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Research on the role of the subject coordinators in secondary schools has shown that this role can influence the successful implementation of the school’s vision which in turn can influence teachers’ performance and students’ results. The fact that subject coordinators are the link between the administrators and the teachers makes them essential players in implementing this vision in the classroom. The importance given to this role varies among schools: from marginal in some schools to nearly ‘venerated’ in others.

This study aims to investigate 1) the Bolman and Deal leadership and management styles of subject coordinators as perceived by coordinators and principals; 2) any differences in these perceptions of styles according to subject of instruction, sector and gender; 3) the Bolman and Deal leadership and management behaviors of subject coordinators as perceived by coordinators and principals.

The sample for this study is 16 coordinators randomly selected from public and private schools in the Greater Beirut and Mount Lebanon area. Coordinators participating in the study filled out a questionnaire adapted for this study. In addition, a sample of the 16 coordinators was interviewed regarding issues identified in the questionnaire.

Finally, the eight heads of the schools to which the coordinators belong filled a similar version of the questionnaire and were interviewed to identify their perceptions of what the coordinators are doing. Data was analyzed to produce a profile for each coordinator. These profiles were compared and contrasted to identify patterns among schools. Major findings of this study included the following: (1) The leadership and management styles of coordinators in Lebanese secondary schools are Human Resources and Structural (2) Math and Male coordinators view the structural style ranking first. Language and Female coordinators view the human resources style as ranking first. As for the principals, the Private and Female coordinators have a human resources dominant style. Public and Male coordinators have structural dominant style. (3) The behaviors determining the role of coordinators in Lebanese Secondary schools are: (1) Supportive, (2) Participative, (3) Analytic, and (4) Organized according to the perceptions of coordinators and their principals’.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Through my experience as a teacher, coordinator, principal and finally academic dean in different secondary schools in Lebanon, I came across different perceptions and definitions of the coordinator’s role in Lebanese schools. These perceptions often contradicted my own assumption that a coordinator’s role should be more of a ‘reference’ person and a guide than an ‘authority’. I assumed that the coordinator should be knowledgeable enough in his subject matter, of course, but also that s/he should have leadership skills to move “his/her” department towards a more productive and creative kind of teacher output. In my previous experience as a coordinator, the school head at one of the schools I worked in, offered me the position of a Principal, and when he heard me decline his offer he was surprised! He told me he couldn’t understand why I would be interested in remaining a ‘technician’, while I could become a leader! Later on, when I moved to another school, I realized that although coordinators were more valued in that school than in my previous one, they were still performing their tasks as ‘technicians’, rather than as ‘inspirational leaders’. They would be checking teachers’ preparations rather than reflecting on them, and guiding teachers towards better performance.

I am now an Academic Dean in one of the reputable schools in Mount Lebanon. I have been “promoted” to a higher position than a “coordinator”, a position different from that of a “principal” as it remains centered in the academic affairs, and on working primarily with “coordinators” rather than everybody else in the school. Hence, I became interested in finding out what do coordinators exactly do, what is their role,
and how does a Dean help run the school’s academic affairs through them. For that, I needed answers to such questions as: What style of leaders or managers was I dealing with? What is the role they perform as perceived by themselves and by their principals, in order to elicit the views of significant others?

Reviewing the research, I came across a lot of literature dealing with these issues. It was a relief to realize that even in the UK and the US, the role of coordinators was not clearly defined and developed. In both countries, many studies aimed at clarifying the confusion in the definition of the role revealed by previous studies: In the case of the UK, the National Council of School Leadership (NCSL, 2001) publications for example focused on redefining the role of the coordinators, while in the US, research conducted after the publication of A Nation At Risk (1983), went a bit further exploring leadership styles of coordinators (Marotta, 2002; Thomas, 2002; Kruskamp, 2003). The report, A Nation at Risk, itself suggests that the decline of American schools is caused partly by “weakness of purpose, confusion of vision, underuse of talent, and lack of leadership” (p. 15) from department heads. In the same report, the National Commission on Excellence in Education states that it believes “that school boards must consciously develop leadership skills at the school and district levels if the reforms we propose are to be achieved” (p.32). Those reforms include tasks handled by coordinators like curriculum enhancement, teachers’ development and raising graduation standards.

Purpose and Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to identify the role of the coordinator in a randomly selected sample of eight Lebanese Secondary Schools (public and private) in the Greater Beirut area, through the study of the coordinator’s self perception of his/her use of the four leadership styles (as measured by the Bolman and Deal Orientations
(Self) survey) and to elicit the perceptions of significant others, the Principal in this study, directly responsible for the coordinators regarding the use of those styles.

Style, Behavior and Role

The first step is therefore to determine the leadership style(s), which provides us with the coordinators’ and principals’ most common behaviors, according to Bolman and Deal’s theory (1997). Behaviors are dimensions contained in each style, in pairs, giving a more explicit description of the leadership role.

By using the definition of the role as “a socially expected behavior pattern usually determined by an individual’s status in a particular society” (Merriam-Webster dictionary, 1993), combined with the fact that each style suggests a different view of the leadership role (Thomas, 2002), the “role” of the coordinators would then be defined as being the string of “behaviors” the study will unveil as being most commonly used by coordinators in performing their daily duties.

The study therefore seeks to investigate, through the style(s) used by the coordinators and identified by the principals, the coordinators’ definition of their role as well as their principals’ definition. Specifically, this study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the Bolman and Deal leadership and management styles of subject coordinators as perceived by coordinators and principals?

2. Do these perceptions of styles differ according to subject of instruction, sector and gender?

3. What are the Bolman and Deal leadership and management behaviors of subject coordinators as perceived by coordinators and principals?
Rationale and Significance for the Study

This kind of research on the role of coordinators is rare in the context of a third world country. The Lebanese educational system offering French, American and Lebanese programs of studies in different organizational cultures (American, French, public), would allow me to check for differences in the perception of the role of the coordinator between different school sectors, public and private. This variety is rarely provided elsewhere, and I hope that the conclusions I will arrive at serve as a trigger to further and more in-depth study of the role of coordinators in Lebanon.

Limitations of the Study

1. This study is limited to schools in the Greater Beirut Area which is considered to be an “academically developed” area of the country, as opposed to other parts of Lebanon.

2. One instrument, Bolman and Deal’s Orientations survey (Self), is of the self report type. This can result in bias as people in general tend to give a better image of their work and personality than reality. An explanation that the study is not an evaluation of the coordinators’ personality is meant to avoid such bias, but the risk remains real.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This section includes two parts. In the first part, a summary of the research on the role of coordinators in secondary schools is presented. In the second part, research on the leadership and management styles of subject coordinators is presented. The first covers the “what” aspect and the second the “how” of this important function.

Role of Coordinators

From Siskin (1995) to Kruskamp (2003), research revealed many aspects of the role of coordinators and its implication for schools. Siskin (1995) started by a description of the subject matter departments that ‘define who teachers are, what they do, where and with whom they work, and how they and their work are perceived by others’ (p.2). It was taken for granted by him, that the organization of the department would be around the subject coordinator, hence the role of the subject coordinator had to be derived from that of the subject departments.

Others tried to define the role of the coordinators themselves rather than that of subject departments, and arrived at agreements that such a role includes: organization (Brown et al., 2000; Marotta, 2002), management (Marotta, 2002; Bowman, 2002), and handling curriculum issues (Worner & Brown, 1993; Marotta, 2002). Some of these researchers even attributed the role of budget preparation to the coordinator (Kujawa et al., 1988; Worner & Brown, 1993). All these studies however, unveil a great amount of discrepancy in the terminology they use. In fact, referring to the results of a 1986 poll conducted among 200 Catholic high school department chairs, Kujawa et al. (1988)
mention that coordinators have ‘responsibilities’ defined to be: (1) establishing
departmental goals and objectives, (2) evaluating progress towards these goals and
objectives, (3) budget preparation and monitoring, and (4) establishing departmental
policies and procedures and teacher evaluation. Worner and Brown (1993) define seven
major ‘functions’ for coordinators some of which are: ensuring department consistency,
recommending the department budget, and implementing curriculum change in the
department. Peculiar to this study is that it mentions what coordinators don’t do, that is,
evaluating teachers for ‘personnel decisions’. Turner (1996) views the coordinators’
role as being a role of, (1) organization, (2) management, and (3) leadership, of a team
of teachers in order to achieve departmental success. Busher and Harris (1999)
determined four dimensions for the role of subject coordinators: (1) transactional role
(power is used “over” others), (2) collegiality (power “through” or “with” others), (3)
supervisory role (supporting colleagues’ development), and (4) representative role
(representing the views of teachers to senior staff). Brown and Rutherford (1998)
conclude that coordinators ‘act’ as: (1) servant leaders (leading with people not through
them by empowering them to release their creative abilities), (2) organizational
architects (creating new organic form of developmental structure to enhance
commitment), (3) moral educators (demonstrating a set of deep personal values and
beliefs), (4) social architects (developing integrated networks of partnership with other
groups) and (5) leading professionals in their departments, by promoting a collegial
approach in decision making. Marotta (2002) talks about five ‘areas of responsibility’
for coordinators: (1) Management, (2) Supervision, (3) Human Relations, (4)
Organization, and (5) Program.

Other researchers such as Turner (1996) stressed on the contextualization of
the role of the coordinator, whereas the definition of the role depends on the
environment the in which the coordinator is operating. Wise and Bennett (2003) agree on the need to contextualize the role in a survey conducted in 2003 for the NCSL. In fact, they stated that it was not acceptable to treat all middle leaders in secondary schools as one homogenous group, considering the fact that there are “very sharp differences in the perceptions and expectations of the different categories of middle leaders” (p. 3).

The Lebanese Ministry of Education defines the role of coordinators in secondary schools in a document dealing with the internal organization of secondary schools. This document defines the role in terms of responsibilities such as: “Developing yearly plans, follow-up on methodologies of teaching and homework correction, observing classes, supervising exams, conducting monthly meetings, updating teachers on new methodologies, following-up on implementation of clear cut policies and monitoring laboratory visits” are the required tasks from coordinators. “A science coordinator also handles laboratory sessions for Chemistry and Biology” (1974, By Laws of Secondary Schools).

The above clearly shows that it is not clear yet whether coordinators act, perform tasks, have responsibilities, have leadership roles or whether they are assigned functions by their supervisors that they will have to perform. The difference in terminology reflects confusion regarding the role perception of the coordinator by different researchers and practitioners. According to Marotta (2002), the perception of the importance attached to each of the areas of responsibility of a coordinator varied between teachers, coordinators and principals. This difference in perception of the role between principals, teachers and even coordinators themselves, was also raised by Orris (1988), Korach (1996), Mercer (1996) and Mayers (2001). Bowman (2002) however establishes a clear cut distinction between the role of coordinators as: a) leaders when
they focus on aspects of organizational culture: mission, vision, engagement and adaptability, and b) managers, when they focus on ‘conversational inquiry that engages others in creating possibilities, breakthroughs, and a sustainable future for their common enterprise’ (p.161).

Despite the above attempts, confusion on the perception of the role of coordinators and therefore on the terms used to describe this role remains real. This role confusion is bound to cause role conflict that prevents the coordinators from operating in a specific style that benefits their schools (Brown et al., 2000; Korach, 1996, Kruskamp, 2003; McGarvey et al., 1997; Hammond, 2000; McArthur, 2002). Moreover, Briggs (2001) found out, in a study on leadership roles of 13 middle managers in the UK, that there was evidence of a lack of “role definition, which serves to undermine the autonomy and authority of managers”.

