



Montana public school superintendents : a demographic study and a forecast for the future
by John Jay Erdie

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
Montana State University

© Copyright by John Jay Erdie (1987)

Abstract:

This study identified the relationship that exists among public school superintendents and selected variables based upon the classification of the school district that they are employed in. The study also determined the manpower needs for the position of district superintendent in the state of Montana through the year 2000.

The population for the study consisted of 188 public school superintendents employed in the state of Montana during the 1986-1987 school year. The data were collected using a modified instrument developed by the American Association of School Administrators.

Chi Square Test of Independence at the .05 level of significance was used to analyze the statistical hypotheses. The analyses indicated that there was a significant relationship between eleven of the variables and school district classification. They were: Age of the superintendent; Prior administrative experience; Mobility patterns of first superintendency; Total years of educational experience; Salary received by superintendents; Length of superintendents' contracts; Educational preparation of superintendents; Decentralizing large districts; Reorganizing smaller districts into larger units; Maintenance of effective in-service programs and Professional memberships that superintendents hold.

Based upon the data, the following conclusions were drawn: Class III school districts have the youngest superintendents; Aspiring superintendents will enhance their employability by first becoming building principals; Class III superintendents have less continuous years of employment than do the other two classifications; Class I superintendents have more total years of experience, a longer employment contract, higher levels of formal preparation, higher salaries, a need to maintain effective in-service programs and are more concerned about decentralization than are Class II and III superintendents; Reorganizing smaller districts into larger ones was not an issue of concern to Class I superintendents; Professional membership for Class I superintendents was equally distributed among AASA, ASCD and PDK; and notwithstanding other variables, better than 50 percent of the practicing superintendents will reach minimum retirement age in the next 12 years.

MONTANA PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS:

A DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY AND A

FORECAST FOR THE FUTURE

by

John Jay Erdie

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Education

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

May 1987

Main
D378
Er 275

11

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

John Jay Erdie

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

5-13-87
Date

Ronald Robson
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Approved for the Major Department

5-13-87
Date

Ronald Robson
Head, Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

5-27-87
Date

ms Malone
Graduate Dean

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. I further agree that copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this thesis should be referred to University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted "the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute copies of the dissertation in and from microfilm and the right to reproduce and distribute by abstract in any format."

Signature *John Jay Endic*
Date *MAY 13, 1987*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This writer wishes to thank Dr. Donald Robson, Chairman of his graduate committee, for his expertise and knowledge and, his friendship, in the completion of this study. He also expresses appreciation to other committee members for their encouragement, support and willingness to serve on this committee as well as their friendship: Dr. Leroy Casagrande, Dr. Ardys Clarke, Dr. John Picton, Dr. Robert Thibeault and Dr. Jack Gilchrist.

In addition, a special thanks to my wife Karen Jo and my two daughters, Jennifer and Kristine, for their understanding and encouragement during this entire educational endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL	ii
STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE	iii
VITA	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
ABSTRACT	xiv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Need for the Study	5
General Questions Answered by the Study	7
General Procedures	10
Limitations and/or Delimitations	12
Definition of Terms	13
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	18
Introduction	18
Tenure in Position	18
School District Size	22
Place-Bound Versus Career-Bound	26
Politics	28
Personal Conflicts	31
Professional Preparation	32
Economics	35
Tenure Statutes	37
Supply and Demand	37
Certification	38
Formal Preparation	39
Gender	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Age	40
Number of Superintendencies Held . .	41
III. PROCEDURES	42
Introduction	42
Population Description and Sampling	
Procedures	43
The Methods of Collecting Data	43
Statistical Hypotheses Tested	45
Analysis of Data	56
Precautions Taken For Accuracy	57
IV. RESULTS	58
Respondents	58
Statistical Hypotheses	59
Null Hypothesis 1	60
Null Hypothesis 2	61
Null Hypothesis 3	63
Null Hypothesis 4	64
Null Hypothesis 5	65
Null Hypothesis 6	66
Null Hypothesis 7	69
Null Hypothesis 8	70
Null Hypothesis 9	71
Null Hypothesis 10	73
Null Hypothesis 11	74
Null Hypothesis 12	75
Null Hypothesis 13	76
Null Hypothesis 14	77
Null Hypothesis 15	78
Null Hypothesis 16	78
Null Hypothesis 17	79
Null Hypothesis 18	80
Null Hypothesis 19	81
Null Hypothesis 20	82
Null Hypothesis 21	83
Null Hypothesis 22	84
Null Hypothesis 23	85
Null Hypothesis 24	86
Null Hypothesis 25	87
Null Hypothesis 26	88
Null Hypothesis 27	89
Null Hypothesis 28	90

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Null Hypothesis 29	91
Null Hypothesis 30	92
Null Hypothesis 31	93
Null Hypothesis 32	94
Null Hypothesis 33	95
Null Hypothesis 34	96
Null Hypothesis 35	97
Null Hypothesis 36	99
Null Hypothesis 37	99
Null Hypothesis 38	100
Null Hypothesis 39	102
Null Hypothesis 40	103
Null Hypothesis 41	104
Null Hypothesis 42	105
Null Hypothesis 43	105
Null Hypothesis 44	106
Null Hypothesis 45	107
Null Hypothesis 46	108
Null Hypothesis 47	109
Null Hypothesis 48	110
Null Hypothesis 49	111
Null Hypothesis 50	112
Null Hypothesis 51	113
Null Hypothesis 52	114
Null Hypothesis 53	115
Null Hypothesis 54	116
Null Hypothesis 55	117
Null Hypothesis 56	118
Null Hypothesis 57	120
Null Hypothesis 58	121
Null Hypothesis 59	122
Null Hypothesis 60	123
Null Hypothesis 61	124
Interpretation	125
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	132
Summary	132
Conclusions	135
Recommendations for Further Study	140
Recommendations for Action	140
REFERENCES CITED	142

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
APPENDICES	147.
Appendix A - Cover Letter	148
Appendix B - Survey	150
Appendix C - Followup Letter	161
Appendix D - Analysis of Superintendent Survey	163

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Current position experience and classification	61
2. Age and classification	62
3. Gender and classification	63
4. Teaching experience and classification	64
5. Prior administrative and supervisory experience	65
6. Mobility and classification-First superintendency	67
7. Mobility and classification-Second superintendency	68
8. Mobility and classification-Third superintendency	69
9. Years experience as a superintendent and classification	70
10. Educational experience and classification	71
11. Salaries and classification	72
12. States and classification	73
13. Length of contract and classification	74
14. Noneducational employment and classification	75
15. Career choices and classification	76
16. Educational preparation and classification	77
17. Satisfaction and classification	79

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
18. Social-cultural issues and classification . . .	80
19. Issues in school staff relations	81
20. Student activism	82
21. Decentralization of large school district . . .	83
22. Reorganization of smaller districts	84
23. Changing priorities in curriculum	85
24. Ways of teaching or operating educational programs	86
25. Financing schools	87
26. Assessing educational outcomes	88
27. Support of non-public schools	89
28. Growing federal involvement	90
29. Caliber of local boards of education	91
30. Decreasing student enrollments	92
31. Visibility of superintendent	93
32. Attacks on superintendent	94
33. Drugs in the schools	95
34. Students values and behaviorial norms	96
35. Employment of qualified teachers	97
36. Employment of qualified support staff	98
37. Social-cultural issues and classification (Leave position)	99
38. Issues in school staff relations (Leave position)	100

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
39. Student Activism (Leave position)	100
40. Decentralization of authority (Leave position) .	101
41. Reorganization of small districts (Leave position)	102
42. Changing priorities in curriculum (Leave position)	103
43. New ways of teaching and operating educational programs (Leave position)	104
44. Financing schools (Leave position)	105
45. Assessing educational outcomes (Leave position)	106
46. Support of non-public schools (Leave position)	107
47. Federal involvement in education (Leave position)	108
48. Elected to or removed from local boards of education (Leave position)	109
49. Decreasing student enrollments (Leave position)	110
50. Visibility of superintendent (Leave position)	111
51. Attacks on superintendent (Leave position) . . .	112
52. Drugs in the schools (Leave position)	112
53. Students values and behavioral norms (Leave position)	113
54. Employment of qualified teachers (Leave position)	114

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
55. Employment of qualified support staff (Leave position)	115
56. In-service programs	116
57. Hours in a week devoted to superintendency . . .	117
58. Evenings devoted to superintendency	119
59. Saturdays devoted to superintendency	120
60. Sundays devoted to superintendency	121
61. Plans of superintendent	122
62. Years remaining before minimum retirement . . .	123
63. Professional membership	125
64. Summary of null hypotheses	126
65. Mobility of superintendents	In Jacket

ABSTRACT

This study identified the relationship that exists among public school superintendents and selected variables based upon the classification of the school district that they are employed in. The study also determined the manpower needs for the position of district superintendent in the state of Montana through the year 2000.

