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INTRODUCTION

Each year some 2,000 school districts (24) throughout the country seek men to fill the vacated position of school superintendent. The laws of most states fail to require or even mention the employment of a superintendent of schools, but make the school board responsible for the administration of the public schools (51). Since a board can act only when it is in session, it must depend on an executive officer, the superintendent, to act for it in performing the daily details of school administration. Ideally, the board is searching for an administrator who can perform at the highest level maximizing the educational potential for the community and its children.

This demand for quality performance makes the superintendent's position extremely important, so important that writers in this area preface their articles with statements such as the one which appears in the American Association of School Administrators 24th Yearbook (2, p.69).

No task confronted by a board of education can be more important than that of obtaining a highly competent head executive when a vacancy in that office arises.

Such emphasis puts a burdensome responsibility upon the board of education in their selection procedures, on professors of educational administration, and institutions that prepare administrators.

Each year there are certificated candidates for the superintendency who seek positions and are selected over other qualified candidates. Assuming leadership qualities are evident in these candidates, are there qualifications and characteristics that are deemed more desirable by the selecting body, the board of education? Do variables of school size or
wealth of the district influence boards in their selection of a superintendent?

This study was to determine the characteristics which influence boards of education in selecting their superintendent, and the administrative behavior desired by such boards in their chief school administrator.

Boards of education have been in existence since early colonial days. In 1646 Massachusetts law (58) made it necessary for each community of 50 families or more to establish and maintain a school. This resulted in a large increase in the number of schools and brought about the appointment of "selectmen" who visited the schools and reported back at the town meetings on the school's operation.

Massachusetts law of 1826 (58) established school committees, or boards of education as they were later called, separate from other governing agencies. This committee served in a dual capacity of an executive as well as a legislative body. Its authority was limited only by state law or the will of the people in their selection of local board members. Thus, the board of education became the only agency in a given community empowered by law to operate public elementary and secondary schools. Knezevich described the board as the instrument through which local control over the operation of the school was maintained (30, p.213).

The school district is a quasi-municipal corporation, and the school boards are the officers of this corporation. They exercise those powers which are (1) granted in expressed words, (2) those which can be fairly implied as necessary or incidental to the powers expressly granted, and (3) those essential to the realization of purposes of educational
The board of education has the responsibility of providing for and maintaining schools within its local district. Such responsibility involves providing for and maintaining a building, the selection of a staff, securing equipment and supplies, adopting regulatory and operational policy, as well as other tasks related to the educational system. The power exists only in the board, as individual members have the authority of the office only during called board meetings and have no power to act individually.

In Iowa, boards of education are elected on a nonpartisan ballot for a three year overlapping term. They may be elected from specific areas or at large, and in many cases both procedures are used. For example, a board member may be elected from each area being served with the remaining members being elected at large. The size of the boards varies from three to seven members with larger boards being more common in cities and reorganized districts. Board members receive no monetary compensation for their services in Iowa.

Since its conception, the superintendent's role has changed a great deal and requires boards of education to be more selective. Griffith (24) has categorized the superintendent's development into three stages. The first period (1837-1910) saw the superintendent's responsibility limited largely to instruction and advising the board of education. The second stage (1910-1945) was labeled the "businessman" superintendent. Here he became the executive officer of the board of education, emphasizing efficiency in operation and made educational decisions based
upon business criteria. Democratic administration was the prevailing ideology. In the third and present period (1943—) the superintendent has entered a time wherein his position is viewed as that of a professional school administrator.

Along with the changes in the superintendent's responsibility have come demands from State Departments of Public Instruction for increased training and requirements for certification. Boards of education have the responsibility for selecting the public school superintendent. The qualifications and characteristics which influence the board of education should be of great importance.

The Problem

Numerous studies have been made in reference to the existing characteristics and qualifications of public school superintendents. The initial problem of this study was to identify and examine those characteristics and qualifications deemed most desirable for superintendents by board representatives of the 455 public high school districts in Iowa. A secondary aspect of the study was to compare these qualifications and characteristics sought by boards with selected variables of the communities.

Research conducted by Boardman (5), Coker (12), Glassburner (21), and Weber (41) indicated a positive relationship between the success of the administrator and his ability to perform in a democratic manner. If boards desire to employ a successful superintendent, it must be assumed that boards of education will seek a superintendent who practices
democracy in the execution of his duties. Therefore, a third area investigated was the identification and examination of the administrative behavior sought by boards of education in their superintendent.

The specific objectives were:

1. To determine characteristics and qualifications of the superintendent desired by boards of education.
2. To examine other factors which may influence the board in its selection of a superintendent.
3. To determine the desired administrative behavior sought by boards of education.
4. To compare the characteristics, qualifications, and administrative behavior desired by board representatives with (1) size of school enrollment and (2) wealth of the district.

Assumptions

This study was based upon the following assumptions:

1. That board presidents' perceptions toward selected variables are representative of the board they represent.
2. That individual boards of education seek superintendents who possess certain characteristics and that these characteristics can be identified by board presidents.
3. That leadership qualities are possessed by persons certified to hold the position of superintendent.
Purpose of the Study

The purposes of the study were:

1. To provide an overview of the characteristics and qualification factors influencing boards of education in the selection of their superintendent of schools.

2. To assess the attitudes of board representatives toward the desired administrative behavior of the superintendent.

3. To compare the characteristics, qualifications, and administrative behavior desired with community variables to determine if a relationship exists.

4. To provide data for administrators entering the field so they may be more cognizant of factors which may influence their employment.

5. To provide information for professors of educational administration and institutions charged with the preparation of, and inservice education for, school administrators.

Definition of Terms

In order to clarify the meaning of the terms used in this study, the following definitions were made:

District wealth: The assessed valuation per resident child in average daily attendance (ADA) in the high school district.

Perception: The abstract qualities of insight and/or intuition innately possessed by board members, which influence their decisions concerning the desirable characteristics of the administrator.

Administrative behavior: Behavior to stimulate and support organized
efforts for getting integrated action that will be acceptable to educators in the advancement of educational goals.

Democratic behavior: Behavior recognizing man as an intelligent being, able to think and reason, and also upon recognition of the personal worth and dignity of each individual; recognition of the right of each individual to participate freely in intelligent discussion and decision upon all issues which concern him. This right may be exercised by the individual himself or may be delegated to representatives freely selected by the individual concerned, carrying with it acceptance of responsibility by the group for actions freely taken.

Autocratic behavior: Behavior which stresses obedience and productivity characterized by aloofness from the group and discouragement of inter-member communication except as channeled through him, monopolizing initiatory action, making decisions and giving directions without consulting others. This definition is similar to that used by Warters (60).

Sources of Data

Data for this study were obtained from two major sources, the State Department of Public Instruction and members of the Boards of Education in Iowa school districts. The former provided enrollment data and lists of schools, board members, their addresses, and district wealth. A questionnaire was devised and used to obtain information from school board members regarding their perception of desirable personal and professional characteristics of school superintendents.
Reliability of the questionnaire was enhanced by conducting personal interviews with 10 board presidents in the stratified sample. These interviews also provided an opportunity to secure additional information regarding factors which influence boards in the selection of a superintendent.

Delimitations

The scope of this investigation was confined to (1) a study of the personal and professional characteristics deemed desirable in the superintendent as perceived by Iowa school board presidents, (2) factors which may influence boards in the selection of the superintendent, (3) district and community characteristics in those districts which maintained a public high school during the 1966-67 school year.

Board presidents were selected as respondents because of the common practice among boards of education to rotate the presidency among their members. Thus board presidents were thought to be representative of the board they serve.

The perception of personal and professional characteristics of superintendents were limited to administrative behavior, age, experience, training, race, religion, and marital and family status. Community characteristics were limited to enrollment sizes and wealth of the local district. The balance of the statements in the questionnaire provided board presidents the opportunity to examine other factors which may influence their selection of the superintendent.
Organization of the Study

The material presented in this study was divided into five chapters. The first chapter includes an introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, basic assumptions, the purpose of the study, definition of terms, sources of data, and scope of the study. The second chapter contains a summarization and analysis of related literature and research. The methodology and design for the study are discussed in the third chapter. The fourth chapter includes a presentation and discussion of the data collected from the board presidents. The fifth and final chapter of the study presents a summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations for further study.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In studying the literature relating to characteristics sought by boards of education in their superintendent, numerous articles can be located which have been written on how boards should proceed in their selection process. Other articles have been written and studies made on the profile of the superintendent, selected characteristics and/or traits of practicing school administrators. However, research on factors influencing boards in their selection and the qualifications desired in a superintendent has been neglected until as recent as 1950. Since this time, several researchers have probed into this area.

Literature cited and related research reviewed was categorized into five general areas: (1) Selection procedures used by boards of education when seeking a new superintendent, (2) Factors which boards consider when selecting a new chief administrator, (3) Democratic administrative behavior of public school administrators, (4) Measurement of attitudes, and (5) Characteristics and qualifications of practicing school administrators.

Selection Procedures

White (62) found when studying the characteristics of local school board policy manuals that provisions governing the selection of personnel appeared in 95 percent of the manuals. This indicates the importance placed upon the selection process.

Many articles have been written regarding these procedures. The bulk of such writings has been position papers rather than actual studies in
the field. Writers of these articles are usually board members or school superintendents who have recently gone through the mechanics for selection. Ogden (46) found that even though numerous articles had been written, they tended to emphasize what should be considered when selecting a new superintendent, but little data are available as to what factors are considered.

In 1962 Duluth, Minnesota, was in the process of selecting a new superintendent. The board of education had never experienced hiring a new superintendent as their present school head had served 18 years in this position prior to his announcement of retirement.

School board member Mundt (41) relates the procedures which his board followed. Initially a three-man committee was selected to spearhead the drive. The committee sought assistance from the State Commissioner of Education and followed standard procedures. The criteria or tangible qualifications sought by the committee were:

1. Age 45 to 55.
2. A proven administrator.
3. A Ph.D. degree preferred.
4. A married man with a family.
5. A man who has had classroom experience.
7. Offices, affiliations, and distinctions in educational and community work.

The recommended procedures for selecting a superintendent are enumerated by most writers in this area. Ellena's (20, p.16) 11 step process includes most of those listed by such writers.
1. Make a public announcement of the vacancy.
2. Get consultation assistance if you need it.
3. Tell applicants where to apply.
4. Draw up specifications for the job.
5. Select a special committee to canvass for prospective candidates.
6. Provide consideration for local applicants.
7. Screen applicants to narrow the field.
8. Go visit the applicants in their present community.
9. Involve the whole board in the final selection.
10. Inform the public upon the selection made.
11. Don't forget to return to placement bureaus all credentials and confidential letters.

Ellena summarized his article by stating that a well-planned program aimed at selecting the best available individual as superintendent required:

- Appreciation on the part of the board of the nature and importance of a good superintendent. Determination of desirable characteristics that should be possessed by a superintendent. A plan to identify desirable prospects and to screen them and the use of sound procedures in making the selection and appointment after the data had been collected.

The practice of using professional assistance is widely recommended. Seventy-five percent of a nationwide sampling of superintendents (44) recommended this practice. The cost for such services is less than 20 percent of a superintendent's yearly salary (26). Some boards make a practice of using the assistance of the retiring superintendent as reported by Huggett (25), but this practice is not supported by all. Kenney (29) believed that when a practice such as this was used the tendency was to
name a person who reflected the retiring superintendent's image, minimizing the introduction of new ideas. Similar situations occur when boards elevate an assistant within the system to the post of superintendent of schools. Kenney called such a practice the "Mirror Effect."

McCarty's (35) study of succession in the superintendency indicated that the appointment of a superintendent provided an excellent opportunity to determine future policy. His findings revealed a significant proportion of school districts have found that 10 years of the same operation are enough. After 10 years of one superintendent, vital school systems will probably select a man from outside their system. The converse is true when the tenure of the retiring superintendent has been less than 10 years.

Promotion from within the system has been shown by Ogden and Pulley to be a factor of size. Ogden (46) reported that, of the California schools he studied, some 50 percent favored promotion from within the system. The larger the school, the greater the trend for such practices. Pulley (50) found in his nationwide study that in schools below 500 enrollment, about 30 percent of the new superintendents were appointed from within the system as compared with 55 percent in schools of 4,000 and above.

In comparing the findings of Pulley or Ogden with that of McCarty's, consideration must be given to the recency of McCarty's study and that his conclusions were based upon superintendents' tenure upon retiring. According to Meisnner (37), the difficulties involved in the selection process are in direct proportion to the size of the community and size of
The University of Wisconsin Teacher Placement Bureau conducted a survey to ascertain what matters are discussed with board members during interviews (55, p.46). It found the following:

1. The administrator raised the majority of the questions.

2. Most candidates introduced questions concerning their limits of authority and the office facilities available, whereas boards showed a marked interest in the academic training they wanted in their man.

3. Significant questions asked by the board as to each candidate's personal data and background dealt primarily with the applicant's previous administrative and work experiences, his marital and family status, amounts of graduate training in school administration courses, and his attitude and participation in social service activities.

4. The average length of such interviews was 73 minutes.

The selection process used by boards of education was examined by Baker (4) in 13 midwestern states in 1948-1951. His data were obtained by way of a check list sent to superintendents, board chairmen, and personal interviews with newspaper editors, superintendents, and board members. His findings revealed that (1) lack of planning is characteristic of most boards of education in selecting a superintendent, (2) boards seldom use faculty members in the selection process, and (3) boards of education tend to place a high value upon the candidate's experience in the superintendency.

Whether information on the candidate is obtained by interview or other means, writers agree that the candidate's training, experience,
character, past performance, special achievements, and personal qualities are of utmost importance to the board. Within these areas individual differences will disclose influencing factors that ultimately determine the selection.

Factors Boards Consider When Selecting a New Superintendent

The previous section of this chapter reported on the selection procedures commonly used by boards of education in their search for and employment of an administrator. In this portion of the review, the factors which should be and are considered will be examined.

Few studies have been prepared in this area and those that have been found were prepared in the early 1950's. A more recent study, reportedly conducted at the University of Nebraska in 1965 by Albert, was sought in an attempt to obtain more recent data but this search proved fruitless. The data that have been reviewed on influencing factors and desired characteristics may be compared with that obtained by this study.

The factors involved in the selection of public school superintendents in the United States were examined by Pulley (50) for the years 1949-1951. In this nationwide study the schools were stratified by size of community into city schools (over 2,500 population) and rural schools (2,500 and less). A questionnaire was prepared and sent to a sample of board presidents to examine selected characteristics they desired in their superintendent and operative board policies relating to the selection process. Newly appointed superintendents were also surveyed regarding selected characteristics they possessed and factors they felt influenced
their appointment.

The results obtained from board presidents indicated the following:

1. Staff members, lay groups, and local professional associations were generally not included in the selection process. Less than 13 percent consulted teachers while less than eight percent used lay groups or local professional associations.

2. The majority of the boards obtained assistance from College and University Placement Bureaus, State Departments of Education, and College Departments of Education.

3. Job specifications were drawn up in one form or another by 75 percent of the boards.

4. The majority of the boards required their superintendent to be over 30 years of age while almost 40 percent indicated no age preference.

5. In 85 percent of the cases such a position was limited to men.

6. A married man with a family was considered necessary by 31 percent of the districts.

7. Most generally the master's degree was a minimum requirement with four percent of city schools requiring a doctor's degree compared to 1.6 percent of the rural schools.

8. Over two-thirds of the districts made a practice of visiting the candidate's community.

9. Almost one-half of the boards required a unanimous vote necessary for the appointment of the school superintendent.

The board presidents indicated the most difficult problem in the selection of a new superintendent was making the final choice from top
people who were about equal in qualifications. Several recommendations were made:

1. Make sure you visit the applicant's community.
2. Take time to investigate the candidate.
3. The first step should be consultation with College Placement Bureaus and State Departments of Education.
4. Look for young people on the way up instead of someone who is willing to coast.
5. The possibility of using a group discussion technique with several candidates participating to determine leadership skill in working with small groups. (This technique is not supported by superintendents, according to a survey report (44) appearing in The Nations Schools.)

In general, it was found that boards are widely divergent in their methods of selection and most do not have a set procedure which they follow. Those in smaller communities seek younger men, and as school enrollment increases, the tendency is to want an older man.

Data obtained from the newly appointed superintendents disclosed that the majority of them were 40 to 50 years of age and had a minimum of a master's degree. Over 39 percent of the city superintendents had held a similar position with a median 8.7 years of experience compared with 33 percent and 5.7 years of experience for rural superintendents. Almost half of them had been invited to apply for the position. The data examined indicated that as schools became large, there was more promotion from within the system. Better than 44 percent of the superintendents in schools of over 4,000 were promoted from within compared to 29 percent in
Areas considered by superintendents to be major factors in their selection were their background of experience, professional preparation, personnel handling, and personal recommendations. Other areas considered influential were: personal appearance, experience within the school system, age, and marital status.

Factors influencing governing boards of California high schools in the selection of their chief administrator were examined by Ogden (46). An extensive list of professional and personal traits, mannerisms, and personality items was prepared and sent to every school board member of a high school district in California. Board members were asked to respond favorably, unfavorably, or immaterially to this list of items. Other statements were prepared to determine influential factors in their selection process.

