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CHAPTER I

The public school superintendent selection procedures have been one of the most maligned and ignored aspects of our educational process. Each spring, in hundreds of American public schools, persons are selected to serve as superintendent of schools in the respective school districts. During the course of this selection process the position is advertised, the field of candidates screened, and the final selections made for what, in the opinion of this writer, is a most important and influential position in our society. Considering the potential influence the person selected for this position has on a school district and community, this researcher believes that considerable attention should have been paid to procedures used in the selection of this administrative officer. This does not appear to be the case, however. The approach has apparently been one of a rather specious nature. This study was conceived with need to know just how carefully this process was handled.

There were five particular areas which appeared to be lacking in research. These areas included the following: (1) the procedures used in recruiting candidates for the position, (2) means of assessing and screening candidates, (3) the criteria utilized in the actual selection of superintendent, (4) post-selection critique of methodology by board members, and (5) observance of provisions in the Equal Employ-
ment Opportunity Act in the selection process.

One of the objectives of this research was to determine if district size was a factor in methods employed to procure applicants for the superintendent position. It was also the intent of this researcher to determine the relationship of district size to screening and selection techniques as employed by selected boards of education. Further, this dissertation was conceived in the hopes of identifying personal qualities which seemed to enhance the employment success possibilities of prospective superintendent candidates. This assessment included such areas as the positive or negative impact on board members of a candidate's personal appearance, verbal expression, and dress. An attempt was also made to identify which outside agencies were used to solicit applicants. The researcher also attempted to identify geographic influences on the previously mentioned concerns. The writer was interested in whether similar methods of vacancy publication, screening of candidates, and final selection criteria were used nationwide or whether there were noticeable differences contingent upon geographic location of the school district.

An educational concern of this investigation was which type of academic preparation most impressed school board members. Was a doctorate necessary or desirable and was there a preference for Ed.D. or Ph.D. degrees? Also, this writer was intrigued by the possibility of board preferences based upon the institution at which the training occurred. Preferences
for such as in-state, Ivy League, or institutions which specialize in school administration education were explored.

Another area which was examined was the frequency of violations of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act. These violations were viewed with respect to enrollment size and geographic location.

Another, more board of education-oriented concern of this dissertation questioned the boards' satisfaction with their selection process. The investigator was specifically interested in whether they believed their procedures successful and whether they would continue upon another occasion to use their current superintendent selection practices.

The hypotheses which were tested in this research included the following:

A. There is no significant difference in the vacancy publication procedures with respect to enrollment size or geographic location of the school district.

B. There is no significant difference in the candidate screening procedures, as applied by selected boards of education, with regard to enrollment size or geographic location.

C. There is no significant difference between large and small school districts or geographic locations, with regard to interview procedures.

D. There is no significant difference with regard to the degree of influence of hairstyle, attire, or verbal expression on board members with respect to enrollment size or
geographic location.

E. There is no significant difference between the type of individual the board of education perceived they were hiring and their perception of this person at the time this study was conducted.

F. There is no significant difference between large and small school districts or geographic location with respect to observance of the requirements of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act.

There are several basic assumptions under which this study was conducted. The investigator made the assumption that the superintendent selection process occupied an important role in the total educational sphere. This writer also found, after an extensive search and review of literature related to this process, that general knowledge in this area is obscure and difficult to obtain. Based on these observations and assumptions, this researcher recognized a need to identify and inspect the existing practices. It was further assumed that all candidates for superintendent positions were legally qualified under the statutes of the respective states. It was also assumed that the school board members who supplied data for this research had insights, reactions, and opinions regarding the selection process as initiated and completed by their school districts.
Definition of Terms

Superintendent candidate - Person who has expressed interest in and formally made application for the position of superintendent of schools.

Board members - Persons who were members of the respective boards of education when the current superintendent was elected.

Equal Employment Opportunity Act - A portion of the 1964 Civil Rights Bill which prohibits employment discrimination based upon sex, age, creed, or color.

Delimitations of the Study

This study involved the examination of the superintendent selection process in selected school districts throughout the United States. The research was confined to four hundred school districts which have experienced the hiring of a superintendent between the 1971 and 1974 school years. The investigation was limited to four specific areas of the superintendent selection process. These areas included procedures utilized by boards of education in procuring candidates for a superintendent vacancy, methods of screening these candidates, post-selection critique by school board members of their methodology, and concerns regarding violations by school boards of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act. The input for statistical evaluation was provided by two members of the school board from the respective school districts. There was
no superintendent involvement.

Data were gathered using a questionnaire which was distributed to two school board members from each identified school district. This encompassed a total of eight hundred school board member contacts.
CHAPTER II

The search for literature and related materials for this research has been extensive, yet has turned up very little that can be directly applied to this project as background materials or in a supplemental manner. Two ERIC searches have been made under the direction of Mr. Ken Marks, an ERIC search specialist at the Iowa State University Library. These searches turned up nothing pertinent to this research.

A complete hand search of the dissertation abstracts has been made. A detailed search of personnel management abstracts has also been made, to no avail. A search of the psychological abstracts has been made in hopes of finding at least some related area in industry. This also was fruitless.

Datrix Education Research Retrieval Service was employed. The return communication from Datrix simply states, "no related research available in this area."

In yet another attempt to unearth related materials, the Phi Delta Kappa Research Service was contacted. Dr. William GePhart, director of the department, expressed the feeling that this was an area with which little has been done, if any, to date.

Dr. Joseph Millard, Director of Educational Services for Polk County, was consulted in an attempt to run various journal searches and also in an attempt to make contact with several of his acquaintances who are involved with personnel
selection in industry. This also turned up nothing.

As a rather last hope, Mr. Roy Park and Dr. Clifford E. Smith of the I.S.U. Industrial Engineering staff were contacted regarding the possibility of any related material in industry. These two men were both of the identical, firm opinion that nothing has been done along this line in industry. These two gentlemen expressed the opinion that if anything has been done, it would have been done on a private intra-company basis and would not have been published. Thus, the review of literature, which would appear to be extensive, turned up very little in this area.

Since this investigation was apparently a probe of the unknown, this writer felt it might be of some benefit to review the opinions and suggestions of several current authors. These are, of course, opinions on rather limited research and often not directly related to the superintendent selection process as this writer proposed to examine it. Should such information be collected and reviewed, some references and comparisons could be made between the point of view expressed by cited authors and the current state of superintendent selection processes around the country. It must be remembered, however, that this researcher was principally concerned with recruiting, screening, and selection procedures as they existed at the time of the inquiry.

In the January, 1971, issue of Administrator’s Notebook (1) an article authored by Edwin M. Bridges and Melany E. Baehr
concerned itself with the future of administrator selection procedures. Mr. Bridges and Ms. Baehr expressed the thought that current criteria for selecting administrators are vulnerable. They felt that when the assault comes, the attackers will be champions of civil rights. These authors indicated "reason to be the weapon and the courtroom the battlefield." It is their opinion that when the attack begins, it will not be limited to conventional paper and pencil tests. Scored interviews, biographical information blanks, and work history requirements will be scrutinized.

To the discomfort of many members of the credentialed society, the new property, a certificate to practice educational administration, will face the same test. If educational requirements fail to show a significant relationship to effective performance when the possibility for discrimination exists, they too, in all likelihood, will be declared illegal. In short, no criterion of selection seems exempt from the validity if discrimination can be demonstrated (1).

It appears obvious to this researcher that the basis for litigation would sprout from the guidelines on employee selection procedures as developed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. This was authorized by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (3). Bridges and Baehr expressed the feeling that if the legal briefs followed previously established patterns involving civil rights issues, relevant social science research will be used as supplemental material in support of the argument.

William A. Kendrick (5) conducted a related study in 1970 which, on a limited basis, examined procedures used by
California boards of education in selecting their superintendents. Dr. Kendrick collected these data from California superintendents who were new in their position in the 1969-1970 school year, board members who were serving at the time the superintendents were selected, and members of screening committees who assisted the boards in reaching their decision. This research indicated that boards recognized the need for adopting policies for the selection process and establishing qualification criteria for candidates. Findings also demonstrated that fifty percent of the responding districts used professional consultants while forty percent utilized the consultative skills of the outgoing superintendent.

Kendrick also noted that all responding board members of districts which employed screening committees recommended the continuation of this practice. He also noted that the California study revealed most districts visited the communities of the finalist candidates.

An important consideration, in this researcher's opinion, was that less than thirty-three percent of responding boards of education requested assistance in their screening from consultants. A national observation will be very interesting in this regard as Kendrick's research evidenced a recognition of the need for aid in screening, although most do not agree that persons serving in this capacity require specialized training of any form or background in educational administration (5).
A doctoral dissertation study conducted at the Ohio State University by S. T. Henderson (4) in 1971 was launched to determine the impact of the utilization of consultants by boards of education in Ohio. The thrust of this research was directed toward examining the selection process profiles of school districts which used consultants as opposed to those who did not. There were three revelations as the result of Dr. Henderson's examination: (A) use of consultants resulted in increased written responsibilities with regard to description of the school district, briefing board members on procedures, preparing the selection process in written form, preparing selection budgets and rating sheets. It also involved considering both candidates from within and without the system. (B) Both board presidents and consultants were in agreement that the three most beneficial services provided by these consultants were design of the selection process, recruitment of candidates and initial screening aid (4), and (C) the utilization of consultants resulted in board members being less personally involved in the total selection process.

An article in the March, 1973, edition of The American School Board Journal, authored by Charles Fowler, dealt explicitly with implications of superintendent hiring. The author indicated that the manner in which a board of education approaches this hiring procedure will be directly reflected in their satisfaction of his job performance (2). This study also confirmed value in some common-sense hiring procedures.
such as planning of selection procedures, preparation of written job description, broadcasting the vacancy over large geographic area, preparation of a brochure describing the school district, and structuring a detailed interview format. The only selection variable which surfaced in this study with a significant relationship to "overall" performance was the geographic consideration mentioned above, i.e., the wider the geographic selection base, the better the success forecast. It was Fowler's opinion that the use of planned selection procedures attracted applicants skilled in personnel administration. He also noted that boards which place emphasis on a detailed candidate interview format were in a better position to judge how a candidate would "wear" with community and staff than those which did not. This article alluded to a general conclusion that school boards which engage in self-fulfilling wishes may subconsciously design procedures to identify certain qualities (2).