The population for the study consisted of 188 public school superintendents employed in the state of Montana during the 1986-1987 school year. The data were collected using a modified instrument developed by the American Association of School Administrators.

Chi Square Test of Independence at the .05 level of significance was used to analyze the statistical hypotheses. The analyses indicated that there was a significant relationship between eleven of the variables and school district classification. They were: Age of the superintendent; Prior administrative experience; Mobility patterns of first superintendency; Total years of educational experience; Salary received by superintendents; Length of superintendents' contracts; Educational preparation of superintendents; Decentralizing large districts; Reorganizing smaller districts into larger units; Maintenance of effective in-service programs and Professional memberships that superintendents hold.

Based upon the data, the following conclusions were drawn: Class III school districts have the youngest superintendents; Aspiring superintendents will enhance their employability by first becoming building principals; Class III superintendents have less continuous years of employment than do the other two classifications; Class I superintendents have more total years of experience, a longer employment contract, higher levels of formal preparation, higher salaries, a need to maintain effective in-service programs and are more concerned about decentralization than are Class II and III superintendents; Reorganizing smaller districts into larger ones was not an issue of concern to Class I superintendents; Professional membership for Class I superintendents was equally distributed among AASA, ASCD and PDK; and notwithstanding other variables, better than 50 percent of the practicing superintendents will reach minimum retirement age in the next 12 years.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the public school system, few employees in the district have more visibility than the superintendent of schools. During the school year, events occur when other employees draw the attention of the media and the public for various reasons but in a majority of districts, the superintendent is the person who represents the school district. Formal images of the role of superintendent are not hard to identify according to Blumberg (1985). These images are often observable in recruiting brochures that are published by most school districts when conducting a search to fill the vacancy for superintendent. He suggested that the superintendent's job can be divided into four parts: (1) improving educational opportunity, (2) obtaining and developing personnel, (3) maintaining effective relations with the community, and (4) providing and maintaining funds and facilities. Dolce (1976) suggested the superintendent of schools tends to be the most visible aspect of a school system and plays a symbolic as well as a management role. Whether or not the superintendent is greatly influential in policy decisions, s/he is perceived to be influential. The superintendent is

an easy symbol for accolade or disapproval and is associated with the weaknesses and strengths of the district as well as the management of all employees, students and facilities. Metaphorically speaking, superintendents describe themselves as being both a producer and director in a theatrical production, an orchestrator, a coach, a manipulator, a judge and a politician (Blumberg, 1985).

A superintendent is selected by a lay board of citizens who have been elected by the public. Superintendents not only execute policies that are enacted by the lay board but become advisors for that board and other groups in the community. In carrying out the mandates of the board of trustees and acting in the capacity of advisor, the superintendent's ideas are sometimes deemed unacceptable. Consequently, conflicts arise between the board of trustees and superintendents and/or between the superintendents and the community. In analyzing the interrelationship that exists in any school district, Dolce (1976) contended that boards of trustees are really outside of an organization. They represent an institutional function and they represent society. Teachers, principals and assistant superintendents represent the organization. Teachers represent the technical aspects of an organization. Principals and assistant superintendents represent the management aspects.

The position of the superintendent lies between society's representatives, the board, and the organization--teachers, principals and other administrators. Whenever there is a gap between society and the organization, the most fragile point is that of the superintendent.

Burlingame (1977) noted that conflict may force career changes of public school superintendents but not all career changes are the result of conflict or are filled with bitterness. Many superintendents leave a district for reasons other than conflict. Some leave for enhanced salaries. Mobility is characteristic of a career-bound superintendent (Gerardi, 1981). Others depart because they want to be an influencing force in a larger district. Burlingame (1979) found a higher rate of turnover existed among superintendents in Illinois school districts which had enrollments of fewer than 500 students.

Linked into the problem of mobility for superintendents is the issue of supply and demand. Based upon existing mobility patterns, whatever they may be, is the question of whether there are enough certified public school superintendents available to serve today's school districts. Even though public school enrollments have declined, doctoral degree recipients in school administration have increased substantially (Downey, 1985). The need for additional administrators has not been documented. The education profession might be edging

toward disharmony between supply and demand (McCarthy, Kuh & Zent, 1981). While an oversupply of potential job incumbents can have some positive effects on the profession (e.g., strengthening certification requirements and preparation program standards), without sufficient knowledge of supply and demand trends, the profession cannot adequately respond to market changes. The education profession could be on the brink of another personnel imbalance similar to that between teaching positions and qualified candidates which characterized the 1970's. The negative consequences of a disproportionate supply and demand ratio among school superintendents can possibly be avoided if a data-based portrayal of the market situation is made available to interested stakeholders (e.g., potential administration students, employed administrators, preparation program faculty and state department personnel). In a West Virginia study (Martin & Andes, 1979), the supply of school administrators outstripped the demand. The demand or need for administrators included 240 vacant positions as compared to the certification of 325 new public school administrators. McCarthy et al. (1981) found an apparent oversupply of building administrative positions, especially at the elementary level. In a six state study that included California, Georgia, Indiana, Massachusetts, Nebraska and Texas, the only administrative positions for which an increase in demand was indicated

were special education directors/supervisors and supervisors of federal programs. This seemed to be, at the time, related to federal funding priorities.

Statement of the Problem

Using the school years 1977-1978 through 1986-1987, the problem of this study was two-fold: (1) to determine whether a relationship existed between the dependent variables, school district size, classification and the following factors: tenure, mobility, experience as a superintendent, total educational experience, age, educational preparation, salary, membership in professional organizations, gender, educational issues and future plans of employment; and, (2) to determine the manpower needs for the position of district superintendent in Class I, II and III districts in the state of Montana through the year 2000.

Need for the Study

Few researchers have spent much time, effort or energy inspecting closely the professional lives of public school district superintendents (Burlingame, 1979). Downey's (1985) statistical analysis of school board members and superintendents speaks for itself. Both groups are among the least studied in the field of education.

Mobility studies of district superintendents and what the future holds for such positions in the state of Montana are non-existent. The state of affairs in a number of states (McCarthy et al. 1981) resulted in data limitations that precluded the formulation of concrete conclusions. The Nebraska state department personnel could provide data only on the number of certified administrators who held positions for the the 1979-1980 school year. In Indiana, certification data have been available only since 1978 because statistics had been combined for the preceding twelve year period. In Indiana, Georgia and Massachusetts, data are recorded by calendar years as compared to California, Nebraska and Texas that utilize fiscal year data. In California, the number of certificates issued each year includes newly certified individuals as well as certification renewals that are required every five years. Consequently, California data reflect an unknown number of persons who are not entering the educational administration availability pool for the first time.

In addition to the varied practices associated with record keeping and certification, there are other variables affecting supply and demand that cannot be assessed accurately. A case in point is that some states had a large number of individuals who were practicing administrators but who did not hold proper administrative credentials (Martin and Andes, 1979). Availability of

personnel from other states and the characteristics of incumbents themselves (professional aspirations, mobility, age, etc.) affected the supply and demand picture. Another variable to consider is the incentives for early retirement. One such incentive is "buying out" an administrator by offering a sizeable sum of money for early retirement. This is a practice that is currently taking place in Alaska.

In summary, McCarthy et al., (p. 9) indicated that...

At the present time, the education profession cannot make enlightened policy decisions based on the current data available from state departments or from various institutions of higher education. Educational policymakers might be reluctant to take action based upon what appears to be incomplete supply and demand data. Both supply and demand are nebulous, elastic concepts, having many of the properties of an invisible gas which expands, contracts and takes different shapes as the result of external forces. Scientific investigations of these concepts without the assistance of sophisticated controls and techniques is therefore hazardous to say the least, all of which may explain why investigators have reported few studies of this nature.

Without sufficient knowledge of supply and demand trends, the profession cannot adequately respond to market changes.

General Questions Answered by the Study

This study answered the following questions:

1. Are years of experience in current position for superintendents independent of school district size?

2. Is the chronological age of superintendents independent of school district classification?

3. Is the gender of superintendents independent of school district classification?

4. Are years of prior classroom teaching experience for superintendents independent of school district classification?

5. Is experience, prior to appointment as superintendent, in other administrative or supervisory positions independent of school district classification?

6. Are the mobility patterns of superintendents independent of school district classification?

7. Are total years of experience as a superintendent independent of school district classification?

8. Is total educational experience for superintendents independent of school district classification?

9. Is the salary received by superintendents independent of school district classification?

10. Are the number of states that the superintendent has served as the chief school administrator independent of school district classification?

11. Is the length of the superintendent's employment contract independent of school district classification?

12. Is the non-educational employment of superintendents independent of school district size?

13. Is the career path of superintendents independent of school district classification?

14. Is the educational preparation of superintendents independent of school district classification?

15. Is the degree of satisfaction with course work leading to superintendency certification independent of school district classification?

16. Are the issues and challenges currently facing superintendents independent of school district classification?

17. Are the possible reasons for leaving the superintendency independent of school district classification?

18. Are the inservice programs that superintendents need to maintain their effectiveness independent of school district classification?