Ogden's study, among other things, revealed the following salient points: (1) The personality of an administrator was the strongest factor influencing board members in their selection of a new administrator. (2) Administrative experience, educational background, and the board's evaluation of the school currently headed by the candidate were factors of primary importance influencing boards' decisions. (3) Few California schools had developed stated criteria to guide them in their selection procedures. (4) The practice of a majority of the California school districts was to select their new administrator from outside the local school system. (5) In selecting administrators, school boards favored relatively young men. Administrators who were 50 years of age or more,
regardless of experience, were exceptions if elected to a new administra-
tive position.

In general, California boards preferred a family man between the ages of 40 and 50. He should have had experience at the high school level and promotion from within the system was likely in larger schools. The advanced degree was desired with his index of worth as an administrator being measured by his loyalty to his staff. Administrative experience, educational background, evaluation of the school the candidate presently heads, and his personal recommendations were most important while age, marital status, degree held, and religious affiliation were considered to a lesser degree.

These studies have revealed that boards are selective and that certain factors are considered more heavily than others in weeding out candidates for appointment to the position of superintendent of schools. The role of the superintendent has been shown to vary with the times. The growing concern for the protection of individual rights has prompted a new dimension to be added for purposes of this study, the examination of desired administrative behavior.

Democratic Administrative Behavior of Public School Administrators

As was previously brought out in chapter one, the selection of a highly competent superintendent is considered the most important function of a board of education. In order to view his position and administra-
tive behavior in its proper and present environment, a brief review must be made of the superintendent, his position, and influence upon the
educational process.

The origin of the public school superintendent is traced back to 1837 when Buffalo, New York, and Louisville, Kentucky, created this position (30). The duties of the first superintendents were concerned with coordination, instructional supervision, and the grading of attendance centers. The superintendent was responsible for carrying out the demands of the board of education and had little influence in forming local educational policy. This was due, to some degree, by the lack of training and experience necessary to hold such a position. As the growth and importance of educational institutions have evolved, the training and experience necessary for the administrator has increased and the purposes of the chief administrator have changed.

Today, we see the public school superintendent as an initiator of ideas, an improver and expander of the quality of education, a man of knowledge, training and experience, acting as a consultant to the board of education and community in regard to the educational process. Roald Campbell (9, p.53) describes the function of the superintendent in the following manner.

To define and clarify the purpose and direction of the schools, to establish and maintain an organization to work at these purposes, and to secure and allocate resources needed by the organization.

Bernard Donovan, superintendent of New York City schools (15, p.55), wrote that "... the superintendent of schools must be all things to all men these days. However, he should still be the leader of his profession in his area."

The public school superintendent is still in the position of
implementing board action, but he has a great deal more influence upon what this action will be than his predecessor. According to Douglas (16, p.3), the traditions, environment, and ideals of our country have been reflections of the school and its curriculum to a greater degree than any other single agency in society. "This function of the school has served at all levels of social and cultural development from the most primitive forms of society to such highly complex societies as our modern democracies."

Thus, the educational system is charged with the responsibility of perpetuating a particular way of life. The cultures of ancient countries, as well as present totalitarian and democratic nations, have relied upon the educational system to maintain their culture.

The basic fact so far as nationalism and education are concerned is that nationalism is nurtured and developed through the process of education both in school and out . . . It is no exaggeration to say that developing citizens loyal to our country is the first concern of the American schools, as it is the first concern of schools in every nation-state (7, p.157).

As democratic behavior is not inherited, it must be learned. The degree to which democracy is practiced within the educational environment is dependent on the manner in which the school is administered. How well a democracy works depends upon how ably it is led. Ward Miller (39), and Miller and Spalding (38) support this contention and feel that the main function of the school administrator should be the promotion of democracy.

Similar support may be gained from Neil Sullivan, school superintendent at Berkley, California, as he wrote (57, p.53):

Superintendents face new pressures, new challenges, new expectations on the part of staff members and the public alike.
Implementing board action; but he has a great deal more influence upon what this action will be than his predecessor. According to Douglas (16, p.3), the traditions, environment, and ideals of our country have been reflections of the school and its curriculum to a greater degree than any other single agency in society.

This function of the school has served at all levels of social and cultural development from the most primitive forms of society to such highly complex societies as our modern democracies.

Historically the country's educational system was charged with the responsibility of perpetuating a particular way of life.

... nationalism is nurtured and developed through the process of education both in school and out ... It is no exaggeration to say that developing citizens loyal to our country is the first concern of the American schools, as it is the first concern of schools in every nation-state (7, p.157).

This traditional point of view has been subject to challenge by many segments of American society today as they seek to insure the freedom of critical thinking individuals.

As democratic behavior is not inherited, it must be learned. The degree to which democracy is practiced within the educational environment is dependent on the manner in which the school is administered. How well a democracy works depends upon how ably it is led. Ward Miller (39), and Miller and Spalding (38) support this contention and feel that the main function of the school administrator should be the promotion of democracy.

Similar support may be gained from Neil Sullivan, school superintendent at Berkley, California, as he wrote (57, p.53):

Superintendents face new pressures, new challenges, new expectations on the part of staff members and the public alike.
Too many act as though these are inherently threatening and to be resisted. If the superintendent sees his role as an autocrat, the "great white father"; if he regards his position as a sinecure; if he is unwilling to accept gracefully the changing role of the schools and fails to recognize the need for innovation, he is obsolete. On the other hand, if he is willing to work as the leader in a cooperative venture to innovate, to seek improved ways of making the schools relevant to the needs of individual students and of the society he will find his position is one of the most crucial in our society today.

The degree to which educators believe such contentions may be shown by the fact that it is difficult to find educators and school administrators who repudiate the democratic methods and advocate authoritative administrative methods. Studies indicate that approximately 95 percent of the school's professional staff, administrators and teachers, believe that schools must be operated democratically. Such beliefs are not always supported by practice.

We can think of not a few administrators who practice autocracy while they preach democracy. This contradiction between words and deeds can best be understood not as a manifestation of hypocrisy but rather as a manifestation of underlying conflicting drives whose full nature is beyond the conscious awareness of the individual.

Pounds and Bryner point up the discrepancies between theory and practice by noting

... the persistence of autocratic administrator-teacher relationships and teacher-pupil relationships long after the development of the democratic society.

They contended that social or cultural lag of the school may be classified under the headings of administration, curriculum, methods, and teacher-pupil relations.

The lag between theory and practice is not confined to the administration of schools but exists in the related areas listed above. Mort and
Cornell (40) pursued an extensive study of the practices of Pennsylvania schools in adopting new ways and procedures. They found that once a worthwhile innovation was discovered, it took another extended period of time for adaptation and acceptance. Taylor et al. (59, p.23) writing in the National Educational Journal expressed it in this manner: "... a great and immediate need exists for speedy action to close the gap between what is known through research and what is applied in educational practice." Thus, our time might well be described by future educational historians as the beginning state in the development of theory and practice in democratic educational administration.

Common experience has taught us that some individuals are more successful than others in getting something done. It is often thought that such persons know the right people or they have been in the right place at the opportune time to turn a situation to their favor. During the past several decades, many concentrated studies have been made to determine what makes for good leadership.

Studies of leadership in small groups (63) have indicated that democratic type of leadership has been more effective in our society than authoritarian. Leadership implies getting work done and is associated with the attainment of group objectives through cooperative efforts. Cooperation is based on the faith that individual staff members can achieve these objectives through cooperative efforts. The situation facing the administrator is to obtain a general feeling of well-being among members of the staff so that all members will pull together for the pursuit of the common purpose. Such a feeling is identified as morale.
Morale will be furthered by general atmosphere in the school system. Salaries, working conditions, and availability of instructional supplies and equipment are related to morale. Although salaries are important, an increase in salary will not reduce emotional pressures on teachers. Democratic school administration which attempts to release the abilities of teachers, develop a democratic spirit in supervision, and open lines of communication are conducive to the development of morale (30, p.384).

Education in the United States is challenged by the following quotation: "The paramount goal of the United States was set long ago. It is to guard the rights of the individual, to insure his development, and to enlarge his opportunities" (22, p.1). The statement of the Educational Policies Commission, in 1961, supported this idea by stressing the importance of developing critical thinking individuals to protect the social order's principal goal: freedom (43).

It is important that the school administrator recognize this objective and seek to carry it out by providing the organizational climate necessary to foster such goals. In order to maximize these goals, the organizational structure must reflect an atmosphere which encourages individuals working willingly and eagerly toward common goals.

The organizational structures have been the subject of intensive research by theorists in the field of administration. One of the most well known, McGregor, examined conventional organizations and stated:

"... conditions imposed by conventional organizational theory and by the approach of scientific management for the past half century have tied men to limited jobs which do not utilize their capabilities, have discouraged the acceptance of responsibility, have encouraged passivity, have eliminated meaning from work (36, p.89)."

To counteract the practices of such organizations, McGregor proposed a theory of management, which he called Theory Y, that attempts to free
people from the too-close control of conventional organizational structures, giving them a greater degree of freedom to direct their own activities, to assume greater responsibility, and to satisfy their egoistic needs.

Theory Y is based upon the idea that human behavior is not a consequence of man's inherent nature. It is a consequence rather of the nature of organizations, of management philosophy, policy, and practice.

The present hierarchical design of school administration is attacked by Eaton (17, p.77) who believed that confusion and the inability to achieve our educational goals are the obvious outcomes where one preaches democracy in an authoritarian organization.

No longer must we blindly acquiesce to an idea which is directly opposed to our democratic values. Not only are the so-called principles of hierarchical organization but shaky myths, they are not in sympathy with the values of democracy. It might well be asked what effect authoritarian organization in the public schools has on youngsters who are taught ideals of democracy. Children are not blind nor are they innately stupid. By mere observation, it should be clear to them that what is being taught in the classroom regarding human dignity and democracy is not in accord with the operation of the school.

It must be noted that authorities in the field of educational administration have supported the theory of democratic school administration. Research in this area, however, has been largely confined to the school principal's level.

Lein (32, pp.80-82) studied the democratic practices of secondary principals in the upper-midwest. The democratic characteristics he found common among authorities in this field are included in the following pages, as they were guideposts for the situations in part two of the questionnaire developed for this study.
1. He respects the inherent worth and dignity of each individual.

2. He is considerate, sensitive, mild, jovial, personal, confiding, objective, truthful, patient, courteous, sincere, and shows restraint in his personal and professional relationships.

3. He is prone to guide suggestions, stimulate self-direction, effectively communicate all information needed for greater understanding, show and praise ideas that come from others.

4. He is open-minded and flexible, receptive to new ideas, and understanding of those who deviate from the norm.

5. He accepts himself and is relatively free from ego-contempt; he is not overly concerned with self-dignity, tends to speak in terms of the group rather than of self, and shares credit for success with subordinates.

6. He invites adverse criticism, and organizes in a manner which makes suggestions and criticism easily obtained from others without their fearing reprisal or antagonism.

7. He frees himself from routine details, knows how to delegate duties by distributing leadership throughout the group rather than focusing it upon himself or upon a select few, pushes others into the foreground so that they may taste success, and is concerned with the growth of others.

8. He is extremely concerned with the process used in accomplishing a task, seeking to provide an opportunity for all those who are affected by a decision to have an appropriate part in its determination and implementation, as well as with the product or end result of that task.

9. He stresses continuous evaluation of present practices in a never-ending search for improving the school program.

10. He refers to the group the task of selecting those problems or areas of primary concern that necessitate group action.

11. He delegates to the group the power of decision making, in areas that affect and interest them, as often as possible, and will accept the decision of the group as final without exercising or displaying administrative veto, reservations, or sacred prerogatives.

12. He surveys the group for advice and counsel and is very
sensitive to their suggestions and desires when it is impossible to delegate to the group the power of decision-making.

13. He makes independent decisions in the light of previously adopted policy, and will inform the group of all decisions and the reasons for making them when it is impossible for him to consult with the group.

14. He encourages the formation of strong, vigorous, and active organizations for the purpose of enabling various groups concerned with the educational program to make their wishes felt.

15. He will not attempt to control groups formed for the purpose of making decisions, making recommendations, or appealing decisions.

16. He will encourage public participation in educational matters, but will not relinquish professional control in areas of professional jurisdiction.

17. He encourages student participation in school administration by encouraging formation of student organizations that enable students to have a voice in decision making as well as to provide an avenue for experiencing democracy in action.

18. He functions within the constitutional and legal restrictions imposed upon him and educational programs.

19. He exercises voluntary restraint when the common beliefs, attitudes, customs, or traditions that prevail in the community deem it proper for him to do so.

20. He recognizes the professional domain of those who work with him in the educational setting, and does not attempt to infringe upon the rights and privileges of those who operate within this domain unless they show incompetence which necessitates corrective action.

21. He recognizes regulatory standards as minimum standards, and seeks to operate above these minimum requirements by continuously implementing new ideas that may lead to improvement.

22. He encourages classroom teachers to apply corrective measures to himself when he shows incompetency, just as he would apply corrective measures to an incompetent teacher.
23. He accepts the responsibility delegated to him by the adult society to regulate the behavior of students entrusted to his care by applying restrictive and restraining measures, but grants to the students as much freedom as possible in regulating their own affairs.

24. He formulates as few rules and regulations as possible, only when it is within his jurisdiction to do so and when such action is needed to protect the freedom and welfare of the group or the individual.

25. He uses every possible means to help community members gain a good understanding of the school program.

26. He ensures true and equal representation of the whole when forming a group for making decisions, and ensures each member of the group equal power in determining the decisions.

27. He diligently works toward achieving equality of opportunity within the educational setting.

28. He recognizes individual differences; promoting individuals and accepting others as they are.

29. He protects and assists the school personnel in the conduct of their rightful duties and privileges.

30. He enforces decisions democratically formulated, equally, without fear or favor, in order to protect the welfare of the group and the rights and welfare of the individual.

A questionnaire based upon these characteristics was sent by Lein to three staff members in each of 205 schools with the intended purpose of determining the extent to which certain characteristic democratic administrative behaviors were exhibited by their principals. His instrument consisted of 25 questions each reflecting one characteristic democratic or undemocratic trait. Five responses were provided under each question classifying the level of democratic behavior practiced.

Lein found those principals who were included in the study did not, as a group, appear to exhibit characteristic democratic behavior in their administrative roles to the extent that would be expected in a democratic
social order. They did, however, behave significantly more democratically than undemocratically. This inconsistency in behavior may indicate that their behavior is governed more by the tasks which face them than by developed principles of administration.

Democratic administrators must cope with many difficult situations. Issues such as teachers' oaths, the censorship or discharge of teachers with unpopular and so-called radical views, and the militant attitudes of teachers all seem to refute the present administrative process.

This attitude among teachers was discussed at a conference at Iowa State University sponsored by the Iowa Department of Classroom Teachers April 1, 1967. James Thurston (33, p.6L), a National Education Association consultant, stated that teachers

after years of impossible assignments, intolerable conditions and inadequate pay are breaking out of their timidity and inferior feeling . . . They are seeking greater participation in the total educational program and that the new breed of teacher has an innate hunger to be doers and they resist having things done for them.

Greig (23) studied the working patterns of 27 secondary principals in Michigan and their effects on the opinions and attitudes of teachers. These principals were examined to determine whether their behavior was basically democratic or autocratic. Then the favorable or unfavorable attitudes or opinions of teachers under either relatively democratic or autocratic principals were investigated.

The 27 principals were ranked on the basis of the results obtained from the Principals Behavioral Check List. The two most democratic and two most autocratic were further studied. Opinions from the teachers in these four schools were obtained. The results of his study supported the
the following hypotheses:

1. The working patterns of the high school principal in Wayne County, Michigan, will tend to be more democratic than autocratic.

2. Principals will tend to perceive themselves as more democratic than teachers feel they are.

3. The opinions and attitudes of the teachers in high schools with relatively democratic principals are more favorable toward the working patterns of the principal than in the case of those with relatively autocratic principals.

4. Schools with relatively democratic principals have more adequate communication than those with autocratic principals.

5. Teachers under relatively democratic principals are professionally more satisfied than those teachers under relatively autocratic principals.

Such evidence indicates the teacher’s attitude is dependent upon the extent democratic administrative procedures are practiced by school administrators.

Coker (12) went a step further to identify characteristics in effective and ineffective school administrators. A classification committee composed of four educators, who had through their official position observed and evaluated 32 principals in a county school system, was chosen. This committee selected the 16 most effective and the 16 least effective principals. Staff members in these schools were then given the Tennessee Rating Guide to determine a set of personal behavioral characteristics which were believed to be essential for effective school leaders.
As a result of her study, she found that a principal's ability to use the opinions of others, an action indicating that the principal believed democratic means are essential to the attainment of democratic ends, was a significant factor contributing to the success of the administrator.

A study by Cali (6) was conducted to determine what chief school administrators think are some of the behaviors needed in order to operate effectively in their human relations with teachers. The results from 110 superintendents in eight counties of New York State indicated that democratic administration was of greatest importance. The categories identified and ranked in order were: (1) Democratic administration, (2) Group dynamics, (3) Interpersonal relations, (4) Recognition of individual differences, (5) Pupil-centered administration, (6) School-community relations, and (7) Cultural, ethnic group differences. According to his findings, superintendents in larger districts tended to value this democratic behavior consistently higher than those in smaller districts.

