the researcher is able to estimate how confident one can be in inferring that phenomena observed in samples would also be observed in the populations from which the samples were drawn. The inferential statistics enable the researcher to estimate how reliable the observations may be.

The basic strategy in inferential statistics is to compute the extent of difference among observations that would be likely to arise by chance alone. The result of this computation is often called the error term, known as Type I and Type II errors. Then the observed differences

\(^{42}\)Ibid., p. 302.

\(^{43}\)Weber, p. 87.
among observations are compared with the error term. If the observed differences are similar to the differences that could arise by chance, the researcher cannot reject the likelihood that the observed differences were merely a function of chance. If the observed differences are greater than the error term, the researcher consults the tabled value of his statistic to determine whether the ratio of observation to error is great enough to reject the chance explanation of the .05 level of confidence.

The indices most commonly used in inferential statistics are: t-test, analysis of variance, and the chi square test of significance. The t-test for noncorrelated groups was employed to compare two sample means drawn independently from the populations. The t-test was used to find whether the difference between two sample means was statistically significant.

The t-test and t-table value were used to determine significance at the .05 level. The t-tests were used to compare the means of the sub-total populations (deans vs chairpersons; deans vs faculty; chairpersons vs faculty). If the compared means of the paired sub-total populations, in regard to difference in perceived role expectation, were found to be significant at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Analysis of variance is used to compare the means of more than two samples and to test the null hypothesis that no significant differences exist among the means obtained from these samples.
The variance ratio of F test is generally accepted as a method which can be employed as the test of significance to indicate the probability required for rejection or accepting the null hypothesis. Garrett indicated that F furnishes an overall comprehensive test of the significance of the difference among means.\(^{44}\) The five percent (.05) level of probability was adopted as the appropriate level of significance for rejection of the null hypothesis. The F test is an "overall" significance test which may indicate a difference among two or more means, usually more than two, without specifying which means differ significantly.

Rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance implies that one or more of the sample mean differences are so great that they would occur by chance in less than five percent of the samples of the same size from the population in which the mean differences are zero.

The analysis of variance was used to compare the mean scores of the three subpopulation respondent groups, deans, faculty and chairpersons, on the six point Likert scale response variables.

After having performed an analysis of variance and a significant F among the group means is found at the .05 level, the null hypothesis, that there was no difference among the deans, chairpersons and faculty in their perceived importance of the task expectations for the chairperson's role, was rejected.

In situations in which more than two groups are being compared, a significant F does not imply that each sample \( \bar{X} \) necessarily differs significantly from every other sample \( \bar{X} \) and quite often there is interest in pinpointing more precisely where the differences lie. This will lead to an inquiry about the significance of the differences between specific pairs of means. What is required then, is some technique which will allow us to follow up the analysis of variance with further statistical comparisons.

Although the t would appear to be an appropriate test for this purpose, there are several statistical difficulties which prohibit its use. Performing multiple t-tests of difference between various means is not the best way to compare means after the F test because more than one t-test must be performed. The probability of incorrectly rejecting a null hypothesis, \( H_0: \mu_a = \mu_b \), is alpha for one t-test; the probability of incorrectly rejecting one or more null hypotheses when several tests are performed is considerably greater, with a maximum probability equal to the sum of all the alpha levels. The Scheffe method is known as an overall alpha associated with all possible comparisons. With multiple t-tests there is no way of accurately determining an overall alpha level.\(^{45}\)

The Scheffe test provides the advantage of permitting the comparing of any pair of means or any pair of subsets of means that is desired and places no limits on the number of comparisons that may be made with any set of data.\(^{46}\)

\(^{45}\)Spence, p. 168.

\(^{46}\)Ibid.
The Scheffe procedure is not limited to simple comparisons of pairs of means, as the t-test, but may be used to study more complex relationships. It also allows the researcher to compare the mean of one group to the mean of other groups combined. The Scheffe test is the most flexible of the multiple-comparisons procedures available to researchers; it fits a great variety of situations and has received widespread use.

It is possible to follow a significant test of the overall null hypothesis with Scheffe procedure and find that the Scheffe does not detect any significant differences. The theory underlying the Scheffe test assures that it will indeed find at least one significant difference under these circumstances; however, this significant difference need not be a simple pairwise comparison. The power of the Scheffe test is equal to that of the F-ratio for the test of the overall null hypothesis only with respect to the largest difference (which may be a simple pairwise comparison or some complex comparison).

This research study has employed chi square to test the null hypothesis of independence of certain specific variables of a biographical nature (no relationship between position, academic rank, tenure status, sex, age, degree of education, years of service, previous occupational position, prior professional experience) and average importance rating of task responses.

47 Roscoe, p. 314.
48 Ibid., p. 315.
49 Ibid.
Chi square statistic is an index employed to find the significance of differences between proportions of subjects, objects, events, and so forth, that fall into different discrete categories, by comparing observed frequencies and expected frequencies.\textsuperscript{50}

One of the aims of educational research is to obtain greater understanding of relationships among variables in populations. For example, one might ask, "What are the perceived role expectations of departmental chairpersons of physical education at historically black senior institutions of higher education in the United States?" Perceptions cannot be directly observed. Nor can all departmental chairpersons be directly observed. But this does not mean that ignorance about this and similar questions must remain. There are indicators that approximate the constructs of task duties and responsibilities; that is, there are observable behaviors that are accepted as being valid indices of these constructs. Furthermore, these observed characteristics of the sample can be used as indicators to approximate the characteristics of a population.

Although there may be any number of groups and any number of categories, apparently the situation that arises most often in research is the one in which we have two groups and two categories of response; the data are expressed in a $2 \times 2$ table. The computation of chi square as it is used to test for significance of independence, this study, will be based on a $2 \times 2$ table, although the method is the same for any number of groups and categories.

\textsuperscript{50}Ary, p. 156.
In order to explain more clearly how chi square is used in this study, the relationship between degree of education a respondent has and perceived task responses were grouped into two categories, more important and less important. Each task statement presented in the questionnaire instrument was rated by each respondent on a zero to five (0-5) Likert Scale. After each respondent had considered all task statements and returned the mailed questionnaire, his or her mean score was computed on all task statements and those respondents whose average rating for all statements reached 3.0 and above were grouped into the more important category. All respondents whose average rating was 2.9 and below were grouped into the less important category. Average rating was computed by totaling the task responses for each respondent and dividing by total number of task statements, 60. The figure nine (9) was used in the computer program to identify non-responses. The unchecked responses were ignored and not computed in the mean. The non-responses represented about .71 percent of the total number of responses tabulated or 108 out of 15,240 responses.

The decision to use 3.0 as the cutoff point for grouping the mean scores of all task statements into the important and non-important categories was made arbitrarily by the researcher at the point considered to be the minimum significant level of importance, three (3) average importance. This cutoff point divides the task statements with high mean scores from those task statements with lower mean scores. The lower mean scores were placed in the less important category and the high mean scores were placed in the more important category. This means that all
respondents whose mean scores were 3.0 and above perceived the task statements as being more important to the work of the departmental chairperson of physical education (more important category), and those respondents whose mean scores were 2.9 and below perceived the task statements as not being very important to the work of departmental chairpersons of physical education (less important category).