The Leadership and Management Styles of Subject Coordinators

Many studies focused on defining the role of the coordinator, they all had a set of common findings for the characteristics of that role, suggesting that coordinators have to be able to assume responsibilities that require varied skills in management and leadership. These characteristics included behaviors like being inspirational, adroit, participative, organized and supportive (Kujawa et. al, 1988, Worner & Brown 1993; Turner, 1996; Brown & Rutherford, 1998; Busher & Harris, 1999; Brown et al., 2000; Bowman, 2002; Marotta, 2002). These behaviors, along with others, are also found in the work on leadership styles by Bolman and Deal (1997).

The starting point in understanding the role of the coordinators in Lebanese schools would be then to try to determine their leadership and management styles and their ability to reframe their roles according to the situations at hand. Through this
understanding we will be able to determine whether a coordinator fits more closely into one of the four styles established by Bolman and Deal (1997): Structural, Human Resource, Political or Symbolic leader.

Bolman and Deal Leadership Style Approach

*Why Bolman and Deal?*

As codirectors of the National Center for Educational Leadership, a research consortium of Harvard, Vanderbilt, and the University of Chicago, Bolman and Deal (1997) produced an insightful and leading work on structures of organizations in general, and the leadership challenges they pose on the application of their theories in the educational field. The main feature of the interest in their model is that it allows leaders to reframe their leadership style, in order to serve the organization’s vision. This ability to reframe meets most of the current thinking on effective leadership as well as the results of recent research that focuses on establishing a relationship between the role of the coordinator and the development of successful schools (Brown & Rutherford, 2000; Tymms, 1995; NCSL, 2001; Frost-Harris, 2003).

Bolman and Deal (1997) argue that the aim of their work ‘is to help managers enrich the ideas and approaches they bring to work’ (p.15). They also believe that ‘the most basic change strategy is to improve management and leadership’ and that the ability to use ‘multiple frames is associated with greater effectiveness for managers and leaders’. A statement that is in alignment with the findings listed in A Nation at Risk (1983) in that the National Commission on Excellence in Education states that it believes “that school boards must consciously develop leadership skills at the school and district levels if the reforms we propose are to be achieved” (p.32).

While each of the four-styles model has its own image of reality, leaders are
advised to reframe between all four in order to ‘develop a greater appreciation and
deeper understanding of organization’ (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 15). The emphasis is
very much on being able to use the appropriate style for each context rather than
standardizing the approaches to problem solving. It also allows the observer to have a
clear cut identification of each coordinator’s role through the study of her/his leadership
style. The four styles of Bolman and Deal as well as the behaviors contained in each can
be summarized as follows (Thomas, 2002):

*The Structural Style*

Emphasis of leaders in this style is on goals, specialized roles and formal
relationships. Responsibilities are allocated to participants in the organizations and
rules, policies, procedures, and hierarchies are created to coordinate diverse activities.
The image of leadership in this style is that of social architecture or top-down chain of
command. The structural leader behaves in an organized and analytic way.

*Behaviors*

- *Organized:* The leader behaves in an organized way by developing clear
goals and policies which held people accountable for results.
- *Analytic:* A leader behaves in an analytic way by thinking clearly and
logically and approaching problems with facts.

*The Human Resources Style*

The leaders in this style see the organization as an extended family, inhabited
by individuals who have needs, feelings, prejudices, skills and limitations. They believe
organizations should be tailored to people so that people do their job well while feeling
good about it. The image of leadership for this style is that of empowerment, or
cooperation. The Human Resources leader behaves in a participative and supportive
way.
**Behaviors**

- **Participative**: By fostering participation and involvement, listening and openness to new ideas, a leader would have a participative behavior.

- **Supportive**: As for the supportive behavior, the leader’s concern would be about feelings of others and her/his responsiveness to them.

**The Political Style**

Leaders in this style perceive organizations as arenas, contests or jungles. They believe that different interests compete for power and scarce resources. These leaders are adepts in bargaining, negotiation, coercion and compromise. They might form coalitions around specific interests and change them as issues come and go. The image of leadership here is: Advocacy. The behavior of the political style leader is powerful and adroit.

**Behaviors**

- **Powerful**: To behave in a powerful way a leader had to be persuasive and have the ability to mobilize people and build alliances and support.

- **Adroit**: The adroit behavior required the leader to be skillful, especially in negotiations in the face of conflict and opposition, and sensitive.

**The Symbolic Style**

The emphasis in this style is on symbolic forms (story, metaphor, music…). Organizations are treated as tribes, theaters, or carnivals and seen as cultures propelled more by rituals than by rules. This style, unlike the other three, doesn’t believe in assumptions of rationality. The image of leadership in this style is inspiration and the leader behaves in an inspirational and charismatic way.

**Behaviors**

- **Inspirational**: The inspirational leaders inspired colleagues and subordinates
to loyalty and enthusiasm and communicated a strong sense of vision.

- **Charismatic:** The charismatic leaders are imaginative, and emphasize culture and values.

The Bolman and Deal four frames are not the first examples of attempts to define roles through leadership styles. A study done by Konet (1989), in a doctoral study on a randomly selected sample of suburban schools in New Jersey, USA, made use of Fiedler’s Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) (1989). This scale divides leaders into task-oriented type versus relations-oriented type and declares that:

> ‘given a department in which the leader and staff have good working relations, the tasks given to the leader are clear and structured, and the power granted to the leader is sufficient, teachers will be more satisfied with work, co-workers, and supervision under a task-oriented leader. Given the same departmental factors, teachers will be more satisfied with pay under a relations-oriented leader’ (p.385).

The results of Konet’s study confirmed Fiedler’s predictions of leadership styles and its effect on co-workers (Konet, 1989).

The testing of the validity of a typology was used more recently in the research by Brown and Rutherford (1998), which uses Murphy’s typology (1998) for analyzing leadership and managerial roles of the subject coordinators. Murphy’s typology defines four inter-related leadership and managerial roles of leaders as: a) Servant leaders, b) Organizational architects, c) Moral Educators or d) Social Architects. One of the results of their study is that they added a fifth type, that of Leading Professional leaders. Another result was the finding that Murphy’s typology is an ‘extremely useful and robust framework for describing the many facets’ of the role of coordinators (Brown & Rutherford, 1998). Murphy’s typology was selected by them because of its ‘emphasis on building relationships and on clarifying why things should be done or not’ (p. 76).

The importance of the coordinator’s leadership style has been chosen as a focus
of several writers, although without using a specific typology. Common styles or behaviors related to styles, featuring in the definition of the role of ‘successful’ departmental heads were noticeable in many results of similar studies: collegiality, using collaborative approaches, serving as a key chain between top-management and teachers, flexibility towards change, and ability to handle diversity of tasks (Mc Garvey et al., 1997; NCSL, 2001; Fletcher-Campbell, 2003; Hammond, 2000; Simkins et al. 2003; Bowman, 2002).

Analyzing leadership styles has practical and not only theoretical benefits. The study done by Brown and Rutherford (1998) provided ‘a fascinating glimpse of the strengths and the weaknesses of the leadership of the heads of department and of the other internal conditions within their departments’ (p. 75). Konet (1989) was able to establish correlations between style of leadership of coordinators and co-workers satisfaction. Following on these same steps this study aims at coming up, through Bolman and Deal’s (1997) four-style model, with similar conclusions that can have practical values through understanding the definition of the role of the coordinators by a set of style-related behaviors.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to investigate the leadership and management styles and behaviors of subject matter coordinators in a number of Lebanese secondary schools. For this purpose, data were collected from sixteen coordinators and eight principals of the secondary divisions of eight public and private schools in the Beirut and Mount Lebanon areas. This chapter describes the participants, research setting, procedures, instruments, data collection, and data analysis procedures.

Participants and Research Settings

Participants in the study were eight principals and sixteen coordinators. Eight of the coordinators were math coordinators, and the other eight were foreign language coordinators at the secondary school level. Nine of the coordinators were females and seven males. The schools themselves were divided evenly between the private and public sectors since there were four private and four public schools located in Mount Lebanon and Beirut. The language of instruction used to teach math in the selected schools was either English or French. Twelve of the sixteen coordinators and six of the eight principals were selected for follow up interviews based on their availability and willingness to share information. The number of years of experience of the coordinators ranged between one and thirty six with an average of 12.29 years.

Schools were selected to represent different socio-economical background, gender and religious affiliations. A brief description of each school is given in Table 1 below.
Table 1

*Description of the participating schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Schools</th>
<th>Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sin El Fil for Boys and Girls</td>
<td>English, Mixed, Secular, Christian majority area, middle class to poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Renee Mouawad for Boys</td>
<td>English, Boys, Secular, Sunni majority area, middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shoueifat for Boys and Girls</td>
<td>English, Mixed, Secular, Druze majority area, middle class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permission to use the public schools as research sites was obtained from the Director of Secondary Education in the Ministry of Education. The selection of private schools was made according to two criteria, (a) the need to have a representative sample with regard to gender, socio-economic status, and religious affiliation and (b) the researcher’s personal knowledge of the directors of the schools. Permission to use the private schools as research sites was acquired from the rectors or presidents of the schools. All the schools selected included pre-university grades from K to 12.
Procedures

The main instrument used in this study is a questionnaire entitled, “Leadership Orientations” that was filled out by principals and coordinators; in addition in-depth interviews were conducted with six of the eight principals and twelve of the sixteen coordinators to follow-up on questionnaire responses. The questionnaire aimed at three main things:

1. Determining the Bolman and Deal leadership and management styles of subject coordinators as perceived by coordinators and principals.

2. Investigating any differences in these perceptions of styles according to subject of instruction, sector and gender.

3. Determining the Bolman and Deal leadership and management behaviors of subject coordinators as perceived by coordinators and principals.

Personal interviews conducted after filling out the questionnaires served as a means to confirm the results obtained from questionnaires and elaborate on the responses.

The researcher visited all eight schools during March and April 2006 and met with the sixteen coordinators and the eight principals. The first meeting with the participants was to explain the purposes of the study as well as the nature and purposes of the questionnaires. It was very important to assure all participants that they were not to be evaluated at any stage of the study.

The questionnaires were handed-in to participants during the first meeting in March, and were collected two weeks later. A number of coordinators left some questions unanswered so the researcher had to explain these questions further in order to obtain their final answers. Responses to the questionnaires were sorted out and tallied by the researcher before proceeding to the interviews which lasted for two weeks.
Interviews were conducted with the twelve coordinators and the six principals of the four private schools and two of the four public schools. The private schools were: Al-Kawthar school, American Community School, St. Famille School, Sagesse High School, and the two public schools were: Renee Mouawad Public School and Sin-El-Fil Public School. The interviewees were told of the results of the questionnaires and asked to confirm and/or reject the style(s) that best described them. That step required a brief explanation of the characteristics of each style. Interviewees were handed a document (Appendix E) containing the characteristics of each style and the related behaviors and went over its content with the researcher. Once words like Structural, Human Resources, Political and Symbolic were clear to the interviewees the confirmation of the results of the study was more reliable. Most of the interviews were tape-recorded, after securing the approval of the concerned interviewees. Most of the interviews were tape-recorded, after securing the approval of the concerned interviewees. These interviews were transcribed for analysis later.