19. Are the number of hours per week devoted to the superintendency independent of school district classification?

20. Are the number of evenings devoted to the superintendency in a typical week independent of school district classification?

21. Are the number of Saturdays devoted to the superintendency in a typical month independent of school district classification?

22. Are the number of Sundays devoted to the superintendency in a typical month independent of school district classification?

23. Are the future plans that superintendents have independent of school district classification?

24. Are years remaining for minimum retirement independent of school district classification.

25. Is the membership superintendents hold in professional organizations independent of school district classification?

26. Is the manpower needs for the position of superintendent, through the year 2000, independent of school district classification?

General Procedures

This study began with an extensive review of the literature as it related to public school district superintendents and their mobility patterns, continuous employment as a superintendent, size of district(s) served, and manpower needs.

Relative to Montana superintendents and fulfilling the purposes of this study the following tasks were completed:

1. Using the school law book, School Laws Of Montana, 1985, the definition of school district classification sizes--

Class I, Class II and Class III--were established

2. Using Directory of Montana Schools, 1985-1986, all public school districts, both elementary and secondary, having certified superintendents were classified according to definitions of Class I, II and III districts
3. After gaining permission to use a survey developed by the American Association of School Administrators, a field study of the instrument was conducted by asking practicing superintendents to fill out the survey
4. After the beginning of the 1986-1987 school year, 188 Montana certified district superintendents were surveyed using the AASA instrument.

The results of the survey were statistically analyzed and findings presented. From the findings, conclusions and recommendations were drawn for future needs of certified district superintendents in Montana.

Limitations and/or Delimitations

The limitations of this study were as follows:

1. The study was restricted to the state of Montana
2. The study was restricted to district superintendents in Class I, II and III school districts
3. The study was restricted to numbers of certified superintendents who are endorsed to practice in Montana whether or not they have a degree in school administration
4. The study was restricted to the school years 1977-1978 through 1986-1987.

The delimitations of this study were as follows:

1. Change of status of school district classification during the school years 1977-1978 through 1986-1987 as a result of population fluxuations. These population changes will cause a district to be reclassified
2. The study deals with the demand for superintendents and not the supply of superintendents.

Definition of Terms

Activism. A designation for the characteristic of any person or group of being continually busy to no significant end (Good, 1973:8).

Attack. An assault with unfriendly or bitter words (Good, 1973:47).

Career-bound Superintendent. One who has held two or more superintendencies and first became superintendent at an age younger than the median age of all superintendents in the study (Gerardi, 1981:604).

Career Choices. The progress or general course of action that a person chooses, as in some profession or undertaking; the occupation or profession, especially one requiring special training, followed as one's lifework (Good, 1973:79).

Class I School District. A first class district has a (community) population of 6,500 or more (School Laws of Montana, 1985) MCA, 1985, 20-6-201.

Class II School District. A second class district has a (community) population of 1,000 or more but less than 6,500 (School Laws of Montana, 1985) MCA. 1985, 20-6-201.

Class III School District. A third class district has a (community) population of less than 1,000 (School Laws of Montana, 1985) MCA, 1985, 20-6-201.

Decentralization. Delegation of more authority and duties to subordinates (Good, 1973:135).

District Superintendent of Schools. The chief executive and advisory officer charged with the direction of schools in a local school administrative unit, as in district (Good, 1973:571).

Educational Preparation. The total formal preparation that a person has completed in an educational institution; more usually it is understood to include, in addition, the aggregate of his experience in positions involving educational activities (Good, 1973:434).

Employment Contract. A formal agreement, usually in writing, entered into by the employee and the employing authority, stating the salary to be paid and the length of the term of the contract and setting forth general duties to be performed by the employee (Good, 1973:134).

Federal Involvement. Any control exercised by the Federal government (Good, 1973:237).

Inservice. A program of planned activities designed to improve the quality of service rendered by the employee (American Educators Encyclopedia, 1982:268).

Manpower. A portion of the nation's population that is capable of engaging in productive employment. It includes all who are potentially employable (The Encyclopedia of Education, 1971:54).

Militancy. The term applied to the movement of being more effective, having a greater voice in making educational policy and taking collective action to achieve ends (Good, 1973:367).

Mobility. The ability to move oneself from one's present position to one's desired position in another part of the environment (Good, 1973:370).

Mobility Pattern. A mode where one has the ability to move from one's present position to one's desired position in another part of the environment (Good, 1973:30).

Noneducational Employment. Any employment that is performed for purposes other than the discussion of policies, practices and methods related to teaching and operation of a school system (Good, 1973:402).

Place-bound Superintendent. One who holds only one superintendency and has become superintendent at an age older than the median for the entire study (Gerardi, 1981:604).

Professional Organization. A framework of relationship in which the personnel is set up to facilitate the accomplishment of some mission by promoting cooperation and facilitating an effective exercise (Good, 1973:402).

Qualified Teacher. The education, experience and physical, social and mental characteristics of an

instructor that determines his fitness for an educational position (Good, 1973:464).

Race Relations. Any bond or connection that renders one entity in any way relevant to another (Good, 1973:487).

Reorganization. A change in the geographic area included in an attendance area or administrative unit (Good, 1973:490).

Sanction. A principle of morality that urges or makes binding an action; duty or judgment because of consequences (Good, 1973:507).

Student Norms. A single value or range of values constituting the usual performance of students (Good, 1973:388).

Student Values. Any characteristic that is deemed important by a student because of psychological, social, moral or aesthetic considerations (Good, 1973:636).

Supply and Demand. The ratio between the number available and the number of vacancies (Good, 1973:576).

Support Staff. Personnel that perform tasks in a manner that will uphold and strengthen other personnel in achieving results properly expected of each (Good, 1973:553).

Tenure. The length, usually expressed in years, of service in a single position or school system (Good, 1973:594).

Visibility. The degree or extent to which something or someone is noticed (Good, 1973:641).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter reviewed the literature of tenure in position and supply and demand of public school superintendents. Under these two major headings are a number of variables that are reflected in the literature.

Tenure In Position

Initial points exist for causes of turnover among superintendents in different sized districts regardless of the time and geographic location. Lutz (1963) distinguished nine major factors related to tenure of superintendents. The first factor identified was district size. Other factors included short tenure of teacher staff, short-term contracts for superintendents, short tenure in prior positions by superintendents, low per-pupil evaluation, and lower quality of external accreditation visits. In interviews with some superintendents, Lutz identified community instability, inadequate living conditions, inadequate community services, partiality by the superintendent to certain board members (overly

supportive as compared to less supportive of others), involvement in board elections and undesirable personality traits in the superintendent as reasons for turnover of superintendents. "Specializing" in building new facilities, closing under-utilized schools, revamping curriculum offerings, and "cleaning house" so a successor may rebuild a district were additional turnover factors suggested by Burlingame (1979). Peters (1978) found two general explanations of superintendent turnover in rural Illinois public schools, personalistic and political issues. Personalistic issues reflected the personal qualities of the superintendent. Such qualities included poor judgment in distinguishing board decisions from those that should be made by the superintendent, failure to keep informed and lack of openness with the board that generated suspicion and distrust. Political issues were the result of social and/or economic changes. Revisions in school policies do not keep pace with the demands of factions requesting change. Failure to coordinate change with this demand frequently results in political involvement by unrepresented elements of the community. The involvement of new political interest groups usually causes resentment among members of the old power structure and, in the end, results in further political segregation. If the new political forces are strong, they will change the composition of the board to represent their values

concerning education. Changing the composition of the board often results in a "new" superintendent.

A variable that influences the tenure of superintendents is how well the administrative style of the superintendent matches the working style of the board of trustees (Katz, 1985). Katz (1985) felt that corporate school boards (boards that are similar to the mythic corporate board that meet in an awesomely impressive boardroom complete with flip charts and computer printouts) had a good matchup with superintendents who were highly task-oriented. The opposite, but nevertheless a matchup, was the board of trustees that acted in a familial manner with a superintendent who was relationship-oriented. The mythic familial board would be a board that gathered in an intimate boardroom and behaved rather like a group of family elders, making decisions for a large, loosely connected clan of cousins, children and in-laws. Mismatches cause conflict and can result in superintendent dismissal. Katz (1985) felt that recognition of these styles could defuse problems and lead to better working relationships between the chief school officer and the board of trustees.

Career-bound versus place-bound career mobility was addressed by Carlson (1972) in looking at superintendents' careers and performance. Career-bound superintendents occupied a higher place in the social order, enjoyed a

greater status among peers, were more prone toward innovation, more readily confronted the environment to bring about change and usually became involved in the social network of interaction. The place-bound superintendent conversely reflected the traditional values of the school community, was usually promoted to his or her position from within the district and, as was implied, hoped to remain in the district. S/he placed a higher value on retaining the position rather than on other educational concerns. The place-bound superintendent seldom brought much change to the school district. The career-bound superintendent was much more likely to induce change.