Now the question is whether these frequencies (more important and less important categories) indicate a significant difference between the two groups, respondents with master's degrees and respondents with doctorate degrees. The following is a schematized 2 x 2 table, where the letters in the cells indicate the observed frequencies.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>DEGREE OF EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Important</td>
<td>( A : B )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A + B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Important</td>
<td>( C : D )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C + D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A + C     B + D
```

With this scheme, chi square can be computed directly as follows:

\[ \chi^2 = \frac{n(AD-BC)^2}{(A+B)(C+D)(A+C)(B+D)} \]

Based on the degrees of freedom, if the chi square value is smaller than the value in the chi square table, the null hypothesis,

\[ ^{51} \text{Roscoe, p. 257.} \]
which states that there is no significant difference between the perceived importance of the tasks and the degree of education of the respondent is accepted. When a significant chi square was obtained, at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was rejected, concluding that there is a relationship.

When a significant chi square was obtained, the null hypothesis was rejected concluding there is a relationship; the phi coefficient previously discussed in this chapter was used to describe the degree of the relationship.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section is designed to provide descriptive data on study population, institutions and biographical and demographic data characteristics and information on subpopulation respondents, deans, chairpersons and faculty. The second section presents statistical treatment analysis of the biographical and demographic data and task inventory statement data hypothesized.

The basic purpose of this research study was to conduct a task analysis of the perceived role expectations of the departmental chairperson of physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities in the United States. This study only includes those institutions offering professional preparation programs in physical education leading towards a baccalaureate degree in teacher education.

The study researched and perceived task role expectations of the departmental chairpersons as perceived by their immediate reference groups, deans or divisional heads of teacher education, the departmental chairpersons of physical education themselves and the physical educational departmental faculty.

The study research data were collected between February and June of 1980, by the use of a questionnaire instrument. A questionnaire was
sent personally to the immediate reference group subpopulations, deans, chairpersons and faculty of the 72 study population institutions identified as qualifying to participate in the research study. Respondents were asked to supply personal biographical data, demographic information and their perceived role task responsibility expectations for departmental chairpersons of physical education. The personal mailing, it was hoped, would aid in assuring the confidentiality of any response data and the anonymity of individual respondents. The respondents were asked to indicate their position, title, or status at the study population institutions, along with the name and private or public status of their institutions, as a coding technique. As an additional check the questionnaires were printed on colored paper. A different color was mailed to each group of subpopulation respondents (gold to deans, ivory to chairpersons, white to faculty). This technique significantly facilitated the later classification of subpopulation respondents for tabulation and statistical treatment of data.

Seventy-two questionnaires were mailed to departmental chairpersons; 57 questionnaires or 79 percent were returned and all were usable, for the highest rate of return. The second highest rate of return came from the deans or superordinate administrators. They returned 40 of the 72 questionnaires mailed or 56 percent and all were usable. The faculty returned 157 of the 288 questionnaires mailed or 55 percent and all were usable. A total of 254 of the 432 questionnaires or 59 percent were returned.
Of the questionnaires sent out to chairpersons all were returned in time to be included in the statistical analysis. Only two completed by the deans and four by the faculty arrived too late for inclusion. Following are the questionnaires listed in Table 1 as being unusable.

**TABLE 1**

**DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRES ACCORDING TO SUBPOPULATION RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation Respondents</th>
<th>Questionnaires Mailed</th>
<th>Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Questionnaires Unusable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Data Section**

This first section includes data on institutional characteristics such as name, state, municipal location, private or public status, organizational level titles used for teacher education and physical education units, (i.e., college, school, division, department, etc.), academic titles for the physical education area, such as Physical Education, Health and Physical Education, Physical Education and Recreation, Physical Education and Athletics, etc.; position title used to identify administrative heads of teacher education, such as dean, director, head, etc., and position title used to identify administrative heads of physical education
such as head, chairperson, director, etc. It includes such characteristic biographical data of respondents as academic rank, tenure status, sex, age range, degree of education, undergraduate and graduate fields of specialty; such demographic information as years of service in present position, years of employment at present institution, previous occupational experience. The table formats presenting these types of information indicate the number and percent of responses. In addition, there are brief discussions concerning some of the numbers and percents of responses from the 19 states, the District of Columbia, and the respondents of the 72 study population institutions.

Table 2 indicates the state and municipal location of each of the study population institutions. It shows the public or private status of each institution, and the respective number and percent of the total study population institutions by state.

North Carolina has the largest number and percent of historically black senior colleges and universities by location in the United States and also leads the nation in number of state-supported historically black institutions of higher education. Texas has the largest number of privately supported historically black institutions of higher education and the second largest number of historically black institutions of higher education in the United States. Alabama, Georgia and Mississippi are tied for the third largest number of historically black institutions of higher education.
TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY POPULATIONS IN INSTITUTIONS
ACCORDING TO STATE AND MUNICIPAL LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/INSTITUTION/CITY</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA A &amp; M UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILES COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STILLMAN COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscaloosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TALLADEGA COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talladega</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuskegee Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILANDER SMITH COLLEGE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Bluff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWARD UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D. C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D. C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/INSTITUTION/CITY</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETHUNE COOKMAN COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD WATERS COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA A &amp; M UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA MEMORIAL COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBANY STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARK COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT VALLEY STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOREHOUSE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORRIS BROWN COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELMAN COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DILLARD UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAMBLING STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XAVIER UNIVERSITY OF LOUISIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE/INSTITUTION/CITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARYLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWIE STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND EASTERN SHORE - Princess Anne</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISSISSIPPI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSON STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY - Itta Bena</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUST COLLEGE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUGALOO COLLEGE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tougaloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISSOURI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINCOLN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH CAROLINA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIZABETH CITY STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAYETTEVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON C. SMITH UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVINGSTONE COLLEGE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA A &amp; T STATE UNIVERSITY - Greensboro</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE/INSTITUTION/CITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY - Durham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAINT AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAW UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINSTON-SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilberforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILBERFORCE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilberforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGSTON UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEYNEY STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINCOLN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLEN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENEDICT COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAFLIN COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangeburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. C. STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangeburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE/INSTITUTION/CITY</td>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOXVILLE COLLEGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEMOYNE-OWEN COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISHOP COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON-TILLOSON COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JARVIS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL QUINN COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAIRIE VIEW A &amp; M UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILEY COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMPTON INSTITUTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORFOLK STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE/INSTITUTION/CITY</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
<th>PRIVATE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUEFIELD STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluefield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania and West Virginia have no privately supported historically black senior institutions of higher education.

Data included in Table 3 shows the organizational titles used by the study population institutions to identify the organization level of teacher education and physical education, including the respective number and percentage of institutions.

Table 3 tabulations conform to the researcher's expectations. The researcher did not expect physical education to be a part of an independent school level organizational unit. See Table 4 and explanation for further clarification.

As indicated in Table 3 only one study population institution has physical education as a part of a school level organizational title; that is, a School of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Safety and
Athletics, with a dean level administrator and athletic director. In this case each of the title area components is a departmental level unit with separate department heads responding to the school dean.

### Table 3

**Organizational Titles Used by Institutions To Identify Organizational Level of Teacher Education and Physical Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Titles</th>
<th>Teacher Education</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Responses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 indicates the titles used by the study population institutions to identify the physical education academic component, including the respective number and percentage of institutions.

Table 4 tabulations indicate that a majority, 34 or 59.65%, of the study population institutions do not identify athletics with physical education, in terms of titles, while 22 or 38.60% do identify athletics with physical education. This might explain the very low mean score rating of task inventory statements, 33, maintaining coaching responsibilities, and, 57, responsible for athletic program.
Table 4 reveals the superordinate and subordinate administrative titles used by the study population institutions to identify individuals responsible for teacher education and physical education at the study population institutions, including the respective number and percentage of institutions.

Table 5 indicates that the majority of the study population institutions--75%--use chairperson or dean as superordinate administrative titles for individuals responsible for the teacher education programs at their
respective institutions. It also reveals that the majority of the study population institutions—84%—use chairperson or head as subordinate administrative titles for individuals responsible for the professional preparation program in physical education.

**Table 5**

SUPERORDINATE AND SUBORDINATE ADMINISTRATIVE TITLES FOR INDIVIDUALS RESPONSIBLE FOR TEACHER EDUCATION AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION AT RESPONDENT INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLES</th>
<th>SUPERORDINATE</th>
<th>SUBORDINATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Responses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 indicates the distribution of academic rank of respondents according to subpopulations, deans, chairpersons and faculty, including the respective number and percentage.
TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF ACADEMIC RANK OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>ASSISTANT PROFESSOR</th>
<th>ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR</th>
<th>PROFESSOR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32.28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 reveals what the researcher has observed from many accreditation reports: That many study population institutions show a heavy or disproportionate number or percentage of faculty in the junior or lower level academic ranks, instructor and assistant professorship. The table indicates that 117 or 75% of the responding faculty hold junior or lower level academic ranks. Two or 5% of the deans and one or 1.75% of the chairpersons, for a total of three or 1.29% of the total responding population did not answer this question.

Table 7 indicates the distribution of tenure of respondents according to subpopulations, deans, chairpersons and faculty, including the respective number and percentage.

Table 7 reveals what the investigator has observed as being the trend in black senior institutions of higher education in the United States. That is, a trend towards obtaining or maintaining a 50 to 60% tenure status among faculty positions across the board.
### TABLE 7

**DISTRIBUTION OF TENURE OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>NON-TENURE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73.68</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47.77</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>56.30</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the distribution of sex of respondents according to subpopulations, deans, chairpersons, and faculty, including the respective number and percentage.

### TABLE 8

**DISTRIBUTION OF SEX OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34.39</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 indicates that females are below the 25% level in the key administrative positions, dean and chairpersons, among the study population institutions in this study. This should be a concern for the study population institutions in the areas of Titles VI and IX, as well as for their affirmative action programs. The female faculty are slightly .66% above the 1/3 or 33% level.

Table 9 indicates the distribution of age of respondents according to subpopulations, deans, chairpersons, and faculty, including the respective number and percentage.