As one can see by the apparent lack of information regarding the de facto selection procedures, it is an area which obviously was in need of further exploration. This researcher attempted to examine this process in such a manner as to identify current practices and make recommendations regarding the improvement of these approaches to superintendent selection.
CHAPTER III

The initial step taken by this investigator, following the identification of the problem, was the classification of the four geographic regions from which states were to be selected and among which comparisons were to be made. The four regions were suggested in *World Geography Today* by Roemer, Israel and Durand, Jr. The selected states by geographic area are:


**Midwestern states** - Iowa, Nebraska, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

**Southern states** - Oklahoma, Arkansas, Alabama, North Carolina, and Texas.

**Western states** - Washington, California, Arizona, Colorado, and Oregon.

In addition:

**Large school district** - School district with a total district enrollment of 3,500 students or greater.

**Small school district** - School district with a total district enrollment of 3,499 students or less.

Considering the fact that this writer desired to examine the hiring procedures on a basis of district size as well as geographic location, an identification of district populations was necessary. A figure to differentiate between large and
small school districts was mandated. Following an examination of several possible figures, the decision was made to use 3,500 total student enrollment as the dividing point. This figure is one suggested and used by the Iowa Association of School Administrators in their examinations of various enrollment-oriented problems. The Iowa State Educational Association figures were considered as well as recommendations from various national organizations, i.e., National Association of School Boards, National Association of Secondary School Principals, etc.

In light of the enrollment of the schools to be sampled and considering the number of superintendent changes in these states during the years selected for this research, the figure 3,500, in the opinion of this researcher, was the most appropriate. Although a total student enrollment of 3,500 was not considered "large" in the metropolitan sense, several of the Western and Southern states had a very limited number of districts with an enrollment that high, let alone several which had changed superintendents since 1971. From each of the four geographic designations, five states were randomly selected, making a total of twenty states which were surveyed.

Upon identifying those twenty states, the executive secretary of the American Association of School Administrators was contacted. This person, in turn, provided the writer with the names of the respective executive secretaries for the State Associations of School Administrators.
A letter was sent to each of these men (see Appendix A) soliciting their cooperation in identifying twenty school districts in their states which had hired a superintendent since 1971. This letter asked for a further breakdown of ten districts with a total student population of 3,500 and above. It also requested a list of districts which had a total student population of less than 3,500.

Once the individual school districts were identified, a letter was sent to the school board secretary, in care of the superintendent (see Appendix B). This letter requested aid in identifying two school board members who were incumbent at the time the superintendent was hired. Upon receipt of these names, this researcher forwarded to them a questionnaire with cover letter attached (see Appendix C).

The questionnaire was formulated by identifying the areas to be researched and subsequently attempting to examine as many phases of these areas as possible. The researcher had several meetings with Professor Ross A. Engel, school board members, Iowa State University Statistical Laboratory personnel and other educators in an attempt to revise and refine the instrument to best seek the data desired.

As the completed questionnaires were returned, they were coded for transferring information to punched cards. The data analysis included rankings and the test statistics, chi square.
Following the analysis of the data, it was decided to present information to the reader on each of the ninety-one variables included on the questionnaire. An attempt was made, however, to report the findings according to superintendent selection process subgroups within the questionnaire. It should be noted that in many cases, according to the results of the survey instrument, there were no significant differences between the large and small school districts nor the four geographic regions. There was a total of 746 questionnaires distributed. Three hundred seventy-eight were returned for a return of fifty-one percent. The responses by region were as follows: east - 85, for twenty-three percent of the total; midwest - 113, for thirty percent of the total; south - 81, for twenty-one percent of the total; and west - 99, for twenty-six percent of the total. By enrollment the figures included 189 responses for large districts and also 189 for the smaller districts. Each had a percentage of fifty.

The first group of questions presented to the participating school board members dealt with the criteria used by the board of education in selecting their superintendent. It was discovered that a minimum of eighty-two percent of the responding school districts in each of the four geographic areas, regardless of enrollment, discussed at a regularly scheduled board meeting the type of individual for whom they
were looking. The following tables present a breakdown of responses by enrollment size and location respectively.

Table 1. Discussion of potential candidates at regularly scheduled school board meeting by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did discuss at a regularly scheduled meeting</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not discuss at a regularly scheduled meeting</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{a}_{n=377} \quad x^2=2.00 \quad 1 \text{ df} \quad P=.16 \]

Table 2. Discussion of potential candidates at regularly scheduled school board meeting by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did discuss at a regularly scheduled meeting</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not discuss at a regularly scheduled meeting</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{a}_{n=377} \quad x^2=3.26 \quad 3 \text{ df} \quad P=.35 \]

Concerning the question whether the strengths or weaknesses of the preceding superintendent had a direct bearing on selecting the new person, there was a statistically significant difference between both enrollment sizes and geographic locations. The following two tables project these differences by region and enrollment size.
There was no significant difference between school size or geographic region concerning the question of explicitness in the job specifications provided the candidates by the school boards. The question read:

To what degree of specificity did your Board of Education define the job specifications for help in screening candidates?

- Precisely specific
- Considerable amount of specificity
- Slightly specific
- Very unspecific
The most popular response by size and region was "considerable amount of specificity." The vast majority of responding school board members also replied that the candidates were provided a copy of said job specifications. For enrollment sizes, $X^2=1.21$, 3 df, $P=.75$. For location comparisons, $X^2=6.34$, 9 df, $P=.71$.

When posed the question "How important was a Doctor's degree in the selection of your superintendent?", forty-seven percent of the larger districts responded "important, but not necessary." "Not important" was second in the balloting with thirty-four percent. The smaller schools responded with fifty-five percent feeling the degree was not important. Forty percent of the smaller districts felt it was important, but not necessary. Seven of the smaller schools considered the degree a negative factor while none of the larger schools responded in that fashion. $X^2=44.08$, 3 df, $P=.00$. With regard to geographic considerations, there was no significant difference.

One point of interest to the reader might be that the southern states were the only delegation to prefer the response "important, but not necessary." The other three regions preferred the response "not important." Also, the southern states did not cast a single vote considering the degree a negative factor. $X^2=9.29$, 9 df, $P=.41$.

When these same school board members were asked to prognosticate the importance of a Doctor's degree for future superintendents of their districts, there was no significant
difference with respect to size or geographic location. The large schools responded with fifty percent preferring the "important, but not necessary" response. Twenty-one percent of the large schools predicted a Doctor's degree would be mandatory while only four percent of the small schools perceived this in the future. The overwhelming response for the smaller districts was split with forty-eight percent saying it was "important, but not necessary" and forty-seven percent regarding the degree as unimportant. Geographically the results were very similar with the midwest states registering the only two votes considering a Doctor's degree a negative factor in future selections. Those two votes represented approximately two percent of the midwest respondents. The enrollment statistics were: $X^2=32.52, 3 \text{ df}, P=.00$. For location the figures included $X^2=14.26, 9 \text{ df}, P=.11$.

When asked to rank four criteria - age, experience as a superintendent, educational degrees, and experience with problems the sampled district was having at the time of the superintendent selection - according to their importance, with 1 being most important and 4 being least important, the geographic results were as follows:
Table 5. Ranking of age, experience, and educational degrees by geographic region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as superintendent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational degrees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with problems district is having</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n=345 \)

The results based on school enrollment were evidenced in the following chart.

Table 6. Ranking of age, experience, and educational degrees by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as superintendent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational degrees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with problems district is having</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n=345 \)

There was no significant difference between the geographic regions nor enrollment size.

When asked what the educational degree preference was for superintendent candidates, fifty-eight percent of the
larger schools preferred the Ed.D. to either the Ph.D. or Ed.S. The smaller schools' reaction was similar; however, the Ed.D. received only one vote more than the Ed.S. The Ed.D. was also the favorite across the geographic regions. Of the 378 questionnaires returned, 142 persons failed to respond to this question. The following tables detail the results.

Table 7. Degree preferences by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n=236 \quad x^2=26.05 \quad 2 \text{ df} \quad P=.00 \]

Table 8. Degree preferences by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n=236 \quad x^2=3.83 \quad 6 \text{ df} \quad P=.70 \]

An overwhelming majority of both large and small schools across all four geographic regions replied that they had not considered anyone for their superintendency who was not trained in education. Nine percent of the large schools did, while only six percent of the smaller schools indicated they had considered someone not trained in education. With regard
to the geographic regions, the western states led with twelve percent of the respondents saying they had considered someone not trained in education. Enrollment statistics were \(X^2 = 0.62, 1\) df, \(P = .43\). Geographic statistics included \(X^2 = 6.32, 3\) df, \(P = .10\).

When asked to predict the future of people being hired as superintendents who did not have training in education, the data produced a more liberal picture. The southern states rated lowest with fourteen percent saying they would, in the future, consider someone as a superintendent candidate who was not trained in education. Both the eastern and western states responded with twenty-eight percent indicating training in education was not mandatory. Thirty percent of the larger schools felt that the lack of training in education did not eliminate a candidate while eighteen percent of the small schools responded similarly. There was a highly significant difference between the large schools and the small schools. \(X^2 = 6.61, 1\) df, \(P = .01\) for size. For geographic location, \(X^2 = 6.04, 3\) df, \(P = .11\). The schools that suggested a possibility of hiring a person not trained in education were presented with four possible options to educational training. These included Business Administration, Accounting, Law, and Personnel Administration. The overwhelming choice for both large and small districts, across all four geographic designations, was Business Administration. The legal training was the least favored alternative. The validity of this question
is dubious due to 274 missing observations.

Dealing with the question of psychological testing as a screening device, ninety-three percent of the districts responded by saying that they did not ask candidates to submit to any psychological or personality tests. There was no significant difference between the large and small schools nor across the four geographic regions. For enrollment, $X^2=0.22$, 1 df, $P=.64$. For location, $X^2=2.72$, 3 df, $P=.44$.

A significant difference was identified between school sizes and across the geographic regions regarding how important it was to the school board members that a candidate be under contract at the time he or she makes application for the new superintendency. The following tables identify the percent of respondents for each possible reply.