Burlingame (1979) suggests that training programs were a cause for length of tenure in position of superintendents. Too much of what happened in small rural districts appeared to be the results of self-choice by individuals and not conscious consequences of training programs. More knowledge is needed about small rural districts, their superintendents and the relations between clients and professionals in such settings. Until that kind of knowledge base can be incorporated in the development of pre-service and in-service training for small rural district superintendents, it is regretfully suggested that instead of a matter of winning some and

losing some, small rural superintendents will win few and lose frequently.

Not all of the factors identified as contributing to tenure in the superintendency have been adequately studied. Where the research focused in detail on selected factors contributing to tenure in position or lack of it, a detailed discussion of the findings concerning those factors follows.

School District Size

Burlingame (1979) in his exhaustive review of research done on the factor of school district size and the tenure of the superintendent began with reports prepared in the 1950's at the Midwest Administration Center of the University of Chicago and by the American Association of School Administrators. The two reports had a consistent finding, the turnover rate of superintendents was greater in smaller school districts than it was in larger school districts. While there were differences in ways that districts were classified, e.g., whether numbers of pupils or teachers determined size of district, the evidence always pointed to above average rates of turnover in smaller or less-populated districts. In a 17-year study (covering the years 1960-1976) of 89 school districts in Illinois, Burlingame (1979) noted the "safest" (continuous employment) districts for superintendents were in districts

with an enrollment of at least 1,000 students with 2,000 or so student enrollment being the best of all possible worlds of employment for a superintendent seeking long tenure. The mean years of continuous employment for the superintendent was 6.3 years for districts of 1,000 to 1,500 students and 6.8 years for districts that enrolled 2,000 students. Districts which had enrollments of 500 or fewer students, employed superintendents who had a mean of 3.82 years of continuous employment followed by 4.93 years of employment for districts with enrollments in size of 500 to 999 students; 5.8 years for enrollments of between 2,000 and 4,999; and 5.4 years for districts which exceeded enrollments of 5,000.

In a ten-year study conducted in Arkansas (Sales & Taylor, 1984), superintendents employed in the smallest school districts with enrollments of 249 or less had a mean of 6.7 years of continuous employment while districts that had student enrollments of between 1,000 to 1,999 employed superintendents who had a mean of 13.2 years of continuous employment. A close second for continuous employment was superintendents who were employed in districts with enrollments of between 2,000 to 3,999 students. Their mean years of employment was 12.7 years. Superintendents employed in districts with enrollments of 500 to 749 students had 10.4 years of continuous employment. Districts with enrollments of 250 to 499 students employed

superintendents who had a mean of 9.2 years of service. Districts with enrollments of 750 to 999 and 1,500 to 1,999, respectively, employed superintendents that had mean years of 8.1 and 8.7. In the Arkansas study, the mean years of experience for a superintendent in one position were 9.9 years.

In a recently completed study of 265 rural school districts in Kansas (Wilson & Heim, 1984), an average of 32.33 superintendent changes occurred per year for the six years between 1978-1979 and 1983-1984. A majority of the districts maintained a high degree of stability with 113 districts retaining the same superintendent for all six years. One hundred twelve districts had two superintendents during the same period of time. In this particular study, the mean student enrollment for rural Kansas districts was 663 students.

After surveying 226 superintendencies in Oregon, W.W. Charter, Jr. (1972) compiled information on the mobility patterns for the school years 1966-1967 through 1967-1968. Out of a potential 76 school districts with student enrollments of 400 or less, 16 school districts had a different superintendent at the end of that two-year period of time. School districts with student enrollments of between 400-999, had a turnover of 12 superintendents for the two years. The second largest school districts (student enrollments of 1,000 to 3,999) had 11 different

superintendents for the two years. The largest districts in the state (student enrollments of 4,000 and over) had a turnover of four superintendents.

Sampling 100 Illinois school districts, Burlingame (1977) traced the career patterns of superintendents beginning in 1960 and concluding in 1976. During that period of time, 11 districts were consolidated. In those 17 years, districts which had student enrollments of less than 499 had a mean of 4.4 superintendents. Districts with student enrollments of between 500-999 students had 3.45 superintendents. Districts that had between 1,000-1,499 students and 1,500-1,999 students had approximately the same mean number of superintendents in 17 years, 2.7 and 2.5 respectively. School districts with the second largest enrollments, 2,000-4,999 students, had a mean of 2.93 superintendents. The largest districts, 5,000 or more students, had the third highest mean rate of superintendent turnover for the 17 year period, 3.14 superintendents. Burlingame (1977) noted that the superintendency seems to be a mobile profession but the tenure in position of superintendents employed in smaller districts is less.

Utilizing the information gathered from 45 states, a study conducted at Brigham Young University (Barker, 1983) found the mean tenure of experience for superintendents to be less in smaller districts. Districts that had 300 or less students employed superintendents for an average of

5.5 years. Districts that had student enrollments of 301 students to 900 students employed superintendents for an average of 6.9 years.

Place-Bound Versus Career-Bound

Superintendent mobility is a factor which influences tenure in position. Some superintendents are place-bound to the extent that they have careers that are completed in a single district. Other superintendents are career-bound and move from district to district. This type of mobility assumes superintendents have choices. Burlingame (1979) noted career-bound superintendents moved from district to district in a vertical fashion. They not only sought to increase their income but they also wished to serve in more prestigious districts. School boards looked at such individuals as outsiders and brought career-bound superintendents into the district to upset the status quo and be change agents. On the other hand, place-bound superintendents were insiders who were retained by school boards to continue current policies and practices. Place-bound superintendents, in many cases, were insiders who started out in the system as classroom teachers and moved up through the ranks to the position of the chief school officer. If there was any voluntary mobility among place-bound superintendents, it was usually vertical movement to another district of the same size.

Blackmon & Petley (1976) conducted a one-year study in 1975 of 66 public school superintendents in Louisiana. In the data profile sheet developed by the researchers, a comparison of demographic data of other superintendents in other states found that Louisiana superintendents tended to enter a given district and, once there, were not very mobile. The same conclusions were drawn about superintendents in West Virginia (Martin & Andes, 1979). Profiles in both of these studies demonstrated that most public school administrators were place-bound.

Among Illinois superintendents, Burlingame (1977) found approximately two out of every three superintendents were place-bound. Those superintendents who moved generally accepted a superintendency of the same type, size and in the same geographic region as the one they left. Such changes are viewed as being horizontal changes, not vertical changes of the career-bound.

In a recent study of 231 Massachusetts school superintendents, Gerardi (1981) defined two types of superintendents: career-bound and place-bound. Career-bound superintendents were so classified if they had held two or more superintendencies and had first become superintendents at an age younger than the median age for all superintendents in the study, a study of 231 Massachusetts school superintendents. Place-bound superintendents were so classified if they had held only

one superintendency (in the district in which they had previously been employed) and had become superintendents at an age older than the median for the entire sample. In this study, career-bound superintendents first became superintendents an average of 12 years earlier in their careers than did place-bound superintendents. Career-bound superintendents saw moving as a part of their career and expected to move an average of once every five years. Place-bound superintendents valued the particular communities in which they lived and formed strong social networks within their districts. They waited for the superintendency to fall vacant in their communities and once hired, defined their position as permanent and expected to fill it until they retired.

Using some recent nationally accumulated figures, Downey (1985) noted superintendents in recent years seemed more inclined to longer tenure. In 1970, almost 25 percent of all superintendents had served as chief executive in three or more schools. In 1984, only 15.5 percent had been as mobile as the 1970 superintendents. During these same periods of time, the mean age of superintendents was 36.7 and 38.9 years, respectively.

Politics

The notion that the school superintendency is a political venture and that effective exercise of the role

requires keen political sensitivity combined with shrewd political skills is one that many people find distasteful, including some superintendents. Education is for children. Education is too important and sacred a function to be mixed up in politics. Educators should maintain a position that is not corrupted by the political battles that occur in the community and consciously seek to ensure that the schools will be unscarred by such battles. Decisions that are made about the schools should be ones based on what is best for the education of children and not on the basis of any special interest group or simply to keep the system functioning with a minimum of conflict. If schools and their operation have ever been conceived as being non-political, that is clearly no longer the case (Blumberg, 1985).

Being the chief executive officer of a school system puts the superintendent in politics. Being a superintendent inevitably involves the manipulation and exercise of organizational power. This is essentially a political activity as are the mobilization of community support and the management of conflict. These are activities that take a great deal of a superintendent's time and concern and, in some cases, can result in a superintendent "moving on" if a conflict results between superintendent and board and/or superintendent and community (Blumberg, 1985).