**TABLE 9**

**DISTRIBUTION OF AGE OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 and Over</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>6 15</td>
<td>13 32.5</td>
<td>11 27</td>
<td>10 25</td>
<td>40 15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>15 26</td>
<td>18 32</td>
<td>15 26</td>
<td>8 14</td>
<td>57 22.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>21 13</td>
<td>45 29</td>
<td>42 27</td>
<td>37 23</td>
<td>12 8</td>
<td>157 61.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>22 8.66</td>
<td>66 25.98</td>
<td>73 28.74</td>
<td>63 24.80</td>
<td>30 11.81</td>
<td>254 100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 reveals that six or 15% of the deans or superordinate administrators are under 40 years of age. There are 34 or 85% of the deans 40 years and above, while 21 or 52.5% are over 50 and 10 or 25% are over 60.
There are 16 or 28% of the chairpersons under 40 years of age, 41 or 72% being 40 years old and above, 23 or 40% are 50 years and over and eight or 14% have reached 60 years and above.

The faculty also has the majority, 91 or 58%, of its respondents above 40 years of age; the remaining 66 or 42% are below the age of 40. Only 21 or 13% of the faculty respondents are below 30 years of age, while 12 or 8% of the faculty are 60 years and over.

Table 10 reveals the degree of education of respondents according to subpopulations, deans, chairpersons and faculty, including the respective number and percentage.

**TABLE 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>DOCTORATE</th>
<th>MASTERS</th>
<th>BACCA-</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>42.13</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>57.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 reveals a lower number of terminal degree respondents holding superordinate or dean and chairperson administrative positions,
87.5% and 63% respectively, than the researcher had expected. The terminal degrees among the faculty were about as expected.

Table 11 shows undergraduate and graduate professional preparation of respondents according to subpopulations, deans, chairpersons and faculty, including the respective number and percentage.

Table 11 indicates that only 13 or 32.5% of the superordinate administrators or deans of teacher education had undergraduate majors in education. The researcher was indeed gratified that five or 12.5% of the superordinate administrative respondents held undergraduate majors in physical education and that five or 38% of the 13 undergraduate education majors were occupied in their field.

The fact that a majority, 27 or 67.5%, of the deans were not undergraduate majors in education was indeed a surprise to the researcher.

Table 11 reveals that 29 or 72% of the superordinate administrators or deans pursued graduate work in education. Also five or 12.5% of the deans with undergraduate specialties in physical education pursued graduate studies in physical education. The chairpersons and faculty graduate specialization remain very much like the undergraduate pattern.

Table 12 indicates the years of service in present position of respondents according to subpopulations, deans, chairpersons and faculty including the respective number and percentage.

Table 12 reveals that the majority, 24 or 60% of the respondent deans have occupied their present position less than five (5) years, while fewer chairpersons, 26 or 45%, and fewer faculty, 61 or 39%, have occupied their present position less than five (5) years.
TABLE 11
DISTRIBUTION OF UNDERGRADUATE FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATE FIELDS OF SPECIALIZATION OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of all the respondents have occupied their present positions less than 10 years. As for the administrative positions, the researcher views the statistics as an indication of position tenure expectancy of five (5) to ten (10) years.

Table 13 reveals the years of employment at present institution according to subpopulations, deans, chairpersons and faculty, including the respective number and percentage.
Table 13 indicates that the largest number of deans, 12 or 30%, the largest number of chairpersons, 14 or 24.5%, and the largest number of faculty, 60 or 38%, have five (5) years of tenure or less at their respective study population institutions.

The majority of the deans, 22 or 55%, and the majority of the faculty, 97 or 62%, have 10 years of tenure or less at their respective study population institutions.

The majority of the chairpersons, 32 or 56%, have more than 10 years of tenure at their respective study population institutions. The tenure range of 21 years and over has the second largest group of chairperson respondents, 12 or 21%, and the largest group over ten (10) years of service with the present study population institution.

Table 14 shows previous occupational position held by respondents according to subpopulations, deans, chairpersons and faculty, and the three major employment sectors, government, private and educational, including the respective number and percentage.

### TABLE 14

**DISTRIBUTION OF PREVIOUS OCCUPATIONAL POSITIONS OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PRIVATE GOVERNMENT SECTOR</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>NO RESPONSE</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 reveals that the vast majority of the respondents in each subpopulation had been previously employed with an educational agency.

Tables 15, 16, 17, 18 indicate prior professional experience of respondents according to subpopulations, deans, chairpersons, faculty and the subpopulation combined, respectively, including corresponding number and percentage.

Table 15 indicates that the superordinate administrators or deans have had prior administrative professional experience on public school levels K - 12 and in higher education. Also, they have had rather extensive prior teaching experience on public school levels K - 12 and in higher education. There is some evidence of coaching experience by these superordinate administrators.

Table 16 reveals that the chairpersons have had rather limited prior administrative professional experience on the public school level K - 12. Their greatest prior administrative experience appears to be limited to higher education. There is evidence of extensive prior teaching experience on the public school level K - 12, as well as in higher education. While the coaching experience of the chairpersons is very evident at the K - 12 level of public education, it is most extensive at the higher education level.

Table 17 shows the faculty as having more prior administrative professional experience at the K - 12 level of public education than the chairpersons themselves. The prior teaching experience of faculties is extensive at all levels, public education K - 12 and higher education. Their prior coaching experience covers all levels, K - 12 and higher education extensively.
### Table 15
**Distribution of Prior Years of Professional Experience of Respondent Deans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>Elem K-6</th>
<th>Jr. Hi. 7-9</th>
<th>Sr. Hi. 10-12</th>
<th>Jr. Col.</th>
<th>Col/Uni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16
**Distribution of Prior Years of Professional Experience of Respondent Chairpersons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>Elem K-6</th>
<th>Jr. Hi. 7-9</th>
<th>Sr. Hi. 10-12</th>
<th>Jr. Col.</th>
<th>Col/Uni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 17

**DISTRIBUTION OF PRIOR YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENT FACULTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>ELEM K-6</th>
<th>JR. HI. 7-9</th>
<th>SR. HI. 10-12</th>
<th>JR. COL.</th>
<th>COL/UNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 18

**DISTRIBUTION OF PRIOR YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS COMPOSITELY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>ELEM K-6</th>
<th>JR. HI. 7-9</th>
<th>SR. HI. 10-12</th>
<th>JR. COL.</th>
<th>COL/UNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29.14</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS SECTION

This second section of this chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis of the data collected, all of which are being devoted to answering the hypotheses stated in Chapter I. The statistical treatments employed were mean scores, Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient and phi coefficient descriptive statistics; t-tests, analysis of variance, Scheffe multiple comparison test and chi-square inferential statistics.

As outlined in Chapter I of the study, the problem embraced a number of sub-problem objectives identified in Table 16, pp. 143-151. Here, the study identifies the following: (1) Specific role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform traditionally in colleges and universities that these administrators perform traditionally at historically black senior colleges and universities; and that they (chairpersons of physical education departments) perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by all the subpopulation, deans, chairpersons and faculty respondents combined; as perceived by superordinate administrators or deans of teacher education; as perceived by chairpersons of physical education departments themselves; and as perceived by departmental faculty of physical education; (2) the relative rated importance of the role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by superordinate administrators or deans of teacher education, as perceived by chairpersons of physical education departments themselves, and by departmental faculty of
physical education according to mean rankings; (3) the relative ranking relationship between:

a. The perceived role-task expectation responsibility responses of the chairpersons of physical education departments and those of the superordinate administrators or deans of teacher education at historically black senior colleges and universities.

b. Between the perceived role task expectation responsibility responses of the chairpersons of physical education departments and those of the departmental faculty of physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities.

c. Between the perceived role task expectation responsibility responses of the superordinate administrator or dean of teacher education and those of the departmental faculty of physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities.

Finally to be identified and displayed are the relationships among all the subpopulation respondents (deans, chairpersons, faculty) individually in contrast to all the subpopulations combined according to mean rankings.

Table 19 reveals that the total population of respondents, deans, chairpersons and faculty combined, rated 20 or 33 percent of the task inventory statements as above average in importance or a composite mean score of 4.0 and above. The total population rated 30 or 50 percent of the task inventory statements as of average importance, 3.0. They rated 7 or 12 percent of the task inventory statements as below average importance, 2.0, 2 or 3 percent of the task inventory statements as not important but should be performed and 1 or 2 percent of the task inventory statements as should not be performed, .9 percent and below.
TABLE 19
MEAN RANKINGS OF TASK INVENTORY STATEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>MEANS ALL (N254)</th>
<th>MEANS DEANS (n40)</th>
<th>MEANS CHAIRS (n57)</th>
<th>MEANS FACULTY (n157)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- PREPARE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT (15)</td>
<td>4.681</td>
<td>4.725</td>
<td>4.842</td>
<td>4.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEVELOP DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT OF AIMS AND OBJECTIVES (2)</td>
<td>4.476</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>4.596</td>
<td>4.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- HOLD DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS ON REGULARLY (54)</td>
<td>4.449</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>4.614</td>
<td>4.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DIRECT CONTROL OF DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET EXPENDITURES (e.g. supplies, equip., etc.) (16)</td>
<td>4.433</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>4.632</td>
<td>4.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PREPARE ANNUAL REPORTS (achievements, problems, needs, projections) (21)</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>4.475</td>
<td>4.439</td>
<td>4.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEVELOP LONG RANGE PLANS (1-3 years) (13)</td>
<td>4.406</td>
<td>4.550</td>
<td>4.596</td>
<td>4.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN CONTINUOUS OPPORTUNITIES FOR AND ENCOURAGE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT AMONG FACULTY (in-service, further study, research attendance at local, state and national conferences) (20)</td>
<td>4.390</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>4.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ESTABLISH DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES AND STANDARDS GOVERNING FACULTY TEACHING LOAD, COMMITTEE WORK ASSIGNMENTS (44)</td>
<td>4.327</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>4.474</td>
<td>4.261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 19 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>MEANS (N)254</th>
<th>MEANS DEANS (n40)</th>
<th>MEANS CHAIRS (n57)</th>
<th>MEANS FACULTY (n157)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N) Indicates original number on questionnaire</td>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>RANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RECOMMEND SALARIES AND/OR SALARY RAISES (14)</td>
<td>4.323</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.475</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CONDUCT PERIODIC DEPARTMENTAL SELF STUDIES (1)</td>
<td>4.287</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DETERMINE DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS (4)</td>
<td>4.283</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.600</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN CONTINUOUS PROGRAM OF CURRICULUM STUDY AND IMPROVEMENT (42)</td>
<td>4.280</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.150</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN CONTINUOUS DEPARTMENTAL AND PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCESS (59)</td>
<td>4.264</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.175</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- INTERPRET INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES, DIRECTIVES AND REGULATIONS TO FACULTY MEMBERS AND STAFF (47)</td>
<td>4.181</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CONDUCT ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR NEW FACULTY (56)</td>
<td>4.150</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN COOPERATIVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS WITH STATE OFFICE OF EDUCATION (46)</td>
<td>4.047</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN COOPERATIVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS AND/OR INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM ARRANGEMENTS WITH LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM (45)</td>
<td>4.035</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASKS</td>
<td>MEANS (N)254 RANK</td>
<td>MEANS (n40) RANK</td>
<td>MEANS (n57) RANK</td>
<td>MEANS (n157) RANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ESTABLISH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS FOR FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>4.028 19</td>
<td>3.725 37</td>
<td>4.211 17.5</td>
<td>4.038 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILIZATION, CONTROL AND INVENTORY (52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN FACULTY PERSONNEL RECORDS (3)</td>
<td>4.008 20</td>
<td>4.075 10</td>
<td>4.035 23</td>
<td>3.981 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LEADERSHIP IN STATE, NATIONAL AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATIONS (e.g. officer, on program) (37)</td>
<td>3.988 21</td>
<td>4.100 22.5</td>
<td>3.702 36</td>
<td>4.064 16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEPARTMENT SPOKES-PERSON AT SCHOOL, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>3.969 22</td>
<td>4.150 20.5</td>
<td>4.053 21.5</td>
<td>3.892 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVELS (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DISTRIBUTE INFORMATION TO COMMUNITY, STUDENTS AND FACULTY CONCERN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ING NEW PROGRAM SERVICES AND/OR TRENDS AND DEVELOPMENTS (51)</td>
<td>3.961 23</td>
<td>3.975 27.5</td>
<td>4.000 24</td>
<td>3.943 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- REVIEW COURSE OUTLINES AND/OR COURSE</td>
<td>3.894 24</td>
<td>4.200 18</td>
<td>4.228 16</td>
<td>3.694 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTATION METHODS OF FACULTY (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CONTRIBUTE SCHOLARLY ARTICLES TO PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS (35)</td>
<td>3.882 25.5</td>
<td>4.075 24.5</td>
<td>4.070 20</td>
<td>3.764 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN COOPERATIVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS WITH NEIGHBORING</td>
<td>3.882 25.5</td>
<td>3.950 30</td>
<td>3.895 28</td>
<td>3.860 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMS (48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PERFORM CONSULTANT SERVICES (38)</td>
<td>3.857 27</td>
<td>3.550 45.5</td>
<td>3.491 42</td>
<td>3.420 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASKS</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) Indicates original number on questionnaire</td>