Table 9. Importance of candidate being under contract at time of application by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered a negative factor</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$a_n=367$  $X^2=8.71$  3 df  $P=.03$
Table 10. Importance of candidate being under contract at time of application by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered a negative factor</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a_n=367 \quad x^2=20.43 \quad 9 \text{ df} \quad P=.02 \)

This researcher was concerned about the preference of boards of education when presented with a situation where there were no feasible candidates with experience as a superintendent. Five alternative suggestions were offered to these people and there were considerable differences of opinion between the larger and smaller districts. The question read:

Please rank the following situations in order of preference with regard to background of a superintendent candidate for your district with "1" being most desirable.

The five following options were provided:

(1) A person who has had teaching experience and is currently in graduate school meeting the superintendent requirements for the state.

(2) A person who has had teaching experience, has state certification for the position of superintendent, and is currently being discharged from the armed forces.

(3) A person who has had superintendent experience, left the profession for several years and desires to return.

(4) A person currently serving in a school district in the central office.
(5) A person experienced in school administration but not as a superintendent.

The data presented the following results with seventy-one missing observations:

Table 11. School board experience preferences for candidates with no superintendent experience by enrollment\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A person who has had teaching experience and is currently in graduate school meeting the superintendent requirements for the state</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who has had teaching experience, has state certification for the position of superintendent, and is currently being discharged from the armed forces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who has had superintendent experience, left the profession for several years and desires to return</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person currently serving in a school district in the central office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person experienced in school administration but not as a superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a_{n=314}\)

When observing the same options but viewing it in light of geographic location, data uncovered the following, with seventy-one missing observations:
The reader can easily see there were some basic disagreements when scrutinizing the data from a geographic point of view. Both the large and small schools, regardless of geography, preferred a person with previous superintendent experience who had left to try another occupation but was now interested in returning over a candidate with no previous superintendent experience.
A review was made of the methods used by selected boards of education in publishing their most recent superintendent vacancy. Six choices were allowed on the questionnaire. These included newspaper ads, college placement services, professional employment agencies, utilization of college professors as consultants, word of mouth, and special contacts such as friends, relatives, etc. The top response for the larger districts was the utilization of college professors, while the smaller schools preferred college placement services. The least used method in both size districts was special contacts such as friends and relatives.

When examining these data with respect to geographical preferences in the publication procedure, this writer discovered that the eastern states and the southern states preferred to utilize college professors in recruiting prospective candidates for their top position. The data indicated a midwest preference for using special contacts such as friends, relatives, etc. Western states opted for college placement services as their main source of candidate contact. The midwestern states revealed college placement services as their least favored approach for publishing superintendent vacancies. The other three geographic regions designated special contacts such as friends, relatives, etc., as their least preferred approach to publishing their superintendent vacancy.

When asked if the school board had someone it favored for the position before the vacancy was actually announced, a
minimum, across both enrollment sizes and all four geographic regions, of seventy-five percent of the respondents replied negatively. Of the minority who did have a preconceived favorite, they proceeded in the larger districts by seriously considering other applicants before confirming the initial choice. The smaller school systems did not announce the vacancy and proceeded to hire the person the board favored. When this same question was viewed across the geographic designations the east and midwest followed suit with the larger districts while the southern and western states styled their procedure after the schools of smaller enrollments and did not announce the vacancy. The following two tables identify the differences.

Table 13. Board hiring of preconceived favorites by enrollment$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board favored someone for position of superintendent before vacancy was announced</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board had no preconceived favorite</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a n=352 \quad \chi^2=1.36 \quad 2 df \quad P=.51$
Table 14. Board hiring of preconceived favorites by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board favored someone for</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position of superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before vacancy was announced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board had no preconceived</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favorite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a_n=352 \quad x^2=9.70 \quad 6 \text{ df} \quad P=.14 \]

A highly significant difference between the two size divisions was revealed when selected school board members were asked if they opened the new vacancy to anyone who cared to apply. Of the respondents who replied affirmatively, fifty-three percent were large enrollment representatives while forty-seven percent were from the smaller systems. The negative reply was, indeed, in the minority with its largest response a mere eighteen percent when viewed across the western states. Enrollment figures included \[ x^2=6.13, \quad 1 \text{ df}, \quad P=.01 \]. For geographic location, \[ x^2=4.96, \quad 3 \text{ df}, \quad P=.18 \].

Of the 358 persons who responded to the question of whether their respective boards of education reduced the field of candidates from the original number of applicants, only thirty replied negatively. There was no significant difference with regard to size or location. Of the 328 who replied yes, there was a significant difference between enrollment sizes as evidenced by the table of percentages following.
Table 15. Reduction from original number of applicants by enrollment\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduced number of candidates to</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced number of candidates to 2</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced number of candidates to 3</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced number of candidates to 5</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced number of candidates to 7</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced number of candidates to 10</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced number of candidates to 15</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) \(n=328\)  \(X^2=12.17\)  5 df  \(P=.03\)

In investigating the geographic preferences, all the regions with the exception of the south appeared to have preferred a final field of five candidates. The majority of southern board members indicated a reduction to three. The vast majority of respondents also concurred that the preceding superintendent did not aid in the selection of his predecessor.

This researcher attempted to determine how extensively the superintendent vacancies were advertised and compare the spectrum with regard to enrollment size and geography. The following tables indicate the percentages by enrollment and by geographic designation.
Table 16. Breadth of superintendent vacancy advertisement by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionally</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationally</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not advertise</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n=319 \quad x^2=27.87 \quad 4 \text{ df} \quad P=.00 \]

Table 17. Breadth of superintendent vacancy advertisement by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionally</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationally</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not advertise</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n=319 \quad x^2=66.66 \quad 12 \text{ df} \quad P=.00 \]

This writer directs the reader's attention to the considerable discrepancy in Table 16 among the national percentages. The smaller schools, for the most part, advertise very little on the national level whereas the larger districts concentrate on a broader spectrum in publishing the vacancy.
In Table 17 it has become obvious that the western states prefer national exposure while the other three regions are more conservative, generally, in their announcement of the superintendent opening. This research indicates a sizeable difference between the southern region and the others with regard to the percentage of school boards that did not advertise the position at all.

The next portion of research examined factors which were influential in the respective boards of education's choice of candidates.

The question of asking the superintendent to submit to a standardized test such as the Miller's Analogy Test or Graduate Record Examination was explored. With regard to the size variable there was no significant difference between the large and small districts. The overwhelming response was "no," with ninety-one percent of the large districts and eighty-nine percent of the smaller districts concurring. When explored on the basis of geography there was a significant difference. The eastern and midwestern states concurred with the majority negative response of the large and small schools. The south and west states, however, tallied eleven percent and seventeen percent respectively of their respondents in the affirmative. For size, $X^2=0.28, 1 \text{ df}, P=.60$. For geographic location, $X^2=7.91, 3 \text{ df}, P=.05$.

When asked which approach they preferred for introductory purposes, the school board members replied with the following
order of preference:
(1) letter of application
(2) applicant's credentials from college or university
(3) picture of applicant
(4) phone call from applicant

This reflected the universal feeling regardless of district size. The singular deviant when considering the geographical location was the southern region which reversed numbers one and two from the above list.

Another phase of influential factors with which this investigation dealt was the more personal side of the process. This involved asking participating school boards if their consideration of a candidate would be negatively affected by such things as hair length, facial hair, obesity, and physical handicaps.

Forty-eight percent of the smaller districts responded by confirming that their consideration of a candidate would be adversely affected if the length of his hair were over his ears. Thirty-two percent of the larger districts concurred. This was a highly significant difference based on enrollment. Regarding the same question as seen in a geographic reference there was a significant difference, as twenty-eight percent of the eastern, thirty-eight percent of the midwestern, fifty-two percent of the southern, and forty-two percent of the western respondents indicated that their considerations would be negatively affected by hair length over the ear. The size
A beard was deemed offensive to twenty-six percent of the large school respondents and thirty-seven percent of the smaller schools. This figure represented a significant difference. As viewed geographically, the eastern states were least bothered by a bearded candidate with fifteen percent rejoining that their consideration would be negatively affected. At the other end of the spectrum was the southern region with fifty-three percent of their board members indicating negative feeling toward bearded superintendent candidates. This evidenced a highly significant difference in geographic location. Enrollment figures included \( X^2 = 8.89, 1 \text{ df}, P = .00 \). Location statistics included \( X^2 = 9.77, 3 \text{ df}, P = .02 \).

The mustachioed candidate fared much better according to this researcher's data. The mustache had a negative effect on thirteen percent of the larger districts and nine percent of the smaller enrollments. Again the southern districts voiced the most opposition to mustaches with a seventeen percent negative response. Also following suit with the least objection was the eastern region with five percent opposing mustachioed superintendent candidates. For size differences, \( X^2 = 0.80, 1 \text{ df}, P = .37 \). For geographic differences, \( X^2 = 6.22, 3 \text{ df}, P = .10 \).

Reviewing the affect obesity had on the consideration of a prospective superintendent by a school board member, it was
noted that there was a significant difference between geographic regions, but not between enrollment sizes. Forty-three percent of the large schools and forty-eight percent of the small schools felt obesity negatively affected the consideration they gave to a candidate. The eastern states responded with thirty-two percent saying obesity was a negative consideration. Fifty-three percent of the midwestern states replied they were not encouraged by obesity, while forty-four percent and forty-nine percent of the south and west regions respectively concurred. For enrollment differences, $X^2 = 0.77$, 1 df, $P = .38$. For geographic location, $X^2 = 8.80$, 6 df, $P = .03$.

This study also dealt with the feelings of board members concerning superintendent candidates who were physically handicapped, but not to the extent they could not perform the functions of the job. There was no significant difference between the large and small school districts. Both had over an eighty percent agreement that if the person were handicapped, but could function in the position, the handicap would not be a negative consideration. There was, however, a significant difference between the east region and the west region with regard to the same question. The eastern states had a total of ninety-three percent who felt that their consideration of a candidate would not be negatively affected if he were handicapped but could perform the functions of the job. Only seventy-eight percent of the western states concurred. The enrollment figures included $X^2 = 1.97$, 1 df, $P = .16$. The loca-
tion figures indicated $X^2=8.39$, 3 df, $P=.04$.