Superintendent turnover subsequent to a change in the composition of the school board is a factor to be considered when studying the length of tenure of superintendents. Four southern California counties and 117 of their school districts were the focus of a research report that utilized data spanning 15 years from 1951-1965 (Walden, 1965). Part of the study dealt with superintendency turnover as the result of the defeat of a single incumbent board member. A significant relationship was found between selection of a new superintendent and incumbent board member defeat. The data strongly suggested that defeat of incumbent school board members and the political instability of the school districts were related to the superintendent not having his or her contract renewed. The incumbent board member's defeat was a reflection of a struggle for power between an emergent power clique and an incumbent group. After an incumbent school board member defeat, involuntary superintendent turnover was found; superintendents were being asked to leave via direct dismissal or by not being offered a contract renewal or because of conflict with the school board resignation was requested. Voluntary turnover in these districts was characterized in this study as being when the superintendent retired, left the district with evidence of support from the school board or no evidence of conflict with the board existed. Iannoccone (cited in

Cambron-McCabe & Odden, 1982) attributed political realignment of the school board and superintendent dismissal to turning-point election periods (TPEPs). TPEPs are intense disruptions of traditional voting patterns that result in policy changes and can result in replacement of incumbent superintendents. Peters (1978) suggested the politics of superintendency turnover was the result of changes in the community which first lead to changes on the school board. Demands by new community members for changes in the curriculum, for example, either were met by the board and superintendent or else the newcomers eventually gained control of the board and dismissed the superintendent.

All of the superintendent's educational expertise--curriculum development skills, knowledge of teaching and learning, knowledge of educational theory, for example--are for naught if the superintendent does not survive in the position (Blumberg, 1985).

Personal Conflicts

Closely associated with the political demise of superintendents are the personal conflicts that arise between superintendents and school boards. Peters (1978) made reference to such conflicts as personalistic and viewed them as a factor that resulted in superintendent turnover. Unclear expectations between superintendents and

school boards, communication failures between school boards and superintendents and failure by superintendents to implement board policies fell within the category of personalistic problems. Leading to dismissal and inclusive of personalistic problems would be allowing differences on issues to become personal on the part of the superintendent, and failure to not only implement board policies but support policies.

Professional Preparation

Burlingame (1979) felt training programs need to look deeper into the personnel, programs, problems and joys of school districts, particularly rural districts in order to reduce conflicts that develop between superintendents and school boards and superintendents and communities. Conflict situations seemed to be the result of poor judgment on the part of superintendents and possibly consequences of training programs. Hersey (1977) felt that assessment centers could define standards for judging satisfactory performance of administrators by developing defined competencies. The result of the assessment centers would indicate to a practicing or aspiring administrator where his/her strengths and weaknesses were and what types of training were needed. Burlingame (1977) felt training programs needed to understand the nature of small

districts, their patterns of social and educational change and their unique problems and advantages.

Arkansas superintendents (Sales & Taylor, 1984) felt their training programs needed to emphasize the human relations skills, knowledge of educational and social changes, systems skills and computer skills.

Over the years the perceived needs of professional preparation of school administrators has not always kept up with the times. The American Association of School Administrators (1960) and the Kellogg Foundation did a cooperative study on the superintendency. The study revealed the professional preparation of school superintendents to be badly in need of complete overhauling. To help alleviate these shortcomings, it was recommended that professional preparation programs include instruction in accounting for funds, making budgets, leading discussions, organizing programs, studying the community, interviewing applicants, formulating objectives, building curricula, improving instruction, evaluating programs, working with groups, making decisions, studying theory and on-the-job learning. More recently the American Association of School Administrators (1982) identified seven competencies needed to strengthen the profession of school administration. Among the major reasons listed by AASA for development of these guidelines were "strengthening the profession" and "refining" certification

and doctoral programs in educational administration. These seven competencies focused on course work that: (1) evaluate, design and implement school climate improvement programs; (2) develop an understanding of political theory at the local, state and national level and applying political skills; (3) develop a systems approach to curriculum design; (4) plan and implement an instructional management system; (5) develop an effective staff development and supervision program; (6) develop an understanding of the necessary finances for the educational program and securing quality people to implement the educational program; and (7) develop capabilities to conduct research and utilize research findings.

In a study conducted by The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration during the early 1970's (Valenti, 1983), nine concepts were recommended after investigating the programs of five southern universities that prepared educational administrators. The concepts provided instruction of students in the following: (1) accommodating to change within organizations in a larger society, (2) developing concern for individuals and the directing of management technology and resources in the attainment of individual goals, (3) building the team concept of administration and the concept of cooperation of the educational enterprise with community agencies, (4) developing leadership and teamwork in the direction of

specialists, (5) developing goal-centered authority relationships among educational faculty and administrators, (6) providing knowledge of the nature of organization which enables members to train and function more effectively, (7) developing the concept of accountability for the success of students in relation to specified outcomes, (8) providing basic research on learning and behavior, and (9) the proper use of research knowledge and skills in the solution of educational problems.

Providing for the adequate preparation of school administrators should not be left to any one group or institution. Practicing school administrators, boards of education and professors of educational administration need to continually assess the needed competencies for educational administration programs (AASA, 1960).

Economics

Economic conditions within the school district and the salary paid the superintendent are factors that influence how long a superintendent will stay in a district. Assessed valuation of property measures the gross wealth of a school district and reflects the social class of a community. Walden (1976) noted that changes in assessed valuation of a district reflected changes in land uses. As assessed land valuations change, so do assessed valuation per child in average daily attendance in a school district.

Both suggest changes in the social class composition of the school district's population and can be the beginning of political "problems" between the incumbent board and new arrivals to the community. As was the case in several districts in southern California (Walden, 1976), the economic changes in the district and the change in incumbent board member led to the termination of employment of several superintendents.

The consolidation of school districts and the salaries paid to superintendents reflect mobility patterns of superintendents. A study conducted in Kansas (Wilson & Heim, 1984) showed that superintendents moved because of school closures. Declining student enrollments and ineffective operations forced consolidation. Salaries paid to superintendents for performance of duties could be a reason for superintendency mobility. In the study of Illinois rural superintendents (Burlingame, 1979), salaries of ten superintendents who moved reflected no consistent pattern. In most cases, there were modest salary increases of four percent. Smaller sized school districts reflected a smaller salary being paid to the superintendent (Barker, 1983). Districts that had student enrollments of 300 or less reported twice as many superintendents making less than \$35,000 as compared to districts that had student enrollments of between 301 and 900. Looking at career-bound versus place-bound superintendents (Gerardi,

1981), career-bound superintendents averaged five percent more salary than did place-bound superintendents.

Tenure Statutes

Tenure statutes for superintendents vary in states and are mirrored in superintendent mobility (Gerardi, 1981). In Massachusetts, where tenure for a superintendent is at the discretion of the school board, career-bound superintendents more often have tenure than their place-bound counterparts. Weischadle (1977) identified the tenure statutes in 24 states for superintendents. Tenure was synonymous with continuous employment and extended contracts. Lifetime tenure for superintendents was unique in two states, New Jersey and Minnesota. In South Dakota, a continuing contract was provided to superintendents with a permanent employment status as was the case in Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin and Wyoming. The remaining 17 states in the study had statutes whereby superintendents were considered for continuous employment a year at a time.

Supply And Demand

The first part of this chapter looked at the factors that influence public school superintendents and their tenure in position. A variety of reasons have been noted for superintendents being mobile.

The concluding part of this chapter reviewed the literature as to the supply and demand of public school superintendents and looked at the factors that have influenced supply and demand.

To begin with, mobility and length of contracts are factors in the tenure of superintendents when one considers the manpower needs of the superintendency. McCarthy et al. (1981) felt there was a decreased amount of mobility of incumbent superintendents and, as such, longer lengths of tenure resulted. In 1970, 37.4 percent of the superintendents had only one-year contracts. In 1984, approximately 68 percent had contracts of three years or longer (Downey, 1985). Such information would indicate that longer contracts decreased mobility of superintendents and affected the demand for superintendents.

Certification

When the supply of qualified superintendents exceeds the demand, efforts to raise entrance requirements to the superintendency usually are accelerated (McCarthy et al. 1981). These authors suggested it was time for the profession to identify the competencies necessary for satisfactory administrative performance and to reflect those performances in certification requirements.

As the competition for fewer administrative openings became increasingly keen, criteria for judging applicants

for available positions became more explicit. Local districts or regional cooperatives might institute assessment centers in which administrators would receive feedback on performance and assistance in designing professional improvement plans.

Formal Preparation

As public school enrollments have declined, superintendents with doctoral degrees in school administration have increased substantially (McCarthy et al. 1981). Gerardi (1981) found career-bound superintendents had a doctorate more often than did place-bound superintendents. Downey (1981), in a national study, found superintendents holding doctorates were up almost 38 percent in the 15-year period from 1970-1984.

Gender

Changes in the supply and demand picture have implications for affirmative action efforts (McCarthy et al. 1981). As the job market becomes increasingly tighter, perhaps males, who have traditionally had more opportunities for entry level administrative posts, will fare better than women in securing line leadership. The number of women superintendents increased by 130 percent between 1970 and 1984 but the small number of women who served as chief executives made the percentage increase almost inconsequential (Downey, 1985). In additional

studies (Burlingame (1977), Sales & Taylor (1984) and Martin & Andes (1979), women who were at the helm of school districts varied from one such woman in the first two studies to no women in the third.