<td>ALL (N)254 RANK (n40) RANK (n57) RANK (n157) RANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SERVE ON EVALUATION AND/OR ACCREDITATION TEAMS (18)</td>
<td>3.827</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (rank, tenure, promotion, personnel re-views) (30)</td>
<td>3.819</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.950</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CONDUCT PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR PROSPECTIVE STUDENT MAJORS (43)</td>
<td>3.795</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.675</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF FACULTY AND/OR STUDENTS (49)</td>
<td>3.791</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.050</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION ON GRADUATES (28)</td>
<td>3.760</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN SCHOOL, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY WIDE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS (58)</td>
<td>3.717</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ADVISE OF NEW TEACHING AIDS OR INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND/OR SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FIELD (53)</td>
<td>3.705</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.950</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ASSIGN STUDENT ADVISORS (22)</td>
<td>3.697</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEVELOP PROPOSALS FOR FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL FUNDING (17)</td>
<td>3.657</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN REGULAR RESEARCH ENDEAVORS (36)</td>
<td>3.594</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASKS</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
<td>MEANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) Indicates original number on questionnaire</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DEANS</td>
<td>CHAIRS</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS AND/OR ACTIVITIES (29)</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>3.975</td>
<td>3.544</td>
<td>3.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PURSUE POST-DOCTORATE PROGRAM OR STUDIES (41)</td>
<td>3.531</td>
<td>3.650</td>
<td>3.807</td>
<td>3.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES (5)</td>
<td>3.508</td>
<td>3.565</td>
<td>3.719</td>
<td>3.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IDENTIFY AND UTILIZE OUTSIDE CONSULTANTS AS RESOURCE PERSONS (11)</td>
<td>3.488</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>3.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MONITOR ADVISEMENT PROCEDURES USED BY FACULTY (23)</td>
<td>3.409</td>
<td>3.650</td>
<td>3.719</td>
<td>3.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MONITOR IMMEDIATE PHYSICAL PLANT MAINTENANCE (40)</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>3.456</td>
<td>3.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- COMPLETE AND ANALYZE STATISTICAL DATA RELATED TO ADMISSIONS, SELECTION, RETENTION AND GRADUATION CRITERIA (26)</td>
<td>3.319</td>
<td>3.550</td>
<td>3.298</td>
<td>3.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN STUDENT ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES (25)</td>
<td>3.268</td>
<td>3.300</td>
<td>3.456</td>
<td>3.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PROVIDE PLACEMENT SERVICES, CAREER COUNSELING AND MARKET INFORMATION FOR GRADUATES (24)</td>
<td>3.197</td>
<td>3.075</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>3.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MONITOR GRADING PRACTICES, STANDARDS AND GRADE DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY (39)</td>
<td>3.193</td>
<td>3.600</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>3.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASKS</td>
<td>MEANS ALL (N)</td>
<td>MEANS DEANS (n)</td>
<td>MEANS CHAIRS (n)</td>
<td>MEANS FACULTY (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N) Indicates original number on questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PARTICIPATE IN UNIVERSITY WIDE PROGRAM PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT (50)</td>
<td>3.161 48</td>
<td>4.300 14</td>
<td>4.333 12.5</td>
<td>4.064 16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN NATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION EXAMINATION TUTORIAL PROGRAM (19)</td>
<td>3.154 49</td>
<td>3.150 49.5</td>
<td>3.316 47</td>
<td>3.096 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEVELOP GRADING STANDARDS FOR THE DEPARTMENT (12)</td>
<td>3.039 50</td>
<td>3.750 35.5</td>
<td>3.333 46</td>
<td>2.752 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CONDUCT STUDENT RECRUITING ACTIVITIES (32)</td>
<td>2.961 51</td>
<td>3.050 53.5</td>
<td>2.860 55</td>
<td>2.975 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- COMPILE AND ANALYZE STATISTICAL DATA RELATED TO TESTING (ACT/SAT, National Teachers Exam, etc.) (27)</td>
<td>2.949 52</td>
<td>3.125 51</td>
<td>2.965 52</td>
<td>2.898 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PARTICIPATE IN GENERAL REGISTRATION PROCEDURES (8)</td>
<td>2.909 53</td>
<td>3.150 49.5</td>
<td>3.105 50</td>
<td>2.777 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MONITOR LIBRARY RESOURCES (10)</td>
<td>2.787 54</td>
<td>3.050 53.5</td>
<td>2.877 53</td>
<td>2.688 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CONDUCT ONE TO TWO PURELY SOCIAL AFFAIRS EACH YEAR TO INCLUDE FACULTY AND THEIR FAMILIES (60)</td>
<td>2.677 55</td>
<td>2.600 55</td>
<td>2.719 56</td>
<td>2.682 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DIRECT STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCES (6)</td>
<td>2.543 56</td>
<td>2.400 56</td>
<td>2.877 54</td>
<td>2.459 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEVELOP COMPUTER PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS (9)</td>
<td>2.185 57</td>
<td>2.350 57</td>
<td>2.281 57</td>
<td>2.108 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASKS</td>
<td>MEANS (N)</td>
<td>MEANS DEANS (n40)</td>
<td>MEANS CHAIRS (n57)</td>
<td>MEANS FACULTY (n157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL (N)254 RANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ADMINISTER INTRAMURAL AND/OR CLUB SPORT PROGRAM (34)</td>
<td>1.669 58</td>
<td>1.775 58</td>
<td>2.070 58</td>
<td>1.497 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RESPONSIBLE FOR ATHLETIC PROGRAM (57)</td>
<td>1.106 59</td>
<td>1.300 59</td>
<td>1.281 59</td>
<td>0.994 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MAINTAIN COACHING RESPONSIBILITIES (33)</td>
<td>0.949 60</td>
<td>1.200 60</td>
<td>1.211 60</td>
<td>0.790 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 indicates that the superordinate administrators or deans rated 26 or 43 percent of the task inventory statements as above average importance, or having a mean score of 4.0 and above. The deans rated 28 or 47 percent of the task inventory statements as of average importance, 3.0. They rated 3 or 5 percent of the task inventory statements as below average in importance, 2.0 and 3 or 5 percent of the task inventory statements as not important but should be performed.

Table 19 shows that the chairpersons rated 24 or 40 percent of the task inventory statements as of above average importance, having a mean score of 4.0 and above. The chairpersons rated 27 or 45 percent of the task inventory statements as of average importance, 3.0. They rated 7 or 12 percent of the task inventory statements as below average in importance, 2.0 and 2 or 3 percent of the task inventory statements as not important but should be performed.

Table 19 reflects that the faculty rated 19 or 32 percent of the task inventory statements as having above average importance or a mean score of 4.0 and above. The faculty rated 30 or 50 percent of the task inventory statements as average in importance, 3.0. They rated 8 or 13 percent of the task inventory statements as below average in importance, 2.0; 1 or 1 percent of the task inventory statements as not important but should be performed and 2 or 3 percent of the task inventory statements as should not be performed, .9 and below.

Table 19 reveals that the deans ranked 11 or 73 percent of their top 15 or 25 percent task inventory statements within the top 15 or 25 percent of the over-all ranking of the task statements. The chairpersons ranked 13 or 87 percent of their top 15 or 25 percent task inventory
statements within the top 15 or 25 percent of the over-all ranking of the task statements. The faculty ranked 15 or 100 percent of their top 15 or 25 percent task inventory statements within the top 15 or 25 percent of the over-all ranking of task statements.

Table 19 indicates that there is one hundred percent agreement among respondents on rankings 1, 57, 58, 59 and 60. There is also 66 percent agreement among respondents on rankings 3, 5, 14, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 54 and 56. The Spearman Rank-order Correlation Coefficient, presented later, delineates the high pair-wise ranking correlation between the respective respondent subpopulations and total population.

Table 20 provides a composite breakout of numbers and percentage of mean averages per question by subpopulation groups individually and in combination.

Table 20 reveals that the deans rated 90 percent of the task inventory statements as having average importance and above. The chairpersons rated 85 percent of the task inventory statements as holding average importance and above. The faculty rated 82 percent of the task inventory statements as being of average importance or above, while the combined respondent population rated 83 percent of the task inventory statements as average or above in importance.

The study presents the identified tasks utilized to develop the questionnaire instrument for collecting the descriptive data concerning the respondents and their perceived role expectations of chairpersons of physical education departments at historically black colleges and universities.*

*Appendix E, p. XV (217), "Sub-problem Objectives," No. 3.
TABLE 20

COMPOSITE BREAKOUT OF NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF MEAN AVERAGES PER QUESTION BY SUBPOPULATION GROUPS INDIVIDUALLY AND COMBINED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATINGS</th>
<th>DEANS</th>
<th>CHAIRPERSONS</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>COMBINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO. OF Q</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>NO. OF Q</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 60 100.00 60 100.00 60 100.00 60 100.00
The hypotheses to be tested are stated in the null form. When the null hypothesis is assumed, it implies that the population mean differences between the variables is zero. In order to reject the null hypothesis, statistical analysis of the data must indicate that a population mean difference greater than zero exists. The null hypothesis is accepted if the statistical analysis indicates that the population mean difference between the variables is not significant.

The hypotheses expressed in the null form facilitate testing their statistical significance. In the discussions that follow the null hypotheses are stated preceding the presentation of the results and the findings.

Null hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference among the deans, chairpersons and faculty respondents in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairperson. Table 18 summarizes the results of calculations of the analysis of variance of difference in actual perceptions among subpopulation respondents, administrators or deans, chairpersons and faculty as measured by the task inventory statement questionnaire instrument.

Inspection of Table 21 reveals that differences in actual perceptions were significant at the .05 level with an F value of 3.01. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

When the overall hypothesis of equal means is rejected by the analysis of variance, this does not indicate that every sample mean differs significantly from every other in the group. It is reasonable to assume, on the basis of rejection of the overall null hypothesis,
### TABLE 21

**DESCRIPTION OF SUBPOPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>VALUE LABEL</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>STD. DEV.</th>
<th>SUM SQ</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Chairpersons</td>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>480.000</td>
<td>3.0573</td>
<td>0.6227</td>
<td>60.4841</td>
<td>0.3877</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>184.000</td>
<td>3.2281</td>
<td>0.5981</td>
<td>20.0351</td>
<td>0.3578</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>Chairpersons</td>
<td>131.000</td>
<td>3.2750</td>
<td>0.5541</td>
<td>11.9750</td>
<td>0.3071</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>795.000</td>
<td>3.1299</td>
<td>0.6118</td>
<td>92.4942</td>
<td>0.3744</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>DEGREE OF FREEDOM</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.218</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>*3.010</td>
<td>0.0497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>92.4942</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94.7122</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.*
that at least one sample mean differs significantly from another one. Generally, the rejection of the overall hypothesis or equal means without identifying which means are significantly larger than which other means is not a very satisfactory conclusion to a research analysis.

In order to identify specifically the relative difference in actual perception among the subpopulations, deans, chairpersons and faculty, the data reported in Table 22 was further statistically treated for comparisons or contrasts among means by multiple comparisons test.

The Scheffe test is the most general of the multiple-comparisons procedures, being suited for use under almost any circumstance. It is not limited to samples of equal size, nor is it limited to simple pairwise comparisons.

The Scheffe is used at this point in this study to further refine the research conclusion reached in rejecting null hypothesis 1. In addition to delineating the research conclusion reached in rejecting null hypothesis 1, the Scheffe multiple-comparisons test is used to facilitate testing the statistical significance of null hypothesis two (2), three (3) and four (4). The formula is as follows:

\[ F = \frac{(M_1 - M_2)^2}{\text{MS}_w (1/n_1 + 1/n_2)(K-1)} \]

with \( \text{df} = K - 1, N - K \)

**Null hypothesis 2.** There is no significant difference between the deans and the chairpersons in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairpersons.
**TABLE 22**

**SCHEFFE MULTIPLE-COMPARISONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NULL HYPOTHESES</th>
<th>F - VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEAN vs CHAIRPERSONS</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEANS vs FACULTY</td>
<td>*2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAIRPERSONS vs FACULTY</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY vs DEANS AND CHAIRPERSONS COMBINED</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

The Scheffe statistical procedure test reveals that the level of difference between the perceptions of the dean and those of the chairpersons with an F value of .711 was not significant at the .05 level. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Null hypothesis 3.** There is no significant difference between the deans and the faculty in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairpersons.

The Scheffe statistical procedure test revealed that the level of difference between the perceptions of the dean and those of the faculty, with an F value of 2.08, was significant at the .05 level. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

**Null hypothesis 4.** There is no significant difference between the chairpersons and the faculty in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairperson.
The Scheffe statistical procedure test revealed that the level of difference between the perceptions of the chairpersons and those of the faculty, with an F value of 1.33, was not significant at the .05 level. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

In view of the very narrow or slim margin on which null hypothesis 1 was rejected and given the versatility and flexibility of the Scheffe test as a multiple-comparisons procedure, the researcher was interested in investigating the mean of the faculty compared to the mean of the deans and chairpersons combined. The formula is as follows:

\[
M_{1+2} = \frac{n_1M_1 + n_2M_2}{n_1 + n_2} \\
F = \frac{(M_3 - M_1 + M_2)^2}{M_{Sw} \left(1/n_1 + n_2 + 1/n_3\right)} (K - 1)
\]

It was interesting to note that when the only significantly different subpopulation faculty mean was compared with the combined means of the deans and chairpersons, the Scheffe statistical procedure test revealed that the level of difference between the perceptions of the faculty and those of the chairpersons and the deans combined, with an F value of 1.36, was not significant at the .05 level. Thus the slim margin of difference was negated, which leads the researcher to assume that the very narrow margin of difference between the subpopulation deans and subpopulation faculty was offset by the stronger similarity of the subpopulation chairpersons and subpopulation faculty or some other variable.
In this study mean scores were computed on each of the 60 task inventory statements representing the perceptions of the subpopulation respondents (deans, chairpersons and faculty), individually, as well as the total population (all three subpopulations combined). The mean scores were ranked from highest to lowest, thereby ranking the 60 task statements. Spearman rank order correlation coefficients were computed on the 60 task statement mean rankings of the aforementioned populations pairwise, to determine the rho value (p).