Instruments

Leadership Orientations Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in this study was entitled “Leadership Orientations”. It was developed by Bolman and Deal (1990) and intended to explore leadership styles in terms of four frames with the aim of determining which of these styles are identified by individuals as most common. There are two versions of this questionnaire: one intended for the coordinators themselves to identify their own leadership styles, labeled “self”, and the other intended for principals to identify the leadership styles of coordinators who work with them in their own schools, labeled “other”.

Both versions (self and other) contain the same 40 items and are divided into

1 Two coordinators refused to have their interviews tape-recorded.
three sections: I) behaviors, II) style, and III) effectiveness. Section I is intended to
determine leadership styles through behaviors. These are classified into four styles:
Structural, Human Resource, Political and Symbolic. Each style is divided in turn into
two sub-categories (behaviors): a coordinator with a Structural style is described as
Analytic and Organized, a Human Resources coordinator is described as Supportive and
Participative, a Political coordinator as Adroit and Powerful and a Symbolic coordinator
as Inspirational and Charismatic. According to Bolman (personal communication, May
9, 2006) “The instrument doesn't provide a simple way to specify a dominant style”, it is
therefore used to determine the most frequently used style.

Section II of the questionnaire includes six forced-choice questions that require
coordinators to identify their leadership styles in terms of “categories” rather than
behaviors while Section III (effectiveness) intends to elicit responses regarding the
effectiveness of individuals as managers and leaders.

Only Section I (behaviors) was used in this study for the following reasons:

1. This section enables researchers to determine the coordinators’ style as well
   as specific behaviors and thus provides a more detailed description of their role.

2. Section II contained six forced-choice questions which require the respondent
to identify the leadership style which describes the coordinator best from among the four
styles. The items in this section require that participants be familiar with the Bolman
and Deal theory, a fact of which the researcher was not sure about since most
coordinators and principals in these schools were not professionally certified, hence not
used in this study.

3. Section III deals with effectiveness of coordinators as leaders or managers,
information that is not relevant to the purposes of the study.

The sixteen coordinators filled-out Section I of the “Self” version of the
questionnaire (see Appendix A) while the principals of the eight schools filled out the same section of the “Other” version (see Appendix B). Permission to use the questionnaire was granted to the researcher by the authors of the questionnaire on January 31, 2006 (Bolman, personal communication, January 31, 2006). The questionnaires were translated to French by the researcher and the translation was approved by Bolman who authorized their use for the study (Bolman, personal communication, May 27, 2006).

The need to use the version “other” is premised on the assumption that “the validity of self-ratings of leadership is generally low, so there is considerable advantage in getting colleague ratings”, as Bolman states on his personal website (Bolman, 2006; www.leebolman.com). Bolman’s website also mentions that the instrument has very high internal consistency reliability: Cronbach’s alpha for the four style measures ranges, for section I, between 0.91 and 0.93. These reliabilities were collected from a pilot test run on both students and managers, including samples ranging between 1200 and 1400 participants on sections I and II of the questionnaire respectively. In addition to reliability the instrument underwent tests of internal validity and consistency, leading to the conclusion that it contained items that measured the four leadership styles (Meade, 1992).

Section I of the questionnaire (behavior), which was used in this study, consists of 32 statements representing leadership behaviors used by coordinators in their day-to-day performance of tasks. A five-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always) was used to rate how often the described behavior occurred. The 32 statements are grouped into four leadership styles, the Structural, Human Resource, Political, and Symbolic. Each of the leadership styles is in its turn subdivided into two subscales. The items are distributed among the 4 styles and their subscales as follows:
The Structural Style (items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29) is divided into two subscales:

- Analytic: includes items 1, 9, 17, 25. An example of items in this subscale is question number 1: “Do you think very clearly and logically”?
- Organized: includes items 5, 13, 21, 29. An example of items in this subscale is question number 5: “Do you strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines”?

The Human Resource style (items 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30) is divided into two subscales:

- Supportive: includes items 2, 10, 18, 26. An example of items in this subscale is question number 2: “Do you show high levels of support and concern for others”?
- Participative: includes items 6, 14, 22, 30. An example of items in this subscale is question number 6: “Do you build trust through open and collaborative relationships”?

The Political style (items 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31) is divided into two subscales:

- Adroit: includes items 7, 15, 23, 31. An example of items in this subscale is question number 7: “Are you a very skillful and shrewd negotiator”?
- Powerful: includes items 3, 11, 19, 27. An example of items in this subscale is question number 3: “Do you have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done”?

The Symbolic style (items 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32) is divided into two subscales:

- Charismatic: includes items 8, 16, 24, 32. An example of items in
this subscale is question number 16: “Are you highly imaginative and creative”?

Inspirational: includes items 4, 12, 20, 28. An example of items in this subscale is question number 20: “Are you able to communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission”?

Interviews

The semi-structured interview used in this study included two types of questions: open-ended questions used to probe coordinators and principals about their responses to the questionnaire, and a number of close-ended questions used to collect information about interview participants (Appendices D & E). The close-ended questions were pilot tested with one coordinator and one principal from a private school that did not participate in the study. The pilot interviewees commented that more than one question dealt with the same idea, and that a number of the questions required lengthy and time-consuming answers. Accordingly, redundant questions were eliminated and a number of questions were changed to make them more direct and less time-consuming to answer without jeopardizing the quality of responses. The interviews with the principals (Appendix D) included similar questions to those of the coordinators (Appendix C) to enable the researcher to conduct a direct comparison between the perceptions of both groups regarding the role of the coordinator. Interview questions were translated to French to meet the needs of all participants.

Data Analysis

Leadership Orientation Questionnaire

The leadership styles of coordinators were determined by adding the scores on the items of the questionnaire related to each of the four styles of section I of the questionnaire (Structural, Human resources, Political, and Symbolic). The maximum
The scores for coordinators were ranked and compared with those for their principals to demonstrate the similarities and differences between the responses of the two groups. The ranking was done in the following way:

The scores by style (over 40) of each coordinator were arranged in decreasing order. The styles were then labeled as rank 1, rank 2, rank 3 and rank 4 styles. Following that step, a counting of the number of times the structural style appeared in rank 1, rank 2, rank 3 and rank 4, for all coordinators, was performed. The same process was done for the human resource, the political and symbolic styles. The results were then reported in a table showing the tally and percentage for each style as perceived by coordinators. A similar procedure was followed for the scores obtained according to the principals’ perceptions. The results were also reported in a table showing the tally and percentage for each style.

Comparison between ranks of styles as perceived by coordinators and principals helped in answering the first question raised in this study namely “What are the Bolman and Deal leadership and management styles of subject coordinators as perceived by coordinators and principals?”

The ranks by style were then rearranged according to subject of instruction, sector and gender of coordinators in order to check for any differences in results. The purpose of this step is to answer the second question of the study “Do these perceptions of styles differ according to subject of instruction, sector and gender?”

The scores on the two subscales of each style (behaviors) were also ranked and compared for both the coordinators’ and the principals’ responses. The maximum score
on each subscale is 20 for four items since a 5-point Likert scale was used. The items in
each of the eight subscales were as detailed in the previous section also. The procedure
that was followed to do the ranking for behaviors is the same as the one adopted for the
styles. However, eight ranks were used in that case to match the number of behaviors.
This step aimed at answering the third question in this study “3) What are the Bolman
and Deal leadership and management behaviors of subject coordinators as perceived by
coordinators and principals?”

Interviews

As mentioned earlier, the interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. Two
coordinators refused to have their interviews taped for personal reasons. Six interviews
were conducted in French and eighteen in English. Data from the interviews were
analyzed to obtain clarifications, confirmations, or refutations of the questionnaire
answers. Overall, the findings from the interviews facilitated the understanding of the
questionnaire’s results.

Once finalized, the results helped the researcher determine a set of specific
behaviors that the coordinators in the secondary schools were more likely to adopt. The
coordinators were able then to reflect on those behaviors according to Bolman and
Deal’s theory (1997) and decide if this set of behaviors described the role they played in
their schools or not. Using the same procedure, principals were able to reflect on the
perception they have of the coordinators’ leadership styles and behaviors, and whether
these matched with the reality of the job the coordinators were performing at school.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Three research questions were raised in this study. The first one was to “determine the Bolman and Deal leadership and management styles of subject coordinators as perceived by themselves and by their principals”. The answer to this question was obtained in two forms, one quantitative and the other is qualitative. The quantitative was extracted from responses to Section I (behavior) of the Bolman and Deal questionnaire, “Leadership Orientations”. The qualitative was expressed in answers given by coordinators and principals to questions asked when interviewed by the researcher.

The second research question was to investigate if “these perceptions of styles differ according to subject of instruction, sector and gender”. This question was answered based on rearranging the quantitative results extracted from responses to Section I of the Bolman and Deal questionnaire, according to the subject of instruction of each coordinator (mathematics or language), the sector the school is affiliated to (private or public) and the coordinator’s gender (male or female).

The third research question was to “determine the the Bolman and Deal leadership and management behaviors of subject coordinators as perceived by themselves and their principals”. This question was answered based on responses to the same questions in Section I of the Bolman and Deal questionnaire but with an attempt to extract “a set of behaviors” for the coordinators. These behaviors have been described in the literature review chapter and the items in the questionnaire that correspond to each behavior (2 subsets for each style) were identified (see Chapter 3 pp. 22-23).
The qualitative source, which is also made up of answers to the interview questions by the same group, allowed again for confirmation of the questionnaire’s findings. It allowed the interviewees to state whether the dominant styles and behaviors, as obtained from the quantitative results, formed an accurate description of their styles and behaviors as coordinators. In addition, the participants got the chance to elaborate more on their perception of the styles and behaviors of coordinators in Lebanese secondary school.

Quantitative Results

The quantitative results will be presented in three sections, each dealing with one of the three research questions. The first section presents results concerning the leadership and management style(s) of subject coordinators as perceived by themselves and by their principals. The second section presents the results of leadership and management styles of coordinators according to the three variables of subject of instruction, sector and gender. The third section presents results regarding the set of behaviors, which are subscales of styles, of the coordinators in the participating schools as perceived by themselves and by their principals.

Leadership and Management Styles of Subject Coordinators

The leadership styles were determined from Section I of the “Leadership Orientations” questionnaire. The total possible score was 40 for each of the four styles, each expressed in terms of 8 attributes with a maximum score of 5 for each, those scores were ranked in decreasing order and the frequency of selection of each style in rank 1, rank 2, rank 3 and rank 4 was summarized in Table 2. The results show the rank of each style, in all types of schools participating in the study, according to both coordinators and principals.
Table 2

*The frequency and percent of ranks of the four leadership styles as perceived by the coordinators and principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that for coordinators, the human resources style of leadership had the highest frequency in rank 1 (9 out of 16) and in rank 2 (7 out of 16). The structural style had the second highest frequency in rank 1 (7 out of 16) and in rank 2 (5 out of 16). None of the coordinators ranked the political or symbolic styles in rank 1. The political style had the highest frequency in rank 3 (10 out of 16) and rank 4 (6 out of 16). The symbolic style had the highest frequency also in rank 4 (6 out of 16).

As for the principals, the structural style of leadership had the highest frequency in rank 1 (9 out of 16) and the second highest frequency in rank 2 (5 out of 16). The human resources style had the second highest frequency in rank 1 (7 out of 16) and the highest frequency in rank 2 (7 out of 16). The political style had the highest
frequency in rank 4 (10 out of 16) while the symbolic had the highest frequency for
rank 3 (10 out of 16).