In an attempt to identify other personal characteristics which influence school board members involved in selecting a superintendent this writer compiled a list of characteristics and asked the board members to rank them, 1 being high and 4 being low. The list included the following four items: (n=323)

(1) fluency of speech
(2) dress
(3) physical attractiveness
(4) hairstyle

With only one geographic exception, all polled persons ranked the four considerations as they appear above. The southern region reversed items two and three. The largest discrepancy between any two geographic or enrollment balloting for any one characteristic was thirteen votes. This was registered in a difference between midwest and east regarding the question of dress.

When these same school board members were asked how important it was that their superintendent be married, fifty-two percent of the larger districts replied "not important," while the leader for the smaller districts was "important" with forty-nine percent. The east and west regions concurred with the larger districts with sixty-one percent and fifty-one percent respectively. The midwest and southern regions were more in agreement with the smaller districts with fifty-one percent of their districts considering marriage important. For size
differences, $X^2 = 4.70$, 4 df, $P = .32$. For geographic differences, $X^2 = 23.31$, 12 df, $P = .03$.

When a similar question was asked, "How important is it that the candidate have children?", the trend of the responses was very similar to that of the previous question. "Not important" was the majority response for both sizes and all regions, fifty-two percent being the lowest as offered by the southern states. Sixty-nine percent of the eastern states' respondents was the highest percentage reply for "not important." The following two tables project the balloting.

Table 18. Importance of candidate having children by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered having children a negative factor</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$a_n=365$ \ $X^2=3.87$ \ 3 df \ $P = .28$
Table 19. Importance of candidate having children by geographic location*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered having children a negative factor</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n=365 \quad X^2=15.74 \quad 9 \text{ df} \quad P=.07 \]

When school board members were asked if a telephone call, prior to sending a letter of application, was offensive to them eighty-one percent of the total respondents replied "no." For size differences, \( X^2=1.49, 1 \text{ df}, P=.22 \). For geographic differences, \( X^2=0.21, 3 \text{ df}, P=.98 \).

A question was posed regarding the negative effect of a candidate wearing glasses. When viewed on the basis of size there was no significant difference with enrollment sizes. Ninety-two percent said that glasses were not a consideration in hiring a superintendent. There was, however, a significant difference when comparing the geographic regions. The east and west regions had ten percent of the respondents who re-plied they would consider it a negative factor if the can-di-date wore glasses. One percent of the south and midwest regions considered glasses a negative factor. The enrollment statistics indicated \( X^2=6.05, 3 \text{ df}, P=.11 \). The location figures indicated \( X^2=18.01, 9 \text{ df}, P=.04 \).
The same question was posed substituting a hearing aid for glasses. There was a significant difference between enrollment sizes with large schools having thirteen percent who considered the hearing aid in a negative light when selecting a superintendent. Twenty-three percent of the smaller schools shared this thought. In viewing the question geographically, there was also a significant difference. Twenty-nine percent of the southern state respondents implied a negative reflection. Ten percent of the midwestern state respondents agreed. The east and west regions tallied fourteen percent and twenty-one percent respectively. For enrollment, $X^2=10.18$, 3 df, $P=.02$. For location, $X^2=17.98$, 9 df, $P=.04$.

The following tables indicate the height preferences as projected by the polled school board members, presenting the comparison between enrollment sizes and indicating the variation between the four geographic areas. There was no significant difference between either size or location.

Table 20. Height preferences by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height Preferences</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 6'4&quot;</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'11&quot;-6'4&quot;</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'7&quot;-5'10&quot;</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5'7&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height not important</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=335 $X^2=2.53$ 3 df $P=.47$
Table 21. Height preferences by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 6'4&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'11&quot;-6'4&quot;</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'7&quot;-5'10&quot;</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5'7&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height not important</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n=335 \quad \chi^2=13.12 \quad 9 \text{ df} \quad p=.16 \]

An investigation was conducted which concerned itself with the preferences of school board members regarding the institution at which a candidate completed his/her graduate work. The two following tables denote the preferences by size and geographic designation, with 1 being highest.

Table 22. Educational institution preference ranking by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Institution</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-state institution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State university</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private university</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy League institution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of state institution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution with outstanding reputation for training school administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n=338 \]
Table 23. Educational institution preference ranking by geographic locationa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-state institution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State university</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private university</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy League institution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of state institution</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution with outstanding reputation for training school administrators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a_n=338

The use of consultants by boards of education was explored in this investigation. There was a significant difference between the large and small school districts. Forty-one percent of the responding large schools indicated they did use a consultant while thirty-six percent of the smaller districts comported. There was a highly significant difference in view of the geographic regions. Fifty-one percent of the western respondents replied in the affirmative while the east, midwest, and south replied with thirty-two percent, forty-one percent, and twenty-six percent respectively. College professor was the occupation of the vast majority of consultants. The least used was the incumbent superintendent. There was a highly significant difference between the western states and
the other three regions regarding the occupation of consultants. While the other three regions averaged seventy percent using college professors and less than two percent using community persons, the western section of the country tallied forty-four percent college professors and twenty-nine percent community persons. For enrollment, the figures included \(X^2=17.43, 2 \text{ df}, P=.02\). The location figures included \(X^2=16.07, 6 \text{ df}, P=.01\).

When the boards who did employ consultants were asked to what extent this person participated in the superintendent selection process, there was a significant difference between enrollment sizes and a highly significant difference when scrutinized on a geographic basis. The most frequent response from all parties who utilized the services of a consultant was that the consultant screened candidates and proposed several possibilities to the board of education. Considering the size variable, the pronounced difference between large and small districts was that the small districts had eight percent of their consultants who suggested only one person the consultant had known through personal contact. The large districts had none that suggested only one final candidate but twenty-five percent suggested several persons he/she had known through personal contact.

The data suggest the reason for a highly significant difference between geographic regions was the large variation between the consultant practices of the midwest and those of
the south. Eighty-eight percent of the districts in the midwestern who employed consultants utilized them by asking them to screen candidates and propose several possibilities. Only forty-one percent of the southern consultants were used in that fashion. Fifty-five percent of the southern consultants were asked to suggest several people they had known through personal contact as possible superintendent candidates. The size statistics indicated $X^2 = 8.50$, 3 df, $P = .04$. The location figures included $X^2 = 32.77$, 9 df, $P = .00$.

When asked how heavily the respective boards of education relied upon the consultants' recommendation, the choice was "considerably" for a majority of both large and small schools. There was a significant difference between the geographic regions, however. The following tabulation indicates, by percentage, how heavily the responding board members relied upon their consultants' recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very heavily</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave it only token consideration</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[$^a_n = 165$ $X^2 = 16.89$, 9 df $P = .05$]
When board members were asked if they thought the use of consultative help was successful in their district, eighty-seven percent of the larger school districts felt that their use of this person was successful. However, only forty-eight percent said they will employ a consultant for the next superintendent vacancy. For enrollment, $X^2=3.88$, 1 df, $P=.05$.

Seventy-eight percent of the smaller districts felt a benefit from the use of a consultant but only thirty-five percent replied they will utilize a consultant's services for the next superintendent vacancy. For size, $X^2=1.87$, 1 df, $P=.17$.

Geographically the results were very similar. An overwhelming percentage felt their consultant had been successful. For location, $X^2=3.21$, 3 df, $P=.36$. Concurrently, feelings were rather negative about the use of a consultant in future superintendent selections. The western region was the only area which responded very favorably to the use of a consultant in the future. Sixty percent of the board members indicated they would employ consultative services for their next vacancy. For location, $X^2=15.45$, 3 df, $P=.00$.

The participating school board members were provided with eight alternatives which may have been used in making the final decision as to who the new superintendent would be. They were asked to check the one they used during their most recent selection. The following tables list the eight alternatives and their ranking by size and region.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One to three hour interview by Board of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three hour interview by Board of Education Committee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three hour interview by Board of Education and faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview family members of prospective superintendent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit community where candidate previously resided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with the candidate's minister</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with the Board of Education where candidate was previously employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with faculty members on the staff where candidate was previously employed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\text{n=329}\)
Table 26. Procedure used for final decision on applicants by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One to three hour interview by Board of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three hour interview by Board of Education Committee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three hour interview by Board of Education and faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview family members of prospective superintendent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit community where candidate previously resided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with the candidate's minister</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with the Board of Education where candidate was previously employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk with faculty members on the staff where candidate was previously employed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[n=329\]
From these tables it becomes obvious that the one to three hour interview by the board was the most popular form of finalizing the selection process. It also points out that very few school board members are interested in speaking with the candidate's minister.

Candidate expenses were also a concern of this research. In asking if the participating districts paid expenses for the candidate and/or family to visit the community there were highly significant differences between both enrollment sizes and geographic locations. Seventy percent of the larger districts did pay expenses for their finalists, while only thirty-eight percent of the smaller schools did. Geographically the midwest region topped the other three regions with sixty-six percent paying expenses. The remaining three regions, east, south, and west, tallied forty-three percent, thirty-eight percent, and fifty-nine percent respectively as districts who paid candidate expenses for community visits. The enrollment statistics included $X^2 = 33.74$, 1 df, $P = .00$. The location figures indicated $X^2 = 18.49$, 3 df, $P = .00$.

This writer was interested in whether following the total procedure of selecting the chief administrator, the school boards felt they had been successful with their approach to hiring. When asked to what degree they, as individuals, felt their board had selected the type of individual they were seeking, fifty-eight percent of the larger schools and forty-nine percent of the smaller districts replied with a firm
"very high correlation." Only one-half of one percent of the large districts and three percent of the smaller districts stated they did not get the type of person they sought. All four of the geographic regions replied, in the large majority, that the correlation between the individual for whom they had been looking and their final selection was very high. The following two tables outline specific responses. The question to participating board members was:

To what degree do you feel, as a board member, that you selected the type of individual you were seeking?

Table 27. Selection success as perceived by school board members by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high correlation</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High correlation</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average correlation</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average correlation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not get the type of individ</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n=367 \quad \chi^2=4.73 \quad 4 \text{ df} \quad P=.32 \]
Table 28. Selection success as perceived by school board members by geographic location^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high correlation</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High correlation</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average correlation</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average correlation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not get the type of individual we intended to select</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a n=367  X^2=12.98  12 df  P=.37

Fifty-two percent and fifty-six percent of the large and small districts, respectively, indicated that the person who was the superintendent before the current superintendent was hired could not have remained had the person desired. Viewing this same variable in a geographic reference, the midwest, south, and west regions all replied that their incumbent was not given the option to continue. The east region was the only exception, with fifty-four percent of the respondents indicating that the former superintendent left of his own accord. The statistics for enrollment included X^2=0.56, 1 df, P=.46. The figures for location included X^2=4.90, 3 df, P=.18.