The mean scores and the mean score rankings computed on the 60 task inventory statements by the total population (deans, chairpersons, and faculty combined), along with the mean scores and the mean score rankings of each of the 60 task inventory statements by the three subpopulations (deans, chairpersons and faculty) respondents individually are presented in Table 16. These data are presented in table format so that differences between the mean scores and mean score rankings, for each of the 60 task inventory statements, can be shown with greater clarity.

To determine the degree of relationship between the mean score rankings of the task statements (based on mean scores) for the three subpopulations in terms of pairs (deans and chairpersons, deans and faculty and chairpersons and faculty) and between each of the three subpopulations and the total population (all three subpopulations combined) as pairs (deans and total population, chairpersons and total population and faculty and total population) the Spearman rank order correlation coefficients were calculated.
As cited earlier, Glass and Stanley state, by using the Spearman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient raw data may be converted to ranks, or ranks may be fathered as the original data. "Rank in graduating class" is an example of the conversion of ordered scores to ranks: grade-point averages are computed for each of 500 students, say a rank of one is assigned to the highest grade point average, two to the next highest, . . . , 500 to the lowest.* This correlation coefficient is a method used to describe the relationship between the two sets of ranks, X and Y. It is defined as the product moment correlation coefficient computed on two sets of the n consecutive, untied ranks 1 . . . , n. The coefficient is symbolized by p.

No special interpretation can be given to p over and above the statement that it equals the product-moment correlation calculated on ranks. The value of p can never be less than -1 nor greater than +1. It equals +1 only if each person has exactly the same ranks on both X and Y.

Despite the similarity between p and r, the test and tables of significance are different. Thus the t value was computed, as an approximation of the p level of significance. The formula used in this study to compute the approximate t value for the Spearman rank-order correlations coefficient is as follows:

\[ t = p \sqrt{N - 1} \]

It is important to note that in this study the purpose for using the t value to determine the significance of each rho coefficient was that the table with ranked differences for the Spearman rank

*Above, p. 103.
order correlation coefficient included only 30 degrees of freedom. The number of degrees of freedom for this study was 58 which was included in the t table. The t table value is an accepted approximation of the rho table value for determining critical p levels of significance.

Once the t values were computed, the t table value was used to determine whether the t value of the two ranked variables reflected a significant relationship. The t table value at the .05 level was used to test the significance of the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient of the mean score rankings of the three subpopulations as pairs (deans and chairpersons, deans and faculty and chairpersons and faculty) as well as the rankings of the total populations against each of the three subpopulations as pairs.

If the t value is equal to or larger than the 5 table value at the .05 level, then there is a significant relationship between the two ranked variables. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

In order for this study to address null hypotheses five through ten, concerning the degree of relationship between the mean rankings of the 60 task inventory statements based on mean scores for each of the subpopulations (deans, chairpersons and faculty) and the total population (deans, chairpersons and faculty combined), the Spearman rho value is the most frequently used statistic.

Table 23 shows the Spearman rank-order correlations coefficients for the mean rankings of the three subpopulations pairwise, and the respective t value.
TABLE 23
SPEARMAN RANK-ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF THE MEAN RANKINGS OF THE THREE SUBPOPULATIONS PAIRWISE AND THE RESPECTIVE t VALUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBPOPULATIONS</th>
<th>RHO VALUE</th>
<th>t-VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEANS v. CHAIRPERSONS</td>
<td>.9260</td>
<td>*7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEANS v. FACULTY</td>
<td>.9233</td>
<td>*7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAIRPERSONS v. FACULTY</td>
<td>.9280</td>
<td>*7.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant positive relationship at the .01 level.

Null hypothesis 5. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the deans and chairpersons.

The rank-order correlation coefficient between the deans and chairpersons mean score rankings was found to be +.93. The t value computed was found to be +7.11; thus the relationship is significant at the .01 level, the conclusion being that there is a significant positive relationship between the rankings of the task statements by the two respective subpopulations.

Null hypothesis 6. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the deans and the faculty.

The rank-order correlation coefficient between the deans and faculty mean score rankings was found to be +.92. The t value computed was found to be +7.09; thus the relationship is significant at the
.01 level, the conclusion being that there is a significant positive relationship between the rankings of the task statements by the two respective subpopulations.

Null hypothesis 7. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the chairpersons and the faculty.

The rank-order correlation coefficient between the chairpersons and faculty mean score rankings was found to be +.93. The t value computed was found to be +7.13; therefore the relationship is significant at the .01 level, the conclusion being that there is a significant positive relationship between the rankings of the task statements by the two respective subpopulations.

Based on the statistical analysis presented, it appears that the three subpopulations ranked the task statements in very similar ways.

In order to determine whether a significant relationship exists between the mean rankings for the subpopulations (deans, chairpersons and faculty) and the mean rankings of the total population (mean rankings of all three subpopulations combined) the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient and the t value were computed.

Table 24 indicates the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient for the mean rankings of each of the three subpopulations against the mean rankings of the total population pairwise, and the respective t value.
TABLE 24
SPEARMAN RANK-ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF THE
MEAN RANKINGS OF THE THREE SUBPOPULATIONS AGAINST THE TOTAL
POPULATION PAIRWISE AND THE RESPECTIVE t VALUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATIONS</th>
<th>RHO VALUE</th>
<th>t-VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION v. DEANS</td>
<td>.9557</td>
<td>*7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION v. CHAIRPERSONS</td>
<td>.9607</td>
<td>*7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION v. FACULTY</td>
<td>.9903</td>
<td>*7.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant positive relationship at the .01 level.

Null hypothesis 8. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, of the total population (all three subpopulations combined) and the deans.

The rank-order correlation coefficient between the total populations and the deans was found to be +.96. The t value computed was found to be +7.34; thus the relationship is significant at the .01 level, the conclusion being that there is a significant positive relationship between the rankings of the task statements by the two respective populations.

Null hypothesis 9. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the total population and the chairpersons.

The rank-order correlation coefficient between the total population and the chairpersons was found to be +.96. The t value computed was found to be +7.38, showing that the relationship is significant at the
.01 level, and thus making valid the conclusion that there is a significant positive relationship between the rankings of the task statements by the two respective populations.

Null hypothesis 10. There is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the total population and the faculty.

The rank-order correlation coefficient between the total population and the faculty was found to be +.99. The t value computed was found to be 7.61, thereby revealing that the relationship is significant at the .01 level, and thus that there is a significant positive relationship between the rankings of the task statements by the two respective populations.

Based on the statistical analysis presented, it appears that each of the subpopulations ranked their task statements means very much like the mean rankings of the total population. It also appears that the measures of ranking relationship between each of the subpopulations and the total population were stronger than the measures of ranking relationship between each of the subpopulations pairwise. The spread of differences between the means for the task statement responsibilities of departmental chairpersons were extremely narrow.

In a brief summary of the rho values, it appears that the three subpopulation respondents (deans, chairpersons and faculty) were very close in their rankings of the 60 task inventory statements. Likewise the mean rankings of each subpopulation group were very much like the total population. It was also interesting to note that when the one
significantly different subpopulation (faculty) mean was compared to the combined means of the deans and chairpersons, the slim margin of differences was lost. The researcher feels it safe to assume that the very narrow margin of difference between the subpopulation deans and faculty was offset by the closer similarity of the subpopulation chairpersons and faculty.

**Chi Square**

The question was asked: "What is the relationship between the relative importance of the task inventory statements as perceived by the respondents, deans, chairpersons and faculty, and their position (administrative or faculty), their academic rank (junior rank— instructor or assistant professor; senior rank— associate professor or professor), their tenure status (tenured or non-tenured), their sex, their ages, their degree of education, their years of service in present position, and their years of employment at present institution?" To statistically test this, the chi square test of independence was selected.

How the chi square was used as a statistical technique in this study is described above, p. 114. The chi square test for independence is used for construction of Tables 25 through 32, pp. 168-175. The respondents were classified according to sex, age, tenure status, positions, academic rank, degree of education, years of service, and years of employment. The total average frequency ratings attached to all the task statements on a given questionnaire were categorized according to degree of importance. The chi square formula is as follows:

\[ \chi^2 = \frac{n(AD-BC)^2}{(A+B)(C+D)(A+C)(B+C)} \]
Null hypothesis 11. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the occupational position of respondents. Table 25 contains the raw data tabulations used in the chi square calculations. With one degree of freedom, the chi square value of 1.24 in Table 25 is smaller than 3.84 chi square table value at the .05 level; thus the null hypothesis is accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATOR</th>
<th>FACULTY MEMBERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE IMPORTANT</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93.81</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS IMPORTANT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.24 \quad P .05$

In this case, there is no significant difference between the occupational positions of the respondents and their perceived average importance rating of the task expectation responsibilities of the departmental chairperson of physical education. In the case of a significant difference the phi coefficient is used to describe the degree of difference between independent and dependent variables. The phi coefficient must lie between 0 (reflecting complete independence) and 1 (indicating complete dependence or association between variables).
Null hypothesis 12. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of task and the academic rank of respondents. Table 26 contains the raw data tabulations used in the chi square calculations. With one degree of freedom, the chi square value of 3.10 in Table 26 is smaller than the 3.84 chi square table at the .05 level; thus the null hypothesis is accepted.

**TABLE 26**

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACADEMIC RANK AND AVERAGE IMPORTANCE RATINGS OF TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE RATING</th>
<th>ACADEMIC RANKS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SENIOR RANKS</td>
<td>JUNIOR RANKS</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE IMPORTANT</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>88.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS IMPORTANT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 3.10\)  

P. 05

Null hypothesis 13. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the tenure status of respondents. Table 27 contains the raw data tabulations used in the chi square calculation. With one degree of freedom, the chi square value of .65 in Table 27 is smaller than the 3.84 chi square table value at the .05 level; thus the null hypothesis is accepted.
### TABLE 27

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TENURE STATUS AND AVERAGE IMPORTANCE RATINGS OF TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE RATING</th>
<th>TENURE STATUS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TENURED</td>
<td>NON-TENURED</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE IMPORTANT</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>89.29</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>85.96</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS IMPORTANT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = .65$          

*P = .05*

**Null hypothesis 14.** There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of the task expectations and the sex of respondents. Table 28 contains the raw data tabulations used in the chi square calculations. With one degree of freedom, the chi square value of .05 in Table 28 is smaller than the 3.84 chi square table value at the .05 level; thus the null hypothesis is accepted.
### TABLE 28

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX AND AVERAGE IMPORTANCE RATINGS OF TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE RATING</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE IMPORTANT</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>86.96</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS IMPORTANT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .05 \quad p .05 \]

**Null hypothesis 15.** There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of the task expectations and the age of respondents. Table 29 contains the raw data tabulations used in the chi square calculations. With one degree of freedom, the chi square value of .5 in Table 29 is smaller than the 3.84 chi square table value at the .05 level; thus the null hypothesis is accepted.
### Table 29

#### Relationship Between Age and Average Importance Ratings of Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Rating</th>
<th>39 &amp; Under</th>
<th>40 &amp; Over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Important</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>87.36</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.5 \quad P = 0.05 \]

Null hypothesis 16. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of the task expectations and the degree of education of respondents. Table 30 contains the raw data tabulations used in the chi square calculations, as well as the percent of respondents represented. With one degree of freedom, the chi square value of 0.3 in Table 30 is smaller than the 3.84 chi square table value at the .05 level; thus the null hypothesis is accepted.
### TABLE 30
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEGREE OF EDUCATION AND AVERAGE IMPORTANCE RATINGS OF TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE RATING</th>
<th>DOCTORATE</th>
<th></th>
<th>MASTER'S</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE IMPORTANT</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87.96</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>88.03</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>88.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS IMPORTANT</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .3 \]

Null hypothesis 17. There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of the task expectations and the years of service in present position of respondents. Table 31 contains the raw data tabulations used in the chi square calculations, as well as the percent of respondents represented. With one degree of freedom, the chi square value of 7 in Table 31 is larger than the 3.84 chi square table value at the .05 level; thus the null hypothesis is rejected.