In both cases the human resources and structural styles are ranked in the first
two places which means that they are basically the most likely style to be representing
coordinators. It is to be noted that the “dominance” between these two styles is reversed
when moving from coordinators’ perception to principals’ perception. Coordinators see
the human resources style to be dominant followed by the structural while the principals
see the structural as dominant followed by the human resources style.

Leadership and Management Styles According to Subject, Sector and Gender

Leadership and Management Styles of Mathematics and Language

Coordinators. Of importance to this study too, is to check for differences in the
perception of the style of the coordinator according to the subject they teach. Towards
this, data in Table 2 was divided into two parts. Table 5 shows the frequency and ranks
of coordinators and principals on the four styles of leadership according to the subject
of instruction.

Table 3 shows that for math coordinators, the structural style of leadership had
the highest frequency in rank 1 (6 out of 8). The human resources style had the highest
frequency in rank 2 (6 out of 8). The political style had the highest frequency in rank 3
(5 out of 8). The symbolic style shared the highest frequency in rank 4 with the political
style (3 out of 8).

The language coordinators’ scores gave the human resources style the highest
frequency in rank 1 (7 out of 8) and the structural style had the highest frequency in
rank 2 (5 out of 8). The political style had the highest frequency in rank 3 (5 out of 8).
The symbolic style shared the highest frequency in rank 4 with the political style (3 out
of 8).
Table 3

The frequency and percent of ranks of the four leadership styles as perceived by the coordinators and principals (by subject)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to principals’ scores, the structural style of leadership had the highest frequency in rank 1 for the math coordinators (5 out of 8) as well as the language coordinators (4 out of 8). The human resources style had the highest frequency in rank 2 for the math coordinators (3 out of 8) while it was a tie for the language coordinators between structural and human resources (4 out of 8). The symbolic style had the highest frequency in rank 3 for math coordinators (6 out of 8) while it was a tie for the language coordinators between the symbolic and the political (4 out of 8). The political style had the highest frequency in rank 4 for both coordinators (6 out of 8 for math and 4 out of 8 for language).

The math and language coordinators disagree on their dominant style as the results in the tables above show. The math coordinators strongly believe that they are
mainly structural while the language coordinators strongly believe that they are mainly human resources. However, the principals perceive both type of coordinators to be mainly structural.

*Leadership and Management Styles of Subject Coordinators in Private and Public Schools.* Of importance to this study too, is to check for differences in the perception of the style of the coordinator between private and public schools. Towards this, data in Table 2 was divided into two parts. Table 4 shows the frequency and ranks of coordinators and principals in private and public schools on the four styles of leadership in private schools.

Table 4 shows that for coordinators in private schools, the human resources style had the highest frequency in rank 1 (5 out 8) and in rank 2 (3 out of 8). The structural style had the highest frequency in rank 2 also (3 out of 8). The political style had the highest frequency in rank 3 (6 out of 8) and the symbolic style had the highest frequency in rank 4 (4 out of 8). As for coordinators in public schools, both the human resources and structural styles had the highest frequency in rank 1 (4 out of 8) in rank 2, the human resources style had the highest frequency (4 out of 8). In rank 3, the political and symbolic styles had the highest frequency (4 out of 8). The political style had the highest frequency in rank 4 (4 out of 8).

For principals in private schools, the human resources style of leadership for coordinators had the highest frequency in rank 1 (6 out of 8) while the structural had the highest frequency in rank 2 (4 out of 8). The symbolic style had the highest frequency in rank 3 (5 out 8) and the political style had the highest frequency in rank 4 (6 out of 8). In public schools, principals’ scores showed that the structural style had the highest frequency in rank 1 (6 out of 8) while the human resources style had the highest frequency in rank 2 (6 out of 8). The symbolic style had the highest frequency in rank 3
(5 out of 8) and the political style had the highest frequency in rank 4 (4 out of 8).

Table 4

The frequency and percent of ranks of the four leadership styles as perceived by the coordinators and principals (by sector)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in the above tables show that the coordinators agree relatively on their dominant style in both private and public schools. The dominant style would be the human resources style. The dominance of the human resources style is confirmed by the private schools principals while the public school principals seem to view the coordinators’ style as mainly structural. In fact, principals view the dominance of styles in reverse order. Private school principals see it as mainly human resources followed by structural while public schools principals view it as mainly structural followed by human resources.
Coordinators’ and Principals’ Perceptions of Styles for Male and Female Coordinators. Examining the perceptions of coordinators for their styles according to gender was also relevant to this study and a comparison between the ranks of styles by gender was performed to check for any differences in perception. The results in Table 2 were divided into two sets. One represents the female coordinators’ perception and another representing the male coordinators’ perception. The table below shows the frequencies and ranks obtained accordingly.

Table 5 shows that for male coordinators, the structural style of leadership had the highest frequency in rank 1 (4 out of 7). The human resources style of leadership had the highest frequency in rank 2 (4 out of 7). The symbolic style had the highest frequency in rank 3 (4 out of 7) and the political had the highest frequency in rank 4 (4 out of 7). As for female coordinators, the highest frequency in rank 1 is for the human resources style (6 out of 9), the structural style has the highest frequency in rank 2 (4 out of 9). In rank 3, the political style has the highest frequency (7 out of 9). The symbolic style had the highest frequency in rank 4 (5 out of 9).

For principals, the highest frequency in rank 1 was for the structural style for male coordinators (5 out of 7) and the human resources (5 out of 9) for the female coordinators. In rank 2, the highest frequency was for the human resources style for male coordinators (4 out of 7) and the structural style (4 out of 9) for the female coordinators. The symbolic style had the highest frequency in rank 3 for both male coordinators (5 out of 7) and female coordinators (5 out of 9). The political style had the highest frequency in rank 4 for both male coordinators (4 out of 7) and female coordinators (6 out of 9).
Table 5

*The frequency and percent of ranks of the four leadership styles as perceived by the coordinators and principals (by gender)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Rank 1 Male</th>
<th>Rank 1 Female</th>
<th>Rank 2 Male</th>
<th>Rank 2 Female</th>
<th>Rank 3 Male</th>
<th>Rank 3 Female</th>
<th>Rank 4 Male</th>
<th>Rank 4 Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>4 57 3 33 1 14 4 44 1 14 1 11 1 14 1 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>3 43 6 67 4 57 3 33 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 43 7 78 4 57 2 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2 29 2 22 4 57 2 22 1 14 5 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>5 71 4 44 1 14 4 44 0 0 1 11 1 14 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2 29 5 56 4 57 3 33 1 14 0 0 0 0 1 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 14 0 0 2 29 3 33 4 57 6 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>1 14 1 11 1 14 2 22 5 71 5 55 0 0 1 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male coordinators viewed themselves as mainly structural then human resources while the female coordinators viewed themselves as mainly human resources then structural. The principals also viewed the dominance of styles in the same order, structural then human resources for male coordinators and human resources then structural for female coordinators.

*Behaviors of Subject Coordinators*

The behaviors served as a way of determining the behavior pattern that defines the role. Those behaviors were determined from Section I of the “Leadership Orientations” questionnaire. The total possible score was 20 for four items under each behavior, since a 5-point Likert scale was used for each item of behavior. Those scores were ranked in decreasing order and the frequency of selection of each behavior in rank 1, rank 2, rank 3, rank 4, rank 5, rank 6, rank 7 and rank 8 was summarized in Table 6.
The results show the rank of each behavior, in all types of schools participating in the study, according to both coordinators and principals.

Table 6

*The frequency and percent of ranks of the eight leadership behaviors as perceived by the coordinators and by the principals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Rank 5</th>
<th>Rank 6</th>
<th>Rank 7</th>
<th>Rank 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adroit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adroit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that coordinators’ scores revealed that the supportive behavior had the highest frequency in rank 1 (9 out of 16), the participative behavior had the highest frequency in rank 2 (6 out of 16), the analytic and participative behaviors had
the highest frequencies in rank 3 (3 out of 16). In rank 4, there is a tie between the
frequencies of the analytic, organized, participative, adroit and charismatic behaviors (3
out of 16). The inspirational behavior has the highest frequency in rank 5 (6 out of 16).
The powerful behavior had the highest frequency in rank 6 (2 out of 16). The powerful,
adroit and charismatic behaviors had the highest frequencies in rank 7 (6 out of 16). The
powerful and charismatic behaviors had the highest frequencies in rank 8 (3 out of 16).

The principals’ scores revealed that both the analytic and participative
behaviors had the highest frequencies in rank 1 (8 out of 16). The analytic, organized,
participative, supportive and inspirational behaviors had the highest frequencies in rank
2 (4 out of 16). In rank 3, the highest frequencies went for the supportive, inspirational
and adroit behaviors (3 out of 16). The organized behavior had the highest frequency in
rank 4 (4 out of 16). The inspirational had the highest frequency in rank 5 (5 out of 16).
The charismatic had the highest frequency in rank 6 (4 out of 16). The charismatic had
the highest frequency in rank 7 (6 out of 16). The powerful had the highest frequency in
rank 8 (5 out of 16).

These results suggest that the dominant behavior according to coordinators is
the supportive one followed by the participative, analytic and organized in that order.
The first two behaviors being part of the human resources style and the second two
being part of the structural style; those results are in line with the results obtained for
the style. However, one behavior related to the political style (adroit) and one related to
the symbolic style (charismatic) also appear in rank 4.

The principals have a more balanced view of the dominant behavior of
coordinators attributing rank 1 to two behaviors (analytic and participative) and rank 2
to five behaviors (analytic, organized, participative, supportive and inspirational). This
suggests that, although the dominant style according to principals is the structural style,
the behaviors related to it were not perceived as the dominant behaviors for coordinators. Rank 1 was in fact shared by a structural behavior (analytic) and a human resources behavior (participative) while rank 2 was equally shared by all four behaviors related to the structural and human resources styles and included also a symbolic behavior (Inspirational).

Finally, it is to be noted that the dominant behavior perceived by the coordinators is clearly the supportive one and it differs from the dominant behaviors perceived by the principals which are analytic and participative.

Qualitative Results

The qualitative results are also presented in two sections. The first suggested the confirmation of the results on the leadership style and management of the subject coordinators obtained from the “Leadership Orientations” questionnaire. It was found from the questionnaire that the styles of coordinators as perceived by them are Human Resources, Structural, Political and Symbolic in that order (according to ranks) while as perceived by their principals their styles were Structural, Human Resources, Symbolic and Powerful in that order (according to ranks).

The interviewees were told of the results and asked to confirm and/or reject the style(s) that best described them. That step required a brief explanation of the characteristics of each style. Interviewees were handed a document (Appendix E) containing the characteristics of each style and the related behaviors and went over its content with the researcher. Once words like Structural, Human Resources, Political and Symbolic were explained to the interviewees the confirmation of the results of the study was hopefully more reliable.

The second section suggested the confirmation of the results on the behaviors
of coordinators as derived from the “Leadership Orientations” questionnaire. It was found that coordinators perceive themselves as having a Supportive, Participative, Analytic, Organized, Inspirational, Powerful, Adroit, Charismatic behavior in that order (according to ranks). As perceived by their principals, these behaviors were Analytic, Participative, Organized, Supportive, Inspirational, Charismatic, Powerful and Adroit in that order (according to ranks). The interviewees were asked to confirm and/or reject the behavior that they tend to have.