Maienza (1986) felt that the socioeconomic status of women may affect access to the superintendency. Her study examined access to the superintendency for ten men and ten women, with particular emphasis on predictors of access for women. Data analysis indicated that women differed from men on certain personal, career and family variables. Women did not receive the sponsorship of professional networks but relied on visibility across school districts. Social class appeared to have a strong effect on access to the superintendency for females. Jones and Montenegro (1983) concured. Women were reared to defer to men and to be nurturing rather than aggressive. Old attitudes, prejudices and child-rearing patterns conditioned men to assume leadership positions while women provided supporting roles. Society's values and beliefs affected men's and women's behaviors.

Age

Looking at the age of superintendents, the data suggested superintendents in 1984 were more settled in and were slightly older than their counterparts were in 1978 (Downey, 1985). Forty-three percent of the superintendents

in 1984 were between 40 and 49 years of age while in 1978, 42 percent fell in the same age range. Paddock (1978) found the mean age of women superintendents slightly higher than men superintendents. The mean age for women was 49 years and men were 48.

Number Of Superintendencies Held

After reviewing the number of districts served in the 15-year period and some implications for supply and demand, superintendents were more "settled in" and did not serve as many districts as they had in past years. Downey (1985) profiled 87 percent of the superintendents in 1970 as having served in one to three districts. In 1984, 94 percent of the superintendents had served in less than three districts. Downey's study implied that superintendents were less mobile.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

The problem of this study was: (a) to determine whether there is a relationship between tenure, mobility, experience as a superintendent, salary, membership in professional organizations, gender, educational issues and future plans of employment as district superintendents in Class I, II and III school districts in the State of Montana; and, (b) to determine the manpower needs for the position of district superintendent for Class I, II and III districts in the state of Montana through the year 2000.

This chapter included the following topics:

1. Population Descriptions and Sampling Procedures
2. Methods of Collecting Data
3. Statistical Hypotheses to be Tested
4. Analysis of Data
5. Precautions Taken for Accuracy.

Population Description And Sampling Procedure

The population of this study consisted of 17 Class I, 102 Class II and 69 Class III public school districts which employed a district superintendent of schools during the school years of 1977-1978 through 1986-1987. The total population for the study included 188 public school districts. The sampling of this study included all of the 188 public school districts and the 188 public school district superintendents employed during the 1986-1987 school year. There are 550 (1984-1985) public school districts in the State of Montana serving 154,412 students but only slightly more than one-third employ a district superintendent of schools (Directory of Montana Schools, 1985-1986).

The Methods Of Collecting Data

The researcher utilized the ten issues of the Directory of Montana Schools, beginning with the 1977-1978 issue and concluding with the 1986-1987 issue. The Directory of Montana Schools is published in Helena, Montana, by the Office of Public of Instruction. The information in the directory is alphabetized by county and lists each school district in the county by name and number, the chairperson of the district, the clerk of the district, the superintendent of the district (if there is

one), the building principal (if there is one) and, in some cases where an administrator is not employed in the district, a supervising teacher. Additional information includes school building telephone numbers for the administrators and clerk and a home telephone number for the chairperson. The directory also includes grades served and student enrollments for the preceding school year. In the concluding part of the directory, all schools and personnel listed in the directory are in alphabetical order for easy reference. Having identified the 188 school districts that have certified superintendents, the ten issues of the directory "tracked" each of the 188 districts to see how many superintendents they had in ten years. The information contained in the directories was used to analyze the mean tenure of superintendents by school district classification.

The remaining information needed for the study was collected by using an instrument developed by the American Association of School Administrators. This data gathering instrument was used by the AASA in two national surveys: The American School Superintendency, 1971 and, most recently, The American School Superintendency, 1982, A Full Report.

In order to assure content validity, a pilot study was conducted using superintendents who were currently chief school administrators. Based on responses made by these

individuals, some wording changes were made in the instrument.

Approximately three months into the 1986-1987 school year, the final instrument, together with a cover letter explaining the survey, was mailed to the population. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was included for the respondent to return the instrument. Two weeks after the instrument was mailed out, a follow-up letter was sent out to those superintendents who had not responded. Four weeks after the initial mailing, non-respondents were contacted by telephone and encouraged to respond.

Statistical Hypotheses Tested

During the course of this study, the investigator tested the following null hypotheses:

1. Ho: The years of experience in current positions for superintendents are independent of school district classification.
2. Ho: The chronological age of superintendents is independent of school district classification.
3. Ho: The gender of superintendents is independent of school district classification.

4. Ho: Years of prior classroom teaching experience for superintendents are independent of school district classification.
5. Ho: Prior to appointment as superintendent, experience in other administrative or supervisory positions is independent of school district classification.
6. Ho: The mobility patterns of superintendents are independent of school district classification.
7. Ho: Total years of experience as a superintendent are independent of school district classification.
8. Ho: Total years of educational experience for superintendents are independent of school district classification.
9. Ho: The salary received by superintendents is independent of school district classification.
10. Ho: The number of states that a superintendent has served in is independent of school district classification.

11. Ho: The length of the employment contract for superintendents is independent of school district classification.
12. Ho: Noneducational employment of superintendents is independent of school district classification.
13. Ho: The career choices of superintendents are independent of school district classification.
14. Ho: The educational preparation of superintendents is independent of school district classification.
15. Ho: The degree of satisfaction of the course work leading to the superintendent being certified is independent of school district classification.
16. Ho: Social-cultural issues such as race relations, integration or segregation that superintendents face are independent of school district classification.
17. Ho: Issues of negotiations, strikes, sanctions or some form of teacher militancy that superintendents face are

independent of school district
classification.

18. Ho: Issues of student underground
newspapers and student strikes that
superintendents face are independent
of school district classification.
19. Ho: The issue of decentralization that
superintendents face is independent of
school district classification.
20. Ho: The reorganization of small school
districts into larger school districts
is an issue that superintendents face
and is independent of school district
classification.
21. Ho: Curriculum issues that superintendents
face are independent of school
district classification.
22. Ho: Teaching and operation of educational
programs are issues the superintendent
faces and are independent of school
district classification.
23. Ho: Financing the educational program is an
issue facing superintendents and is
independent of school district
classification.

24. Ho: Accountability of the educational program is an issue that faces the superintendent and is independent of school district classification.
25. Ho: Growing support for non-public schools is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.
26. Ho: Federal involvement in education is an issue that superintendents face and is independent of school district classification.
27. Ho: Membership on the board of trustees of local school districts is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.
28. Ho: Decline in student enrollment is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.
29. Ho: Greater visibility of the superintendent is independent of school district classification.

30. Ho: Increasing attacks on the superintendent are independent of school district classification.
31. Ho: Use of drugs in the schools is an issue facing the superintendent and is independent of school district classification.
32. Ho: Change of student values and norms is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.
33. Ho: Obtaining qualified teachers is an issue that superintendents face and is independent of school district classification.
34. Ho: Employment of qualified support staff is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.
35. Ho: Social-issues such as race relations, integration or segregation will cause superintendents to leave position and are independent of school district classification.
36. Ho: Issues of negotiations, strikes, sanctions or some form of teacher

militancy will cause superintendents to leave the position and are independent of school district classification.

37. Ho: Issues of student underground newspaper and student strikes will cause the superintendent to leave the position and are independent of school district classification.
38. Ho: Decentralization of the school district will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.
39. Ho: The reorganization of school districts will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.
40. Ho: Curriculum issues are issues that will cause a superintendent to leave the position and are independent of school district classification.
41. Ho: Teaching and operation of educational programs are issues that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and are independent of school district classification.

42. Ho: Financing the educational program is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.
43. Ho: Accountability is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.
44. Ho: Growing support of non-public schools is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.
45. Ho: Involvement of the Federal government in education is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school school district classification.
46. Ho: Membership on the board of trustees of the local school district is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

47. Ho: Declining student enrollment is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.
48. Ho: Greater visibility is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.
49. Ho: Increasing attacks on the superintendent are issues that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and are independent of school district classification.
50. Ho: Use of drugs in the schools is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.
51. Ho: Change of student values and norms is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and are independent of school district classification.
52. Ho: Obtaining qualified teachers is an issue that will cause the

superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

53. Ho: Employment of qualified support staff is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

54. Ho: Maintaining effective in-service programs is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

55. Ho: The hours per week the superintendent devotes to the position are an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

56. Ho: The number of evenings per week a superintendent devotes to the position is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

57. Ho: The number of Saturdays in a month the superintendent devotes to the position is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.
58. Ho: The number of Sundays in a month that the superintendent devotes to the position is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.
59. Ho: Plans of the superintendent are independent of school district classification.
60. Ho: Years remaining in the superintendency before reaching minimum retirement age are independent of school district classification.
61. Ho: Membership the superintendent has in a professional organization is independent of school district classification.