Since there is a significant difference between the respondents perceived importance of the task expectations and their years of service in present position, a phi coefficient was calculated to describe the degree of the difference. The formula is as follows:

\[ \phi = \frac{BC - AD}{\sqrt{(A+C)(B+D)(A+B)(C+D)}} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORE IMPORTANT</th>
<th>10 &amp; UNDER</th>
<th>11 &amp; UNDER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>88.57</td>
<td>86.08</td>
<td>87.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS IMPORTANT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 7 \]

The phi coefficient value is +.04 which indicates a rather small degree of difference between the perceived expectations of the respondents and their years of service in present position.

To determine if the \( r_\phi +.04 \) value represents a significant relationship between \( X \) and \( Y \) the chi square statistic was employed. In this case \( X^2 = N r_\phi^2 \). With one degree of freedom \( X^2 = .41 \). Comparing the above obtained \( X^2 \) value of .41 with that of the chi square table value of 3.84, the above obtained \( X^2 = .41 \) is smaller and not significant at the \( P .05 \) level of confidence. Thus, the null hypothesis that these variables are independent is accepted.

**Null hypothesis 18.** There is no significant difference between the perceived importance of task and the years of employment of respondents. Table 32 contains the raw data tabulations used in the chi square calculations. With one degree of freedom, the chi square value of .99 in Table 32 is smaller than the 3.84 chi square table value at the .05 level; thus the null hypothesis is accepted.
TABLE 32
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT AT PRESENT INSTITUTION AND AVERAGE IMPORTANCE RATINGS OF TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVERAGE RATINGS</th>
<th>YEARS OF EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 &amp; UNDER</td>
<td>11 &amp; OVER</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE IMPORTANT</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>86.01</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS IMPORTANT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .99 \quad \text{P} .05 \]

Chapter V of this study will provide a summary of the study as well as the conclusions, implications, and recommendations which are based on the analysis of the data as presented in this chapter.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

A summary of this research investigation, conclusions and/or implications drawn from the findings, and recommendations will be presented in this chapter.

This descriptive research study was initiated upon the assumption that the college or university is a social organization in which various groups, the board of trustees, the president, the provost or vice president for academic affairs, the superordinate administrator or dean of teacher education, the departmental chairperson, the faculty and the students, are related according to position. Position includes not only the actions and qualities expected of the individual in the position and his obligations, but also the actions and qualities which he may expect from others, his rights. This study was specifically designed to investigate the role concepts of the departmental chairperson of physical education, as perceived by immediate reference groups.

Role concept studies have emerged as a more sophisticated research medium for studying the rights and obligations of an individual who occupies a particular position in a social system in the twentieth century. Role studies have become accepted as creditable research endeavors.
Though the roles of the various administrators are derived through the expectations held by all the interested groups with which the administrators work to further the goals of education, the expectations held by the immediate reference groups are of particular significance. These immediate reference groups, superordinate administrators of deans of teacher education, the departmental chairpersons and the departmental faculty, are the central figures in a college or university primary function, that of education.

The degree of relationship between the role expectations held by the departmental chairperson for the departmental chairperson's position and the role expectations held by the departmental faculty for the departmental chairperson's position is very important in determining the general atmosphere and morale in a department. Research indicates that the congruence in role expectations is one of the most influential factors in determining overall job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The same is true for the degree of relationship between the role expectations held by the departmental chairperson for the departmental chairperson's position and the role expectations held by the superordinate administrator or dean of teacher education for the departmental chairperson's position. The congruity of immediate reference groups and their role expectations is highly conducive to the chairperson's effectiveness and the professional growth of the department, consequently improving the instructional program.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The study is of a task analysis of the role expectations of the departmental chairpersons of physical education, their routine duties
and responsibilities, at historically black senior colleges and universities in the United States as perceived by selected immediate reference groups: (1) the immediate superior, (such as a dean or divisional head) referred to as the superordinate administrator, or dean; (2) the departmental administrators themselves, referred to as the departmental chairperson or chairperson; (3) and the departmental professional personnel, referred to as the departmental faculty or faculty.

This study was limited to those black senior institutions of higher education offering professional preparation programs in physical education leading towards a baccalaureate degree in teacher education.

The problem embraced several sub-problems:

1. The identification and defining of components of the administrative process at the departmental level which were appropriate to this study.

2. The utilization of identified and defined components of the administrative process as categories around which the task inventory statement questionnaire instrument was developed.
   a. Designing of the instrument to provide appropriate means for securing perceptions of selected participants;
   b. Designing of the instrument to provide a clear and usable description of the task responsibilities of the departmental chairperson.

3. The identification of the study population for distribution in accordance with study limitations and willingness to participate.
4. The administration of the questionnaire to all participants;

5. The exercise of followup procedures to secure at least 55 percent return.

This research study was designed and conducted to investigate eighteen (18) hypotheses. Underlying this investigation are basic assumptions which the researcher used in planning the design of the study. To avoid excessive repetition detailed information and statements of hypotheses and assumptions appear above, Chapter I, pp. 16-21.

Education administrators hold central positions in the educational system, and society is dependent upon the effectiveness of this social institution. Administrators must understand their roles, as interpreted by educational and professional associates, if they are to perform in an effective manner.

It is imperative that administrators understand how educational and professional associates view the role expectations which define their jobs and determine the amount of conflict faced by administrators in the many and often contradictory demands made upon them.

The literature heavily documents the paramount importance of greater communication and cooperation between superordinate and subordinate administrators and faculty in the decision-making processes of college and university governance.

This study has been designed and conducted to provide an insight into the general role expectations of the departmental chairperson of
physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities. Furthermore, this study seeks to provide information which can be used in increasing the effectiveness of communication among higher education personnel, deans or heads of teacher education, departmental chairpersons of physical education and departmental faculty of physical education. Therein lies the significance of this research study.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of related literature concerned itself with two major topics. First, a review of the historical background of role concept studies and literature related to role theory in education. Second, an examination of related literature on the role of the collegiate department chairperson.

A comprehensive review of selected and related literature provided the background for conceptualizing the direction of this study. The review of related literature resulted in identification of biographical and demographical data and information essential to the research study, task duties and responsibilities which administrators, teachers, and/or their assistants might be expected to perform as part of their routine job description; and a task inventory technique developed by Marsh, Madden and Christal (1961) of the United States Air Force Personnel Research Laboratory and a list of task statements to be checked if done and rated on a Likert-Type scale—a technique found to be a reliable and valid procedure for collecting extensive job descriptions.
Job analysis techniques were instrumental in developing certain personnel management procedures, such as job descriptions, hiring guidelines, job classification, job ratings, and more clearly defined criteria for promotions and terminations. The technique helped clarify delineation of lines of authority. Duties and responsibilities were identified in relation to other positions both vertically and horizontally.

A number of studies employed job analysis techniques to gather essential information relating to a number of physical education positions. Tasks were identified and studied against specifically predetermined criteria. Significant information was gathered which could be used to improve curricula offerings for professional preparation programs in physical education leading towards the baccalaureate degree in teacher education.

The research questionnaire instrument for this study was conceptualized as descriptive instead of evaluative in design and function. The research data were collected between February and June of 1980. A questionnaire was sent personally to each respondent in each subpopulation, deans, or heads of teacher education, departmental chairpersons of physical education and physical education departmental faculty.

The initial task statement expectations for the departmental chairperson of physical education was first approached through a review of the literature and then submitted to a jury of twelve (12) experts. The jury of experts was made up of former superordinate administrators of teacher education at historically black senior institutions of higher education, former departmental chairpersons of physical education at the
study population institutions, and former physical education departmental faculty members of study population institutions. The initial list contained several hundred task inventory statements covering four sub-role segments: administrator and supervisor, program planner and developer, teacher and counselor and researcher and service.

A task inventory technique developed by Marsha, Madden and Christal (1961) of the United States Air Force Personnel Research Laboratory was adopted as the basic format for the research instrument of this study. They used a list of task inventory statements to be rated on a Likert-Type Scale.

From the task statements a questionnaire was developed by listing the task inventory statements in a random order without regard to their sub-role segments. The final research questionnaire instrument contained a 14-item section of biographical and demographical data and information, a 60-item task inventory statement response section and a 36-line space section for listing additional task inventory statements.

There were six possible response variables for each task statement on a six-point, zero to five (0-5), Likert scale. These responses were: (0) should not perform; (1) not important, but should perform; (2) below average importance; (3) average importance; (4) above average importance; (5) maximum importance for the actual tasks performed.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

From a population of 88 historically black senior colleges and universities in the United States, 72 institutions of higher education were selected. Thirty-five (35) public and thirty-seven (37) private
historically black senior colleges and universities constituted the 72
study population institutions. The study population institutions were
limited to those historically black senior colleges and universities
offering professional preparation programs in physical education lead-
ing to a baccalaureate degree in teacher education, and those that
chose to participate. The 72 superordinate administrators or deans of
teacher education, the 72 departmental chairpersons of physical educa-
tion and 288 physical education departmental faculty members constituted
the respondent population.

The questionnaire, with accompanying introductory letter, was sent
to the 432 individuals included in the respondent population. These
individuals were asked to express their expectations for the role of
the departmental chairperson of physical education at historically black
senior colleges and universities in the United States by indicating on
the six-point Likert scale (0-5) whether they would or would not expect
a departmental chairperson to perform each of the sixty stated functions
on the questionnaire, and their relative degree of importance. A copy
of the questionnaire is included in Appendix E.

DATA ANALYSIS

The processes for analyzing the data collected from the respon-
dents' questionnaires included frequency and percentages on task checked
by deans or heads of teacher education, departmental chairpersons of
physical education and physical education departmental faculty personnel.
The biographical and demographical data and information were statistically
treated by means of descriptive and inferential techniques and reported
in table form for greater understanding and clarity. The research de-
sign specifically employed mean scores, Spearman rank-order correlation
coefficient and phi coefficient descriptive statistics; t-tests, analy-
sis of variance, Scheffe multiple comparison test and chi-square in-
ferential statistics to treat the data.

Organizing research data that have not been arranged in some kind
of order is very difficult. But it is a fundamental step in descriptive
statistics. Two ways of organizing such data are frequently employed:
(1) arranging the measures into frequency distributions, and (2) present-
ing them in graphic form. For the purposes of this study frequency dis-
tributions provided the systematic arrangement of individual measures for
lowest to highest. Also, many observations would not be apparent if the
scores had not been so organized. Organizing the data in this fashion
facilitates the computation of various useful statistics. Correspondingly
percentages were expressed to indicate the number of cases involved based
on the N or n of the population.

Mean scores were computed on all task statements reported by
total population (faculty, chairpersons and deans combined) and by
subpopulations (faculty, chairpersons and deans by individual reference
groups), on composite and individual questions to determine the perceived
importance of these tasks. The individual question mean score ratings
were presented in rank-order table form so that relationships or differ-
ences between the mean scores for the individual tasks inventory state-
ments for the total population and the three subpopulations could be
shown with greater clarity.
To determine the degree of relationship between the rankings of the task statements, based on mean scores for the total population and the three subpopulations, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was employed.

When a significant chi square was obtained, the null hypothesis was rejected, the conclusion being made that there is a relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The question was how much of a relationship? The phi coefficient was used to describe the degree of that relationship.

The preceding statistics were used to organize, summarize and describe the data. However, there was a need to go further in analyzing and interpreting the data. After making observations of the sample, it was desired to make induction or inference regarding general findings for the entire population from which the sample was drawn. To do this statistical techniques were used that allowed the making of valid inferences from the sample to the whole population.

Inferential statistics provided the tools and means by which the researcher was able to estimate how confident one can be in inferring that phenomena observed in samples would also be observed in the populations from which the samples were drawn. The inferential statistics enable the researcher to estimate how reliable the observations might be.

The basic strategy supported by the inferential statistics was the computation of the extent of difference among observations that would be likely to arise by chance alone. The result of this computation is often called the error term, there being both Type I and Type II errors.