Interviewees were also able to elaborate more on the role they have at schools, which helped enrich the findings of the study.

Confirmation of Leadership and Management style of Coordinators

The results revealed by the quantitative data were exposed and explained to the twelve coordinators and six principals that were interviewed. A brief description of each style’s characteristics was shared with the interviewees to help them select the most appropriate style(s) coordinators have. Only two of the selected interviewees were found to be aware of the Bolman and Deal theory and of the four styles.

The results of the interviews, concerning style, are summarized below:

- The Structural style and the Human Resource style are agreed upon, unanimously, to be the leadership and management styles of coordinators in the schools.

Confirmation of the Behaviors of the Coordinators

The results revealed by the quantitative data concerning behaviors did not need to be explained to the twelve coordinators and six principals that were interviewed. They were clear enough to them and the process of confirmation went on through direct questions to the interviewees to know if they agree or disagree with any of the behaviors mentioned in the questionnaires.

The results of the interviews are summarized below:
The Analytic, Organized, Participative and Supportive were unanimously selected as being the behaviors of coordinators in Lebanese secondary schools,

None of the interviewees agreed with the Powerful and Charismatic behaviors as being part of the coordinators’ behaviors

Qualitative analysis of the interviews indicated the following:

- Coordinators and Principals who were interviewed selected, unanimously, two main styles they perceived to be the best description of the coordinators’ style. Those styles were the Structural and the Human Resources. These findings are in line with the consistently higher ranks scored by the coordinators on both of these styles.

- A similar unanimous selection was made for four of the eight behaviors namely the Analytic, Organized, Participative and Supportive behaviors. This is also in line with the results of the ranks obtained from the answers to the questionnaire.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was first, to determine the Bolman and Deal leadership and management styles of subject coordinators as perceived by themselves and by their principals, second to check for any differences in perceptions of these style according to subject of instruction, sector and gender and third, to determine the set of leadership and management behaviors that best describe the role coordinators perform in their schools as perceived by themselves and by their principals. A review of literature was conducted on the different definitions of the role of coordinators as well as on the leadership and management styles of coordinators. A questionnaire was distributed and completed by sixteen coordinators and eight principals in eight K-12 schools in the Greater Beirut and Mount Lebanon areas. Then twelve of the coordinators and their six principals were interviewed for further understanding of the questionnaires’ results.

The data analysis took two forms. Responses to questionnaires were quantitatively analyzed. Quantitative analysis involved computation, ordering and comparison of ranks and frequencies of coordinators’ scores and principals’ scores on section I of the questionnaire. Interviews were qualitatively analyzed.

Leadership Styles of Coordinators in Lebanese Secondary Schools

The first research question raised in the study was to investigate, “What are the Bolman and Deal leadership and management styles of subject coordinators as perceived by themselves and principals?” Answering this question requires referring to
the results of this study and linking them with the reviewed literature and Lebanese context.

An interesting finding in this study was that all interviewees agreed that the leadership styles of coordinators in Lebanese secondary schools were the Human Resources and the Structural styles. Those styles were also ranked first and second as revealed by the answers on section I of the “Leadership Orientation Questionnaire” by all participants to the study but some ranked them differently. In fact, the coordinators viewed themselves as mainly human resources then structural whereas the principals viewed them to be mainly structural and then human resources.

Bolman and Deal (1997) argue that although applying all four styles helps managers and leaders “develop greater appreciation and deeper understanding of organizations” they may be drawn to one or two styles often rejecting others (p. 15). Their findings from studies performed on leaders, show that main emphasis of leaders is on the same two styles favored in this study while other frames tended to be neglected (p. 277). The choice of the participants in this study of the Human Resources and Structural style is then in accordance with the Bolman and Deal findings. Findings from several other studies conducted in different parts of the world on higher education administrators revealed that all administrators were working in the Bolman and Deal Human Resources style (Thomas, 2002). The Structural style, used by the coordinators according to this study, was not mentioned as being used by higher education administrators.

The results of this study are also aligned with those of Konet (1989) in which the leaders were divided into two types, the task-oriented type and the relations-oriented type. The first type uses top-down supervision and operated with clear and structured tasks (Konet) a common point with the behavior of Bolman and Deal’s Structural style.
The second type uses collaborative approaches while dealing with teachers, a behavior that is also typical of Bolman and Deal’s Human Resources leader.

On the other hand, the leadership styles of participants in this study had common points with only two of the five leadership styles defining the roles of coordinators in the Brown and Rutherford (1998) study conducted on eight heads of department in Catholic secondary schools in the UK. In the Brown and Rutherford (1998) typology, the Servant Architect and the Organizational Leader while leading with people not through them by empowering them to release their creative abilities and creating new organic form of developmental structure to enhance commitment behaved like Human Resources style of leaders as defined by Bolman and Deal. The remaining three leadership styles of the Brown and Rutherford typology are the Moral Educator that is similar to Bolman and Deal’s Symbolic style, the Social Architect that is similar to Bolman and Deal’s Political style, and the Leading professional that is specific to the Brown and Rutherford study (1998) and is not similar to any style in the Bolman and Deal theory as it basically focuses on improving teaching, learning and achievement in the department, a specificity that Bolman and Deal didn’t define separately in their typology. This difference in leadership styles between coordinators might be due to the environment the coordinator is working in (Turner, 1996).

As compared to the Busher and Harris (1999) study, the results for leadership styles of participants in this study revealed common points with the Transactional role, using top-down management as the Structural style and the Collegiality role using power with others as the Human Resources style. The Supervisory role and the Representative role were not mentioned in the findings of this study.

As a matter of fact, the context of the Lebanese secondary schools participating in this study, might explain the selection of the coordinators and the principals of just
two styles. If the emphasis of the coordinator is on Organized and Analytic behavior, the ideal leader would be the Structural style leader (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p.271); if the emphasis of the coordinators is on collaboration the leader would be the Human Resources style leader (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p.272).

The contextualization of the style of coordinators was raised by Turner (1996) whereas the conclusions reached in his study suggested that no standardized style or role for coordinators can be deduced. It has also been mentioned in the Brown and Rutherford study (1998) that the change in the style or role of coordinators was done in the context of implementation of new Teacher Training Agency (TTA, 1998) policies. This suggests that the restricted use by coordinators in Lebanese secondary schools of two styles might be due to the context that they work in, which might not require more from them.

The findings of this study suggest that through the usage of the Human Resources and Structural styles, coordinators in the participating secondary schools develop, or fit in already developed, structured sets of routines and specialized tasks, that will allow achieving goals and objectives as well as coordinating diverse activities. At the same time, coordinators cooperate with teachers to achieve these goals while feeling good about what they are doing, and empower them rather than using a top-down chain of command (Bolman & Deal, 1997, pp.13-14). These findings are supported by one of the interviewed coordinators description of his style:

My office is opened to all teachers and they are welcome any time to come in. We don’t necessarily discuss academic matters; we can have coffee as I like them to feel at ease in here. However, when it comes to follow-up on their work, I am very strict on deadlines and standard operating procedures, after all, things have to be done with in due time and appropriately!

The principal of this coordinator seemed to agree also with her coordinator’s
The coordinator should at the same time gain the trust of the teacher and be friendly with him but only to be able to make him achieve the required tasks in the best possible way. He cannot be too nice nor too strict, something he is able to achieve perfectly.

On the other hand, the findings of the study also suggest that the coordinators in Lebanese secondary schools may not be able to operate within contexts of scarce resources, of conflict and of opposition (more the purview of the Political style) or even inspire other and communicate a strong sense of vision (more the purview of the Symbolic style) (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p.14). In fact, through the interviews, it was clear that the coordinators were sometimes not satisfied with the work they were doing and blamed the matter on scarce resources and on relationship problems with some teachers. This problem was mainly apparent in public schools where coordinators shared with the researcher their dissatisfaction with their timetables or with the quality of teachers they work with. These obstacles they are facing wouldn’t affect them much had they been able, or allowed, to reframe into Political or Symbolic style of leaders. In fact, the results show that they might be able to reframe as ranks on items related to the Political and Symbolic style were not too low with respect to ranks for the other two styles. However, they either felt it to be not applicable to their job description or that they were not allowed to do it.

Perception of Styles According to Subject, Sector and Gender

The second research question raised in the study was to check if “these perceptions of styles differ according to subject of instruction, sector and gender?” Results of the study according to this variable revealed the following:
Subject of Instruction

The findings of this study revealed that, as subject of instruction is concerned, the math coordinators ranked the structural style in first place and the human resource in second place, while the results were in reverse order for the language coordinators. Math, as a subject teaches and is based on logic, analysis and organization. Clear thinking and analytic approaches are necessary conditions to teach math. That might have affected the leadership style of coordinators. This “requirement” of analytic and organized behaviors is not mandatory for language coordinators to teach their subject. Humanistic values are treated in language classes, especially at the secondary level, which is the target of this study. These particularities might explain the ranking of each subject coordinator. On the other hand, the principals do not view the styles of coordinators as being different according to the subject of instruction. In fact, they perceive the coordinator’s style as being mainly structural then human resources. This might be due to the fact that coordinators are perceived as references in their subject of instruction capable of organizing their departments and following-up on teachers mainly, more than professionals who are present at school to provide support to the teachers whenever needed.

Sector

The ranking of the human resources style in first place by the coordinators was not affected by the sector their school belonged to. In fact, results of the study showed that whether a coordinator was operating in the private or public sector, s/he still perceived her/his style as being mainly human resources. The difference in setting and resources in between both sectors didn’t have any effect on the approach the coordinators will use with teachers. This difference seem to affect the principals’ views however as the private school principals believe that the human resources style is the
main style of coordinators while the public school coordinators view the structural style as being the main one. This might be due to the difference in expectations and priorities between both principals. In fact, the private sector, especially the schools visited by the researcher, were clearly pushing for a supportive and participative role of the coordinators regardless of the cost of such a role. In the public schools however, focus was on finishing the program and preparing the students for the official exams. This difference in priorities affects the view of the principals as in private schools; the official exams’ success is not an aim in itself. These schools serve a certain mission that goes beyond the target of official exams. They are either affiliated to international or religious organizations whose priorities are more on the humanistic education of the child rather than on teaching. In fact, one of the principals in a private school said:

The parents are informed that our grades in the official exams as related to the English language are lower than other schools because we teach the true American English, which is not in line with the requirements of the Lebanese official exams

Facing this luxury the private school’s principal has in imposing his school’s philosophy on the parents, a public school principal shared with the researcher the fact that with the limited resources he has, the small amount of support from the ministry and lately, the unstable political situation in the country, his educational goal is limited to provide those kids with all they need to succeed in the official exams.

This discrepancy in financial and moral support might have affected the views of principals especially that the structural coordinator serves ideally the goal public schools principals while the human resources coordinator serves ideally the goal of private schools principal.

Gender

In terms of gender, results of this study showed that the male coordinators
viewed themselves as mainly structural then human resources while the female coordinators viewed themselves as mainly human resources then structural. The principals agreed with this view and these results are in agreement with the results of Korach (1996) who found out that females consistently valued activities that reflect a facilitative and collaborative approach to leadership more highly than males. Males valued more highly management activities. Bolman and Deal (1997) argue that the structural leader perceives the organization s/he works in as a factory while the human resources leader perceives it as a family (p.15). A family relies on the support of the mother as much as a factory relies on the organized and analytic behavior of the father. The results of this study are therefore in line with this common idea about female and male behaviors.