Analysis Of Data

Chi Square (X^2) Test of Independence at the .05 level of significance was used to determine whether a variety of variables of school district superintendents are independent of school district classification. The Chi Square formula used in this study was:

$$X^2 = \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

"O" represented the observable outcomes while "E" represented the expected outcomes.

Williams (1979, p. 106) has stated that there is a reason for using Chi Square.

...there are times when measurement involves nothing more than assigning observations to different categories in a set of well-defined, mutually exclusive categories. Usually in this situation, called nominal scaling, we are interested in comparing how samples differ in terms of assignment into the categories. The typical statistical model used in such cases, and one having widespread utility in communications and education research, is chi-square.

The .05 level of significance was chosen to guard against the Type I error, which occurs when an alternative hypothesis is accepted, but when the null hypothesis should be accepted. Kerlinger (1973, p. 169-170) states that the .05 level means an obtained result that is significant at the .05 level could occur by chance only 5 times in 100 trials. The .05 level was originally chosen and is considered a reasonably good risk. It is neither too high

nor too low for most social scientific research.

The investigator was prepared to accept a 5 per cent probability of making a Type I error. The consequences of doing so, i.e., rejecting a true-null, were not critical to the nature of this study. The result of finding independence when there really was dependence did not result in any serious consequences to a school district superintendent or a school district.

Precautions Taken For Accuracy

In an attempt to eliminate error, each survey instrument was hand checked by the researcher for omissions and discrepancies. For responses that were missing, a telephone call to the superintendent concerned enabled the researcher to obtain most of the missing data.

The researcher utilized the services of Montana State University computer center using the CP6 system and the software package of SPSS, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

During the school year, 1986-1987, this study was conducted to determine whether there was a relationship between public school superintendents and the classification of school district in which they were employed. Selected variables were tested that might assist in explaining their employment as the chief school administrator of the school district. The study also investigated the manpower needs for public school superintendents in the state of Montana through the year 2000.

The results of this study are presented in three sections. First, the population used in the study and information relative to the return rate are discussed. Second, the results from testing the 61 statistical hypotheses are presented. Finally, an interpretation of the findings is presented.

Respondents

The population used in this study consisted of 188 public school superintendents employed in the state of Montana during the 1986-1987 school year. The rationale

for surveying the entire population of public school superintendents was to help ensure the respondents were representative of each of the variables to be tested.

Of the 188 superintendents surveyed, 17 were employed in Class I school districts, 102 in Class II districts and 69 in Class III districts (see definitions on p. 14). Responding to the survey were: 15 Class I superintendents, (88.23 percent); 86 Class II superintendents, (84.31 percent); and, 61 Class III superintendents, (88.41 percent). The combined percentge of all superintendents that returned the survey was 86.19 percent, 162 superintendents.

Statistical Hypotheses

The 61 statistical hypotheses in this study were tested using the Chi Square Test of Independence. The null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. In the contingency tables used to illustrate the responses to the survey instrument, each cell of the table has numbers in the upper-right hand corner which are expected values. The other numbers in each cell represent the observed values, i.e., the actual responses of those queried. An explanation of the direction of the responses for each null hypothesis will follow each table.

Hypotheses one through thirteen test the relationship between superintendents' personal and professional

characteristics relative to the classification of school district where they are employed. The next two hypotheses, 14 and 15, test the relationship of superintendents and their satisfaction with the formal educational preparation they received. Hypotheses 16 through 34 test the relationship between superintendents and the educational issues they face in their employment. Hypotheses 35 through 53 test the relationship between superintendents and the educational issues that will cause them to leave the position. Hypothesis 54 tests the relationship between superintendents and their perceptions of the importance of inservice for their district. The next four hypotheses (55-58) test the relationship between superintendents and the amount of time spent on the job. Hypothesis 59 tests the relationship between superintendents and their plans for the future. Hypothesis 60 tests the relationship between superintendents and the years they have until minimum retirement. The last hypothesis (61) tests the relationship between superintendents and the professional memberships they hold.

Table 1 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and years of experience in current position.

Null Hypothesis One. The years of experience in current position for superintendents is independent of school district classification.

Table 1
Current Position Experience and Classification

Classification		Years of Experience					Row Total
		Very Low (0-5)	Low (6-10)	Medium (11-15)	High (16-20)	Very High (20+)	
Class I		9.5 10	3.8 3	1.1 2	0	.3 0	15
Class II		54.7 45	21.8 29	6.4 8	1.6 2	1.6 2	86
Class III		38.8 48	15.4 9	4.5 2	1.1 1	1.1 1	61
Column Total		103	41	12	3	3	162

df=8 Critical $\chi^2=15.51$ Calculated $\chi^2=12.51$ Significance=.13

The data shown in Table 1 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The years of experience in current position for superintendents are independent of school district classification.

Table 2 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and their chronological age.

Null Hypothesis Two. The chronological age of superintendents is independent of school district class.

The data shown in Table 2 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Chronological age is dependent of school district classification. Approximately 49 percent of all Class II

superintendents and 71 percent of all Class III superintendents are 45 years or younger in age, whereas

Table 2
Age and Classification

Years of Age	Classification			Row Total	
	Class I	Class II	Class III		
Youngest (Less than 30)	0	.1	.5	.4	1
Younger (30-35)	0	.5	2.6	1.9	5
Younger Middle (36-40)	0	2.5	13.7	9.8	26
Middle (41-45)	3	4.5	24.3	17.3	46
Older Middle (46-50)	8	3.2	17.4	12.4	33
Older (51-55)	2	1.8	10.0	7.1	19
Oldest (Over 55)	1	1.4	7.4	5.3	14
Column Total	14	76	54		144

df=12 Critical $\chi^2=21.03$ Calculated $\chi^2=26.0$ Significance=.01
the same age range for Class I superintendents accounts for approximately 21 percent of the superintendents. In this

age span, Class I superintendents tend to be older than Class II and III superintendents.

Table 3 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and gender.

Null Hypothesis Three. The gender of the superintendent is independent of school district classification.

Table 3
Gender and Classification

Gender	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Women	1 .9	2 5.3	7 3.8	10
Men	14 14.1	84 80.7	54 57.2	152
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=5.16$ Significance=.07

The data shown in Table 3 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Gender of superintendents is independent of school district classification.

Table 4 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and classroom teaching experience.

Null Hypothesis Four. Years of prior classroom teaching experience for superintendents are independent of school district classification.

Table 4
Teaching Experience and Classification

Classification	Years of Experience					Row Total
	Very Low (0-5)	Low (6-10)	Medium (11-15)	High (16-20)	Very High (20+)	
Class I	6.4 9	5.4 4	2.4 2	0	.5 0	.4 15
Class II	36.6 39	30.8 30	13.8 11	2.7 2	2.1 4	86
Class III	26.0 21	21.8 24	9.8 13	1.9 3	1.5 0	61
Column Total	69	58	26	5	4	162

df=8 Critical $\chi^2=15.51$ Calculated $\chi^2=9.27$ Significance=.32

The data shown in Table 4 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 88 percent of all superintendents have 10 years or less of teaching experience. Years of prior classroom teaching experience for superintendents are independent of school district classification.

Table 5 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and other administrative experience.

Null Hypothesis Five. Prior to appointment as superintendent, experience in other administrative or supervisory positions is independent of school district classification.

Table 5
Prior Administrative and Supervisory Experience

Other Experience	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Asst. Principal	4	1.9 12	10.6 4	7.4 20
Principal	7	7.4 46	41.0 24	28.6 77
Supervisor	2	1.0 5	5.3 3	3.7 10
Director	2	.8 3	4.3 3	3.0 8
Assistant Superintendent	0	.2 1	1.1 1	.7 2
No Response	0	3.8 16	20.7 23	14.5 39
Column Total	15	83	58	156

df=10 Critical $\chi^2=18.3$ Calculated $\chi^2=19.1$ Significance=.04

The data shown in Table 5 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Prior administrative experience is dependent upon employment as a superintendent. Approximately 55 percent of all Class II superintendents had experience as a principal prior to becoming a superintendent. For Class I superintendents, approximately 47 percent had experience as a principal as compared to a lesser percentage, 41 percent, for Class III superintendents.

Tables 6, 7 and 8 illustrate the relationship between superintendents and the length of time they stay in a school district.

Null Hypothesis Six. The mobility patterns of superintendents are independent of school district classification.

Hypothesis Six statistically analyzes the data for the amount of time that superintendents have held their first, second and third superintendencies.

The data shown in Table 6 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The same mobility patterns of superintendents are dependent on school district classification for the first superintendency. More superintendents in Class I school districts have retained their first superintendency longer than superintendents in Class II and Class III school districts.