The length of time consumed by the superintendent selection process was examined in this research. There was a highly significant difference between the large and small districts with respect to the time it took the boards to complete the
selection process. The following table delineates the comparison of time the respective school sizes took to hire their new superintendent.

Table 29. Length of selection process by enrollment\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One to two weeks</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to four weeks</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two months</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four months</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)n=335 \quad x^2=15.49 \quad 4 \text{ df} \quad P=.00

Table 30 explores the identical problem viewed from a geographic point of reference. There was a highly significant difference in the responses between the geographic regions.

Table 30. Length of selection process by geographic location\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One to two weeks</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to four weeks</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two months</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four months</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)n=335 \quad x^2=25.56 \quad 12 \text{ df} \quad P=.01
Equal employment opportunity was a concern of this writer. The writer felt that along with the personal considerations of the various boards of education an investigation into this facet might lend legal substance to the research.

It seemed to this researcher that requiring job applicants to provide a picture with their applications was a rather common request. In examining this in an educational light with regard to filling superintendent vacancies, there was no significant difference between school sizes with seventy-four percent of the respondents replying that they did not require a picture of the candidate. There was, however, a highly significant difference between the geographic regions. The largest difference was between the eastern region, who tallied a total of thirteen percent requiring a picture of the candidates, and the southern region who reported forty-seven percent requiring candidate pictures. For enrollment, $X^2=0.14$, 1 df, $P=.71$. For location, $X^2=25.30$, 3 df, $P=.00$.

When asked how important it was that the candidate not have relatives employed by the district no one responded that it would be considered a positive factor. There was no significant difference between enrollment sizes although forty-four percent of the larger schools considered it unimportant while forty-five percent of the smaller schools registered some disapproval with an "important but not mandatory" reply.
There was a significant difference between geographies with the east, midwest, and south concurring with a majority that relatives in the system was not a detriment. The western region, however, polled forty-six percent who felt the most appropriate response was "important but not mandatory." The size statistics indicated \( X^2 = 3.11, 2 \text{ df, } P = .21 \). The geography figures included \( X^2 = 15.35, 6 \text{ df, } P = .02 \).

Age of the candidate was another area touched upon by this research. There were highly significant differences between the school sizes and also the geographic regions. Fifty-five percent of the responding large schools indicated that the age of the candidate was very important while forty-two percent replied it was not important. The corresponding figures for smaller districts were seventy-one percent and twenty-seven percent. A breakdown by region uncovered fifty-one percent of the eastern states feeling that age was very important while forty-seven percent felt it was unimportant. The midwest responded with figures of sixty-nine percent and thirty-one percent. The southern returns indicated eighty-four percent and thirteen percent. The western respondents tallied forty-seven percent and forty-six percent. For enrollment, \( X^2 = 0.79, 2 \text{ df, } P = .67 \). For location, \( X^2 = 19.99, 6 \text{ df, } P = .00 \).

"Which sex would your board prefer to hire" was a question posed to the selected school board members. There was a highly significant difference between the large and small districts as well as between the four geographic regions. The
following two tables identify percentage differences with regard to size and location.

Table 31. Sex preference by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a} n=353 \quad x^2=9.64 \quad 2 \text{ df} \quad P=.01\)

Table 32. Sex preference by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a} n=353 \quad x^2=36.47 \quad 6 \text{ df} \quad P=.00\)

Only sixteen percent of the large school districts surveyed had females make application for the most recent superintendent opening. Seventeen percent of the smaller districts had at least one female applicant. The eastern region polled the highest number of female applicants with thirty-one percent of those districts having had at least one female apply. Midwestern and southern states had twelve percent who responded affirmatively to the question while the western region
had fifteen percent. Their response indicated a highly significant difference in the number of female applications between the four designated geographic regions. Based on enrollment, there was no significant difference. For size, $X^2=0.06$, 1 df, $P=.81$. For location, $X^2=15.88$, 3 df, $P=.00$.

Of the districts who did have a female applicant for the superintendent vacancy, twenty-two percent of the large school districts and fifteen percent of the smaller districts offered the woman the position. Geographically speaking, the south region offered the position to twenty-five percent of the women who applied. This constituted the highest geographic percentage. The midwest tallied the lowest with fourteen percent of the female applicants being offered the job. Enrollment statistics reflected $X^2=0.33$, 1 df, $P=.56$. Geographic location figures indicated $X^2=0.92$, 3 df, $P=.82$.

The ensuing two tables identify board hiring preferences with regard to race.

Table 33. Racial preferences by enrollment$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a_n=342$  $X^2=12.10$  4 df  $P=.02$
Table 34. Racial preferences by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n=342 \quad x^2=49.09 \quad 12 \text{ df} \quad P=.00 \)

There was a significant difference in race preference between enrollment sizes. There was a highly significant difference between geographic areas.

There was also a highly significant difference in both categories concerning the number of minority people who applied for superintendent vacancies in the participating schools. Twenty-one percent of the large schools had minority applicants while only eight percent of the smaller schools did. Geographically, the western region led the survey with twenty-six percent having had minority people apply. The region with the least number of minority applicants was the midwest with seven percent. The enrollment figures indicated \( x^2=8.97, 1 \text{ df}, P=.00 \). The location figures included \( x^2=15.93, 3 \text{ df}, P=.00 \).

Of the minority people who did apply, ten percent were offered the position from the larger districts and seventeen percent from the smaller districts. The difference was not
significant.

There was no significant difference between the geographic designations as twenty-one percent of the minority people from the western region were offered the job, thirteen percent from the midwest, eleven percent from the east, and of seventeen applicants from minority groups in the south, there were no jobs offered these people. No significant difference between regions was identified. Enrollment statistics reflected $X^2=0.28$, 1 df, $P=.60$. Geographic location figures indicated $X^2=4.03$, 3 df, $P=.26$.

Candidate heights were explored again at this point. This effort, however, was directed with specific concern for preferences which may have influenced school board members and possibly involved some violations of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act. The participating school board members were asked if they would consider it a negative factor if the height of a candidate were over 6'4" or under 5'7". They also were provided with the alternative of "neither would be considered a negative factor." Of the large school respondents, no one felt there would be a negative effect of being over 6'4". Six percent felt their opinion would be adversely affected by a person under 5'7" and ninety-four percent replied it would have no effect. The smaller districts had one percent of the respondents replying that a height over 6'4" would be considered negatively and eleven percent felt under 5'7" would create a negative impression. Eighty-eight percent of
the small school respondents felt neither would be considered a negative factor. There was no significant difference between the larger and smaller school districts.

Neither was there a significant difference geographically. One percent was the highest percentage reply from any area (east) that felt 6'4" would be considered in a negative light. The midwest reported the highest percentage of people feeling that a height under 5'7" would reflect negatively. They reported eleven percent. A minimum of eighty-eight percent (midwest) indicated that neither would be considered a negative factor. For enrollment, \( \chi^2 = 5.78, 2 \text{ df}, P = .06 \). For geographic location, \( \chi^2 = 3.49, 6 \text{ df}, P = .75 \).

The final area explored by this researcher was the religious aspect of the "Equal Employment Opportunity concern. The following two tables illustrate the religious preferences.

Table 35. Specific religious preferences by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\ n = 302 \quad \chi^2 = 9.97 \quad 5 \text{ df} \quad P = .08\)
Table 36. Specific religious preferences by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a_n=302 \quad \chi^2=26.43 \quad 15 \text{ df} \quad P=.03\)

Combining the protestant denominations we arrive at a more general view of the following:

Table 37. General religious preferences by enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a_n=302\)
Table 38. General religious preferences by geographic location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a n=302

There was a significant difference between the geographic regions. No significant difference existed between enrollment sizes.

It should also be noted that with the options provided in the above tables, there were agnostic and atheistic preferences included. Not a single respondent replied that he/she preferred a superintendent be of the atheistic or agnostic persuasion.
CHAPTER V

The purpose of this study was to explore the superintendent selection process and identify variations in procedure based on the size of the school district enrollment and the geographic location. There have been some very limited profile studies made. The culmination of these studies often ended with suggested procedures for hiring a superintendent. There has been virtually nothing done concerning the actuality of the current situation.

Three-hundred-seventy-three school districts were surveyed. Participating districts were sent two questionnaires. Each questionnaire was completed by a school board member who was incumbent at the time the most recent superintendent was elected. Schools were selected from a list provided by the respective states' School Administrators' Association. To be included, a district must have hired a superintendent subsequent to the 1970-71 school year.

There were five areas of research conducted in conjunction with the superintendent selection procedure. They included: (1) criteria used for selecting a new superintendent, (2) identification of screening procedures, (3) factors which influenced the choice of superintendent, (4) success of selection process and recommended changes, and (5) Equal Employment Opportunity survey.
Limitations

The interpretation and use of the conclusions produced and presented by this investigation should be considered under and guided by the following admonitions:

The sampling technique employed.

(1) was limited to 373 school districts selected randomly from twenty states.

(2) realized a fifty-one percent return on 378 respondents. The researcher took the liberty of calling seven districts that had not returned both questionnaires. The results of those calls were as follows:

(a) Three districts had only one school board member remaining who was incumbent at the time of the most recent superintendent election. Thus, only one return from each of these three districts.

(b) Two persons had misplaced the original and followup questionnaires. The writer asked these people to respond verbally and jotted their responses on a questionnaire. They appeared to fall into the "average" or "expected" response category, i.e., their replies did not appear to vary from the majority of replies.

(c) One person's response was that his district required that any questionnaire be approved by a central authority prior to completion. He stated he forwarded it and it never was returned.
(d) A lady responded that she preferred not to fill it out for personal reasons. When the writer told her one of her colleagues had completed an identical one, she maintained her position and refused.

(3) The districts from which the sample came were all identified by the executive secretary of the respective states' Administrators' Association.

(4) On a considerable number of the completed instruments there were several missing observations. Possibilities for these omissions included an oversight on the part of the respondents, or it is conceivable they chose not to respond to a certain item for personal reasons.

The survey instrument.

(1) Questions were posed on both sides of each sheet of paper. Although instructions indicated this, there were several respondents who omitted an entire side.