Behaviors of Coordinators in Lebanese Secondary Schools

The third research question raised in the study was to investigate, “what are the Bolman and Deal leadership and management behaviors of subject coordinators as perceived by coordinators and principals?”

The findings of this study revealed that the four behaviors participants agreed to best describe the behaviors of coordinators, according to them are the following: (1) Supportive, (2) Participative, (3) Analytic and (4) Organized, in that order (according to rank). As for the principals views, the behaviors are in the following order: (1) Participative and Analytic, (2) Organized and Supportive.

The behaviors forming the role of the coordinator would then involve the coordinator in performing the following tasks (Thomas, 2002):

*The Coordinator as a Supportive Leader*

A supportive leader is caring and shows concern about the feelings of others as
well as responsiveness to them (Thomas, 2002). Caring and concern about the feelings of others as well as responsiveness to them has also been a main finding in the studies of Brown and Rutherford (1998) and Marotta (2002).

The processes of caring and concern about the feelings of others as well as responsiveness to them were mentioned in all participating schools and by all participants. However, evidence of support, care, concern and responsiveness to others was harder to detect due to the limited number of visits to the school.

At private school X, the visits to the school occurred while a new computer program was being introduced to the teachers. Sessions of orientation to the use of the Atlas- Rubicon program for curriculum mapping were being conducted. That process was creating an atmosphere of mixed emotions between teachers of the departments concerned with this study. On the day of the interview, the researcher was invited by the principal to attend the orientation sessions before conducting the interview. The coordinators were promoting the program, explaining its benefits, and containing the anger of some of them. After the orientation session, some teachers were complaining of the fact that they are not computer literate and others had suggestions for improvement of the program. The coordinators’ role was to listen to these comments, taking note of relevant matters while trying to stress on the need of such a program. The mere fact that teachers were complaining to the coordinator rather than the principal provided evidence of the Supportive role they had.

During the interview with the Math coordinator, mentioned earlier, and as the teacher who interrupted the interview left, the coordinator pointed out that she was sorry she had to answer the teacher as she has great respect for him and didn’t want to hurt his feelings. Overall, this coordinator had great confidence in her team and believed strongly in their capacities. She stressed on the fact that this was enough for her to care
about their concerns and take their remarks into consideration.

In private school Y, the Math coordinator shared with the researcher the problems he had faced when he was first appointed. Being the youngest teacher in the Math department, older teachers resisted his appointment and were not too cooperative. Instead of forcing them to work with him, using top-down power (typical of Structural style) the coordinator opted for patience and understanding, building confidence and showing respect to the older teachers. He “didn’t want to offend them” which shows that he cares for their feelings.

At private schools Z and T, as well as in the public schools, no evidence of the Supportive role was detected during the school visits. Public schools coordinators seemed to seek support for themselves before trying to provide it to teachers.

*The Coordinator as a Participative Leader*

Fostering participation and involvement, Listening and openness to new ideas, are the characteristics of the Participative leader (Thomas, 2002). Concerning fostering participation and involvement Brown and Rutherford (1998) gave the example of making the staffroom a place where teachers can meet and informally discuss issues of concern to them. As for listening and openness to new ideas, that role is highlighted by Orris (1988) in her study on department chairs whereas she found out that they were more inclined to perform tasks related to communication. A role that is essential for all coordinators according to Bowman (2002).

The setting to enhance the Participative role was nearly absent in public schools as no departmental staffroom existed in three of the schools that were visited and no evidence of quality time spent between colleagues could be noticed. In fact, in one of the public schools the coordinator was complaining about not even being able to see the teacher for coordination purposes due to schedules overlap! That problem might
not interfere with a coordinator whose role is Organized or Analytic as these behaviors are more centered in the coordinators own work rather than teachers’ involvement. However, it might have a more serious effect on the Participative and Supportive role which cannot occur without the presence of the teacher.

Failure to ensure a common time for meetings between teachers and coordinators in public schools suggests that principals seemed more convinced of the follow-up technical role of the coordinator, rather than the supportive and participative one. Coordinators in public schools were willing to help but didn’t have the tools to be participative (time or space). They were willing to share with teachers but couldn’t always make them participate in decision making processes if there was any decision making.

The case was different in private schools. Departmental staffrooms were present in all four of them. They were open spaces where teachers could go in and out at anytime. During the researcher’s visits and while conducting the interviews, some actions indicating the coordinators’ Participative behavior could be observed.

At school X, all departmental meetings were preceded by lunch prepared by the Math coordinator mainly helped by some teachers. Discussion of an article related to education sometimes occurred while colleagues were having lunch. During the interview, a teacher came in to inform the coordinator that he will prepare the mid-year exams. No sign of formal procedure was followed unlike the other private schools where the coordinator’s signature is required on the test before it is handed in to students.

At School Z, teachers had their personalized desks in the staffroom and used the place as an office for them. Teachers were moving around, asking questions to the coordinator while correcting or preparing the weekly plan. Evidence of regular
coordination meetings was found as every teacher had a weekly hour assigned on her/his schedule for such meetings.

In School Y, the collaboration occurred on a more professional basis and Participation were more displayed in the fact that the coordinator was perceived as a reference. Teachers were clearly used, and felt at ease, to come and ask for the coordinators’ point of view on a specific matter.

*The Coordinator as an Analytic Leader*

An Analytic leader has clear and logical thinking and approaches problems based on facts. The Analytic leader attends to detail (Thomas, 2002). An example of thinking clearly and logically and approaching problems with facts was given by (Brown & Rutherford, 1998) to be the task of ensuring a substitute for a missing teacher, that of organizing staffing requests and classroom allocations. The scheduling of classes was mentioned in the Kujawa et al. (1988) study. Worner and Brown (1993) included planning and coordinating departmental meetings in the role.

Both coordinators and principals that were interviewed expected coordinators to be approaching problems with facts, in all participating schools. Whether through the review of their written job descriptions, whenever available or through the answers to the interview questions, coordinators were asked to assign teachers for classes, ensure replacement teachers whenever one teacher was absent, submitting suggestions on the timetables of teachers and providing solutions for problems related to teacher or students’ performance. In the case of the need for students’ reinforcement classes, coordinators were asked to prepare the content of the reinforcement course and the schedule for it.

The school X principal had two reports per academic year submitted to him by coordinators including statistical data related to the performance of students and
teachers. The school Z principal held regular (biweekly) meetings with coordinators to discuss the performance of students and teachers. School Y had more frequent reports submitted by coordinators (as often as monthly reports) along with a yearly report where the coordinator sets objectives to be achieved by his department during the academic year. The coordinator’s yearly evaluation is based on the degree of accomplishment of these objectives. No evidence of reporting was detected through the interviews held at School T coordinators. The Language coordinator however mentioned that “everything” is set by the Academic Dean; “everything” might include yearly objectives.

The process of submitting regular reports was not mentioned by any of the public school principals or coordinators as part of the coordinators role, the reporting being seemingly less formal.

_The Coordinator as an Organized Leader_

As an Organized leader, the coordinator is expected to develop clear goals and policies which held people accountable for results. Classrooms and schools are assumed to be more productive through authority policies and rules. Developing clear goals and policies which held people accountable for results were mentioned by Kujawa et al. (1988) in their study. Konet (1989), Worner and Brown (1993) and Mayers (2002) also mentioned clear cut goals to be at the center of the success of task-oriented managers.

In general, the interviewees had developed clear goals and policies which held people accountable for results in different ways:

In School Y, the job description of the coordinator was well-defined and standard operating procedures made sure that clear goals and policies were developed. The school is accredited by the International Standards Organization (ISO) and accountability procedures in it are already in place. Forms are available for all
departments and all activities around school. They are preserved under copyright and the researcher was only allowed to access them on site. Accreditation is renewed every six month which keeps administrators under pressure of performing up to the level of ISO standards. Coordinators had to implement the procedures that were set and were allowed to make amendments as needed in order to preserve the accreditation.

As for school X, the accreditation from Middle States Association (MSA) required the presence of clear cut procedures but allowed more flexibility in procedures that were adapted to the context the organization is working in. The coordinators were asked to work more on promoting departmental culture that would ultimately lead to developing clear cut procedures appropriate to the school rather than imposing standardized procedures. The accreditation team’s visit occurred every two to five years which allowed for more long term planning.

In the context of School T and School Z, departments varied in their organization. Some coordinators had memos sent out to teachers detailing responsibilities or duties, while others didn’t provide such documents. No evidence on policies that apply to all departments and the way to implement them and hold the people accountable for them were detected.

In the four public schools, clear cut policies existed but coordinators were facing problems in holding people accountable for them because of external factors such as lack of empowerment and lack of support from the administration. Accountability was raised as being the basic weakness in the four public schools as teachers were tenured. Particularly in one case, a Language coordinator found himself in a deadlock situation as he was held accountable for the performance of one of the teachers while his evaluation of that teacher’s work should have terminated the teacher’s contract. The coordinator, who also holds the same job in a private school, stressed on the fact that the
procedure to terminate the contract of a teacher in public schools is more complicated than in private schools, due to external pressure being exerted on the administrators. That same coordinator would get all the support from the private school’s administrators to force the teacher to improve her/his performance or lose the job. Here again, the issue of contextualization of the role of the coordinator arises as affecting the performance of this role.

As for developing clear cut policies at the whole-school level, coordinators, even at school X, were not involved in the process. Their work was strictly related to their department.

The Lebanese Context

In the Lebanese context, better displayed among public schools’ coordinators and principals, the behaviors being (1) Supportive, (2) Participative, (3) Analytic and (4) Organized, in that order (according to rank), would meet entirely the expectations according to the job description of coordinators (Decree No. 590, 1974) through three of the four behaviors, the Analytic, Organized and Supportive.

One of the coordinators in a public school participating in this study stated clearly that:

My role in this school (public) differs from my role in the private school I work in. In fact, I visit this school (public) once a week to make sure that we are on time according to the yearly plans and to check the teachers’ preparation books. Some teachers might need help in some concepts and ask me to prepare activities for them. In the private schools, I am present on a daily basis and I also evaluate the students’ performances and suggest alternative techniques and workshops to teachers.

The principal in this same school tends to totally agree with the coordinator’s
description of the role of the coordinator as he sees that:

Having the coordinator come once a week to check on the progress of the curriculum is vital to us. I cannot do this job as I do not know as much as the coordinator in her subject matter. This follow-up task doesn’t need more than one visit a week, but we value that presence a lot.

In fact, a coordinator with an Analytic, Organized and Supportive behavior would accomplish all the duties and responsibilities required by the ministry of education that is developing yearly plans, follow-up on methodologies of teaching and homework correction, observing classes, supervising exams, conducting monthly meetings, updating teachers on new methodologies, following-up on implementation of clear cut policies and monitoring laboratory visits are the required tasks from coordinators (Decree No. 590, 1974). The coordinator would even exceed the expectations of the job in public school by being Participative as the decree doesn’t mention the behavior, as part of the “requirements” for the job. That might explain why evidence of the Participative behavior was not detected in public schools, although interviewees there viewed it as part of their role.

Being Participative in public schools would be based on a personal initiative undertaken by the coordinator rather than a requirement for the job. That is why the setting for participation is not a must in public schools. Principals encourage it but would not hold the coordinator accountable for it as it is not part of their job description.

In the case of private schools, the coordinator would rather be required to be Participative and is given most if not all of the tools to accomplish that part of her/his role.