Weber (61) matched 20 schools in which there was large use of democratic practices with 20 others in which such practices were little used. He found schools using democratic practices were significantly better than those not using them in these matters:

1. Encouraging teachers to make creative solutions to school problems.
2. Helping teachers to understand school administrators and teachers' responsibilities.
3. Improving the mental and physical health of teachers.
4. Improving staff morale.

5. Improving teacher growth.

Evidence from researchers and writers in this area has indicated democratic administration as being the desired behavior for school administrators with its use resulting in more effective administration. Boards of education should show a strong desire to obtain a democratic superintendent as this review of the literature indicates that democratic behavior is one criteria for an effective administrator.

The Measurement of Attitudes

The word attitude has been defined by Shaw and Wright (54, p.1) as the end product of the socialization process, significantly influencing man's responses to cultural products, to other persons, and to groups of persons. Allport (1, p.45) defined it as a mental and neutral state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related. Robinson (53, p.45), in simple terminology, stated an attitude as a concept used to explain what happens between stimulus and response to produce an observed effect.

Even though a great deal of variation exists in the term attitude, Cardon (10, p.345) found one characteristic to be common.

Attitudes entail an existing predisposition to respond to social objects which, in interaction with situational and other dispositional variables, guides and directs the overt behavior of the individual.

According to Remmers (52), most measurements of attitudes are really measurements of opinions. Opinions, therefore, are expressed attitudes.
As previously indicated, this study is primarily concerned with measuring the responses of individual board presidents to characteristics deemed desirable in the superintendent.

In order to measure attitudes, certain assumptions must be made: that attitudes are measurable, common to the group, held by many people, and that they vary along a linear continuum. Of the psychological-measurement methods that depend upon the judgment of humans, rating-scale procedures seem to be the most popular. Their great ease and convenience with large groups give them unusual appeal. Since no scale was suitable for purposes of this study, it became necessary to construct such a scale.

The first step in the construction of an attitude scale is to obtain items or statements that will represent the universe of interest in a particular test. These statements may be obtained from magazine articles, editorials, books, individuals, or the investigator may personally prepare them.

Edwards (18, p.14) summarized previous work and compiled a list of suggested informal criteria for editing statements to be used in the construction of attitude scales.

1. Avoid statements that refer to the past rather than to the present.

2. Avoid statements that are factual or capable of being interpreted as factual.

3. Avoid statements that may be interpreted in more than one way.

4. Avoid statements that are irrelevant to the psychological object under construction.

5. Avoid statements that are likely to be endorsed by almost everyone or by almost no one.
6. Select statements that are believed to cover the entire range of the effective scale of interest.

7. Keep the language of the statements simple, clear, and direct.

8. Statements should be short, rarely exceeding 20 words.

9. Each statement should contain only one complete thought.

10. Statements containing universals such as all, always, none, and never often introduce ambiguity and should be avoided.

11. Words such as only, just, merely, and others of a similar nature should be used with care and moderation in writing statements.

12. Whenever possible, statements should be in the form of a simple sentence rather than in the form of compound or complex sentences.

13. Avoid the use of words that may not be understood by those who are to be given the completed scale.

14. Avoid the use of double negatives.

Although various techniques for the measurement of attitudes have been developed, the two most frequently used are the method of equal appearing intervals developed by Thurstone and Chave, and the summated rating technique developed by Likert (19).

Thurstone's equal appearing interval method requires a large number of nonmonotone items relating to the attitude objective. The steps involved in constructing a scale by this method are as follows:

1. A large number of items are collected.

2. These items are sorted by a sizeable number of judges into piles or categories which appear to the judges to be equally spaced in terms of the degree of agreement.

3. The categories are numbered, usually from 1 to 11 and a scale
value is computed for each item by averaging all judges' ratings.

4. The semi-interquartile range (Q value) is computed as a measure of interjudge variability and items for which there is much disagreement are rejected.

5. A small number of items are selected for the final scale so that they are spread evenly along the attitude continuum.

When the finished attitude scale is administered, the usual procedure is to ask the respondent to check each opinion that applies to him. It is expected that he will also mark a number of neighboring opinions. A median or mean of the scale values selected is taken as his score. It is recommended that the respondent be restricted to three or five opinions as more statements selected tend to obtain averages toward the neutral zone.

The Likert method of summated ratings is developed along lines more similar to those of ordinary test development. In preparation of Likert-type scales, the following procedures are used:

1. A large number of monotone items are selected.

2. These items are edited with the elimination of items failing to meet the prescribed standards.

3. The remaining items are presented to a sample group who respond by indicating their reaction to the items.

4. Responses to each item are on a 1 to 5 scale from strong agreement (5) to strong disagreement (1).

5. A score is given for each item depending upon the response made. The score for the individual is the sum of all scores for the separate
6. Internal consistency is used on items for the final scale. This consists of selecting the upper and lower 10 percent by way of total score and correlating the item responses with the total test score. Items showing the largest distance between the means of the two groups are retained.

7. The final scale is prepared.

The advantages of the Likert summated ratings are given by Murphy and Likert (42, p.75) to be: (1) it avoids the difficulties of using a judging group to construct the scale; (2) the construction of an attitude scale by the 1 to 5 method is much easier; (3) it yields reliabilities as high as those obtained by other techniques with fewer items; (4) it gives results comparable to those obtained by the Thurstone technique.

It should be noted that the Thurstone method gives absolute meaning to scale units and the individual score achieved while no such situation exists with Likert's method of summated ratings. Remmers (52) points out other differences in the process of measurement which are involved. In the Thurstone-type scales, a subject selects statements which lie close to his position on the continuum, and the further away statements appear in either direction on the continuum from his convictions, the less likely he is to endorse them. In the Likert-type scale, the subject responds to each item. A high score (relating to favorable responses) is obtained by subjects who make more strongly favorable responses to more of the items than subjects with less favorable responses. This represents the cumulative or summated type of measurement with the subject's attitude position
being determined by the amount of favorable responses to the items.

In reviewing the various scaling techniques available, consideration was given to the advantages of each. Since consensus of authorities indicate that results of both the Thurstone-type scale and Likert-type scales are comparable, a modification of the Likert summated rating scale was considered appropriate for this study.

Characteristics and Qualifications of Practicing School Administrators

The studies of Ogden (46) and Pulley (50) indicated that certain qualifications and characteristics were determining factors in the selection of the new superintendent. Studies of the characteristics possessed by practicing administrators will be examined here with the expectation that a comparison can be made between existing traits and those favored by board presidents to be more desirable.

The American Association of School Administrators and Research Division of the National Education Association (3) conducted a nationwide survey to ascertain the general characteristics of public school administrators, and published the results in 1960. The questionnaire was sent to all superintendents in cities of 2,500 population or more. Results were obtained from 3,812 respondents. Data obtained from this survey disclosed the median age of 51 years with age 54 being most frequently reported. Some 90 percent of all superintendents took their first administrative position before reaching age 35, with the average age reported as 28.

The average age for those obtaining their first superintendency was
slightly over 36, with a range from 20 to 55 years. Tenure in their present position indicated a median of eight years with some 35 percent who served less than five years and nine percent who had served 20 years or more.

Selected characteristics of Iowa superintendents were studied by Manatt (34) in 1955. Of the 814 superintendents in Iowa at this time, the median age reported was 45 years with older superintendents being found in schools with enrollments less than 25 and above 400. Fifty percent of the superintendents were between 40 and 50 years of age. The superintendents in 1955 had a median length of three years of service with tenure increasing with the size of the school. Almost one-fifth of the superintendents were new to their position.

Indications were that prior service in the district may have been a factor in their selection as more than 21 percent of the first entrants were promoted from within their district. Some 14 percent or 116 of the 814 superintendents had served in their district prior to attaining the superintendency.

The median age of first entrants to the superintendency was reported as 35 years of age. The median age of entrance into their present position was 40 years. The number entering between 51 and 60 years of age was 82, while eight took their position after reaching 61. The trend was for older superintendents to be appointed in smaller schools.

Of the 814 superintendents, all held the bachelor's degree and 601 held master's degrees. Again, the trend was for superintendents of larger schools to possess the most advanced training.
In 1965 Kramer (31) compared and analyzed selected characteristics of Iowa superintendents between 1955 and 1965. The data were gathered from the "Iowa Professional School Employee Data Sheet" (IPSEDS) on the 459 existing superintendents for the 1964-1965 school year and compared with the findings of Manatt in 1955.

The median age of superintendents was reported to be 47 years with a tendency for younger superintendents to hold this position in smaller schools. Forty-six percent of the superintendents were between 40 and 50 years of age. The median length of service in 1965 was four years with length of service in smaller schools less than in the larger schools. Nearly one-sixth of the superintendents were new to their positions with about four percent being first entrants to the superintendency. The percent of experienced superintendents holding the position in 1965 was greater than that found by Manatt in 1955. The decrease in number of school districts and superintendents' positions caused by district reorganization during this ten year period may have been a factor in the increase of experienced personnel.

The median age of first entrants to the superintendency was reported in 1965 to be 40 years compared with 35 years of age in the 1955 study. One-third, or six of 18 first entrants reported in 1965, were over 50 years of age. The more recent study indicated a trend toward older men entering the superintendency. The experienced older superintendents tend to receive appointments in smaller schools and/or larger systems.

Of the 459 superintendents, 439 held the master's degree with 36 of these holding advanced degrees. The trend for larger schools to have
superintendents with more training was again indicated in Kramer's study.

Characteristics listed by superintendents in 1965 to be most important in carrying out their tasks were: (1) The ability to see the whole picture - each problem in its broad context; (2) An unusual understanding of people; and (3) An unusual ability to live with a high pressure job. The fields of study considered most important by superintendents in the performance of their duties were listed as school finance, curriculum, and public relations in that order. Ogden's 1950 study indicated boards wanted superintendents with business management, curriculum, and public relations background, but failed to list school finance as an area of great importance.

The study of Iowa administrators conducted by Curtis (13) in 1966 yielded similar characteristics to those found by Kramer. Some 95 percent of the superintendents and high school principals held the master's degree. A large percent of the superintendents in larger districts served in that district prior to attaining the superintendency. This indicated a trend for promotion from within or hiring superintendents who were well-known by members of the board.

Smith (56) looked at Minnesota public school superintendents and described the average to be a native of the state who had attended a small city high school, held a major or minor in social studies at the undergraduate level, was less than 50 years of age, and a superintendent in a school enrolling fewer than 600 secondary pupils. He was holding either his first or second position as a superintendent, and had given 15 years of service to education.
The profile of existing characteristics seem to agree that the position of school superintendent is held by men of experience, background, training and preparation superior to that of his counterpart some 20 years ago. The real question of why he was selected over other qualified candidates has not been the intent of most studies in this area. This study examines the characteristics boards of education seek in the man to head their school as well as factors which may influence their selection.

The data examined relating existing characteristics to desired characteristics would indicate that boards do not emphasize the knowledge of financing schools or the degree held by the superintendent as important as superintendents. Boards seem to place a greater emphasis upon the personality of the man than upon his experience and educational background. Whether more recent data will support these findings remains as an area of interest in this study.

Summary

Certain general statements may be made concerning the information gathered from a review of the literature.

The selection of the superintendent of schools is considered one of the most important functions of the board of education. The selection methods used by boards vary a great deal but include, in one form or another, recommended procedures enumerated by authorities in the field.

The demand for greater preparation and an upgrading of the qualifications desired in the superintendent has grown with development of his role.
Many studies have been conducted examining existing characteristics of school administrators. These studies reveal that administrators are better educated, more experienced, and older than their counterparts of 25 years ago. Since boards of education have the power of appointment, other studies were reviewed disclosing factors which influence the boards' selection of a school superintendent. The area considered to be most influential was the candidate's personality. Other areas considered to be major influential factors are his training, experience, and past performance. Boards of education are taking more time and showing greater concern in the screening and selection processes to insure the appointment of a competent chief school administrator.

Size, or enrollment of the school district, was reported as a factor in both how a school district selected its administrator and the qualifications desired in the superintendent. Larger districts encourage and practice promotion from within their system selecting older, more experienced proven administrators to head their schools.

A review of the democratic theory of administration disclosed that a gap exists between what is desired and practiced in school administration. Most educators support the democratic theory of administration while the data reviewed indicated that administrators continue to operate schools in a somewhat autocratic manner. Research in administrative theory reveals that greater efficiency and productivity can be realized from a staff which is administered in a manner which shows greater respect for the inherent worth and dignity of each individual. Indications are that this gap is closing (48) as more attention is being given to the administrative and supervisory process involving more democratic practices.
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The problem of this study was to identify desirable characteristics for public school superintendents as perceived by board presidents representing the 455 public high school districts in Iowa.

This chapter describes the methods and procedures that were used to gather and analyze the required data for the study. The chapter has been divided into five parts: (1) Selection of the population, (2) Description of the instrument, (3) Construction of the instrument, (4) Collection of the data, and (5) Treatment of the data.

Selecting the Sample

The advantages of sampling as compared with complete enumeration as listed by Cochran (11) are reduced costs, greater speed, greater scope, and greater accuracy.

The first limitation of the study was to include only those Iowa districts which maintained a public high school district during the 1966-67 school year. This list was compiled from an official publication of the Iowa Department of Public Instruction (27).

It was further decided to use a random stratified sampling technique in order to examine whether or not those districts will be relatively homogeneous in their performance in this study. The 455 districts were stratified according to two characteristics, total school enrollment and district wealth. The most current data available for this purpose were based on the 1965-66 school year.

The intervals used for stratifying student enrollment were:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Those enrolling less than 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Enrollments from 500 to 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enrollments from 801 to 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Those enrolling more than 1,500 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The characteristic, wealth of the school district, was represented by the assessed valuation per resident child for each district. This measure was calculated as follows:

\[
\text{assessed valuation (dollars)} \div \text{average daily attendance} = \text{school district wealth}
\]

The intervals used for district wealth were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000 to $8,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$9,000 to $11,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the intervals for both characteristics had been selected, each of the 458 schools were placed in the appropriate stratum, and this listing comprised the sampling frame. Therefore, each school in the population could be uniquely represented by using the following notation:

\[X_{ijk} = \text{the } k\text{-th school in the } i\text{-th enrollment class and the } j\text{-th district wealth class}\]

where: \(i = 1,2,3,4; j = 1,2,3;\) and \(k = 1,2,3,\ldots;j\)

This yielded 12 strata from which schools were randomly selected for study.
Table 1. School districts as classed by total student enrollment and district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth (assessed valuation per resident child)</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be noted that a great deal of care was necessary in selecting the interval size to insure that each strata would provide an adequate number of school districts upon which the study was made. This stratifying technique provided a maximum of 108 school districts which were represented in this study. Nine school districts were randomly selected from each strata with the exception of 3-4 from which all nine districts were selected providing 108 districts sampled by the questionnaire in this study. These 108 school districts appear in Appendix A.

Description of the Instrument

The instrument used in collecting data for this study consisted of two parts (see Appendix C). The first part contained items relative to selected personal and professional characteristics sought by boards of education in superintendents, items concerning community characteristics, and other factors which may influence boards in their selection. The
selected characteristics included age, training, experience, marital and family status, religion, and race. The enrollment size and wealth of the district in which the board member serves were indicated by numerical codifications of the questionnaire sent to the board presidents.

The second part of the questionnaire was an opinion scale. It consisted of ten situations involving the superintendent's administrative behavior desired by the local board of education. Each situation covered an area of responsibility within the school community and the responses to these situations measured the desired administrative behavior on a five point scale ranging from democratic behavior to undemocratic behavior.

The basic assumption of the attitude scale was that responses to each of the situations covered the entire scale. The five possible responses to each situation were classified as democratic behavior, mostly democratic behavior, undeterminable behavior, mostly undemocratic behavior, and autocratic or undemocratic behavior.

Construction of the Instrument

The first part of the questionnaire was constructed to identify superintendents' characteristics sought by boards of education. The selected characteristics included age, training, experience, marital and family status, religious affiliation, and race.

After an extensive analysis of selected writings in democratic school administration and related areas, an instrument was devised to measure the administrative behavioral pattern of the superintendent desired by board members. Part two of the questionnaire described situations confronting
the superintendent with administrative problems. Responses to each situation were intended to classify the desired behavior into levels of democratic or undemocratic/autocratic behavior by meeting characteristics of democratic behavior enumerated by authorities in this area.

Lein (32), in his study to determine the extent that democratic behavior was exhibited by secondary principals, listed democratic characteristics he found common among writers. Creig (23), in his study to determine the working patterns of superintendents, devised a scoring scale where he identified the behavioral levels from democratic to undemocratic or autocratic based upon similar characteristics. The situations used in this study were patterned after those used by Creig.