(2) To qualify as a participating school the district must have hired a superintendent subsequent to the 1970-71 school year. This parameter was included in hopes that the memory of participating school board members would be relatively fresh. This writer conceded that the four years between the superintendent selection experience and recalling the procedure was a considerable length of time and the retention may have been less than model.

(3) It was discovered that the small response from the Alabama sector was due to the fact that in this state superin-
tendents are elected by the people, not appointed by school boards.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from the statistical data.

There were a total of 182 variables examined. Ninety-one were based on size variations and ninety-one were based on geographic location of the school districts.

With regard to enrollment size, twelve percent of the variables examined revealed a significant difference between the large school districts and the smaller districts. Another thirteen percent of the variables identified the difference as highly significant.

These same variables viewed geographically demonstrated a significant difference in eleven percent of the cases, and a highly significant difference in twelve percent of the variables.

These figures represented a total of twenty-five percent of the size variables and twenty-three percent of the geography variables.

There are, obviously, considerable differences between large and small schools as well as between the geographic locations. The following two tables summarize the significant and highly significant differences. An asterisk (*) will be used to denote significant differences at the .05 level. Two
asterisks (**) will be used to denote a highly significant difference at the .01 level.

Table 39. Differences in selection criteria due to enrollment variations

I. Criteria used for selecting a new superintendent
(Please refer to Table 4)

2. Did any of the following have a direct bearing on the criteria your Board used in selecting your most recent superintendent?
   - Inadequacies of previous superintendent
   - Strengths of previous superintendent
   - Both strengths and inadequacies of previous superintendent

(Please refer to Table 7)

5. How important was a Doctor's degree in the selection of your superintendent?
   - Mandatory
   - Important, but not mandatory
   - Not important
   - Was considered a negative factor

6. How important will a Doctor's degree be in your Board's selection of future superintendents?
   - Mandatory
   - Important, but not mandatory
   - Not important
   - Would be considered a negative factor

8. In your opinion, which of the following degrees did your Board consider the most desirable in your selection of the current superintendent?
   - Doctor of Philosophy - Ph.D.
   - Educational Doctorate - Ed.D.
   - Educational Specialist - Ed.S.

10. Would you consider a person for the superintendency of your district who was not trained in Education?
    - Yes
    - No

13. How important is it that a candidate be under contract at the time he makes application with your school?
    - Very important
    - Important
    - Not important
    - Considered a negative factor
II. Identification of screening procedures

(Please 28)

**1. Which of the following methods are used by your Board of Education in publishing your most recent superintendent vacancy? Check each which applies.

- Newspaper
- College placement services
- Professional employment agency
- Utilized college professors as consultants
- Word of mouth
- Special contacts such as friends, relatives, etc.

(Please 30)

**4. Did you, as a member of the Board of Education, open the position to anyone who cared to apply?

- Yes
- No

(Please 31, Table 15)

**6. If so, to what number did you reduce the field of applicants?

- 2
- 3
- 5
- 7
- 10
- 15

(Please 32, Table 16)

**11. How extensively was the superintendent vacancy advertised?

- Locally
- Statewide
- Regionally, i.e., Midwest states, Eastern states, etc.
- Nationally
- Did not advertise at all
Table 39 (continued)

### III. Factors influential in choice of superintendent (Page 34)

**3. Would your consideration of a candidate be negatively affected if:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The length of his hair were over his ears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He had a beard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He had a mustache</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He were obese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He were physically handicapped, but could still perform the functions of the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(Page 40)**

**9. To what extent would your Board consider it a negative factor if the candidate wore a hearing aid?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a consider-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would consider it a positive factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(Page 41, Table 22)**

**11. What is your Board's preference with regard to the institution at which a candidate did his/her graduate work? Please list your first, second and last choices as 1, 2, and 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-state institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy League institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of state institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution with outstanding reputation for training school administrators. Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(Page 42)**

**12. Did your Board use a consultant to aid the Board in the selection of your current superintendent?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(Page 43)**

**14. To what extent did this person participate in the selection process?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggested one person he/she had known through personal contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested several persons he/she had known through personal contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screened candidates and proposed several possibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewed candidates and suggested one to Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 39 (continued)

(Please turn page)

**17. Will your Board employ a consultant for the next superintendent vacancy?**

Yes

No

**19. Did your district pay expenses for candidate and/or family to visit your community?**

Yes

No

IV. Success of selection process and recommended changes

(Please turn page)

**3. How long did the selection process take between the time the vacancy was official and the time the new superintendent was hired?**

One to two weeks

Three to four weeks

Two months

Four months

Six months

V. Equal employment opportunity survey

(Please turn page)

**4. Which sex would your Board prefer to hire?**

Male

Female

No preference

**7. Which race would your Board prefer to hire?**

Caucasian

Black

Oriental

Indian

No preference

**8. Did you have any minority group people apply for the last superintendent vacancy?**

Yes

No
Table 40. Differences in selection criteria due to geographic location

I. Criteria used for selecting a new superintendent
(Page 18, Table 3)

*2. Did any of the following have a direct bearing on the criteria your Board used in selecting your most recent superintendent?
   ___ Inadequacies of previous superintendent
   ___ Strengths of previous superintendent
   ___ Both strengths and inadequacies of previous superintendent

(Page 25, Table 10)

*13. How important is it that a candidate be under contract at the time he makes application with your school?
   ___ Very important
   ___ Important
   ___ Not important
   ___ Considered a negative factor

(Page 27, Table 12)

*14. Please rank the following situations in order of preference with regard to background of a superintendent candidate for your district with "1" being most desirable.

As a member of the Board of Education, my order of preference for inexperienced superintendent candidates would be:

   ___ A person who has had teaching experience and is currently in graduate school meeting the superintendent requirements for the state.
   ___ A person who has had teaching experience, has state certification for the position of superintendent, and is currently being discharged from the armed forces.
   ___ A person who has had superintendent experience, left the profession for several years and desires to return.
   ___ A person currently serving in a school district in the central office.
   ___ A person experienced in school administration but not as a superintendent.
Table 40 (continued)

II. Identification of screening procedures

(Page 28)

**1. Which of the following methods are used by your Board of Education in publishing your most recent superintendent vacancy? Check each which applies.
- Newspaper
- College placement services
- Professional employment agency
- Utilized college professors as consultants
- Word of mouth
- Special contacts such as friends, relatives, etc.

(Page 32)

**9. If so, to what extent?
- Involved in each step of the hiring procedure and recommended a candidate to the Board
- Was consulted and recommended several final candidates to the Board
- Consulted with the Board concerning needs of the district, but did not make any candidate recommendations
- Remotely involved

(Page 32)

**10. If your last superintendent made a recommendation to the Board regarding his successor, did you follow the recommendation?
- Yes
- No

(Page 32, Table 17)

**11. How extensively was the superintendent vacancy advertised?
- Locally
- Statewide
- Regionally, i.e., Midwest states, Eastern states, etc.
- Nationally
- Did not advertise at all

III. Factors influential in choice of superintendent

(Page 33)

**1. Do you ask for scores of standardized tests such as Miller's Analogy Test or Graduate Record Exam?
- Yes
- No
Table 40 (continued)

For introductory purposes, does your Board prefer:
(please check all that apply)

**2.** Yes No
- Letter of application
- Phone call from applicant
- Picture of applicant
- Applicant's credentials from college or university

Would your consideration of a candidate be negatively affected if:

**3.** Yes No
- The length of his hair were over his ears
- He had a beard
- He had a mustache
- He were obese
- He were physically handicapped, but could still perform the functions of the job

Please rank the following qualities or characteristics in order ("1" being highest) of how you felt the candidate favorably impressed the Board when they selected their most recent superintendent.

**4.**
- Fluency of speech
- Dress
- Physical attractiveness
- Hairstyle

How important was it to your Board that the superintendent candidate be married?

**5.**
- Mandatory
- Important
- Not important
- Considered having been married a negative factor

To what extent would your Board consider it a negative factor if the candidate wore glasses?

**6.**
- Very negative
- Negative
- Not a consideration
- Would consider it a positive factor

To what extent would your Board consider it a negative factor if the candidate wore a hearing aid?

**7.**
- Very negative
- Negative
- Not a consideration
- Would consider it a positive factor
Table 40 (continued)

**11. What is your Board's preference with regard to the institution at which a candidate did his/her graduate work? Please list your first, second and last choices as 1, 2, and 3.

- In-state institution
- State university
- Private university
- Ivy League institution
- Out of state institution
- Institution with outstanding reputation for training school administrators. Name __________

**12. Did your Board use a consultant to aid the Board in the selection of your current superintendent?

- Yes
- No

**13. If so, what was his/her occupation?

- Professional consultant, i.e., employment agency person
- College professor
- Community person
- Incumbent superintendent

**14. To what extent did this person participate in the selection process?

- Suggested one person he/she had known through personal contact
- Suggested several persons he/she had known through personal contact
- Screened candidates and proposed several possibilities
- Interviewed candidates and suggested one to Board

**15. How heavily did your Board rely on the consultant's recommendation?

- Very heavily
- Considerably
- Gave it only token consideration
- Not at all

**17. Will your Board employ a consultant for the next superintendent vacancy?

- Yes
- No
Table 40 (continued)

**19.** Did your district pay expenses for candidate and/or family to visit your community?
   - Yes
   - No

IV. Success of selection process and recommended changes
   (Page 51, Table 30)
   **3.** How long did the selection process take between the time the vacancy was official and the time the new superintendent was hired?
   - One to two weeks
   - Three to four weeks
   - Two months
   - Four months
   - Six months

V. Equal employment opportunity survey
   (Page 52)
   **1.** Do you require that the candidate for the superintendent supply you with a picture of himself/herself?
   - Yes
   - No

   (Page 53)
   **2.** How important is it to you that the candidate not have relatives employed by the school district?
   - Mandatory
   - Important but not mandatory
   - Not important
   - Having relatives employed by the system would be considered a positive factor

   (Page 53)
   **3.** How important is the age of the candidate?
   - Very important
   - Important
   - Not important

   (Page 54, Table 32)
   **4.** Which sex would your Board prefer to hire?
   - Male
   - Female
   - No preference

   (Page 54)
   **5.** Did you have any female applicants for the last superintendent vacancy?
   - Yes
   - No
Table 40 (continued)

(Page 56, Table 34)

**7. Which race would your Board prefer to hire?**

- Caucasian
- Black
- Oriental
- Indian
- No preference

(Page 56)

**8. Did you have any minority group people apply for the last superintendent vacancy?**

- Yes
- No

(Page 59, Table 36)

**11. Of which religion did you prefer the candidate to be a member?**

- Jewish
- Catholic
- Methodist
- Lutheran
- Baptist
- Agnostic
- Atheist
- No preference

The following table identifies the variables which showed a significant difference between both sizes and locations.