It is also to be noted that in all the participating schools, public or private, the role of coordinators did not include evaluation of teachers to try and preserve the Participative and Supportive approach to coordination. This result coincides with the
findings of Worner and Brown (1993).

It is also striking that although the literature review showed that part of the coordinators’ role was to work on curriculum development (Turner, 1996; Mc.Garvey et al., 1997; Brown and Rutherford, 1998), the participants in this study didn’t mention it as being part of the role of subject coordinators. In fact, although most coordinators and principals participating in the study emphasized on the follow-up and evaluation role of the coordinator for the implementation of the yearly plans and syllabi, none of them tackled the issue of curriculum development. The reason is, according to public school coordinators, that the curriculum is already set by experts and well-defined. As for private school coordinators, reasons for not tackling that matter were given to be lack of time and prioritization of the needs of the departments.

The fact that participants to this study didn’t agree with the other behaviors of leadership, namely those related to the Political and Symbolic styles, suggest the following as not considered to be part of the coordinators’ role in Lebanese secondary schools according to the Bolman and Deal theory:

(1) Persuading and mobilizing people, (2) building alliances and support, (3) Being skillful in negotiations in the face of conflict and opposition, (4) Being sensitive, (5) Inspiring colleagues to loyalty and enthusiasm, (6) Communicating a strong sense of vision, (7) Being imaginative, (8) Emphasizing culture and values (Thomas, 2002).

This process of trying to determine what coordinators don’t do was a distinguishing fact of the study of Worner and Brown (1993). According to their study, coordinators do not evaluate teachers and as previously mentioned in this study all participant schools agreed with that.

The only exception occurs at school X. In fact, coordinators are selected in that school on the basis of commitment and belief to the school’s vision. The principal at
school X sees both coordinators and as he stated in the interview any coordinator at school X as being Inspirational and communicating a strong sense of vision. The Math coordinator used the word “vision” five times during the interview while talking about her behavior in the department. She believed that her role was to provide the department with a vision and inspire the teachers to adopt that vision.

Methodological Limitations

A major methodological limitation is to be added to the ones already mentioned in Chapter One of this study. This limitation was revealed in the context of attempting to confirm the results of the study through interviews.

As reported before, participants in this study selected two out of the four styles, as well as their related behaviors, as being the styles and behaviors coordinators in secondary schools tend to adopt, to the exclusion of the other two and their behaviors. However, the ranks of the styles and behaviors coordinators and principals didn’t agree with, set following the responses of those same participants on the Bolman and Deal questionnaire were, at some places close to the ranks of the structural and human resources styles and their related behaviors. Table 6 shows that the adroit and charismatic behaviors rank in fourth position according to coordinators while the adroit and inspirational behaviors ranked third according to principals.

It is true that it was consistent, throughout the data analysis, that the Human Resources and Structural styles and the related behaviors outclassed the other styles and behaviors in terms of ranks. However, none of the ranks of the discarded styles and behaviors were as low as to be neglected. The reasons for this discrepancy might be one of two:

- Either the words used to describe the styles and behaviors,
• Or the confusion between role and job description.

Words like Political, Charismatic, and Powerful might have some negative meanings in the Lebanese culture. In fact, those three terms were the ones that needed to be clarified the most during the interviews.

On the other hand, there was generally a need to explain to the participants, the difference between job description, which represents “what” to do and the role, which represents “how” to do it. This might be the reason why the coordinators discarded the Political and Symbolic styles and related behaviors. Selecting one or the other of these styles and behaviors might have been considered as beyond their duties and responsibilities.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The intent of this study was to identify the leadership styles and behavior of the coordinators in Lebanese secondary schools as perceived by themselves and by their principals and as measured by the behavior and style scales defined by Bolman and Deal (1997). The ranks on the orientations were the basis for the selection of the dominant styles and behaviors. The interviews enabled the researcher to confirm the styles and behavior interviewees believed to describe coordinators most.

It appears that coordinators in Lebanese secondary schools perceive themselves and are perceived by their principals as operating within two of the Bolman and Deal four styles: Human Resources and Structural. The coordinators discarded the other two styles, the Political and the Symbolic, which affected the behavior of the coordinators removing from it the behaviors related to these two styles that are: (1) Persuading and mobilizing people, (2) building alliances and support, (3) Being skillful in negotiations in the face of conflict and opposition, (4) Being sensitive, (5) Inspiring colleagues to
loyalty and enthusiasm, (6) Communicating a strong sense of vision, (7) Being imaginative, (8) Emphasizing culture and values (Thomas, 2002).

The interviewees either rated those behaviors as irrelevant to them, i.e. not applicable, or not necessary, to the exception of the school X interviewees.

Turner (1996) argued that the role of the coordinator is affected by the context in which s/he is operating.

The findings of this study suggest that the Lebanese context seems to define the role of the coordinator as being Supportive, Participative, Analytic and Organized.

The coordinator has the task of making the school run at the same time as both a factory and as a family. This twofold role might be useful and sufficient in the Lebanese context but might be insufficient if the coordinators are to be involved in any changes in the educational system in Lebanon. Coordinators are not involved in curriculum development, are not well-trained or not allowed, to deal with major changes or to resolve conflicts as well as to share a strong sense of vision.

On the other hand, Harris et al. (1995), Thomas (2002) and Wise and Bennett (2003) established relationships between the role of the coordinators and departmental effectiveness finding that the equivalent of the Inspirational and Adroit behaviors are mandatory along with others to departmental success.

Thomas (2002) also reported the findings of Bolman and Deal on the positive correlation between the political style and the effectiveness as manager and leader.

Bolman and Deal found out that successful organizations were the ones that were led using the four styles (Thomas, 2002).

The above literature review suggests then that there is an imperative need to expose the coordinators to the other styles of leadership and train them to operate using all four styles in order to widen the scope of their role.
This might be less difficult than thought to be as the results of the questionnaires, even though refuted later on by the interviewees, revealed that the characteristics of the other styles and behaviors are already embedded in the coordinators’ minds. In fact, the ranks on the related items were close to the ranks of the other items. Another factor that might make it easy for coordinators to learn how to reframe is the fact that most of them, especially in the public schools, were unhappy with the job they were doing and felt frustrated about not being able to do more for the teachers.

The problem remains that the coordinators attributed that weakness in fulfilling their role to external factors rather than to their inability to use the Political and Symbolic styles.

Another conclusion that was reached in this study is the fact that the perception of styles, according to coordinators, is affected by the subject of instruction and gender but is not affected by the sector coordinators operate in. Math and Male coordinators view the structural style ranking first. Language and Female coordinators view the human resources style as ranking first. As for the principals, the perception is affected by sector and gender but not by subject of instruction. Private and Female coordinators have a human resources dominant style. Public and Male coordinators have structural dominant style. However, in all cases the two selected styles were the human resources and structural.

It would be therefore recommended that research be directed towards investigating the degree of congruence between principals’ and coordinators’ perception of the coordinators’ role as well as the effect of the leadership style and behaviors on the departmental effectiveness. Such research would help in determining the most
appropriate coordinators’ role, in the Lebanese context, to ensure departmental effectiveness.
APPENDIX I

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (SELF)

Form S-4

Your name:____________________

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (SELF)

(For Coordinators)

© 1990, Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, all rights reserved

This questionnaire asks you to describe your leadership and management style.

I. Behaviors

You are asked to indicate how often each of the items below is true of you.

Please use the following scale in answering each item.

1 2 3 4 5

Never Sometimes Always Occasionally Often

So, you would answer '1' for an item that is never true of you, '2' for one that is occasionally true, '3' for one that is sometimes true of you, and so on.

Be discriminating! Your results will be more helpful if you think about each item and distinguish the things that you really do all the time from the things that you do seldom or never.

1. _____ Think very clearly and logically.

2. _____ Show high levels of support and concern for others.

3. _____ Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.

4. _____ Inspire others to do their best.

5. _____ Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.

6. _____ Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.
7. Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.
8. Am highly charismatic.
9. Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.
10. Show high sensitivity and concern for others’ needs and feelings.
11. Am unusually persuasive and influential.
12. Am able to be an inspiration to others.
13. Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.
14. Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.
15. Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.
16. Am highly imaginative and creative.
17. Approach problems with facts and logic.
18. Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.
19. Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.
20. Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.
21. Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.
22. Listen well and am unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.
23. Am politically very sensitive and skillful.
24. See beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.
25. Have extraordinary attention to detail.
27. Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.
28. Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.
29. Strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.
30. Am a highly participative manager.
31. Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.
32. _____ Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.

II. Leadership Style

This section asks you to describe your leadership style. For each item, give the number "4" to the phrase that best describes you, "3" to the item that is next best, and on down to "1" for the item that is least like you.

1. My strongest skills are:
   _____ a. Analytic skills
   _____ b. Interpersonal skills
   _____ c. Political skills
   _____ d. Ability to excite and motivate

2. The best way to describe me is:
   _____ a. Technical expert
   _____ b. Good listener
   _____ c. Skilled negotiator
   _____ d. Inspirational leader

3. What has helped me the most to be successful is my ability to:
   _____ a. Make good decisions
   _____ b. Coach and develop people
   _____ c. Build strong alliances and a power base
   _____ d. Energize and inspire others

4. What people are most likely to notice about me is my:
   _____ a. Attention to detail
   _____ b. Concern for people
   _____ c. Ability to succeed, in the face of conflict and opposition
   _____ d. Charisma.
5. My most important leadership trait is:
   _____ a. Clear, logical thinking
   _____ b. Caring and support for others
   _____ c. Toughness and aggressiveness
   _____ d. Imagination and creativity

6. I am best described as:
   _____ a. An analyst
   _____ b. A humanist
   _____ c. A politician
   _____ d. A symbolic

III. Overall rating

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate yourself on:

1. Overall effectiveness as a manager.
   
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Bottom 20%  Middle 20%  Top 20%

2. Overall effectiveness as a leader.
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Bottom 20%  Middle 20%  Top 20%

IV. Background Information

1. Are you: ____Male  ____Female

2. How many years have you been in your current job? _____

3. How many total years of experience do you have as a manager? _____
Form O-4

Name of person described: _______________

Group code (if any): _____________________

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (OTHER)

(For Principals)

© 1990, Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, all rights reserved

This questionnaire asks you to describe the person that you are rating in terms of leadership and management style.

I. Leader Behaviors

You are asked to indicate how often each item is true of the person that you are rating.

Please use the following scale in answering each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, you would answer '1' for an item that is never true of the person you are describing, '2' for one that is occasionally true, '3' for one that is sometimes true, and so on.

Be discriminating! The results will be more helpful to the ratee if you think about each item and distinguish the things that the ratee really does all the time from the things that s/he does seldom or never.

1. _____ Thinks very clearly and logically.

2. _____ Shows high levels of support and concern for others.

3. _____ Shows exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.

4. _____ Inspires others to do their best.
5. _____ Strongly emphasizes careful planning and clear time lines.

6. _____ Builds trust through open and collaborative relationships.

7. _____ Is a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.

8. _____ Is highly charismatic.

9. _____ Approaches problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.

10. _____ Shows high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.

11. _____ Is unusually persuasive and influential.

12. _____ Is an inspiration to others.

13. _____ Develops and implements clear, logical policies and procedures.

14. _____ Fosters high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.

15. _____ Anticipates and deals adroitly with organizational conflict.

16. _____ Is highly imaginative and creative.

17. _____ Approaches problems with facts and logic.