After a conference with Iowa State University Testing Service officials, it was decided that a 20 member panel would enhance the reliability of the responses. With this recommendation in mind, ten situations (see Appendix B) were submitted to a 20 member judgment panel of educators who were asked to identify the responses to each situation as democratic behavior, mostly democratic behavior, balance between democratic and undemocratic behavior, mostly undemocratic behavior, and autocratic or undemocratic behavior. Such identifying behavioral patterns were unknown to the respondents of the questionnaire. Scale values of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 were respectively assigned to the response categories for scoring purposes. The acceptance level was set at 70 percent agreement and above on each response, or a mean deviation not to exceed a plus or minus .3 of the score established for this study. If the panel's agreement level was met but was not in agreement with the established score,
its judgment was accepted. Responses were rejected if they failed to achieve this acceptance level.

After the responses were scored and the acceptance level determined, they were examined to see if responses to each situation met the established criteria. All responses to situations 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 met the 70 percent agreement level and did not exceed the mean deviation of plus or minus .3 of the established score. Response D in situation 8, and C in situation 9 were accepted on the basis that 70 percent or more of the judgment panel were in agreement with the established score. Other responses to situations 8 and 9 were well within the established acceptance level.

Responses to situations 3 and 10 did not meet the standards established and were re-examined, changed, and resubmitted to a panel for scoring. The results obtained found all responses meeting the level for acceptance. The situations and panels' responses accepted for part two of the questionnaire were as follows:

Situation 1. A group of faculty members has questioned the superintendent's ideas or judgment at a faculty meeting. The superintendent should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panels' rating</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A. remind them that the major responsibility for the school is his and proceed with his ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B. discuss further and try for consensus; otherwise try for faculty study of the problem and accept their decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C. superintendent changes if the faculty is agreed; otherwise he goes along with his ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D. persuades them to see his point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E. discuss further; modifies his views to secure compromise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Situation 2. The school is making plans to change the curriculum. The administrator should:

1. A. make no use of the community for assistance in making the changes, relying upon the experience in the administrative staff.
2. B. use a planning committee with representation from the community and faculty with the intent of accepting their decision.
3. C. talk with individuals about the proposed change and form his decision from these talks.
4. D. use representatives to participate in a planning conference with the administration.
5. E. use a standing committee of faculty members and community leaders to study the problem.

Situation 3. The superintendent is aware of a teacher on his staff whose way of work he feels is harmful to the school. He should:

1. A. ask for his resignation.
2. B. refer the problem to a supervisor and tell him to correct it.
3. C. hold a conference with the teacher focusing on the problem bringing in complaints from others.
4. D. tell the teacher to "shape up or ship out!"
5. E. hold a conference with the teacher evaluating his total performance without bringing in any specific criticism.

Situation 4. The staff has proposed a salary study committee be formed to develop a more adequate salary schedule. The administrator should:

1. A. squelch the idea.
2. B. appoint members of the staff and board to such a committee.
3. C. permit the staff to form such a committee but refrain from giving advice and assistance.
4. D. agree to such a committee, participate in its organization offering assistance when asked to do so.
5. E. agree to such a committee composed of faculty, citizens, and board members. Offer advice and assistance when asked but refrain from taking an active part.

Situation 5. In preparing the school budget, the superintendent should:

1. C. figure the school budget himself as it is his responsibility.
2. B. use the staff, lay citizens, and students in planning the budget, discussing questionable items with the various representatives. Use their judgment in determining the needs.
4. A. ask his staff and department heads to get estimates from the faculty for supplies and equipment and submit them to him, the superintendent deleting items he feels unnecessary.
3  D. talk with department heads, get their estimates and delete
   items he feels unnecessary.
2  E. use last year's budget adding a common percent to each area
   to take care of items suggested by faculty and staff.

Situation 6. The churches in the community have been having difficulty
in conducting evening youth groups because of the activity
schedule at school. Existing board policy does not cover
this. The ministers have asked for school cooperation.
The administrator should:

1  A. issue a statement to the ministers that they may schedule their
   activities as they see fit but the school will continue to set
   their schedule. The problem is theirs, not the schools.
4  B. meet with them to hear and discuss the problems.
5  C. assist in organizing a group of faculty, lay citizens, church
   leaders, and administrators to plan activities which would
   allow a night for church activities during the week.
2  D. send a representative to hear their problem, report back to
   the administrator leaving him to act on the matter as he sees
   fit.
3  E. ask the ministers to submit a plan to him for consideration.

Situation 7. Faculty members have been complaining that supervisors are
not permitting them to teach their courses as they feel
they should. The administrator should:

1  A. ignore the complaints
3  B. propose a meeting for the supervisors discussing academic
   freedom but let them carry on as they see fit.
5  C. investigate the complaints, then call a meeting of the super­
   visors and discuss the situation to re-establish their role as
   a result of their consensus.
4  D. have in-service programs prepared for staff participation on
   the subject.
2  E. call staff's attention to the role of the supervisor indicating
   that they are instructed to follow their supervisors' demands.

Situation 8. A group of young wives in the community has contacted the
school regarding their possibility of using the gymnasium
one night a week for a weight reducing session. The
administrator should:

3  A. write a letter to the group leader explaining the policy of
   the school on the use of the physical plant.
4  B. meet with the group's representative and discuss the situation
   explaining the buildings' use and responsibilities which go
   with such use.
2  C. give his permission indicating that he is extending them this
   privilege and they are not to abuse it.
5. have a conference of activity directors, administrators, and representatives of the group to discuss the scheduled use of the gym to see if a night may be provided.

1. deny their request indicating the building janitors are overworked as it is.

Situation 9. The school authorities have decided to initiate a program of team teaching. Such a plan calls for the use of a large room for group instruction. There are no large rooms available. The administrator should:

2. decide which wall to knock out.

5. have a committee composed of faculty, lay citizens, and professional consultants investigate the problem which had been overlooked in prior meetings using their recommendations to present to the board.

3. consult with the architect about knocking out a wall and base the recommendation to the board on this meeting.

4. have a staff and citizens committee meet for suggestions leaving final judgment to the administrator as to which plan to suggest to the board.

1. decide the new program is not worth the trouble and forget it.

Situation 10. The school patrons have been critical of the reporting procedures used in reporting pupil progress. They have suggested a study committee look into the situation. The administrator should:

5. establish a citizens committee composed of interested persons with representation from the faculty, students, and administrators to study the issue and report their findings to the school officials.

4. bring the problem up at a staff meeting. Appoint a committee of professional staff members to investigate the problem area and submit their recommendations to you.

3. establish a faculty committee to study the problem.

2. have the school administrators study the problem.

1. ignore the criticisms on the basis that as educators, the administration knows the best reporting practices.

Board presidents were instructed to respond to part two of the questionnaire by identifying the responses according to levels of desirability. Their range for the responses were: most desirable, desirable, neither desirable nor undesirable, undesirable, most undesirable. Scale values of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 were respectively assigned these responses for
scoring purposes.

An administrative behavior score was determined by multiplying the judgment panel's selected score times the board president's response ranking in each situation. These response scores were added and a score determined for each situation. The maximum score showed complete agreement with democratic practices and the minimum score (35) indicated complete agreement with undemocratic practices. These situation scores were converted to autocratic-democratic index values on a continuum extending from zero to one hundred. This autocratic-democratic index, hereafter referred to as the A-D index, was calculated as follows:

\[
A-D \text{ index} = \frac{(\text{raw score} - 35)}{20} \times 100
\]

Thus each score was contained along the continuum with the zero to fifty value arbitrarily designated as the autocratic action range and the fifty to one hundred designated as the democratic action range.

A-D index continuum

autocratic action range  democratic action range
0----------------------50------------------------100

The A-D index means are reported for each situation as well as a cumulative A-D index by categories of enrollment and district wealth. This enabled an examination of the pattern of behavior in each situation as well as the behavior pattern of all situations.

The situations were designated to cover the following managerial areas of the school community: Situation one, leadership; situation two, curriculum; situation three, personnel; situation four, personnel; situation five, finance; situation six, public relations; situation seven,
academic freedom; situation eight, public relations; situation nine, physical plant; and situation ten, student welfare.

Collection of Data

Since 108 school districts were included in the sample, it was decided that a mailed questionnaire would serve as the most feasible means to obtain information on boards' perception of desirable characteristics of the superintendent of schools.

A copy of the questionnaire was mailed to each board president of the 108 selected Iowa public high school districts. The mailing to the board presidents included a letter explaining the study, one copy of the questionnaire and one stamped, self-addressed envelope. See Appendix C.

In addition to the numerical code used for the enrollment and district wealth strata, each questionnaire was further identified by assignment of a school number. This procedure provided a means of determining the non-participating board presidents to which follow-up letters were mailed. The first follow-up letter was mailed 14 days after the initial mailing and a second follow-up letter was mailed seven days later. These mailings brought in 107 of the 108 responses. A telephone conversation with the 109th board president provided the impetus for receipt of his response thus registering nine responses in each of the twelve strata for a 100 percent return.

In addition to the data obtained by questionnaire, personal interviews were arranged with ten board presidents. These interviews were conducted with the purpose of verifying the A-D index scores on the mailed
questionnaire as well as adding depth relative to factors which influence
the board's selection of a superintendent. Five board presidents with
low A-D index scores were interviewed as were five with high A-D index
scores.

Treatment of the Data

As the data were received, they were hand tabulated on forms
developed for that purpose. After tabulation was completed, appropriate
tables for exhibiting the data were developed and presented in the chapter
on Findings.

Regarding the preferred characteristics of the school superintendent,
collected in part one of the questionnaire, it was desired to investigate
whether or not the school board president's responses to these character­
istics were associated with the classifications of school enrollment or
district wealth. Hypotheses based upon these cross-classifications were
tested by means of the chi-square test for independence. For example, to
test whether board presidents' responses to preferred age of the school
superintendent were independent of school district wealth, the responses
were formed into a two-way contingency table. Expected values were
computed and chi-square calculated from the formula

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \left( \frac{\text{actual frequency} - \text{expected frequency}}{\text{expected frequency}} \right)^2 \]

The degrees of freedom for this statistic are (r-1)(c-1) where r
equals the number of rows and c equals the number of columns in the
contingency table. This computed \( \chi^2 \) value was compared with the tabulated
value of the $X^2$ distribution at the appropriate level of significance.

A significant difference refers to a value which exceeds the tabular value with appropriate degrees of freedom at the five percent (.05) level while a highly significant difference refers to a value exceeding the tabular value with appropriate degrees of freedom at the one percent (.01) level.

It was not possible to test each of the areas due to the small number indicating a preference for certain characteristics. In others, it was necessary to change groupings so that at least five responses could be recorded within each cell of the contingency table.

The responses to the situations in part two of the questionnaire were scored and the A-D index values were recorded on 80-column code sheets and transferred to International Business Machine (IBM) cards. One of the primary objectives of this investigation was to determine if administrative behavior of superintendents desired by school boards, as measured by the A-D index, was associated with school enrollment or district wealth. Analysis of variance procedures were employed to test these hypotheses, with the factors of school enrollment and district wealth designated as main effects and the variable being the A-D index. Since both classifications were divided into sub-groups with approximately equally-spaced intervals, coefficients of the orthogonal polynomial of appropriate degree were used to form single degree of freedom comparisons in order to ascertain the form of the relationship between the factor and the A-D index. For the factor of school enrollment, grouped into four categories, the total variation attributable to the factor was divided
into a linear component, a quadratic component, and a component representing deviations from a quadratic fit. District wealth was divided into three groups, and the associated variation attributable to a linear relationship and deviations from a linear trend were isolated and tested for significance. For a discussion of the use of orthogonal polynomials in testing for the presence of a linear or curvilinear trend, see Chapter 3 in Ostle (47).

The analysis and its sources of variation can be represented by the following model:

\[ Y_{ijk} = \mu + A_i + B_j + A_B_{ij} + E_{ijk} \]

where \( Y_{ijk} \) = the A-D index score of the \( k \)th school district in the \( i \)th enrollment group and the \( j \)th wealth group

\( \mu \) = overall mean A-D index score

\( A_i \) = \( i \)th school enrollment group

\( B_j \) = \( j \)th wealth group

\( A_B_{ij} \) = interaction of the \( i \)th enrollment group with the \( j \)th wealth group

\( E_{ijk} \) = error

Three major hypotheses were associated with this portion of the study. They were:

1. There is no relationship between wealth of the school district and its preference for a particular pattern of administrative behavior.

2. There is no relationship between student enrollment of the school district and its preference for a particular pattern of administrative behavior.
3. The relationship of wealth of the school district and its preference for a particular pattern of administrative behavior is independent of school enrollment.
FINDINGS

One problem of the study was to determine the characteristics and qualifications of the superintendent preferred by boards of education. A second aspect of the problem was to identify and examine factors which may influence the board in its selection of a superintendent. Finally, an attempt was made to determine the administrative behavior preferred by boards of education using "if-then" situations rather than what administrative behavior "ought to be."

These perceptions by boards of education were to be examined in relation to (1) wealth of the school district and (2) size of the total student enrollment.

The data presented in this chapter were divided into four major divisions. They were: (a) desired characteristics and qualifications, (b) factors influencing selection, (c) preferred administrative behavior, (d) the field survey.

Desired Characteristics and Qualifications

Age

Information regarding the preferred age for a superintendent at the time of his selection, categorized by district wealth, was presented in Table 2. Examination of the data revealed 50 percent of the 108 respondents preferred a superintendent to be over 40 years of age as compared with 36.1 percent indicating a preference for a younger man. There was no demand for an administrator under 30 years of age. In the lowest category of wealth, men over 50 were preferred by five board
Table 2. Preferred age for superintendent at time of selection as perceived by board presidents classified by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age grouping</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>&amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presidents, by three in second category, and no consideration was given to men over 50 in the third and wealthiest category.

In preparing the chi-square contingency table, it was necessary to group the data into two age classifications, under 40, and 40 and over. It should be noted that in Table 3, as well as the other contingency tables, responses that indicated no preferences were omitted in the chi-square tests. The calculated chi-square value was less than the tabular chi-square value and the null hypothesis was not rejected. (There were no significant differences in the responses of board presidents by strata of wealth and the age preferred for superintendents at the time of selection.)

The data reported in Table 4 revealed little variation by the
Table 3. Chi-square contingency table for frequency of choices of board presidents' responses regarding age preference classified by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age grouping</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$12,000 &amp; above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and over</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal. $x^2 = .255$, Actual frequency.

Table 4. Preferred age for superintendent at time of selection as perceived by board presidents classified by student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age grouping</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500 to 800</td>
<td>801 to 1500</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents when considering the various enrollment groups. The smallest
and largest schools responded similarly as did the two middle enrollment
groups.

The chi-square test for independence revealed no significant differ­
ences. It may be concluded by the data in Table 5 that board presidents'
response to a preferred age for a superintendent was independent of the
district's enrollment size.

Table 5. Chi-square contingency table for frequency of choices of board
presidents' responses regarding age preferences classified by
student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age grouping</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Under 40</th>
<th>40 and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500 to 800</td>
<td>801 to 1500</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and over</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal. $X^2 = 6.10$ $X^2 > .05$, 3.d.f. = 7.815 $X^2 > .01$, 3.d.f. = 11.361

$^a$Actual frequency.

$^b$Expected frequency.

Years of administrative experience

Of the 99 respondents indicating a preference for an administrator
with a certain amount of experience, 33 desired one with five or more
years and 46 showed a preference for a superintendent with less than five
years of administrative experience. Nine respondents indicated no preference for a particular experience level. An examination of Table 6 showed the experience categories of less than five years and more than ten years to have the greatest variations. This observed difference

Table 6. Administrative experience desired at time of selection as perceived by board presidents classified by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Less than $9,000</th>
<th>$9,000 to $12,000</th>
<th>$12,000 &amp; above</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

indicated that as the district wealth factor increased, the preference for a superintendent with fewer years of experience also increased. More specifically, 12 board presidents in the lowest category of wealth favored less than five years of administrative experience. This compared with 15 board presidents in the $9,000 to $12,000 group and 19 in the stratum of $12,000 and above. Board presidents preferring an administrator with more
than 10 years of administrative experience were more numerous in the less wealthy districts while board presidents representing districts whose wealth factor was $12,000 and above indicated no desire for an administrator with more than ten years of administrative experience.

The two-way contingency table presented in Table 7 disclosed the

Table 7. Chi-square contingency table for frequency of choices of board presidents' responses regarding desired administrative experience classified by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal. $X^2 = 2.278$, $X^2 > .05$, 2.d.f. = 5.991, $X^2 > .01$, 2.d.f. = 9.210

\(^a\) Actual frequency.

\(^b\) Expected frequency.

necessary data for computing the chi-square test for independence. From results of this test, it may be concluded that board presidents' responses regarding preferred years of administrative experience were independent of the district's wealth.

A study of Table 3 revealed six of the eleven respondents who
Table 3. Administrative experience desired at time of selection as perceived by board presidents classified by student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

indicated a preference for a man with more than ten years of administration represented the largest enrollment category. This difference was lost in grouping the data for the contingency table in Table 9. The computed chi-square value (2.22) was less than the tabular value (5.99).

It may thus be concluded that boards' preference for an experienced administrator was independent of the district's enrollment.