The differences among observations were compared with the error term for acceptance or rejection.

The inferential statistic indices used in this study were: t-test for noncorrelated groups was employed to compare paired sample means drawn independently from the populations. The t-test and t-table were used to determine whether the difference between two sample means was statistically significant at the .05 level.

Analysis of variance was used to compare the mean scores of the three population respondent groups, deans, faculty and chairpersons, on the six-point Likert scale response variables. This was done to determine if a difference existed among the means obtained from these samples.

The Scheffe multiple-comparisons procedures provided the researcher with a statistical follow-up in the event of a significant variance ratio, F test. The Scheffe test provided the advantage of permitting the comparing of any pair of means or any pair of subsets of means that is desired and places no limits on the number of comparisons that may be made with any set of data.

This research study employed chi square to test the null hypothesis of independence of certain specific variables of a biographical and demographical nature (no relationship between position, academic rank, tenure status, sex, age, degree of education, years of service, previous occupational position, prior professional experience) and average importance rating of task responses.

When a significant chi square was obtained, the phi coefficient, previously discussed in this chapter, was used to describe the degree of the relationship.
REPORT OF FINDINGS

The findings of this research study are related to the specific sub-problem objectives as well as the null hypotheses that were tested. The specific sub-problem objectives are presented in Table 19: "Titles Used by Institutions to Identify the Physical Education Academic Component," p. 130 above.

Here, this study identifies the specific role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform in colleges and universities; that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities; that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as the foregoing are perceived by all the following: deans, chairpersons and faculty, respondents combined; superordinate administrators or deans of teacher education, chairpersons of physical education departments themselves and by departmental faculty of physical education. The study further identifies the relative importance of the role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by superordinate administrators or deans of teacher education, by chairpersons of physical education departments themselves and by departmental faculty of physical education according to mean rankings. It further identifies and displays the relative ranking relationship between the perceived role task expectation responsibility responses of the chairpersons of physical education departments and those of the departmental faculty of physical education at historically black
senior colleges and universities and between the perceived role task
expectation responsibility responses of the superordinate administrator
or dean of teacher education and those of the departmental faculty of
physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities;
as well as all the above subpopulation respondents (deans, chairpersons,
faculty) individually against the total population (all subpopulations
combined), according to mean rankings.

The study presents the identified tasks utilized to develop the
questionnaire instrument for collecting the descriptive data concerning
the respondents and their perceived role expectations of the chairpersons
of physical education departments at historically black senior colleges
and universities (Appendix E).

The hypotheses tested were stated in the null form. The hypotheses
expressed in the null form facilitated testing their statistical
significance. In the discussions the null hypotheses were stated pre-
ceding the presentation of the results and the findings.

**Null Hypothesis 1.** There is no significant difference among the
deans, chairpersons and faculty respondents in their perceptions of the
task expectations of the departmental chairperson.

The analysis of variance revealed a significant level of difference
in actual perceptions at the .05 level with an F value of 3.01, reject-
ing the hypothesis.

In order to identify specifically the relative difference in actual
perception among the subpopulations, deans, chairpersons and faculty,
was further statistically treated for comparisons or contrasts among
means by multiple comparisons test.
The Scheffe multiple comparisons test was used to further refine the research conclusion reached in rejecting null hypothesis 1. In addition to delineating the research conclusion reached in rejecting null hypothesis 1, the Scheffe multiple-comparisons test is used to facilitate testing the statistical significance of null hypothesis two (2), three (3) and four (4).

**Null Hypothesis 2.** There is no significant difference between the deans and the chairpersons in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairpersons.

The Scheffe statistical procedure test revealed that the level of difference between the perceptions of the dean and those of the chairpersons with an F value of 7.11 was not significant at the .05 level; thus null hypothesis 2 is accepted.

**Null Hypothesis 3.** There is no significant difference between the deans and the faculty in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairpersons.

The Scheffe statistical procedure test revealed that the level of difference between the perceptions of the dean and those of the faculty with an F value of 2.08, was significant at the .05 level. Thus null hypothesis 3 is rejected.

**Null Hypothesis 4.** There is no significant difference between the chairpersons and the faculty in their perceptions of the task expectations of the departmental chairpersons.
The Scheffé statistical procedure test revealed that the level of difference between the perceptions of the chairpersons and those of the faculty, with an F value of 1.33, was not significant at the .05 level. Null hypothesis 4 therefore, is accepted.

In view of the very narrow or slim margin by which null hypothesis 1 was rejected and given the versatility and flexibility of the Scheffé test as a multiple-comparisons procedure, the researcher investigated the mean of the faculty compared to the mean of the deans and chairpersons combined.

This extended investigation revealed that when the only significantly different subpopulation faculty mean was compared with the combined means of the deans and chairpersons, the Scheffé statistical procedure test revealed that the level of difference between the perceptions of the faculty and those of the chairpersons and deans combined, with an F value of 1.36, was not significant at the .05 level and negated the slim margin of difference.

This led the researcher to assume that the very narrow margin of difference between the subpopulation deans and subpopulation faculty was off-set by the stronger similarity of the subpopulation chairpersons and subpopulation faculty or some other variable.

The Spearman rho rank-order correlation coefficient statistical analysis of null hypotheses:

5. That there is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the dean and chairpersons.
6. That there is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings, of the deans and the faculty.

7. That there is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks, based on mean rankings of the chairpersons and the faculty, revealed that the three subpopulations ranked the 60 task statements very much alike, thus rejecting null hypotheses five (5); six (6) and seven (7).

The Spearman rho rank-order correlation coefficient statistical analysis of null hypotheses:

8. That there is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks of the total population (all three subpopulations combined) and the deans.

9. That there is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks based on mean rankings, of the total population and the chairpersons.

10. That there is no significant relationship between the rankings of tasks based on mean rankings of the total population and the faculty.

This revealed that each of the three foregoing subpopulations ranked the 60 tasks statements very much like the total population. It was also revealed, by the rho statistical analysis, that the ranking relationship between each of the subpopulations and the total population was stronger than the measures of ranking relationship between each of the paired subpopulations pairwise. The spread of differences between the means for the task statement responsibilities of departmental chairpersons were extremely narrow.
The chi square statistical analysis of null hypotheses:

11. That there is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the occupational position of respondents proved to be acceptable.

12. That there is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the academic rank of respondents proved to be acceptable.

13. That there is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the tenure status of respondents proved to be acceptable.

14. That there is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the sex of respondents proved to be acceptable.

15. That there is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the age of respondents proved to be acceptable.

16. That there is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the degree of education of respondents proved to be acceptable.

17. That there is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the years of service in present position of respondents proved to be unacceptable. Thus the phi coefficient was calculated to describe the degree of the relationship. The phi coefficient value of +.04 indicated a slight relationship between the perceived task of the respondents and their years of service in present position.
To determine if the $r_{\phi}^+ + .04$ value represents a significant relationship between $X$ and $Y$ the chi square statistic was employed. In this case $X^2 = N r_{\phi}^2$ with one degree of freedom $X^2 = .41$. Comparing the above obtained $X^2$ value of .41 with that of the chi square table value 3.84, the above obtained $X^2 = .41$ is smaller and not significant at the p .05 level of confidence. Thus, the null hypothesis that these variables are independent is accepted.

18. That there is no significant difference between the perceived importance of tasks and the years of employment of respondents proved to be acceptable. The research revealed that the data failed to reject all the preceding null hypotheses except number seventeen.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. The task inventory statement research questionnaire instrument measures what it was designed to measure; that is, the role task expectations for departmental chairpersons of physical education, as perceived by the immediate reference groups,
superordinate administrators of teacher education, chairpersons themselves and department of physical education faculty.

2. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the specific role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform in colleges and universities.

3. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the specific role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities.

4. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the specific role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by all the sub-population respondents, deans, chairpersons and faculty, combined.

5. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the specific role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by superordinate administrators of teacher education.

6. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the specific role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by the chairpersons of physical education departments themselves.
7. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the specific role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by the departmental faculty of physical education.

8. The task inventory statement identifies the relative rated importance of the role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by all the sub-population respondents, deans, chairpersons and faculty, combined.

9. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the relative rated importance of the role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by superordinate administrators of teacher education, based on a 0-5 Likert scale and computed mean scores.

10. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the relative rated importance of the role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by the physical education departmental chairpersons themselves, based on a 0-5 Likert scale computed mean scores.

11. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the relative rated importance of the role task responsibilities that
chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by the departmental faculty of physical education, based on a 0-5 point Likert scale and computed mean scores.

12. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the relative rankings of the role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by all the sub-population respondents, superordinate administrators, chairpersons of physical education and physical education faculty, combined, based on 0-5 Likert scale and computed mean scores.

13. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the relative rankings of the role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by the superordinate administrators of teacher education, based on a 0-5 point Likert scale and computed mean scores.

14. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the relative rankings of the role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by the physical education department chairpersons themselves, based on a 0-5 point Likert scale and computed mean scores.
15. The task inventory statement instrument identifies the relative rankings of the role task responsibilities that chairpersons of physical education departments perform at historically black senior colleges and universities, as perceived by the physical education departmental faculty, based on a 0-5 point Likert scale and computed mean scores.

16. Occupational positions of respondents did not have an observed effect on how they perceived the importance of the task responsibilities.

17. Academic rank of respondents did not have an observed effect on how they perceived the importance of the task responsibilities.

18. Tenure status of respondents did not have an observed effect on how they perceived the importance of the task responsibilities.

19. Sex of respondents did not have an observed effect on how they perceived the importance of the task responsibilities.

20. Age of respondent did not have an observed effect on how they perceived importance of the task responsibilities.

21. Degree of education of respondents did not have an observed effect on how they perceived the importance of the task responsibilities.

22. Years of service in present position of respondents did not have an observed effect on how they perceived the importance of the task responsibilities.
23. Years of employment of respondents did not have an observed effect on how they perceived the importance of the task responsibilities.

24. There is a definite lack of responsible research and related literature on the roles of superordinate and subordinate administrators of higher education at historically black senior colleges and universities in the United States.

25. The superordinate administrators or deans of teacher education and the departmental chairpersons of physical education have significantly similar views concerning the role task responsibility expectations of the departmental chairperson of physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities.

26. The superordinate administrator or dean of teacher education and the departmental faculty of physical education have significantly different views concerning the role task responsibility expectations of the departmental chairpersons of physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities.

27. The departmental chairpersons of physical education and the department faculty of physical education have significantly similar views concerning the role task responsibility expectations of the departmental chairpersons of physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities.
28. There is a significant relationship among the three sub-populations' rankings of the 60 task statements, based on mean score rankings.

29. There is a significant relationship between each sub-population's rankings of the 60 task statements pairwise, based on mean score rankings.

30. There is a significant relationship between each sub-population's rankings of the 60 task statements and the total population pairwise, based on mean score rankings.

31. The respondents do not perceive the departmental chairpersons of physical education as being responsible for athletics, intramural and/or club sports program and coaching.

32. There exists a wide range of prior professional experience among the respondents.

33. There exists a wide range of professional preparation among the superordinate administrators of teacher education.

34. This study should be used as a significant first step in eliminating the problems of ambiguity surrounding the role of the departmental chairperson of physical education relative to the tasks performed by the chairperson at the historically black senior college and university.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the goals and objectives of colleges and universities, the research data and its analysis, literature related to this study and the researcher's experience, the following recommendations are made:

1. The historically black senior colleges and universities should clearly define the role task responsibilities and expectations of the departmental chairpersons of physical education in their administrative improvement process.

2. The historically black senior colleges and universities should establish written job descriptions clearly defining role tasks, responsibilities and expectations.

3. Professionals recruited to chair departments of physical education should receive detailed written duties, responsibilities and task expectations.

4. Researchers and faculty should be informed concerning the duties, responsibilities and task expectations of department chairpersons.

5. The development of formal and informal learning experiences for departmental chairpersons of physical education should become a major focus for the black senior college or university.

6. In-service training should be instituted to aid departmental chairpersons of physical education in improving their understanding of the role of the departmental chairpersons in
general and the specific role of the departmental chairperson of physical education.

7. The historically black senior colleges or universities should critically analyze administrative roles relative to their goals, objectives of the institution.

8. Efforts should be made to ensure the full recognition of the task responsibilities and expectations of the departmental chairperson of physical education by other established institutional agencies.

9. Departmental chairpersons of physical education at historically black senior colleges and universities should make every effort to become informed about their role task responsibilities and expectations.

10. The departmental chairperson of physical education should become more informed about perceived role expectations.

11. Chief executive officers of institutions of higher education might find it advisable to examine the administrative role and organizational structure within their institutions to determine if each office, including that of the departmental chairperson, is defined to include those activities, duties and responsibilities which best facilitate the achievement of the aims and purposes of the institution.

12. Annual summer institutes for experienced and inexperienced departmental chairmen should be organized.
ADDITIONAL RESEARCH NEEDS

A replicated study should be conducted on the role of the departmental chairpersons at historically white colleges and universities of comparable size and geographic location for a comparison of the white and black professionals.

Additional research is needed in the areas of role perception and job satisfaction for the departmental chairperson.

Job effectiveness studies would assist the departmental chairpersons in an evaluation of themselves.

A study should be made of the administrative process at the departmental level at historically black and white institutions of higher education.

The research findings of this study might be strengthened by larger and more representative study of larger institutions of higher education.

Inquiry might be made regarding how a faculty member's concept of authority and relationship to authority figures affects the expectations he/she holds for the departmental chairperson and his perception of administrative behavior.

A study of chairpersons' responsibility and corresponding authority might prove helpful and instructive.

Based on the evidence of this study, the role of the departmental chairperson in the administrative organization at historically senior black colleges and universities is being more clearly and mutually understood by immediate reference groups than the researcher originally perceived.
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APPENDIXES
November 9, 1979

Registrar
Office of the Registrar
College/University
City, State  00000

Dear Registrar:

I am compiling a roster of heads of teacher education programs and heads of physical education programs at selected colleges and universities offering baccalaureate degrees in physical education.

Will you be so kind as to have one of your staff members complete the enclosed self-addressed stamped cards and return the information as soon as possible?

Your assistance in this effort will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

H. Frank Leftwich, Jr.,
Assistant Professor
APPENDIX B

HEAD OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION

NAME ________________________________

TITLE ________________________________
(Chairman, Etc.)

AREA TITLE ________________________________
(Such as: Department of Health, Physical Education)

THANK YOU KINDLY

HEAD OF TEACHER EDUCATION

NAME ________________________________

TITLE ________________________________
(Dean, Etc.)

CHECK ONE

( ) College of Education  ( ) School of Education
( ) Division of Education  ( ) Department of Education

THANK YOU KINDLY
Respondent
School of Education/College/University
Department of Physical Education
City, State 00000

Dear Colleague:

I am researching the perceived role expectations of departmental chairperson of Physical Education at selected senior colleges and universities in the United States, with baccalaureate degree programs in physical education.

This is not an evaluation of the chairperson and will not be used as such. I seek only to determine what task duties and responsibilities should or should not be expected of a collegiate department chairperson of physical education.

To secure baseline data which will provide a representative description of the task of the chairperson, chief administrators of teacher education, departmental chairpersons themselves and departmental faculty are being asked to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

Please complete the biographical data section. The task statement section only requires one of two actions: (1) deciding the task should be done and rating its importance, or (2) deciding the task should not be done and circling (0) and not rating it. Additional spaces are provided on the back of the questionnaire for tasks you think should be performed and rated.

This information is being gathered anonymously and will be held in strict confidence. Upon completion, please return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope. An early response will be greatly appreciated.

The results will be made available to you if you desire. You may indicate this by checking the results box at the bottom of page (1) one of the questionnaire.

I greatly appreciate your willingness to help.

Sincerely,

H. Frank Leftwich, Jr.

HFL:h
May 6, 1980

Respondent
School of Education/Department of
   Physical Education
College/University
City, State  00000

Dear Colleague:

PLEASE HELP!!! I need your help. I need the enclosed questionnaire completed by you.

This will enable me to meet the response percentage from respondents required by my research committee.

Thank you kindly for your assistance and cooperation in achieving this objective.

Best wishes for an enjoyable summer.

Sincerely,

H. Frank Leftwich, Jr.
**APPENDIX E**

THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION
IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

**Biographical Data/Questionnaire Inventory**

**Instruction:** Please answer and/or check (X) each of the appropriate lines for each of the items in the biographical data section. Thank you kindly.

1. **Name of College or University in which you are employed:**
   - [ ] Private
   - [ ] Public

2. **Your Organizational Level:**
   - [ ] College
   - [ ] Division
   - [ ] Department

3. **Your Academic Area Title:**
   - [ ] Education
   - [ ] Physical Education
   - [ ] Physical Education & Recreation
   - [ ] Health & Physical Education
   - [ ] Physical Education & Athletics
   - [ ] Health, Physical Education & Recreation
   - [ ] Physical Education, Recreation & Athletics
   - [ ] Other

4. **Your Position Title:**
   - [ ] Dean
   - [ ] Director
   - [ ] Chairperson
   - [ ] Coordinator
   - [ ] Faculty Member
   - [ ] Specify

5. **Your Academic Rank:**
   - [ ] Professor
   - [ ] Associate Professor
   - [ ] Instructor
   - [ ] Specify

6. **Tenured:**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7. **Sex:**
   - [ ] Female
   - [ ] Male

8. **Age Range:**
   - [ ] 20-29
   - [ ] 30-39
   - [ ] 40-49
   - [ ] 50-59
   - [ ] 60 and over

9. **Highest Degree:**
   - [ ] Doctorate
   - [ ] Masters
   - [ ] Baccalaureate

10. **Undergraduate Major Field**
    - [ ] Specify

11. **Years of Service in Present Position:**

12. **Years of Employment at Present Institution:**

13. **Previous Occupational Position:**
    - [ ] Specify

14. **Prior Years of Professional Experience on Each Level Below:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Guidance Counselor</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questionnaire Instructions**

Listed on the following pages are task statements. Please rate each task which you think the Chairperson should perform, according to the five point scale, by circling the appropriate number adjacent to each task statement. Circle zero (0) for each task which should not be performed.

**Key:**
- 0. Should not perform
- 1. Not important, but should perform
- 2. Below average importance
- 3. Average importance
- 4. Above average importance
- 5. Maximum importance

**Task Inventory Statements:** (Rating Examples)

1. Teaches Graduate Courses
2. Develops Public Relations Program
3. Performs Technical Writing

( ) Check if results desired (Enclose name and address)
### Task Inventory Statements

**Key:**
- 0. Should not perform
- 1. Not important, but should perform
- 2. Below average importance
- 3. Average importance
- 4. Above average importance
- 5. Maximum importance

1. **Conduct Periodic Departmental Self-Studies.**
   - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

2. **Develop Departmental Statement of Aims and Objectives.**
   - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

3. **Maintain Faculty Personnel Records.**
   - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

4. **Determine Departmental Personnel Requirements.**
   - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

5. **Maintain Teaching Responsibilities.**
   - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

6. **Direct Student Teaching Experiences.**
   - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

7. **Review Course Outlines and/or Course Presentation Methods of Faculty.**
   - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

8. **Participate in General Registration Procedures.**
   - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

9. **Develop Computer Programmed Instructional Materials.**
   - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

10. **Monitor Library Resources.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

11. **Identify and Utilize Outside Consultants as Resource Persons.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

12. **Develop Grading Standards for the Department.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

13. **Develop Long Range Plans (1 to 3 Years).**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

14. **Recommend Salaries and/or Salary Rises.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

15. **Prepare Budget Recommendations for Department.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

16. **Direct Control of Departmental Budget Expenditures**
    - (e.g., supplies, equip., travel, etc.)
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

17. **Develop Proposals for Federal and Non-Federal Funding.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

18. **Serve on Evaluation and/or Accreditation Teams.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

19. **Maintain National Teacher Education Examination Tutorial Program.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

20. **Maintain Continuous Opportunities for and Encourage Professional Growth and Development Among Faculty**
    - (inservice, further study, research, attendance at local, state and national conferences)
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

21. **Prepare Annual Reports**
    - (achievements, problems, needs, projections)
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

22. **Assign Student Advisors.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

23. **Monitor Advisement Procedures Used by Faculty.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

24. **Provide Placement Services, Career Counseling and Market Information for Graduates.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

25. **Maintain Student Academic Advisement Responsibilities.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

26. **Compile and Analyze Statistical Data Related to Admissions, Selection, Retention, and Graduation Criteria.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

27. **Compile and Analyze Statistical Data Related to Testing (ACT/SAT, National Teachers Examination, etc.).**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

28. **Maintain Follow-Up Information on Graduates.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

29. **Maintain Community Service Programs and/or Activities.**
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5

30. **Establish Department Personnel Committee**
    - (rank, tenure, promotion, personnel reviews)
    - Key: 0 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KLY:</th>
<th>0. SHOULD NOT PERFORM</th>
<th>2. BELOW AVERAGE IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>4. ABOVE AVERAGE IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT SPOKES-PERSON AT SCHOOL, COLLEGE &amp; UNIVERSITY LEVELS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>CONDUCT STUDENT RECRUITING ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>MAINTAIN COACHING RESPONSIBILITIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>ADMINISTER INTRAMURAL AND/OR CLUB SPORT PROGRAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>CONTRIBUTE SCHOLARLY ARTICLES TO PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>MAINTAIN REGULAR RESEARCH Endeavors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>LEADERSHIP IN STATE, NATIONAL, AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS (e.g. officer, on program)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>PERFORM CONSULTANT SERVICES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>MONITOR GRADING PRACTICES, STANDARDS AND GRADE DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>MONITOR IMMEDIATE PHYSICAL PLANT MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>PURSUE POST-DOCTORATE PROGRAM OR 'S T U D I E S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>MAINTAIN CONTINUOUS PROGRAM OF CURRICULUM STUDY AND IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>CONDUCT PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR PROSPECTIVE STUDENT MAJORS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>ESTABLISH DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES AND STANDARDS GOVERNING FACULTY TEACHING LOAD, COMMITTEE AND WORK ASSIGNMENTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>MAINTAIN COOPERATIVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS AND/OR INSERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM ARRANGEMENTS WITH LOCAL SCHOOL SYSTEM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>MAINTAIN COOPERATIVE WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH STATE OFFICE OF EDUCATION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>INTERPRET INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES, DIRECTIVES, AND REGULATIONS TO FACULTY MEMBERS AND STAFF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>MAINTAIN COOPERATIVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS WITH NEIGHBORING COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>MAINTAIN AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF FACULTY AND/OR STUDENTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>PARTICIPATE IN UNIVERSITY WIDE PROGRAM PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>DISTRIBUTE INFORMATION TO COMMUNITY, STUDENTS, AND FACULTY CONCERNING NICE PROGRAM SERVICES AND/OR TRENDS AND DEVELOPMENTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>ESTABLISH POLICIES AND REGULATIONS FOR FACILITY AND EQUIPMENT UTILIZATION, CONTROL, AND INVENTORY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>ADVISE ON TEACHING AIDS OR INSTRUCTIOAL MATERIALS AND/OR SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT IN THE FIELD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>HOLD DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS ON REGULARLY SCHEDULED BASIS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>MAINTAIN PROGRAM RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER DISCIPLINES (Special Ed., Early Ed., Elm. Ed., etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>CONDUCT ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR NEW FACULTY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE FOR ATHLETIC PROGRAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>MAINTAIN SCHOOL, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY WIDE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>MAINTAIN CUNINHUAL DEPARTMENTAL AND PROGRAM EVALUATION PROCESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>CONDUCT ONE TO TWO PURELY SOCIAL AFFAIRS EACH YEAR TO INCLUDE FACULTY AND THEIR FAMILIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY:</td>
<td>0. SHOULD NOT PERFORM</td>
<td>1. NOT IMPORTANT, BUT SHOULD PERFORM</td>
<td>2. BELOW AVERAGE IMPORTANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>