18. _____ Is consistently helpful and responsive to others.

19. _____ Is very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.

20. _____ Communicates a strong and challenging vision and sense of mission.

21. _____ Sets specific, measurable goals and holds people accountable for results.

22. _____ Listens well and is unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.

23. _____ Is politically very sensitive and skillful.

24. _____ Sees beyond current realities to create exciting new opportunities.

25. _____ Has extraordinary attention to detail.

26. _____ Gives personal recognition for work well done.

27. _____ Develops alliances to build a strong base of support.

28. _____ Generates loyalty and enthusiasm.

29. _____ Strongly believes in clear structure and a chain of command.
30. _____ Is a highly participative manager.

31. _____ Succeeds in the face of conflict and opposition.

32. _____ Serves as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.

I. Leadership Style

This section asks you to describe the leadership style of the person that you are rating. For each item, give the number "4" to the phrase that best describes this person, "3" to the item that is next best, and on down to "1" for the item that is least like this person.

1. The individual's strongest skills are:
   _____ a. Analytic skills
   _____ b. Interpersonal skills
   _____ c. Political skills
   _____ d. Ability to excite and motivate

2. The best way to describe this person is:
   _____ a. Technical expert
   _____ b. Good listener
   _____ c. Skilled negotiator
   _____ d. Inspirational leader

3. What this individual does best is:
   _____ a. Make good decisions
   _____ b. Coach and develop people
   _____ c. Build strong alliances and a power base
   _____ d. Energize and inspire others

4. What people are most likely to notice about this person is:
   _____ a. Attention to detail
   _____ b. Concern for people
5. This individual's most important leadership trait is:
   _____ a. Clear, logical thinking
   _____ b. Caring and support for others
   _____ c. Toughness and aggressiveness
   _____ d. Imagination and creativity

6. This person is best described as:
   _____ a. An analyst
   _____ b. A humanist
   _____ c. A politician
   _____ d. A symbolic

III. Overall rating

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate this person on:

1. Overall effectiveness as a manager.
   1    2    3    4    5
   Bottom 20%  Middle 20%  Top 20%

2. Overall effectiveness as a leader.
   1    2    3    4    5
   Bottom 20%  Middle 20%  Top 20%
IV. Background Information

The following information will not be provided to the ratee, but will contribute to our efforts to understand how perceptions of leadership styles are influenced by the relationship between rater and ratee.

1. Are you: ____ Male ____ Female

2. Which of the following best describes your work relationship with the ratee:

   ____ The ratee is at a higher level in the organization than I am.
   ____ The ratee and I are at about the same organizational level.
   ____ I am at a higher level in the organization than the ratee.
   ____ I am a client or customer of the ratee's organization.
   ____ Other. Please specify: _____________________
APPENDIX III
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR COORDINATORS

The purpose of the interviews is to enable us to answer the following questions:

- What is the perception of the coordinator of her/his role?

The interviews will be recorded on tape after taking the permission for more in-depth review and analysis of their content.

Questions:

Name:

Position:

1) The Bolman and Deal survey showed that you perceive your dominant style to be mainly:......................, do you agree?

2) The Bolman and Deal survey showed that you perceive your dominant behavior to be mainly:......................, do you agree?

3) How involved in whole-school decisions are you?

4) Do you feel that your job contributes in the successful implementation of the school’s mission and vision? If yes, rate the effect of your job on the implementation of the school vision on a scale from 1 to 3, 1 being slightly, 2 being fairly, and three being totally. If not, do you believe that it should?

5) Do you have enough ‘power’ to impose your decisions? Is this power delegated to you by your job description, your principal or the respect of your peers?

6) Describe in a few words your relationship with the principal and the mode of work between your departments especially in issues of preparing departmental documentation.
APPENDIX IV

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PRINCIPALS

The purpose of the interviews is to enable us to answer the following question:

- What is the perception of the school head of the role of the coordinator?

The interviews will be recorded on tape after taking the permission for more in-depth review and analysis of their content.

Questions:

Name:

Position:

1) The Bolman and Deal survey showed that you perceive the coordinator’s dominant style to be mainly: ........................., do you agree?

2) The Bolman and Deal survey showed that you perceive the coordinator’s dominant behavior to be mainly: ........................., do you agree?

3) How involved in whole-school decisions are the coordinators?

4) Do you feel that the coordinator contributes in the successful implementation of the school’s mission and vision? If yes, rate the effect of her/his job on the implementation of the school vision on a scale from 1 to 3, 1 being slightly, 2 being fairly, and three being totally. If not, do you believe that it should?

5) Do you allow the coordinators to have enough ‘power’ to impose her/his decisions?

6) Describe in a few words your relationship with the coordinator and the mode of work between your departments especially in issues of preparing departmental documentation.
APPENDIX V

BOLMAN AND DEAL’S FRAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metaphor for Organization</th>
<th>Structural Resources</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Political Resources</th>
<th>Symbolic Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Concepts</td>
<td>Factory or machine</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Jungle</td>
<td>Carnival, temple, theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of Leadership</td>
<td>Social architecture</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Inspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Leadership Challenge</td>
<td>Attune structure to task, technology, environment</td>
<td>Align org and human needs</td>
<td>Develop an agenda and power base</td>
<td>Create faith, beauty, meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural Frame

Specialized tasks, sequential work, close supervision, top down.

- Blueprint for pattern of expectations and procedures.
- stable environments are hierarchies and rule oriented.
- to achieve goals and objectives
- rationality prevails over personal and external pressure
- designed to fit orgs circumstances.
- increase efficiency through specialization & division of labor
- forms of coordination and control to insure success
- problems solved through restructuring.

1. How to allocate work
   - knowledge or skill
   - time
   - product
   - customers or clients
   - geography
   - process

2. Combining vertical and lateral power:
   As a group, the organization decides course of action, this is lateral or horizontal decision making. Once all agree, consensus, then the leader
can act in vertical fashion because all have had a stake in its creation. Problems arise in top down situations.

**Imperatives**

- Size and Age
- Core Process
- Environment
- Strategy and Goals
- Technology
- people

**Pressures**

- Impulsive
- Stagnant
- Headless
- Environment shifts
- Technology Change
- Growth of Org
- Leadership Change
- Small groups:
  - one boss is top down
  - dual authority task oriented
  - Simple hierarchy is layers
  - Circle borders on "web inclusion"
  - All-channel network is the web. Star within the circle.

**Human Resources Frame**

This frame regards people's skills, attitudes, energy, commitment. This frame champions idea that orgs can be stimulating, rewarding, and productive.

If organization concerns itself with it's people's welfare then it will succeed.

- Maslow's hierarchy of human needs:
  - Physiological (oxygen, water, food, comfort)
  - Safety (safe from attack)
  - Belongingness and Love
  - Esteem (to feel value of self)
  - Self-actualization (to reach one's potential)

- Manager's assumptions about people become self-fulfilling prophecies. If you have low expectations you will get low productivity.
Conflict

If conflicts arise people tend to:

- withdraw
- become apathetic, passive, indifferent
- resist (sabotage, featherbedding, deception)
- try to climb hierarchy to better jobs
- form groups (unions)
- teach children negative things about work

Improving HR Management

- Invest in People
  - hire right
  - Reward well
  - Provide job security
  - Promote from within
  - Train and Educate Dewey: Learn by doing OJT
  - Share the wealth
- Empowerment
  - Autonomy and Participation
  - Job Enrichment and Cross-Utilization
  - Teaming
  - Democracy and Egalitarianism
- TQM = Total Quality Management
- T-Groups: "sensitivity training," participants and researchers quorum after session to discuss observations. Trainers and participants join in groups as a sort of "plenary." Honest feedback is crucial.
- Survey workers re motivation, communication, leadership, climate.
- OD = Organization Development became product of TQM, T-groups, and Surveys.
- Groups needed to solve problems
  - creates informal roles with so many formal roles around
  - informal rules evolve
  - develop listening skills
  - agree on basics
  - search for commonness
  - Experiment
  - Doubt your infallibility
  - differences of personalities are a groups responsibility
- Groups create shared vision, Leader steers the ship.
Political Frame

Sees organizations as alive screaming arenas.

**Focus of the political Frame is not on resolution of conflict, but on strategy and tactics.**

- Organizations are coalitions
- differences among coalition members
- scarce resources
- scarce resources and differences = conflict
- bargaining, negotiating, jockeying
- POWER

**PF Insists Orgs are Coalitions**

- Org should clear and consistent goal(s)
- established by person with authority
- articulate between structural and political.
  - result can be confusing with multiplicity of goals
  - many in conflict

Power

- Authority is just one power
- recognizes people
- recognizes resources
- forces groups to articulate need and to mobilize
- produces reality
- players = authority + partisans
- to those with info and expertise
- who does rewarding has power
- coercive
- alliances and networks
- Access and control of agendas
- Control of meaning and symbols
- Personal power

Conflict

- not a problem as much as something is amiss
- not to be resolved as much as to form strategy and tactic
- has benefits and costs
- natural and inevitable
- challenges *status quo*
- encourages new ideas and approaches
- Horizontal: between groups, depts
- Vertical: between levels
- Cultural: groups with diff values, traditions, beliefs. Imported
Summary

- Managers should be "constructive" politicians.
- Political frame offers different perspectives

Symbolic Frame

Organizations reek of symbolism from the edifices they work in to their mascots, colors, and products. That some company names have become words, ie xerox, scotch tape, coke, attest to the power of symbolism.

- Meaning, belief, and faith are central to symbolism
- Not what happened but what it means
- How people interpret
- Life is ambiguous
- Symbols are created to eliminate confusion, ambiguity
- To provide direction, and anchor hope and faith
- They form culture tapestry, myths, rituals, ceremonies, and stories.
- Sees life as more fluid than linear
- Embody and express culture
- Symbols help find meaning in chaos, give clarity in confusion, predictability in mystery
  - Myths, fairy tales, stories provide explanations
  - Rituals and ceremonies give heritage
  - Metaphor, humor, and play loosen up and provide depth to situation.
- Myths: Provide stories behind the story. They can blind us to new info and learning opportunities. Myths are not authority. They can keep us sane. All orgs rely on myths or sagas. Myths create internal cohesion, sense of direction, confidence.
- Stories & Fairy Tales: They convey info, morals, values.
- Ritual: Gives structure and meaning to daily life. Morning Coffee. Used to create order, clarity, and predictability. Initiate newcomers.
- Ceremony: Grander than Ritual, more elaborate, less frequent. They punctuate special events.
- Metaphor, Humor, & Play show "as if" quality of symbols. Metaphor: Cook says he is a professional, an artist, a business person and a worker. Humor allows for loosening of tension.
- Organizations are cultures
- Meetings attract people, problems and solutions
- An org without a plan is rudderless, short-sighted, and reactive.
- Plans are symbols
- Plans become games
- Plans become excuses for interaction
- Plans become advertisements
- Evaluations are a ritual to appease the natives.
- Evaluation is high drama and symbolizes success or failure.
- Power is inherently ambiguous
- Orgs are judged primarily by appearance or symbols
Leading Principles

- How one becomes a member is important
  - done by ritual, applying, interviewing etc
- Diversity gives competitive edge
- Example, not command, holds team together
- Specialized Language fosters cohesion and commitment
- Stories record History and Give Group Identity
- Humor and Play Reduce Tension and Encourage Creativity
- Informal players contribute disproportionately to Formal Roles
- Soul is the Secret of success
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