Degree status

The figures in Table 10 disclosed 73 of the 103 respondents (69.4 percent) desired their prospective superintendent to have a master's degree, 15.7 percent a specialist's degree, and 12 percent a doctoral degree. The respondents in the lowest and highest categories of wealth
Table 9. Chi-square contingency table for frequency of choices of board presidents' responses regarding desired administrative experience classified by student enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500 to 800</td>
<td>801 to 1500</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A^a</td>
<td>E^b</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal. $X^2 = 2.225$, $X^2 .05, 3$ d.f. = 7.815, $X^2 .01, 3$ d.f. = 11.341

^aActual frequency.

^bExpected frequency.

Table 10. Desired educational degree at time of selection preferred by board presidents classified by district wealth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Less than $9,000</th>
<th>$9,000</th>
<th>$12,000</th>
<th>$12,000 &amp; above</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
had similar preferences for master, specialist, and doctoral degrees. The board presidents within the $9,000 to $12,000 category disclosed the greatest preference for superintendents with a master's degree and least preference for those with a doctorate. Due to the small number within various groups, the data did not lend itself to the chi-square test for independence.

The responses illustrated in Table 11 portrayed a definite trend in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500 to 800</th>
<th>801 to 1500</th>
<th>More than 1500</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the preference for a superintendent with a doctoral degree as the district's school enrollment increases. This conclusion was based upon the following observations: no respondent gave preference for a superintendent with a doctorate in the smallest enrollment group, one disclosed such a preference in the second enrollment group, two in the third, and
ten in the fourth and largest enrollment group. Of the 13 board presidents preferring to appoint the holder of a doctorate degree as their superintendent, ten represented school districts where the total student enrollment exceeded 1500 students.

**Marital status**

The preferred marital status of the prospective superintendent was reported in Table 12 by district wealth categories. Of the 108 school board presidents' responses, 93 revealed a preference for a married man, nine failed to indicate a preference, and one preferred a widower. The responses by the three categories of wealth showed little variation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data, categorized by the four student enrollment groups in Table 13, indicated little difference in responses and although not tested
statistically, would appear to be insignificant.

Table 13. Preferred marital status of superintendent at time of selection classified by total student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500 to 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family status

The data recorded showed that 62 percent of the board presidents preferred the superintendent to be a family man with children. The other 38 percent indicated by their response that the family status of the superintendent would not influence their selection.

In Table 14, the responses were grouped by the three categories of school district wealth. The greatest preference for superintendents with children was in the wealthiest districts. Little difference may be observed by the data presented in Table 15 grouped by total student enrollment.
Table 14. Preferred family status of superintendent at time of selection classified by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Less than $9,000</th>
<th>$9,000 to $12,000</th>
<th>$12,000 &amp; above</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>21 58.3</td>
<td>13 50.0</td>
<td>28 77.8</td>
<td>67 62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>15 41.7</td>
<td>18 50.0</td>
<td>8 22.2</td>
<td>41 38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Preferred family status of superintendent at time of selection classified by total student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500 to 800</th>
<th>801 to 1500</th>
<th>More than 1500</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>16 59.3</td>
<td>16 59.3</td>
<td>13 66.7</td>
<td>17 63.0</td>
<td>67 62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>11 40.7</td>
<td>11 40.7</td>
<td>9 33.3</td>
<td>10 37.0</td>
<td>41 38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Race preference

The responses to the statement on race preference were recorded by school district wealth and student enrollment. All responses fell into two categories, those having a preference for an administrator belonging to the white race (86.1 percent) and those with no preference (13.9 percent). A variation of responses existed within the categories of district wealth (Table 16). This difference was the preference for the white administrator increased as the wealth factor increased. The data presented in Table 17 by student enrollment groups indicated a great deal of similarity in the responses.

Religious preference

When asked to respond to the religious affiliation of the prospective superintendent, 56 (51.9 percent) of the board presidents indicated a preference for a superintendent of the protestant faith while 52 (48.1 percent) responded with no religious preference. Examination of Table 18 revealed that as the wealth factor increased, there was also an increase in the percent preferring a protestant superintendent.

The chi-square test for independence, however, indicated this difference was not significant. The computed chi-square value of 3.20 was less than the tabular value of 5.99 at the five percent level. One may thus conclude that the responses of the board presidents were independent of the district's wealth.

The data reported in Table 19 categorized by total student enrollment indicated that 17 board presidents, representing the smaller schools of less than 500 students, had a preference for a protestant superintendent.
Table 16. Responses to race preference classified by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Less than $9,000</th>
<th>$9,000 to $12,000</th>
<th>$12,000 &amp; above</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Responses to race preference classified by total student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500 to 800</th>
<th>801 to 1500</th>
<th>More than 1500</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 18. Chi-square contingency table for frequency of choices of board presidents' responses to religious preferences categorized by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious affiliation</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal. $X^2 = 3.20$, $X^2 .05, 2.d.f. = 5.991, X^2 .01, 2.d.f. = 9.210

^Actual frequency.

^Expected frequency.

### Table 19. Chi-square contingency table for frequency of choices of board presidents' responses to religious preferences categorized by total student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious affiliation</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500 to 801</td>
<td>801 to 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal. $X^2 = 3.857$, $X^2 .05, 3.d.f. = 7.815, X^2 .01, 3.d.f. = 11.341$

^Actual frequency.

^Expected frequency.
as did 16 of the 27 respondents representing districts with more than 1500 students. These two groups varied considerably from schools in the 500 to 800 and 801 to 1500 categories, but when the data were subjected to the chi-square test for independence, no significant differences were found.

Factors Influencing Selection

Employment practices

When asked to respond to the practice of hiring a superintendent, 40 of the 108 (37 percent) of the board presidents indicated a preference for hiring a person already in the system while the majority (63 percent) preferred employing a superintendent from outside the present school system. The data recorded by district wealth in Table 20 showed the responses from board presidents in the wealthiest districts favored hiring from outside the system, but not to the degree of those in the other wealth groups. The chi-square test for independence failed to reject the null hypothesis concluding that responses by board presidents were independent of the school district's wealth.

Table 21 reported the employment practice preferred by the size of the school. The responses by the four classes of school size indicated that boards tend to respond very similar and that size of the school does not affect their preference. These indications were supported by the statistical analysis. The chi-square test for independence revealed no significant differences in the responses of board presidents by stratum of enrollment and their preference for a particular employment practice.
Table 20. Chi-square contingency table for frequency of choices of board presidents' responses to hiring practices categorized by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment policy</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>$9,000 to $12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within system</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside system</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal. $X^2 = 1.264 \ X^2 .05, 3 \text{ d.f.} = 7.815 \ X^2 .01, 3 \text{ d.f.} = 11.341$

\(^a\text{Actual frequency.}\)

\(^b\text{Expected frequency.}\)

Table 21. Chi-square contingency table for frequency of choices of board presidents' responses to hiring practices categorized by total student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment policy</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500 to 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within system</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside system</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cal. $X^2 = .318 \ X^2 .05, 3 \text{ d.f.} = 7.815 \ X^2 .01, 3 \text{ d.f.} = 11.341$

\(^a\text{Actual frequency.}\)

\(^b\text{Expected frequency.}\)
Type of administrative experience

Board presidents were asked to rank by importance, the type or level of administrative experience they considered necessary for their prospective superintendent to have. Of the 108 respondents, 86 deemed it necessary for their new superintendent to have prior experience as a superintendent and 14 felt their new superintendent could come from the ranks of the secondary principals. Principals from elementary and junior high schools were mentioned as first choices by four, and four of the board presidents indicated they had no preference.

Responses within the various categories of wealth were similar as noted in Table 22. Superintendent experience was highly preferred in all categories.

An examination of data classified by student enrollment (Table 23) revealed secondary administrative experience was ranked first by six board presidents in the smallest schools, four in schools of 500 to 800, and four in schools enrolling 801 to 1500 students, and was not mentioned by the largest group. One may conclude that in larger schools, more importance was placed upon experience as a successful superintendent and the chances of a principal being appointed chief administrator were greater in the smaller schools.

Background of experience

Board presidents were given the opportunity to indicate the administrative tasks they considered most important. Experience with the school curriculum was ranked first by 42, business management by 36, public relations by 27, public school finance received three first choices and
Table 22. Level of administrative experience, ranked by importance by board presidents, classified by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Less than $9,000</th>
<th>$9,000</th>
<th>$12,000 &amp; above</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Level of administrative experience, ranked by importance by board presidents, classified by student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500 to 800</th>
<th>801 to 1500</th>
<th>More than 1500</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
no first mention was given in the area of the physical plant. Tabulation of first and second choices disclosed business management was mentioned by 83 of the board presidents, curriculum by 66, public relations by 54, school finance by 11, and the school's physical plant by two board presidents. The data indicated that experience within three areas: business management, curriculum, and public relations, were considered most essential.

Examination of the responses in Table 24, grouped by categories of district wealth, revealed one trend. The area of public relations received more first choices as the district wealth factor increased. In the lowest wealth group, public relations was mentioned first by three board presidents, 10 mentioned it first in the second wealth group, and 14 in the third and wealthiest group. The data recorded in Table 25 showed little evidence of the responses varying by enrollment sizes. Each of the enrollment sizes indicated experience with curriculum, business management, and public relations were most important. Experience in areas of school finance and physical plant did not appear to be major areas of concern when selecting a superintendent.

**Most influential factor**

Board presidents were asked to identify the most influential factor in their selection of a superintendent. The respondents listed the superintendent's previous administrative experience most influential. The personal interview was regarded second, followed by the candidate's background of training, and little consideration was given to letters of recommendation.
Table 24. Area of experience, ranked by importance by board presidents, classified by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$12,000 &amp; above</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical plant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Area of experience, ranked by importance by board presidents, classified by student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500 to</td>
<td>801 to</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical plant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data were grouped by school district wealth groups in Table 26 and examined. Little variation was noted in the responses. The data were then recorded by classes of student enrollment (school size) in Table 27. This classification revealed that boards considered the qualifications necessary in a similar fashion. Each enrollment category ranked the factors in the same order.

**Personality**

The personality of the candidate was considered extremely important as indicated by 103 (95.4 percent) board presidents. When asked by what traits they judge a man's personality, board presidents reacted by listing numerous traits. These traits, grouped by similarity of responses, were enumerated in Table 23. As frequency counts in the table indicated, the ability to communicate was considered most important. Traits mentioned most frequently were: ability to communicate, personal dress and appearance, ability to work with others, honesty and sincerity, and the willingness to stand by his convictions.

**Preferred Administrative Behavior**

The administrative behavior scores were reported by mean A-D index values for each situation. The preferred pattern of behavior in the various management roles, within which the superintendent functions, was determined by these values. The mean A-D index value for all situations was used to determine the overall behavior of the superintendents preferred by boards of education. The procedures used to obtain these values were outlined in preceding chapter on Methods and Procedures.
Table 26. Factors most influential in selecting a school superintendent, ranked by importance by board presidents, classified by district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td>1st 2nd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background of training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous administrative experience</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of recommendation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>108 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. Factors most influential in selecting a school superintendent, ranked by importance by board presidents, classified by student enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500 to</td>
<td>801 to</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background of training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous administrative experience</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of recommendation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>108 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28. Traits considered most important in judging a man's personality as reported by board presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Frequency mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal dress and appearance</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work with others</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty and sincerity</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to stand by his convictions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward his work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poise and dignity and respect for others</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to meet people</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A friendly smile and a firm handshake</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactfulness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sense</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Situation one (leadership)**

In situation one, the superintendent's judgment was questioned by a group of faculty members at a faculty meeting. This action, by members of the faculty, challenged the leadership ability of the superintendent. How do boards want their superintendent to react to such a situation? Do they prefer him to stress obedience and discourage inter-member communication or to react in a manner which respects the dignity of man, recognizing that man is able to think, reason, and has the right to participate freely in discussion intelligently? The responses to situa-
tion one measured these patterns of behavior, previously identified by the judgment panel, as varying degrees of autocratic behavior and democratic behavior.

The 103 board presidents reacted to situation one (leadership) with an overall mean A-D index of 63.5. This value fell within the low democratic action range. The average A-D index values for enrollment categories and wealth categories in Table 29 were all in the 60's which may indicate that school boards prefer that the superintendent's image, as a man of power, be maintained even at the expense of some democratic ways.

Table 29. A-D index mean values for situation one (leadership) classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500 to 800</th>
<th>801 to 1500</th>
<th>More than 1500</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The P-values determined by the analysis of variance for situation one (Table 30) did not reveal any significant relationships, resulting in the conclusion that neither enrollment nor wealth were associated with desired behavior. This indicated that the means of the A-D index values...
for the four levels of school size and three levels of district wealth possessed little variation and that these values could be considered estimates of a common population.

Table 30. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for situation one (leadership)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130.96</td>
<td>130.96</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from quad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>281.09</td>
<td>281.09</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138.39</td>
<td>138.39</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.89</td>
<td>66.89</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_L \times W_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>900.60</td>
<td>900.60</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_Q \times W_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,330.23</td>
<td>1,707.56</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74,462.94</td>
<td>775.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>82,937.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Situation two (curriculum)

The responses for situation two presented various levels of involvement in curriculum planning by administrators, faculty, and community members. Each response was considered a level of action, involving either the group in decision making and planning or action that was centered in the superintendent and his inner circle of administrators. The judgment panel had ranked the responses from the most democratic to that which indicated the most undemocratic response.
The data reported in Table 31 for situation two (curriculum) disclosed a slight preference for stronger democratic action as the district's wealth factor increased. The lowest wealth category had an A-D index of 69.0, the second category a 71.5, and the third and highest category of wealth a 73.0 A-D index value. No definite patterns were noted when the data were examined by student enrollments. However, one point of interest was the fourth enrollment category, those enrolling more than 1500 students, had the highest A-D index values recorded within each of the three wealth categories. The F-values for the second situation in Table 32 did not reveal any significant linear or quadratic tendencies by enrollment sizes or factors of district wealth. The mean A-D index value for situation two was 71.0.

Situation three (personnel)

Situation three described a personnel problem in which the superintendent was aware of a teacher on his staff whose way of work he considered harmful to the school. How would the board prefer the superintendent to handle this delicate personnel problem?

Board presidents were given five responses to examine and rank in order of preference. Each response had previously been identified by the judgment panel as representing a level or pattern of administrative behavior. Those responses varied from behavior judged to be most democratic, where the respect and dignity of others was shown, to undemocratic or autocratic behavior which stressed obedience and discouraged inter-member communication. An administrative behavior score was calculated, converted to an A-D index score and the mean values were
Table 31. A-D index mean values for situation two (curriculum) classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for situation two (curriculum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,655.85</td>
<td>1,655.85</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,039.12</td>
<td>1,039.12</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from quad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>319.24</td>
<td>319.24</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>253.88</td>
<td>253.88</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_L × W_L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141.38</td>
<td>141.38</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ × W_L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.32</td>
<td>42.32</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,097.13</td>
<td>774.28</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45,566.92</td>
<td>474.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>52,129.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reported in Table 33.

A great deal of variation and irregularity existed in the A-D index means as evidenced by the high A-D index mean of 91.0 to the low of 67.5. Observation of the data in Table 33 indicated little reason to believe a relationship may exist between the desired behavior and the community variables of school enrollment or district wealth. This judgment was confirmed by the statistical analysis reported in Table 34. No significant linear or quadratic tendencies were found. The mean A-D index value for situation three was 32.0 which registered well within the democratic action range.

Situation four (personnel)

The superintendent was confronted with a staff proposal requesting the formation of a committee to study and develop a more adequate salary schedule in situation four. The superintendent had several ways of handling this problem as indicated by the five responses. The responses covered the continuum from democratic behavior to undemocratic behavior; from keeping channels of communication open to denying the committee's existence. Board presidents were asked to rank the responses in this personnel situation according to the action they preferred their superintendent to take.

Inspection of Table 35 disclosed the average A-D mean index values by categories of wealth increased from 73.0 in the first and lowest wealth group to 76.0 in the second, and an A-D index average of 82.5 in the third and wealthiest category. This consistent increase in higher mean A-D index values with each level of district wealth was evident
Table 33. A-D index mean values for situation three (personnel) classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500 to 800</th>
<th>801 to 1500</th>
<th>More than 1500</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for situation three (personnel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>( \nu )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>280.66</td>
<td>280.66</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,133.61</td>
<td>1,133.61</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>201.79</td>
<td>201.79</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140.74</td>
<td>140.74</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>239.20</td>
<td>239.20</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_L \times M_L )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>47.31</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_Q \times M_L )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>234.36</td>
<td>234.36</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,307.19</td>
<td>724.30</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>39,289.38</td>
<td>398.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43,513.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
within the wealth groups as well.

The F-values, reported in Table 36, disclosed a highly significant (.01 level) linear tendency within the categories of wealth. One may thus conclude that there was a positive relationship between the desired behavior and the school district's wealth, i.e., the wealthier the district, the higher the preference for democratic action as indicated by the high A-D index mean values. No significant effects were noted within enrollment categories. The overall mean A-D index value for this situation was 77.0.

**Situation five (finance)**

Who should become involved in the preparation of the school budget?

This problem of public school finance was presented in situation five. The five responses indicated degrees of involvement in the preparation of the budget by the superintendent, staff, and members of the school community. The judgment panel had previously ranked these responses by levels of democratic behavior. The response judged to be the most democratic was the response in which most segments of the school community became involved in the preparation of the school budget.