Table 41. Differences in selection criteria due to enrollment size and geographic location

I. Criteria used for selecting a new superintendent

2. Did any of the following have a direct bearing on the criteria your Board used in selecting your most recent superintendent?

- Inadequacies of previous superintendent
- Strengths of previous superintendent
- Both strengths and inadequacies of previous superintendent
Table 41 (continued)

13. How important is it that a candidate be under contract at the time he makes application with your school?
   ___ Very important
   ___ Important
   ___ Not important
   ___ Considered a negative factor

II. Identification of screening procedures

1. Which of the following methods are used by your Board of Education in publishing your most recent superintendent vacancy? Check each which applies.
   ___ Newspaper
   ___ College placement services
   ___ Professional employment agency
   ___ Utilized college professors as consultants
   ___ Word of mouth
   ___ Special contacts such as friends, relatives, etc.

11. How extensively was the superintendent vacancy advertised?
   ___ Locally
   ___ Statewide
   ___ Regionally, i.e., Midwest states, Eastern states, etc.
   ___ Nationally
   ___ Did not advertise at all

III. Factors influential in choice of superintendent

3. Would your consideration of a candidate be negatively affected if:
   Yes No
   ___ ___ The length of his hair were over his ears
   ___ ___ He had a beard
   ___ ___ He had a mustache
   ___ ___ He were obese
   ___ ___ He were physically handicapped, but could still perform the functions of the job
Table 41 (continued)

9. To what extent would your Board consider it a negative factor if the candidate wore a hearing aid?
   ___ Very negative
   ___ Negative
   ___ Not a consideration
   ___ Would consider it a positive factor

11. What is your Board's preference with regard to the institution at which a candidate did his/her graduate work? Please list your first, second and last choice as 1, 2, and 3.
   ___ In-state institution
   ___ State university
   ___ Private university
   ___ Ivy League institution
   ___ Out of state institution
   ___ Institution with outstanding reputation for training school administrators. Name ______

12. Did your Board use a consultant to aid the Board in the selection of your current superintendent?
    ___ Yes
    ___ No

14. To what extent did this person participate in the selection process?
    ___ Suggested one person he/she had known through personal contact
    ___ Suggested several persons he/she had known through personal contact
    ___ Screened candidates and proposed several possibilities
    ___ Interviewed candidates and suggested one to Board

17. Will your Board employ a consultant for the next superintendent vacancy?
    ___ Yes
    ___ No

19. Did your district pay expenses for candidate and/or family to visit your community?
    ___ Yes
    ___ No
Table 41 (continued)

IV. Success of selection process and recommended changes

3. How long did the selection process take between the time the vacancy was official and the time the new superintendent was hired?
   - One to two weeks
   - Three to four weeks
   - Two months
   - Four months
   - Six months

V. Equal employment opportunity survey

4. Which sex would your Board prefer to hire?
   - Male
   - Female
   - No preference

7. Which race would your Board prefer to hire?
   - Caucasian
   - Black
   - Oriental
   - Indian
   - No preference

8. Did you have any minority group people apply for the last superintendent vacancy?
   - Yes
   - No

Discussion

There were several thoughts concerning geographic and enrollment trends that surfaced rather frequently during the analysis and reporting of the data. The southern states appeared to be much more conservative on many of the selection practices than did the other three regions. The smaller districts were more conservative oftentimes, also. The eastern states projected the most liberalized approach to the superin-
tendent selection process and, surprising to this writer, the midwest was close behind.

Racial preferences varied according to the population constitution. For example, many of the southwestern states had a higher preference for American Indian superintendents than the eastern states. This researcher, in examining individual instruments and interpreting remarks by individuals on single questionnaires, found a consistency among the southern region to interview minority persons for the position, but not in a single instance was the job offered to a minority person. The law required these school boards to interview a certain percentage of minority people but, at that time, put no enforceable mandate on actual employment. This writer had a very strong feeling that many token interviews were granted merely on the basis of legal appeasement.

It became evident to this researcher, contrary to popular opinion, that the job mortality rate was higher in the smaller districts. When asked if the previous superintendent could have remained in his position had he chosen to do so, the larger schools responded affirmatively four percent of the time more than the smaller schools.

Another area of response which provided dubious results was the preference of school board members regarding graduate degrees. When asked which degree they considered most desirable, a Ph.D., Ed.D., or Ed.S., a large majority responded with Ed.D. This writer believes that this response was due
more to the structure of the question than a personal preference for an Ed.D. over a Ph.D. or Ed.S. The question was posed with the alternatives listed as follows:

In your opinion, which of the following degrees did your Board consider the most desirable in your selection of the current superintendent?
- Doctor of Philosophy - Ph.D.
- Educational Doctorate - Ed.D.
- Educational Specialist - Ed.S.

This researcher felt that the words "Educational Doctorate" may have had undue influence on a number of respondents by implying it was more educationally oriented than the Ph.D.

This writer had one other concern regarding the honesty of a response to a question. The question was as follows:

To what degree do you feel, as a Board member, that you selected the type of individual you were seeking?
- Very high correlation
- High correlation
- Average correlation
- Below average correlation
- Did not get the type of individual we intended to select

There was an extraordinarily high percentage of responses which indicated "very high correlation" and "high correlation." The indication this writer received from reviewing individual instruments was that if these respondents were perceiving their superintendent situation correctly and reporting it accordingly, there would appear to have been a paradox between procedure used and results obtained. The approach used as reported in asides or supplements sent with the completed questionnaires appeared to be often rather disorganized, without a great deal of time spent preparing for the selection
procedure. In light of these observations, this researcher saw the possibility of the respondents being unwilling to concede misjudgment on the part of respective boards of education.

This writer also noticed that the smaller schools registered three percent of their respondents as saying they did not hire the type of individual they sought while only one-half of one percent of the larger schools reacted similarly. The reader will notice that forty-one percent of the larger schools employed consultants to aid in the hiring while only thirty-six percent of the smaller schools enlisted assistance. This researcher sees a practical, apparent positive relationship between the use of consultants in this study and the satisfaction, expressed by the board members, with their selection results.

The possibilities for practical utilization of this research are two-fold. One suggestion would be professorial application in the graduate schools of educational administration. This research provided considerable insight into how selections are made, procedural application and identification of personal qualities which influence boards of education. Regardless of some of the apparent inequities existing in selection procedures, a professor conceivably could have considerable influence on the success of a given candidate searching for a superintendency. Many personal qualities can be nurtured or individually taught to aid in the probability of success.
This researcher envisions possibilities using this thesis as the basis for a unit or possibly a course in superintendent selection processes in conjunction with interview conduct and application procedure. There are many people each year who apply for superintendencies across the country who are unaware of dress, speech, cultural, and application implications.

This information could also be used on a more individual basis by persons interested in assuming a superintendency in another section of the country. Biases based on geography could be examined and the candidate, being better informed, could present himself/herself accordingly.

Recommendations for Further Research

An overview of this research reveals areas related to the superintendent selection process for further study.

One might focus directly upon interview conduct, i.e., positive and negative interview behaviors as perceived by school board members. Concerns regarding non-verbal responses and postures by the interviewing candidate, and how to read these same responses from the interviewing committee, could also be included.

Several superintendent profiles were discovered during a review of the literature. There were, however, no theses dealing with school board member profiles. A researcher could introduce district size, geography, and age as discriminating variables.
Another possibility would be to conduct research with the intention of proposing an appropriate selection procedure based on school size and community culture. The California School Administrators Association has done initial research in this area. There are, however, vast possibilities on the national level.

A final suggestion for further research is school board member occupations and how they affect their roles on the school board. A survey approach could be used examining superintendents' perceptions regarding school board members' contributions to the districts. It would be possible then to compile data indicating which professions appeared to be most conducive to successful school board members in the opinion of current practitioners.
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Dear Sir:

I am a practicing superintendent of schools and a doctoral candidate at Iowa State University under the direction of Dr. Ross Engel. As a dissertation topic I am attempting to analyze the superintendent selection process in selected states across the nation. From this sample I will attempt to make a national projection.

Your state has been selected to serve as one of the samples. Mr. Boyd Shannon, Executive Secretary of the Iowa Association of School Administrators, has given me your name and indicated you might have the information I need.

I would appreciate it if you would identify and send to me the administrative office address of 20 school districts in your state which have had a superintendent change since the school year of 1970-71. Ten of these districts must have a total student enrollment of 3,499 or less and ten must have a total student enrollment of 3,500 or more.

I realize that you are a very busy man, sir, and I do greatly appreciate your help in this matter. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Michael Hupfer
Superintendent
New Hartford School District
New Hartford, Iowa 50660
APPENDIX B
Dear Board Secretary:

I am a practicing superintendent of schools and a Ph.D. candidate under the direction of Dr. Ross Engel at Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa.

As a dissertation topic I have elected to examine the superintendent selection process in various school districts across the nation. Your school district has been chosen as one of the representatives for your state since you have had a recent change in your superintendency.

Enclosed you will find two questionnaires. I would appreciate it very much if you would give each one to a person who was serving on your Board of Education when your current superintendent was selected. Time is a factor and I would appreciate attention to this matter at your earliest convenience.

I realize you are an extremely busy person and I appreciate very much your taking the time to help me with this problem. Please accept my sincere, personal thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Michael Hupfer
Superintendent
New Hartford School District
New Hartford, Iowa 50660
Dear School Board Member:

I am a practicing superintendent of schools and a doctoral candidate at Iowa State University working on my dissertation under the direction of Dr. Ross Engel.

As a practicing superintendent, I am beginning work on a research project which is designed to analyze various facets of the superintendent selection process. You are one of twenty knowledgeable within your state who is being asked to serve as a member of an anonymous panel to aid in this investigation.