The data recorded in Table 37 for situation five resulted in some interesting findings. Most of the A-D index mean values fell with the democratic action range (A-D values 50 - 100) while two cells had scores in the autocratic action range (A-D values, 0 - 50). The overall A-D index for situation five was 57.5. This mean value indicated that boards seemed somewhat reluctant to grant members of the school community, other than the superintendent, the responsibility of planning the district's
Table 35. A-D index mean values for situation four (personnel) classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for situation four (personnel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>676.93</td>
<td>676.93</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from quad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>432.37</td>
<td>432.37</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,604.61</td>
<td>1,604.61</td>
<td>7.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78.36</td>
<td>78.36</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_L \times W_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.04</td>
<td>34.04</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_W \times W_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.47</td>
<td>67.47</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>575.37</td>
<td>143.84</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21,969.40</td>
<td>228.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>25,438.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Values significant at or beyond the one percent level of confidence.
expenditures. The A-D index averages increased as the wealth categories increased. This indicated there may have been a positive relationship between the board responses and district wealth. Examination of the data within wealth and enrollment groups disclosed a great deal of inconsistency in the A-D index means with high and low values recorded in an irregular fashion.

The F-value in Table 38 revealed the quadratic component within the enrollment groups was highly significant at the .01 level. Observation of the A-D index mean values disclosed this relationship involved the similarity of the average A-D index values within enrollment categories of the largest and smallest schools but different from the two middle categories of enrollment. As wealth increased there was a tendency for the preference for democratic behavior to decrease until the center of the population continuum was reached. Then the inverse of this situation took place, as the enrollment continued to increase, the preference for democratic behavior also increased. This highly significant quadratic function indicated an extreme curvature of the A-D index scores within enrollment categories.

Situation six (public relations)

In situation six, the churches in the community were having difficulty conducting evening youth groups because of the activity schedule at school. The superintendent had been asked by church leaders to cooperate. Five methods of meeting this problem were provided, each representing a degree of democratic behavior previously ranked by the judgment panel. The responses varied from a flat denial to degrees of active participation.
Table 37. A-D index mean values for situation five (finance) classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500 to 800</th>
<th>801 to 1500</th>
<th>More than 1500</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for situation five (finance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>959.47</td>
<td>959.47</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,202.78</td>
<td>5,202.78</td>
<td>7.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from quad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.57</td>
<td>66.57</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>833.00</td>
<td>833.00</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L \times W_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>679.25</td>
<td>679.25</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q \times W_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>905.25</td>
<td>905.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,814.91</td>
<td>1,453.73</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71,370.83</td>
<td>743.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>85,916.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Values significant at or beyond the one percent level of confidence.
Board presidents were asked to rank the responses in order of their preferences in this public relations situation. The responses were scored and appear in Table 39 as mean A-D index values.

The mean A-D index for situation six was 89.0 which was a high democratic action score. The average values of the three categories of wealth were very similar as evidenced by two 89's and one 88.5. The A-D index values within enrollment groups disclosed observable differences. Five of the six cells within the two largest enrollment groups held values in the 90's as compared with only one such high A-D index value in the two smaller enrollment categories. Even though all values were in the democratic action range, there was a tendency for higher A-D index values as the schools became larger. Table 40 confirmed this as a significant factor in the linear tendencies within the enrollment classifications at the .05 level. Thus one may conclude that there was a significant relationship between the board's preference for a particular behavior and the size of the school within this situation. This relationship was in the form of higher A-D index values in the democratic range in the larger schools.

Situation seven (academic freedom)

The highest overall A-D index values resulted from the responses to situation seven. Here the superintendent was faced with a problem where teachers were complaining that supervisors were not permitting them to teach their courses as they thought they should. How involved should the superintendent get? Should he attack the problem, or the cause of the problem? Five responses were presented which indicated various ways the
Table 39. A-D index mean values for situation six (public relations) classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500 to 800</td>
<td>801 to 1500</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for situation six (public relations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,211.10</td>
<td>1,211.10</td>
<td>5.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156.72</td>
<td>156.72</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from quad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>520.38</td>
<td>520.38</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_L x W_L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>281.78</td>
<td>281.78</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_Q x W_L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>577.65</td>
<td>144.41</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19,883.20</td>
<td>207.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22,653.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values significant at or beyond the five percent level of confidence.
superintendent may handle the problem. These responses were ranked by levels of democratic behavior. The board's degree of preference for each response determined his A-D index score. The higher the A-D score, the greater the preference for democratic behavior to be used in solving the problem.

The A-D index values for this problem of academic freedom were reported in Table 41. These values were high in the democratic action range as all average A-D index values were in the 90's with a situation mean value of 92.5. It was not possible to detect any notable difference by observation and the examination of the statistical data recorded for situation seven in Table 42 confirmed the observations. No significant relationships were detected between wealth of the school district or school size and the board's preference for a particular pattern of behavior.

**Situation eight (public relations)**

Frequently community groups or individual citizens request the use of the school facilities for various non-profit activities. These requests are usually based upon the premise that these facilities are public property, paid for by public funds, and should be available for public use. Many school districts have adopted policies governing the use of their facilities, delegating to the superintendent authority to carry out these policies.

In situation eight, just such a request was presented to the superintendent. Five methods or ways of handling this public relations problem were provided and board presidents were to indicate how they
Table 41. A-D index mean values for situation seven (academic freedom) classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500 to 800</th>
<th>801 to 1500</th>
<th>More than 1500</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for situation seven (academic freedom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115.65</td>
<td>115.65</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.93</td>
<td>57.93</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. from quad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>290.28</td>
<td>290.28</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_L x W_L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_U x W_L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68.45</td>
<td>68.45</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>246.63</td>
<td>61.66</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7,805.56</td>
<td>76.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>8,650.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preferred their superintendent to respond. These ways of handling the situation had been ranked according to the degree of democratic behavior exhibited in each response. Board presidents who indicated a preference for the more democratic responses would receive higher A-D index values and those who showed a preference for the less democratic responses would in turn receive lower A-D index values.

The data reported in Table 43 revealed an overall A-D index value of 84.0 for situation eight. The lowest and highest A-D index values were found representing the wealth group of less than $9,000. Examination of values for enrollment groups disclosed a constant increase in the A-D index values as the student enrollment increased. This relationship between a preferred behavior and enrollment proved to be significant at the .05 level when the analysis of variance test was applied. Table 44 not only disclosed a significant linear relationship within enrollment categories but also a significant interaction between enrollment and wealth categories involving linear tendencies. This significant interaction meant that the increase of the preference for democratic behavior (increased A-D index values) with the increase of school size was not consistent within the categories of wealth for this situation. The preference for more democratic behavior (increase of A-D index values) by enrollment groups supported the linear trend across the two lower categories of wealth but within the largest wealth group, the A-D index means were somewhat erratic, thus causing the significant interaction.
Table 43. A-D index mean values for situation eight (public relations) classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500 to 800</td>
<td>801 to 1500</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for situation eight (public relations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,460.27</td>
<td>1,460.27</td>
<td>4.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.85</td>
<td>44.85</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from quad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>288.66</td>
<td>288.66</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_L x W_L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,475.82</td>
<td>1,475.82</td>
<td>4.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_Q x W_L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>255.41</td>
<td>63.85</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>29,456.86</td>
<td>306.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>33,012.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values significant at or beyond the five percent level of confidence.
**Situation nine (physical facilities)**

In situation nine, an assessment was made of the school facilities and they were found to be inadequate for implementing an authorized change in the instructional methods. What course of action should the superintendent take? How much advice should be sought and from whom? The judgment panel ranked the five responses on a five point continuum from democratic administrative behavior to undemocratic or autocratic behavior. Boards were then asked to indicate their preference for the various responses.

The mean A-D index value for situation nine, regarding possible alterations of the physical plant, was 83.0 (Table 45). The A-D index values recorded by student enrollment and/or district wealth showed little deviation from the average A-D index values. Examination of the data in Table 46 revealed no significant relationships. The response of the 108 school board presidents to situation nine were not, therefore, affected by the community variables of size of the school or wealth of the district.

**Situation ten (student welfare)**

In situation ten, the superintendent was confronted with school patrons who were critical of the school's existing procedures used in reporting pupil progress. They had requested a study committee look into the situation. The responses in situation ten were attempts at solving the problem in several different ways. The five responses were ranked according to the degree that democratic procedures were involved in each suggested solution. The board president's responses were scored,
Table 45. A-D index mean values for situation nine (physical facilities) classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500 to 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for situation nine (physical facilities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>733.83</td>
<td>733.83</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111.83</td>
<td>111.83</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from quad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>357.70</td>
<td>357.70</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>765.71</td>
<td>765.71</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125.13</td>
<td>125.13</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_L \times W_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139.88</td>
<td>139.88</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_Q \times W_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>154.29</td>
<td>154.29</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>928.75</td>
<td>232.19</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38,393.07</td>
<td>399.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41,710.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
converted to an A-D index value and their mean A-D index values were reported in Table 47.

The average A-D index values increased with each category of student enrollment: 71.0 for the first enrollment group, 73.5 for the second, 80.5 for the third, and 83.0 for the fourth and largest enrollment group. This relationship proved to be significant at the .05 level as indicated in Table 48. Thus, there was a significant relationship between student enrollment and the board's preference for a pattern of behavior as indicated by the response scores. The relationship was linear and positive for the boards preference for democratic behavior increased consistently with the increase in school size. Boards representing larger schools preferred their superintendent to exhibit democratic behavior to a greater degree than those in smaller schools. The average A-D values by wealth categories also indicated a possible relationship. These average A-D values became larger as each wealth category became larger. The statistical analysis, however, failed to find any notable relationship between the preferred behavior and the categories of wealth.

Summary of behavioral situations

One of the major objectives of this study was to identify the administrative behavior preferred by boards of education in their superintendents. Each respondent of the questionnaire received ten behavioral scores, one for each situation. The cumulative A-D value covering all ten situations identified the average pattern of preferred behavior. The average values in Table 49 revealed that board presidents preferred their superintendent to display behavior identified as mostly democratic, as
Table 47. A-D index mean values for situation ten (student welfare) classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>500 to 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 48. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for situation ten (student welfare)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,465.29</td>
<td>2,465.29</td>
<td>4.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from quad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129.46</td>
<td>129.46</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>902.42</td>
<td>902.42</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128.04</td>
<td>128.04</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_L x W_L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>139.75</td>
<td>139.75</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E_Q x W_L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77.09</td>
<td>77.09</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,879.41</td>
<td>719.85</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>49,633.72</td>
<td>517.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>56,355.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values significant at or beyond the five percent level of confidence.
shown by the cumulative A-D value of 78.0. The values within this table indicated a positive relationship because the average A-D values increased as the school size and wealth factor increased. The data, when treated statistically (Table 50), disclosed that there was a significant linear trend within enrollment categories. It may thus be concluded that the larger the school, the greater the board's preference for democratic behavior.

In the process of arriving at this conclusion other differences were noted. The different managerial areas covered by the ten situations were examined. The A-D index values differed greatly from a low of 57.5 in situation five to a high of 92.5 for situation seven. These different A-D values indicated that preferred patterns of behavior varied substantially among different situations. Since superintendents must react to many different tasks, the type of behavior preferred was most likely dictated by the problem with which they were confronted. A review of the situations and the A-D index values (Table 51) disclosed that the lower democratic behavioral scores involved a question of leadership in situation one, the direction of the school's curriculum in situation two, and school finance in situation five. The higher democratic values came from the areas of personnel management, public relations, and academic freedom.

One may conclude that in areas which necessitate contact with the school staff and community, boards preferred a high degree of democratic behavior. The boards expected the superintendent to exhibit democratic behavior to a lesser degree in areas of special training and experience.
Table 49. A-D index mean values for all situations classified by student enrollment and school district wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District wealth</th>
<th>Total student enrollment</th>
<th>Less than 500</th>
<th>500 to 800</th>
<th>801 to 1500</th>
<th>More than 1500</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$9,000 to 12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 and above</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50. Analysis of variance of A-D index scores for all situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>462.96</td>
<td>462.96</td>
<td>4.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadratic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62.26</td>
<td>62.26</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviation from quad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>276.13</td>
<td>276.13</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev. from linear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_L \times W_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_Q \times W_L$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled interaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>607.51</td>
<td>151.88</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10,350.39</td>
<td>107.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>11,799.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values significant at or beyond the five percent level of confidence.
### Table 51. Composite of situations and mean A-D index values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A-D index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Academic freedom</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Student welfare</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand mean A-D index value 78.0

---

**Field Survey**

The interviews were conducted to verify areas of the mailed questionnaire and add depth to factors which may influence boards of education in their selection of a superintendent. The mailed questionnaire sought the board's perception of the kind or type of administrator they desired by asking them to select, rate, and list characteristics they preferred in the superintendent. These two methods of obtaining data should best reflect the thinking of the respondents. Therefore, ten
board presidents were interviewed, five with low cumulative A-D index values and five with high A-D index values. Questions used to guide the interviewer are found in Appendix E.

The board presidents were asked who should be involved in the preparation of the school budget, curriculum revision, personnel policies, and who should present these proposals to the board of education. These types of questions were used to aid in identifying the board's preferred pattern of behavior. Responses indicating great autonomy for the superintendent were interpreted to support the authoritative or autocratic pattern of behavior.

In the five cases representing low A-D index values, responses indicated a preference for all preparation of materials to be channeled through the superintendent and that all proposals should be presented by the superintendent. The five board presidents who had high A-D index values indicated more group activity and involvement should take place in the preparation of school budgets, curriculum revisions, and personnel policies. The presentation to the school board in special areas should be made by representative of that special area.

When board presidents were asked to define democratic administration the responses varied but concerned such things as group participation and respect for others and their ideas. In identifying authoritative or autocratic administration, respondents reacted with the following statements: "where one takes charge, gives orders, and demands action," "the man responsible runs the show with insistence and confidence in his convictions," "dictatorial, one man rule."
Board presidents were then asked the type of administrative behavior they preferred. Most respondents qualified their answers, but the presidents with a high cumulative A-D index value showed a greater preference for democratic practices than those board presidents with low A-D index values. For example, one respondent with a 95.0 index value preferred the democratic administrator because it presented fewer problems for the community and the school staff, while another who had an index value of 52.0 commented that he leaned toward the autocratic pattern of behavior because he felt it next to impossible to get anything done when you involve too many people, and "besides, the superintendent is paid to run the school."

The data obtained by interview collaborated with the data obtained from the mail questionnaire. Board presidents with high A-D values tended to prefer more democratic practices than those presidents with low A-D values.

The general characteristics identified by the mail questionnaire regarding preferences of age, religion, family status, experience, and training were supported by the field survey data. The majority of the board presidents (6 of the 10) who were interviewed felt that the superintendent's religious affiliation was a major factor affecting his selection.

It was found that seven of the ten board presidents had experienced hiring a superintendent and that in these schools, the board was the only body involved in the selection process. All board presidents interviewed with low A-D index values had been through the hiring process. The
average tenure of the superintendent in the five schools having low A-D index scores was 4.2 years compared with 8.3 years for the five other respondents.
As previously described, this study was comprised of four parts. The first aspect of the study was to determine the characteristics and qualifications of the superintendent preferred by boards of education. A second aspect was to identify and examine factors which may influence the board in its selection of a superintendent. A third, and major problem was the identification of the desired administrative behavior of superintendents preferred by boards of education. These perceptions by board presidents representing the 108 boards of education in the sample, were then compared by size of total student enrollment and wealth of the school district. This was done to see if enrollment or school district wealth were factors influencing the board responses in their perceptions of preferred characteristics and behavior of the superintendent.

The data were collected by means of a mailed questionnaire sent to each board president of the 108 school districts selected on the basis of the random stratified sampling technique. The data described in the study were obtained from 108 returned questionnaires representing 100 percent of the sample. Personal interviews were conducted with 10 of the initial respondents. These interviews provided a means of checking the reliability of the autocratic-democratic (A-D index values) scores for part two of the questionnaire. The 10 board presidents selected for interview were five with high A-D scores and five with low A-D scores.

The questionnaire used in collecting the data consisted of two parts.
The first part was constructed to identify preferred characteristics, qualifications, and factors which may influence boards in their selection of a superintendent. The second part of the questionnaire was an instrument designed to identify the administrative behavior preferred by boards of education. This was done by the construction of ten administrative situations and five responses for each situation. These responses had been previously validated by a judgment panel indicating the degree to which democratic procedures were used for handling each of the administrative situations. Board presidents were to rank their preference for the five possible ways of handling each of these situations. This basic procedure provided the data for identifying the administrative behavior preferred by boards of education.

These perceptions by board presidents of the behavior, characteristics, qualifications, and factors considered to influence boards in their selection of a superintendent were statistically treated. The statistical tests were designed to determine the effect or relationship of enrollment or district wealth and a board president's pattern of responses.

**Desired characteristics**

Of the 108 respondents, 54 (50 percent) preferred a superintendent who was over 40 years of age and 39 (36.1 percent) indicated a preference for a younger man. There was no demand for an administrator under 30 years of age. These preferences were indicative of the responses regardless of the district's size or wealth classifications. There were some indications, however, that men over 50 years of age would receive greater consideration for the superintendency in the less wealthy and larger
Most responses regarding the years of administrative experience desired fell into two basic groups; those preferring three to five years of administrative experience (38 percent) and those preferring an administrator with five to ten years of administrative experience (38.9 percent). Board presidents indicating a preference for an administrator with more than 10 years of administrative experience were in the minority but more numerous in the poorer districts and districts with large enrollments.

The majority (69.4 percent) of the 108 respondents preferred their prospective superintendent to have obtained a masters degree, 15.7 percent a specialist's degree, and 12 percent the doctoral degree. No observable relationships seemed apparent when the responses were grouped by wealth categories, but it was noted that the preference for a superintendent with a doctoral degree increased as the district's enrollment increased.

The vast majority (90.7 percent) of the board presidents indicated the preference for a married superintendent with little variation in the responses grouped by either wealth or enrollment categories.

The variables of school size and district wealth did not seem to influence responses regarding family status. Of the 108 respondents, 67 (62 percent) indicated they preferred a candidate with children while the remaining 41 (38 percent) revealed by their responses that family status was not a criteria for selecting the superintendent.

Responses to race preference revealed that 93 of the 108 board presidents preferred their superintendent to be of the white race while
15 indicated that they had no race preference. The preference for a white administrator increased as the wealth factor increased but responses grouped by enrollment categories varied only slightly.

Of the 108 board presidents, 56 responded indicating religious preference for a protestant superintendent while 52 disclosed they had no religious preference. As the wealth factor increased there was also an increase in the preference for a protestant administrator. When the data were grouped by enrollment categories, there was a tendency for the board presidents in the smaller and larger districts to indicate greater preference for a protestant superintendent.

Factors influencing selection

The practice of hiring a superintendent from outside the system or the promotion of a person already in the system was presented to the board presidents. Some 63 percent of the respondents preferred to hire someone from outside the system as their chief school administrator. Although the difference was not significant, most support for the practice of bringing in a new man came from responses representing the less wealthy school districts (less than $12,000 wealth factor) and those board presidents representing schools with the largest enrollments (more than 1,500 students).

Most board presidents (86 of the 108) responded to the questionnaire by indicating they preferred to hire a man who had previous experience as a superintendent. Applicants for the top administrative position who have had experience as a superintendent were preferred over principals seeking a school superintendency. Of the principals, those in the secondary
schools were more favorably looked upon for advancement to the superintendent with their chances for being appointed superintendent greater in the smaller schools.

When considering the background of desirable experiences necessary for the successful superintendent, board presidents readily identified three areas; experience in curriculum, business management, and public relations. These three areas received 105 of the 108 first rankings with little or no consideration given to the areas of finance and physical plant. Examination of the responses revealed a relationship existed in the responses grouped by wealth categories where the public relations experience received greater attention as the district wealth factor increased.

Board presidents were asked to identify the most influential factor affecting their selection of a superintendent. The responses grouped by wealth or enrollment categories did not indicate any noticeable relationship. Both groupings ranked the superintendent's previous administrative experience most influential, the personal interview second, followed by the candidate's background of training. Letters of recommendation did not seem to be much of a factor in the selection of a superintendent.

The personality of the candidate for the superintendency was considered extremely important by some 95 percent of the board presidents. These board presidents indicated that they judged a man's personality on numerous traits. Those most frequently mentioned were: ability to communicate, personal dress and appearance, ability to work with others, and sincerity and honest intentions.
Preferred administrative behavior

Identification of the preferred administrative behavior of the superintendent was achieved by scoring board presidents' responses to the ten administrative situations in part two of the mailed questionnaire. These responses had been validated by a 20-member judgment panel and classified into five levels of democratic or undemocratic administrative behavior. The board presidents' responses were scored by procedures outlined in chapter three and converted to A-D (autocratic-democratic) index values where zero indicated complete agreement with autocratic behavior and 100 complete agreement with democratic behavior. Zero to 50 A-D values were arbitrarily designated as the autocratic action range and 50 to 100 the democratic action range. A board president who consistently selected a response judged to involve the most democratic methods, would in turn have received a high A-D index value indicating a strong preference for democratic behavior.

The mean A-D index value of the 108 board presidents to the ten situations was 78.0. This A-D value was within the democratic action range and indicated that boards of education in Iowa public school districts preferred their superintendent to exhibit administrative behavior that could be classified as mostly democratic. A significant relationship (.05 level) was identified between district enrollment and the response pattern. The larger the school, the greater the preference for democratic behavior.

Examination of the data revealed a great deal of variation among the A-D index mean values for the ten situations. This indicated that the
preferred behavior may have been dictated by the task confronting the administrator. The A-D index values of the various situations disclosed the lowest democratic behavior values in areas of finance (57.5), leadership (63.5), and curriculum (71.0). The higher democratic values came from areas of academic freedom (92.5), public relations (89.0), and personnel management (82.0). These results indicated the boards of education preferred a higher degree of democratic administrative behavior in areas which involved personal contact with the faculty and community.

Limitations

The investigation was confined to a study of Iowa school boards serving public schools which maintained a public high school during the 1966-67 school year.

The findings were based upon 100 percent return of the questionnaire from a stratified random sample of school board presidents. This stratification was based upon the factors of school district wealth and total student enrollment. It was assumed that board presidents' perceptions of selected responses were representative of the board they represented.

Conclusions

As previously indicated, the problems of this study were: (1) to determine characteristics and qualifications of the superintendent desired by boards of education, (2) to examine other factors which may influence the board in its selection of a superintendent, (3) to determine the desired administrative behavior sought by boards of education, and (4) to
compare these perceptions with the size of the school and wealth of the school district. On the basis of the analyzed data collected from the 108 respondents to the mailed questionnaire, the findings of this study justified the following conclusions.

1. Persons under 30 years of age and over 50 years of age are not in demand as candidates for a superintendent’s position.

2. Individuals in administrative positions should accumulate a minimum of three and preferably five years of administrative experience prior to applying for a superintendency.

3. Those persons interested in the position of school superintendent should seek the specialist's or doctoral degree. If one has aspirations of a large school superintendency, the doctoral degree is highly desirable.

4. Single, divorced, or widowed candidates are given very little consideration for the superintendent's position. Candidates, married but childless, are handicapped in competing for the position of superintendent of schools.

5. Racial bias was evident as 86.1 percent revealed a preference for a white superintendent. The lack of contact with other races in Iowa communities may explain this bias, nevertheless, members of races other than white would encounter great difficulty in obtaining a superintendency in an Iowa public school.

6. The majority (51.8 percent) of Iowa school boards preferred their chief school administrator to be affiliated with a protestant church while the remaining 48.2 percent indicated no religious preference. Prospective superintendents who are affiliated with the Jewish, Catholic, or other
non-protestant faiths would have an opportunity to obtain a superintendency in Iowa.

7. The practice of hiring a superintendent from outside the system was favored by 63 percent of the boards. Persons aspiring to advance to the position of superintendent will have greater success in securing the position in districts other than the one in which they are presently employed.

8. The basic promotional route to the superintendency is by way of the secondary school principalship. Elementary and junior high principals have little chance for direct promotion to the position of school superintendent.

9. Three areas of experience have been identified as being more important than others for prospective superintendents. Experiences in curriculum, business management, and public relations are highly desirable for prospective superintendents.

10. Letters of recommendation receive little consideration as a criterion for boards of education in selecting a superintendent of schools. A successful record of past experience is the major consideration.

11. The prospective superintendent's initial contact with board members is a factor which greatly affects his chances of being hired. Those seeking a superintendency should watch their personal appearance and take training in learning how to express and communicate ideas.

12. Board responses regarding preferred characteristics, qualifications, and other factors were subjected to the chi-square test for independence. No significant differences were revealed by response
categories of district wealth or school size. One may conclude that neither the wealth of the school district nor total student enrollment were significant factors influencing board responses in their perceptions of characteristics which affected their selection of a superintendent.

13. The average A-D value (78.0) for the ten behavior situations revealed that boards of education preferred their superintendent to display administrative behavior identified as mostly democratic.

14. Statistical analysis of the ten situations disclosed a significant (.05 level) linear relationship by enrollment categories. The larger the school enrollment, the greater the board's preference for democratic administrative behavior. Superintendents who exhibit democratic patterns of behavior, such as working with people, assigning responsibility, and delegating authority, are more preferred as superintendents in the larger schools than in the smaller schools.

15. The superintendent is hired by the board of education and remains in this position through the discretion of the board. Therefore, the superintendent should have the power to make value judgments based upon his training and experience in areas not covered by written board policy.

Tenure employees' suggestions and involvement should be in areas directly involving them, their working conditions, or status of employment, as evidenced by the support for democratic administrative behavior in areas of personnel management (82.0 A-D value), public relations (89.0 A-D value), and academic freedom (92.5 A-D value).

The degree of democratic behavior preferred varied substantially
among the different situations indicating the type of behavior preferred was most likely dictated by the situation confronting the superintendent.

Recommendations and Discussion

Discussion

The fact that certification for a superintendent requires years of advanced training and successful experience explains the lack of interest in employing a superintendent under 30 years of age. The number of boards of education who indicated no preference in hiring a chief administrator over 50 years of age is more difficult to understand. With upwards to 15 years of public school service remaining until normal retirement age, the successful administrators over 50 years of age are passed over in favor of younger candidates. These school administrators over 50 years of age have much to contribute to public education. Many administrators in our cities, states, and nation come from just such an age group and are in these positions as a result of their background of successful experience.

The school boards are contradictory in their preferences, they considered the successful experience as a superintendent as being most influential in his selection but ignore this background of successful experience in candidates over 50 years of age.

The data on preference for democratic administration of the schools may well support critics of small schools and indicate support for reorganization into larger administrative centers. If school boards believe a purpose of education is to perpetuate our democratic society and the needs of our young people are paramount, they should consider
reorganization into larger school districts. The data in this study indicates the greatest preference for democratic practices affecting student needs exists in schools with enrollments exceeding 1500 students. A positive relationship exists in areas of student welfare, public relations, and academic freedom with size of the school district. The larger the school enrollment, the greater the preference for democratic practices.

Use of findings

The data requested from board presidents, grouped by community variables of wealth and enrollment, and reported in this study should benefit prospective superintendents to realize factors which may influence their employment. The data reported in this study should indicate possible alterations that may be needed in the college curriculum preparing public school administrators. The low support for democratic practices in areas of school finance, curriculum, and leadership indicates boards of education have a tendency to rely heavily upon the superintendent to have a great depth of knowledge in these areas.

Alterations should come not only in the form of additional courses but also in requiring prospective superintendents to receive training which would require them to be placed in positions of responsibility. Such a practice would thus require the trainee to react to varying administrative problems and situations by demonstrating his leadership capabilities while working with other people. These experiences could come in the form of internships, on the job training, simulated conditions, or other types of similar assignments. One of the main criteria, regardless of the method of training decided upon, should provide the
prospective superintendent the opportunity for leadership training, public speaking, and experiences in personnel management under the watchful eye of trained and experienced personnel.

**Recommendations for further research**

Several research studies are suggested by the results of this survey. A major portion of this study identified and examined the administrative behavior preferred by boards of education in Iowa public schools.

Since Iowa's population is basically rural, a similar study could be made in a more populated state thus increasing the scope as to type of geographic area represented and the opinions of the school boards.

A study of a similar nature using the perceptions of faculty members would provide an interesting comparison with the perceptions by boards of education presented in this study.

Having studied perceptions by boards and staff members, a study of superintendents behavior in his position would provide data as to what administrative behavior patterns exist.

These research studies would provide information of not only what is perceived but also the patterns of administrative behavior exhibited by practicing superintendents.

Evaluation studies of existing administrative training programs and methods of instructing should be conducted in institutions which train school administrators.
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APPENDIX A: IOWA SCHOOL DISTRICTS USED IN THE STUDY

Listed by classification of size and wealth factors

Andrew Community
Correctionville Independent
Dow City-Arion Community
New Hartford Community
Lisbon Community
Preston Community
Sabula Community
Urbana Consolidated
Wheatland Community

Denver Community
Lamoni Community
L D F Community
Clarksville Community
New Monroe Community
Solon Community
Springville Community
Tri-County Community
Twin Cedars Community

Belle Plaine Community
Central City Community
Colfax Community
North Linn Community
Mount Vernon Community
Sibley Independent
Postville Community
West Liberty Community
Spirit Lake Community

Cedar Rapids Community
Decorah Community
Fort Dodge Community
Lewis Central Community
Oelwein Community
Osage Community
Urbandale Community
Saydel Consolidated
Council Bluffs Independent
Battle Creek Community
Clearfield Community
Colo Community
East Monona Community
Diagonal Community
Marathon Consolidated
New Market Community
Ocheyedan Community
Russell Community

Coon Rapids Community
Dunkerton Community
Graettinger Community
Hinton Community
Lincoln Community
Lone Tree Community
Nora Springs-Rock Falls Community
Underwood Community
Willow Community

Alta Community
Britt Community
Greenfield Community
Columbus Community
Sumner Community
Nashua Community
Lake City Community
Saint Ansgar Community
West Marshall Community

Algona Community
Central Clinton Community
Audubon Community
Hampton Community
Iowa Falls Community
Le Mars Community
South Tama Community
Spencer Community
West Delaware Community

Central Dallas Community
Thompson Community
Garrison Consolidated
Kanawha Community
Little Rock Community
Pomeroy Community
Rake Community
Grand Community
Cedar Valley Community
Farragut Community
Marcus Community
Meriden-Cleghorn Community
Exira Community
Mormon Trail Community
Oakland Community
Schleswig Community
Sentral Community
Terrill Community
Ackley-Geneva Community
Carroll Independent
Grundy Center Community
North Central Community
Maple Valley Community
Prairie Community
Sheldon Community
West Lyon Community
Williamsburg Community
Benton Community
Dubuque Community
Howard-Winneshiek Community
Humboldt Community
Linn-Mar Community
New Hampton Community
Pella Community
Southeast Polk Community
Western Dubuque Community
APPENDIX B: STATEMENTS TO THE JUDGMENT PANEL
Dear __________:

You have been selected as a member of a judgment panel to rank an opinion survey which will be used later in obtaining data for a doctoral dissertation. Your participation in this portion of the study is sincerely appreciated. Thank you.

Richard Manatt
Associate Professor

Lawrence Johnson
Research Assistant

The following situations and responses have been prepared with the intent of measuring the behavioral pattern board members desire in the superintendent. Your job, as a member of the judgment panel, is to rank the responses in order descending from the most democratic response (5) to that which indicates the most undemocratic response (1). You are to consider all responses to each situation allowing only one to be scored democratic behavior (5), one to be scored as mostly democratic behavior (4), etc. This should be done with each situation. The following scoring scale should be used as a guide for your responses.

Democratic behavior (5).
   a.) action involving the group in decision making with respect to policy and program.
   b.) implementation in line with democratically determined policy.
   c.) action promoting group or individual creativity productivity and satisfaction without harm to others.
   d.) behavior respecting the dignity of individuals or groups.
   e.) action that indicates the superintendent seeks to keep channels of communication open.

Mostly democratic behavior (4).
   That type of action or conduct that contains elements of both democratic and undemocratic behavior but is predominantly democratic.

Balance between democratic and undemocratic behavior (3).
   Action that seems to contain an equal amount of democratic and undemocratic behavior.

Mostly undemocratic behavior (2).

Autocratic or undemocratic behavior (1).
   a.) action to indicate that decision making is centered in the status leader or his inner circle.
   b.) implementation that is not in line with democratic determined policy.
   c.) action that does not promote group or individual creativity.
   d.) action that discourages inter-member communication except that which is channeled through him.
   e.) behavior which stresses obedience.
In each situation you are to fill in the blank in front of each response with the number which refers to the type of administrative behavior that each response most clearly identifies. You are to examine and identify each response so that each of the 5 possible behavioral levels has been used for each situation.

Key:  5 democratic behavior
      4 mostly democratic behavior
      3 balance between democratic and undemocratic
      2 mostly undemocratic behavior
      1 undemocratic or autocratic behavior

Space is provided on the last page for comments you would like to make.

Situation 1. A group of faculty members has questioned the superintendent's ideas or judgment at a faculty meeting. The superintendent should:

___ A. remind them that the major responsibility for the school is his and proceed with his ideas.
___ B. discuss further and try for consensus; otherwise try for faculty study of the problem and accept their decision.
___ C. superintendent changes if faculty is agreed; otherwise he goes along with his ideas.
___ D. persuades them to see his point of view.
___ E. discuss further; modifies his views to secure compromise.

Situation 2. The school is making plans to change its curriculum. The superintendent should:

___ A. make no use of the community for assistance in making the changes, rely upon the experience in the administrative staff.
___ B. use a planning committee with representation from the community and faculty with the intent of accepting their decision.
___ C. talk with individuals about the proposed change and form his own opinion.
___ D. use representatives to participate in a planning conference with the administration.
___ E. use a standing committee of faculty members and community leaders to study the problem.