At no time throughout the project will you or your school district be identified or mentioned by name. It is extremely important that you answer the questions candidly.

I realize you are a very busy person. This project, therefore, has been organized to require only a minimum of your valuable time. Please follow closely the directions at the top of the questionnaire. Please complete as soon as possible and return in the self-addressed envelope provided for you.

May I extend my personal and sincere gratitude to you for your willingness to be of assistance to me in this project.

Sincerely yours,

Michael Hupfer
Superintendent
New Hartford School District
New Hartford, Iowa 50660
Please react to the following items by marking the appropriate response. Thank you.

I. Criteria used for selecting a new superintendent

1. Did you, as a Board of Education member, discuss with other board members at a regularly scheduled Board meeting the type of individual for whom you were looking?
   Yes
   No

2. Did any of the following have a direct bearing on the criteria your Board used in selecting your most recent superintendent?
   - Inadequacies of previous superintendent
   - Strengths of previous superintendent
   - Both strengths and inadequacies of previous superintendent

3. To what degree of specificity did your Board of Education define the job specifications for help in screening candidates?
   - Precisely specific
   - Considerable amount of specificity
   - Slightly specific
   - Very unspecific

4. Did the Board provide the candidate with these job specifications?
   Yes
   No

5. How important was a Doctor's degree in the selection of your superintendent?
   - Mandatory
   - Important, but not necessary
   - Not important
   - Was considered a negative factor

6. How important will a Doctor's degree be in your Board's selection of future superintendents?
   - Mandatory
   - Important, but not necessary
   - Not important
   - Would be considered a negative factor
7. Please rank the following criteria by its importance to you in the selection of your most recent superintendent with "1" being most important.
   - Age
   - Experience as a superintendent
   - Educational degrees
   - Experience with problems your district is having or expected to have, i.e., buildings, bonds, consolidation, etc.

8. In your opinion, which of the following degrees did your Board members consider the most desirable in your selection of the current superintendent?
   - Doctor of Philosophy - Ph.D.
   - Educational Doctorate - Ed.D.
   - Educational Specialist - Ed.S.

9. Did you consider anyone not trained in education?
   - Yes
   - No

10. Would you consider a person for the superintendency of your district who was not trained in education?
    - Yes
    - No

11. If so, which type of academic training would you prefer?
    - Business administration
    - Accounting
    - Law
    - Personnel administration

12. Do you ask candidates to submit to a psychological or personality test of any type?
    - Yes
    - No

13. How important is it that a candidate be under contract at the time he makes application with your school?
    - Very important
    - Important
    - Not important
    - Considered a negative factor
14. Please rank the following situations in order of preference with regard to background of a superintendent candidate for your district with "1" being most desirable.

As a member of the Board of Education, my order of preference for inexperienced superintendent candidates would be:

____ A person who has had teaching experience and is currently in graduate school meeting the superintendent requirements for the state.

____ A person who has had teaching experience, has state certification for the position of superintendent, and is currently being discharged from the armed forces.

____ A person who has had superintendent experience, left the profession for several years and desires to return.

____ A person currently serving in a school district in the central office.

____ A person experienced in school administration but not as a superintendent.

15. Which of the following would your Board prefer if you could not find an experienced candidate who was acceptable to you?

____ A person with previous superintendent experience who had left to try another career but was now interested in returning to a superintendency.

____ A person with no previous experience as a superintendent.
II. Identification of screening procedures

1. Which of the following methods are used by your Board of Education in publishing your most recent superintendent vacancy? Check each which applies.
   - Newspaper
   - College placement services
   - Professional employment agency
   - Utilized college professors as consultants
   - Word of mouth
   - Special contacts such as friends, relatives, etc.

2. Did the Board have someone it favored for the position of superintendent before the vacancy was officially announced?
   - Yes
   - No

3. If so, how did you proceed?
   - Did not announce the vacancy. Hired the person the Board favored.
   - Announced the vacancy and interviewed people simply to meet Affirmative Action requirements or for appearance sake, but hired the Board's preconceived choice.
   - Seriously considered other applicants to confirm our initial choice was the best.

4. Did you, as a member of the Board of Education, open the position to anyone who cared to apply?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Did you reduce the field of candidates from the original number of applicants?
   - Yes
   - No

6. If so, to what number did you reduce the field of applicants?
   - 2
   - 3
   - 5
   - 7
   - 10
   - 15
7. Did the preceding superintendent aid in selecting his successor?
   Yes
   No

8. Did the Board of Education use the preceding superintendent as a consultant in hiring your current superintendent?
   Yes
   No

9. If so, to what extent?
   Involved in each step of the hiring procedure and recommended a candidate to the Board
   Was consulted and recommended several final candidates to the Board
   Consulted with the Board concerning needs of the district, but did not make any candidate recommendations
   Remotely involved

10. If your last superintendent made a recommendation to the Board regarding his successor, did you follow the recommendation?
    Yes
    No

11. How extensively was the superintendent vacancy advertised?
    Locally
    Statewide
    Regionally, i.e., Midwest states, Eastern states, etc.
    Nationally
    Did not advertise at all
III. Factors influential in choice of superintendent

1. Do you ask for scores of standardized tests such as Miller's Analogy Test or Graduate Record Exam?
   Yes
   No

2. For introductory purposes, does your Board prefer:
   (please check all that apply)
   Yes   No
   ___   ___ Letter of application
   ___   ___ Phone call from applicant
   ___   ___ Picture of applicant
   ___   ___ Applicant's credentials from college or university

3. Would your consideration of a candidate be negatively affected if:
   Yes   No
   ___   ___ The length of his hair were over his ears
   ___   ___ He had a beard
   ___   ___ He had a mustache
   ___   ___ He were obese
   ___   ___ He were physically handicapped, but could still perform the functions of the job

4. Please rank the following qualities or characteristics in order ("1" being highest) of how you felt the candidate favorably impressed the Board when they selected their most recent superintendent.
   ___ Fluency of speech
   ___ Dress
   ___ Physical attractiveness
   ___ Hairstyle

5. How important was it to your Board that the superintendent candidate be married?
   Mandatory
   Important
   Not important
   Considered having been married a negative factor

6. How important was it to your Board that the superintendent candidate have children?
   Mandatory
   Important
   Not important
   Considered having children a negative factor
7. As a Board member, does it offend you if a candidate telephones prior to sending a letter of application?
   Yes
   No

8. To what extent would your Board consider it a negative factor if the candidate wore glasses?
   Very negative
   Negative
   Not a consideration
   Would consider it a positive factor

9. To what extent would your Board consider it a negative factor if the candidate wore a hearing aid?
   Very negative
   Negative
   Not a consideration
   Would consider it a positive factor

10. With regard to the height of an applicant, what is your preference?
    Over 6'4"
    5'11" to 6'4"
    5'7" to 5'10"
    Under 5'7"
    Height not important

11. What is your Board's preference with regard to the institution at which a candidate did his/her graduate work? Please list your first, second, and last choice as 1, 2, and 3.
    In-state institution
    State university
    Private university
    Ivy-League institution
    Out of state institution
    Institution with outstanding reputation for training school administrators. Name ________________
    No preference

12. Did your Board use a consultant to aid the Board in the selection of your current superintendent?
    Yes
    No

13. If so, what was his/her occupation?
    Professional consultant, i.e., employment agency person
    College professor
    Community person
    Incumbent superintendent
14. To what extent did this person participate in the selection process?
   ___ Suggested one person he/she had known through personal contact
   ___ Suggested several persons he/she had known through personal contact
   ___ Screened candidates and proposed several possibilities
   ___ Interviewed candidates and suggested one to the Board

15. How heavily did your Board rely on the consultant’s recommendation?
   ___ Very heavily
   ___ Considerably
   ___ Gave it only token consideration
   ___ Not at all

16. Do you feel the use of consultative help was successful in your district?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

17. Will your Board employ a consultant for the next superintendent vacancy?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

18. Please check each of the areas below which your Board used in making the final decision as to who your new superintendent would be.
   ___ One to three hour interview by Board of Education
   ___ One to three hour interview by Board of Education Committee
   ___ One to three hour interview by Board of Education and faculty
   ___ Interview family members of prospective superintendent
   ___ Visit community where candidate previously resided
   ___ Talk with the candidate’s minister
   ___ Talk with the Board of Education where candidate was previously employed
   ___ Talk with faculty members on the staff where candidate was previously employed

19. Did your district pay expenses for candidate and/or family to visit your community?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No
IV. Success of selection process and recommended changes

1. To what degree do you feel, as a Board member, that you selected the type of individual you were seeking?
   - Very high correlation
   - High correlation
   - Average correlation
   - Below average correlation
   - Did not get the type of individual we intended to select

2. Could the person who was your superintendent before the current superintendent was hired have stayed on as superintendent if he/she desired?
   - Yes
   - No

3. How long did the selection process take between the time the vacancy was official and the time the new superintendent was hired?
   - One to two weeks
   - Three to four weeks
   - Two months
   - Four months
   - Six months
V. Equal employment opportunity survey

1. Do you require that the candidate for the superintendent supply you with a picture of himself/herself?
   Yes
   No

2. How important is it to you that the candidate not have relatives employed by the school district?
   Mandatory
   Important but not mandatory
   Not important
   Having relatives employed by the system would be considered a positive factor

3. How important is the age of the candidate?
   Very important
   Important
   Not important

4. Which sex would your Board prefer to hire?
   Male
   Female
   No preference

5. Did you have any female applicants for the last superintendent vacancy?
   Yes
   No

6. If so, was she offered the position?
   Yes
   No

7. Which race would your Board prefer to hire?
   Caucasian
   Black
   Oriental
   Indian
   No preference

8. Did you have any minority group people apply for the last superintendent vacancy?
   Yes
   No

9. If so, was the position offered to this person?
   Yes
   No
10. Would you consider it a negative factor in the selection of a candidate if his height were:
   ____ Over 6'4"
   ____ Under 5'7"
   ____ Neither would be considered a negative factor

11. Of which religion did you prefer the candidate to be a member?
   ____ Jewish
   ____ Catholic
   ____ Methodist
   ____ Lutheran
   ____ Baptist
   ____ Agnostic
   ____ Atheist
   ____ No preference

My sincere thanks for your cooperation!

Michael Hupfer
Superintendent
New Hartford School District
New Hartford, Iowa 50660