Situation 3. The superintendent is aware of a teacher on his staff whose way of work he feels is harmful to the school. He should:

___ A. tell the board of education.
___ B. refer the problem to a supervisor and ask that he correct it.
___ C. inform the teacher of complaints from others.
___ D. have an evaluation conference designed to focus on the problem without any criticism.
___ E. use regular in-service meetings focused on such problems in hope that he will get the message.
Situation 4. The staff has proposed a salary study committee be formed to develop a more adequate salary schedule. The superintendent should:

A. squelch the idea.
B. appoint members of the staff and board to such a committee.
C. permit the staff to form such a committee but refrain from giving advice and assistance.
D. agree to such a committee, participate in its organization offering assistance when asked to do so.
E. agree to such a committee composed of faculty, citizens, and board members. Offer advice and assistance when asked but refrain from taking an active part.

Situation 5. In preparing the school budget, the superintendent should:

A. ask his staff and department heads to get estimates from the faculty for supplies and equipment and submit them to him, the superintendent deleting items he feels unnecessary.
B. use the staff, lay citizens, and students in planning the budget, discussing questionable items with the various representatives. Use their judgment in determining the needs.
C. figure the school budget himself as it is his responsibility.
D. talk with department heads, get their estimates and delete items he feels unnecessary.
E. use last year's budget adding a common percent to each area to take care of items suggested by faculty and staff.

Situation 6. The churches in the community have been having difficulty in conducting evening youth groups because of the activity schedule at school. The ministers have asked for school cooperation. The superintendent should:

A. issue a statement to the ministers that they may schedule their activities as they see fit but the school will continue to set their schedule. The problem is theirs, not the schools.
B. meet with them to hear and discuss the problems.
C. assist in organizing a group of faculty, lay citizens, church leaders, and administrators to plan activities which allow a night a week for church activities.
D. send a representative to hear their problem, report back to the superintendent and then he acts as he sees fit.
E. ask the ministers to submit a plan to him for consideration.

Situation 7. Faculty members have been complaining that supervisors are not permitting them to teach their courses as they feel they should. The superintendent should:

A. ignore the complaints.
B. propose a meeting for the supervisors discussing academic freedom but let them carry on as they see fit.
C. investigate the complaints, then call a meeting of the supervisors and discuss the situation to re-establish their role as a result of their consensus.
D. have in-service programs prepared for staff participation on the subject.
E. insist that the staff follow their supervisors' demands.
Situation 8. A group of young wives in the community has contacted the superintendent regarding their possibility of using the gymnasium one night a week for a weight reducing session. The superintendent should:

____ A. write a letter to the group leader explaining the policy of the school on the use of the physical plant.
____ B. meet with the group's representative and discuss the situation explaining the buildings' use and responsibilities which go with such use.
____ C. give his permission indicating that he is extending them this privilege and they are not to abuse it.
____ D. have a conference of activity directors, administrators, and representatives of this group to discuss the scheduled use of the gym to see if a night may be provided.
____ E. deny their request indicating the building janitors are over-worked as it is.

Situation 9. The school authorities have decided to initiate a program of team teaching. Such a plan calls for the use of a large room for group instruction. There are no large rooms available. The superintendent should:

____ A. decide which wall to knock out.
____ B. have a committee composed of faculty, lay citizens, and professional consultants investigate the problem which had been overlooked in prior meetings using their recommendation to present to the board.
____ C. consult with the architect about knocking out a wall and base the recommendation to the board on this meeting.
____ D. have a staff and citizens committee meet for suggestions leaving final judgment to the superintendent as to which plan to suggest to the board.
____ E. decide the new program is not worth the trouble and forget it.

Situation 10. The school patrons have been critical of the reporting procedures used in reporting pupil progress. They have suggested a study committee look into the situation. The superintendent should:

____ A. establish a faculty committee to study the problem.
____ B. get the school administrators to study the problem.
____ C. establish a citizen committee composed of interested persons with representation from the faculty, students, and administrators to study the issue and report their findings to the school officials.
____ D. ignore the criticisms on the basis that as educators, the administration knows the best reporting procedures.
____ E. bring the problem up at a faculty meeting indicating to the staff that a study committee will be formed of faculty, parents, students, and counselors to investigate the problem and submit their recommendations at another faculty meeting.

Please add any comments you would like to make.
APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE AND FOLLOW-UPS
Dear School Board President:

As president of your board, may I ask for a few minutes of your time in the completion of the enclosed questionnaire? A copy of this questionnaire is being mailed to a selected sample of board presidents in the state with the purpose of identifying the characteristics which influence boards of education in the selection of the superintendent.

Selecting the superintendent is one of the more important functions of boards of education. Therefore, we would like to examine the characteristics of the superintendent and related factors which may influence boards when making this selection. Institutions training school administrators must know the qualities sought by boards of education in order to provide men with the background and training desired. The results of this survey will provide data for a doctoral dissertation and be available to you upon its completion.

Code numbers appearing on the questionnaire are used only for checking questionnaires returned. No individual will be identified in the study as the data will be treated in total.

Your preference for qualities in the superintendent is important and it is necessary that your questionnaire be returned so that data examined will represent all possible returns. A stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire. Your participation in this study is sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,  
Richard P. Manatt  
Associate Professor of Education

Sincerely,  
Lawrence O. Johnson  
Research Assistant
Let us assume that your district is in the process of selecting a superintendent of schools. We would like you to select from the following characteristics and qualifications those you feel, as a representative of your board, would be preferred in the candidate to fill the position. If there is no preference for a particular area, please check the appropriate answer. In selecting the response, consider the community and its ability to pay a salary based upon the qualifications desired. Please indicate your preference by a check mark in the proper place.

1. At the time of selection, what age do you prefer your administrator to be?
   ___ under 30; ___ 30-40; ___ 40-50; ___ 50-55; ___ over 55; ___ immaterial

2. How much administrative experience is desired? (years of experience)
   ___ none; ___ 1-2; ___ 3-5; ___ 5-10; ___ over 10; ___ no preference

3. Degree or level of training desired:
   ___ bachelors; ___ masters; ___ specialist; ___ doctors; ___ immaterial

4. Marital status:
   ___ single; ___ married; ___ widowed; ___ divorced; ___ immaterial

5. Family status:
   ___ no children; ___ children; ___ immaterial

6. Race:
   ___ white; ___ negro; ___ other; ___ no preference

7. Religious affiliation:
   ___ Protestant; ___ Catholic; ___ Jew; ___ other; ___ no preference

8. Which do you prefer to do?
   ___ promote from within your system; ___ employ from outside your system

9. Is your district in the process of planning or constructing a new school or building addition?
   ___ planning; ___ constructing; ___ neither planning nor constructing

10. Is the personality of the candidate a major factor in the selection of the new superintendent?
    ___ yes; ___ no
In these questions, rank by order of importance. (1) for the most important, (2) for the next most important, etc.

11. What type of administrative experience do you consider necessary for the candidate to have?
   _ secondary; _ jr. high; _ elementary; _ superintendent; _ immaterial

12. In what area do you consider a candidate's background of experience most important?
   _ curriculum; _ business management; _ public relations; _ finance; _ school house planning; other _____________

13. Which of the following influences you most in selecting a school superintendent for your district?
   _ background of training; _ previous administrative record; _ personal interview; _ letters of recommendations; other _____________

14. What do you consider to be most important in judging a man's personality?
   ____________________________________________

---

PART II

In each situation you are to rank the responses in order descending from the most desirable response (5) to that which indicates the most undesirable response (1). You are to consider all responses to each situation allowing only one to be scored most desirable (5), one to be scored as desirable (4), etc. In each situation, you are to fill in the blank in front of each response with the number which refers to a level of desirability that you feel that response indicates. There are no right or wrong answers. You are to examine and identify each response so that each of the five possible levels of desirability has been used for each situation.

5 most desirable
4 desirable
3 balance between desirable and undesirable
2 undesirable
1 most undesirable
Situation 1. A group of faculty members has questioned the superintendent's ideas or judgment at a faculty meeting. The superintendent should:

A. remind them that the major responsibility for the school is his and proceed with his ideas.
B. discuss further and try for consensus; otherwise try for faculty study of the problem and accept their decision.
C. superintendent changes if the faculty is agreed; otherwise he goes along with his ideas.
D. persuades them to see his point of view.
E. discuss further; modifies his views to secure compromise.

Situation 2. The school is making plans to change the curriculum. The administrator should:

A. make no use of the community for assistance in making the changes, relying upon the experience in the administrative staff.
B. use a planning committee with representation from the community and faculty with the intent of accepting their ideas.
C. talk with individuals about the proposed change and form his decision from these talks.
D. use representatives to participate in a planning conference with the administration.
E. use a standing committee of faculty members and community leaders to study the problem.

Situation 3. The superintendent is aware of a teacher on his staff whose way of work he feels is harmful to the school. He should:

A. ask for his resignation.
B. refer the problem to a supervisor and tell him to correct it.
C. hold a conference with the teacher focusing on the problem bringing in complaints from others.
D. tell the teacher to 'shape up or ship out'.
E. hold a conference with the teacher evaluating his total performance without bringing in any specific criticism.

Situation 4. The staff has proposed a salary study committee be formed to develop a more adequate salary schedule. The administrator should:

A. squelch the idea.
B. appoint members of the staff and board to such a committee.
C. permit the staff to form such a committee but refrain from giving advice and assistance.
D. agree to such a committee, participate in its organization offering assistance when asked to do so.
E. agree to such a committee composed of faculty, citizens, and board members. Offer advice and assistance when asked but refrain from taking an active part.
Situation 5. In preparing the school budget, the superintendent should:

____ A. ask his staff and department heads to get estimates from the faculty for supplies and equipment and submit them to him, the superintendent deleting items he feels unnecessary.

____ B. use the staff, lay citizens, and students in planning the budget, discussing questionable items with the various representatives. Use their judgment in determining needs.

____ C. figure the school budget himself as it is his responsibility.

____ D. talk with department heads, get their estimates and delete items he feels unnecessary.

____ E. use last year's budget adding a common percent to each area to take care of items suggested by the faculty and staff.

Situation 6. The churches in the community have been having difficulty in conducting evening youth groups because of the activity schedule at school. Existing board policy does not cover this. The ministers have asked for school cooperation. The administrator should:

____ A. issue a statement to the ministers that they may schedule their activities as they see fit but the school will continue to set their schedule. The problem is theirs, not the schools.

____ B. meet with them to hear and discuss the problems.

____ C. assist in organizing a group of faculty, lay citizens, church leaders, and administrators to plan activities which would allow a night for church activities during the week.

____ D. send a representative to hear their problem, report back to the administrator leaving him to act on the matter as he sees fit.

____ E. ask the ministers to submit a plan to him for consideration.

Situation 7. Faculty members have been complaining that supervisors are not permitting them to teach their courses as they feel they should. The administrator should:

____ A. ignore the complaints.

____ B. propose a meeting for the supervisors discussing academic freedom but let them carry on as they see fit.

____ C. investigate the complaints, then call a meeting of the supervisors and discuss the situation to re-establish their role as a result of their consensus.

____ D. have in-service programs prepared for staff participation on the subject.

____ E. call staff's attention to the role of the supervisor indicating that they are instructed to follow their supervisors' demands.
Situation 8. A group of young wives in the community has contacted the school regarding their possibility of using the gymnasium one night a week for a weight reducing session. The administrator should:

___ A. write a letter to the group leader explaining the policy of the school on the use of the physical plant.
___ B. meet with the group's representative and discuss the situation explaining the buildings' use and responsibilities which go with such use.
___ C. give his permission indicating that he is extending them this privilege and they are not to abuse it.
___ D. have a conference of activity directors, administrators, and representatives of this group to discuss the scheduled use of the gym to see if a night may be provided.
___ E. deny their request indicating the building janitors are overworked as it is.

Situation 9. The school authorities have decided to initiate a program of team teaching. Such a plan calls for the use of a large room for group instruction. There are no large rooms available. The administrator should:

___ A. decide which wall to knock out.
___ B. have a committee composed of faculty, lay citizens, and professional consultants investigate the problem which had been overlooked in prior meetings using their recommendation to present to the board.
___ C. consult with the architect about knocking out a wall and base the recommendation to the board on this meeting.
___ D. have a staff and citizens committee meet for suggestions leaving final judgment to the administrator as to which plan to suggest to the board.
___ E. decide the new program is not worth the trouble and forget it.

Situation 10. The school patrons have been critical of the reporting procedures used in reporting pupil progress. They have suggested a study committee look into the situation. The administrator should:

___ A. establish a citizens committee composed of interested persons with representation from the faculty, students, and administrators to study the issue and report their findings to the school officials.
___ B. bring the problem up at a staff meeting. Appoint a committee of professional staff members to investigate the problem area and submit their recommendations to the administrator.
___ C. establish a faculty committee to study the problem.
___ D. have the school administrators study the problem.
___ E. ignore the criticisms on the basis that as educators, the administration knows the best reporting practices.
Dear School Board President:

A short time ago we sent a copy of the enclosed questionnaire to a selected group of Iowa school board presidents representing 108 Iowa school districts. Thus far some fifty percent have been returned. Though this is a considerable number, we are hopeful that each district in the study will be represented.

As of this date we have not received the questionnaire which was mailed to you on October 13. If you have recently returned this questionnaire, please ignore this communication.

If, perchance, you are not presently in the position of a school board president, your response will still be of great value as you have acted in this capacity. The mailing list was secured during a visit with Blythe Conn in Des Moines and is assumed to include current school board presidents.

May we express our appreciation for your fine cooperation which makes this study possible.

Sincerely,

/s/ Richard P. Manatt

Richard P. Manatt
Associate Professor of Education

/s/ Lawrence O. Johnson

Lawrence O. Johnson
Research Assistant
Dear School Board President:

A follow-up letter and a copy of the enclosed questionnaire were sent to you a short time ago. We have thus far received responses from 93 percent of the population. We are particularly interested in having your response included in our summary.

As of this date, we have not received the questionnaire which was mailed to you. If you have recently returned this questionnaire, please ignore this communication.

Your cooperation is both needed and appreciated in gathering data for this study.

Sincerely,

/s/ Richard P. Manatt

Richard P. Manatt
Associate Professor of Education

/s/ Lawrence Johnson

Lawrence Johnson
Research Assistant
APPENDIX D: JUDGMENT PANEL MEMBERS

1. Edwin Barker  
   High School Principal Boone, Iowa

2. William Clark  
   Graduate Student Ames, Iowa

3. Theodore Curtis  
   Classroom Teacher Bettendorf, Iowa

4. William Ferguson  
   School Board Member Glidden, Iowa

5. Dr. John Fields  
   Superintendent Webster City, Iowa

6. Phil Gambs  
   School Board Member Dunlap, Iowa

7. Gordon Gibbs  
   Graduate Student Ames, Iowa

8. Walter Hetzel  
   Superintendent Ames, Iowa

9. Robert Horshfall  
   Area School Superintendent Marshalltown, Iowa

10. Joseph Kissinger  
    Principal LeMars, Iowa

11. Dr. Berard Masse  
    Assistant Professor of Education Ames, Iowa

12. James Mitchell  
    Supervisor, MSEIP Des Moines, Iowa

13. Richard Munster  
    Graduate Student Ames, Iowa

14. Dr. Anton Netusil  
    Assistant Professor of Education Ames, Iowa

15. Richard Petersen  
    Graduate Student Ames, Iowa

16. Harry Ploth  
    High School Principal Dow City, Iowa
17. Ray Pugh  
   Assistant Principal Des Moines, Iowa

18. Dr. James Robinson  
   Superintendent Vinton, Iowa

19. Dean Stuck  
   Graduate Student Ames, Iowa

20. Leonard L. Thompson  
   Superintendent Sac City, Iowa
APPENDIX E: GUIDE FOR INTERVIEWER

Board Presidents

1. Have you experienced hiring a superintendent? Yes____ No____

2. Describe the administrator you prefer
   age: experience:
   training: personal:

3. How much of a factor are the following when hiring a superintendent?
   religion none minor major
   race: none minor major
   family status: none minor major
   public speaking: none minor major

4. Who participates in the selection process for your superintendent?
   board faculty citizens

5. What kind of relationship does your superintendent have with the
   board excellent good average poor
   staff
   community
   students

6. How aware is your community, board, staff, and students of the instruc­
   tional program of the school?

7. Do you feel teachers are more aggressive today? Why?

8. In your opinion, who should be involved in the preparation of the
   budget? board supt. staff citizens
   curriculum revisions? " " " " "
   personnel policies? " " " " "
   Why?

9. When new proposals are presented to the board in the area of
   budget supt. Other
   curriculum who presents them? " " "
   personnel " " "

10. Do you have a written set of board policies? Yes____ No____

11. What type of complaint do you hear most frequently about the school?
    What do you do about them?
12. Who decides on the following?

Books to buy for the library
Money to be spent for books
Purchases athletic equipment

13. If new musical instruments are needed, who submits the request to the board?

14. Who developed the reporting procedure used to report pupil progress?

15. How effective is your present superintendent in carrying out the duties and responsibilities of his position?
(very some little ineffective)

16. How would you define democratic administration?

How would you define authoritative administration?

17. Which do you prefer?

Why?

18. How would you classify your present superintendent? Dem Auth