Table 6
Mobility and Classification-First Superintendency

Number of Years Served	Class I	Classification Class II	Class III	Row Total
1- 3	3 5.5	27 29.6	22 17.0	52
4- 6	3 2.8	17 15.3	7 8.8	27
7-10	4 1.1	5 5.7	1 3.3	10
11+	0 .6	5 3.4	1 2.0	6
Column Total	10	54	31	95

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=15.13$ Significance=.02

The data in Table 7 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The mobility patterns of superintendents are independent of school district classification for the second superintendency.

The data in Table 8 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance for the third superintendency. There is no relationship between superintendents mobility patterns and school district classification.

Table 7
Mobility and Classification-Second Superintendency

Number of Years Served	Class I	Classification Class II	Class III	Row Total
1- 3	1 1.3	6 5.9	3 2.8	10
4- 6	1 1.4	7 6.5	3 3.1	11
7-10	1 1.1	5 5.3	3 2.5	9
11+	1 .3	1 1.2	0 .6	2
Column Total	4	19	9	32

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=3.17$ Significance=.79

The data shown in Table 8 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance for the the third superintendency. There is no relationship between superintendents mobility patterns and school district classification.

In summary of Hypothesis Six, for the first superintendency, the mobility patterns of superintendents are dependent on school district classification. For the second and third superintendency, the mobility patterns of superintendents are independent of school district classification.

Table 8
Mobility and Classification-Third Superintendency

Number of Years Served	Class I	Class II	Class III	Row Total
1- 3	0	4	1	5
4- 6	1	1	2	4
7-10	0	2	2	4
11+	0	0	1	1
Column Total	1	7	6	14

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=5.87$ Significance=.44

Table 9 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and total years of experience as a superintendent.

Null Hypothesis Seven. Total years of experience as a superintendent are independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 9 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Total years of experience for superintendents, in the position, are not dependent on school district classification.

Table 9
Years Experience as a Superintendent and Classification

Classification	Years of Experience as a Superintendent					Row Total
	Very Low (1-5)	Low (6-10)	Medium (11-15)	High (16-20)	Very High (20+)	
Class I	5.6 5	4.2 4	3.0 4	.9 0	1.3 2	15
Class II	32.4 24	23.9 24	17.0 22	5.3 7	7.4 9	86
Class III	23.0 32	16.9 17	12.0 6	3.8 3	5.3 3	61
Column Total	61	45	32	10	14	162

df=8 Critical $\chi^2=15.51$ Calculated $\chi^2=13.99$ Significance=.08

Table 10 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and total years of educational experience.

Null Hypothesis Eight. Total years of educational experience for superintendents are independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 10 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Total years of educational experience are dependent upon school district classification. The larger the school district is, the longer the superintendent has been in the profession.

Table 10
Educational Experience and Classification

Total Years	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Very Low (5-10)	0	2	10	12
Low (11-15)	0	11	14	25
Low Average (16-20)	2	27	17	46
High Average (21-25)	5	18	9	32
High (26-30)	7	18	7	32
Very High (30+)	1	10	4	15
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=10 Critical $\chi^2=18.3$ Calculated $\chi^2=28.2$ Significance=.001

Table 11 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and salaries.

Null Hypothesis Nine. The salary received by superintendents is independent of school district classification.

Table 11
Salaries and Classification

Salaries	Class I	Classification Class II	Class III	Row Total
26,000-30,000	0 .8	1 4.3	7 2.9	8
31,000-35,000	0 4.0	10 23.1	33 15.9	43
36,000-40,000	0 2.8	19 16.1	11 11.1	30
41,000-45,000	2 3.6	30 20.4	6 14.0	38
46,000-50,000	4 2.1	17 11.8	1 8.1	22
51,000-55,000	3 .9	6 5.4	1 3.7	10
56,000-60,000	5 .7	2 3.8	0 2.6	7
61,000-65,000	0 .1	1 .5	0 .4	1
More than 65,000	1 .1	0 .5	0 .4	1
Column Total	15	86	59	160

df=16 Critical $\chi^2=26.3$ Calculated $\chi^2=111.5$ Significance=.00

The data shown in Table 11 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Superintendents' salary is dependent upon school district classification. The larger the size of the school district, the higher the superintendent's salary is.

Table 12 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the states in which they have served.

Null Hypothesis Ten. The number of states that a superintendent has served in is independent of school district classification.

Table 12
States and Classification

Number of States	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
One	12	79	60	151
Two	3	6	1	10
Three	0	1	0	1
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=4 Critical $\chi^2=9.49$ Calculated $\chi^2=8.12$ Significance=.08

The data shown in Table 12 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The number of states superintendents are

employed in is independent of school district classification.

Table 13 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the length of their employment contract.

Null Hypothesis Eleven. The length of the employment contract for superintendents is independent of school district classification.

Table 13
Length of Contract and Classification

Length of Contract	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
One year	6	40	47	93
Two Years	3	16	4	23
Three Years	6	29	10	45
Column Total	15	85	61	161

df=4 Critical $\chi^2=9.49$ Calculated $\chi^2=15.4$ Significance=.003

The data shown in Table 13 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The length of the employment contract for superintendents is dependent of school district classification. The larger the size of the school

district, the greater the length of employment contract for superintendents.

Table 14 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and employment outside the field of education.

Null Hypothesis Twelve. Noneducational employment of superintendents is independent of school district classification.

Table 14
Noneducational Employment and Classification

Types of Employment	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
None	0	1	1	2
Military	1	7	4	12
Business	1	21	18	40
Column Total	2	29	23	54

df=4 Critical $\chi^2=9.49$ Calculated $\chi^2=1.31$ Significance=.86

The data shown in Table 14 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Noneducational employment of the superintendent is independent of school district classification.

Table 15 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and their choices of careers.

Null Hypothesis Thirteen. The career choices of superintendents are independent of school district classification.

Table 15
Career Choices and Classification

Career Choices	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Superintendency	12	63	46	121
Another Type of Educational Administration	1	5	4	10
Noneducational	2	17	11	30
No Response	0	1	0	
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=1.3$ Significance=.97

The data shown in Table 15 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Career choices of superintendents are independent of school district classification.

Table 16 describes the relationship between superintendents and their educational preparation.

Null Hypothesis Fourteen. The educational preparation of superintendents is independent of school district classification.

Table 16
Educational Preparation and Classification

Preparation	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Master's Degree	5	59	49	113
Master's Degree Plus	2	14	6	22
Sixth Year Specialist	1	8	1	10
Doctoral Degree	2	0	0	2
Doctoral Degree Plus	0	0	1	1
Column Total	10	81	57	148

df=8 Critical $\chi^2=15.5$ Calculated $\chi^2=35.6$ Significance=.001

The data shown in Table 16 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 30 percent of the Class I superintendents have an Educational Specialist degree or

higher. For Class II superintendents, approximately 10 percent have a Educational Specialist degree or higher. Only four percent of Class III superintendents have a Educational Specialist degree or higher. The larger the school district is, the higher the educational preparation for superintendents.

Table 17 describes the relationship between superintendents and satisfaction of course work leading to certification of superintendency.

Null Hypothesis Fifteen. The degree of satisfaction of the course work leading to the superintendent being certified is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 17 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The degree of satisfaction of course work leading to the superintendency is dependent of school district classification.

Table 18 illustrates the relationship between superintendent and the social-cultural issues they encounter.

Null Hypothesis Sixteen. Social-cultural issues such as race relations, integration or segregation that superintendents face are independent of school district classification.

Table 17
Satisfaction and Classification

Classification	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Row Total
Class I	2	10	2	1	15
Class II	9	49	25	2	85
Class III	5	26	24	3	58
Column Total	16	85	51	6	158

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=6.31$ Significance=.39

The data shown in Table 18 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Cultural issues are independent of school district classification.

Table 19 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and issues of school staff relations.

Null Hypothesis Seventeen. Issues of negotiations, strikes, sanctions or some form of teacher militancy that superintendents face are independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 19 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The issues of school relations that

superintendents face are independent of school district classification.

Table 18
Social-cultural Issues and Classification

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	1 .8	4 4.8	4 3.4	9
Significant	6 2.6	14 14.9	8 10.5	28
Of Limited Significance	4 5.2	28 29.7	24 21.1	56
Little or No Significance	4 6.4	40 36.6	25 26.0	69
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=7.43$ Significance=.28

Table 20 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and student activism.

Null Hypothesis Eighteen. Issues of student underground newspapers and student strikes that superintendents face are independent of school district classification. The data shown in Table 20 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Student activism issues are independent of superintendent and school district classification

Table 19
Issues In School Staff Relations

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	5	33	20	58
Significant	7	37	26	70
Of Limited Significance	3	13	13	29
Little or No Significance	0	3	2	5
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=1.71$ Significance=.95

Table 21 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the issue of delegating more authority and duties to subordinates.

Null Hypothesis Nineteen. The issue of decentralization superintendents face is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 21 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 83 percent of the superintendents felt the issue of decentralization was an issue of limited to no significance.

Table 20
Student Activism

Degree Of	Classification				Row Total		
	Class I	Class II	Class III				
Of Great Significance	0	.3	2	1.6	1	1.1	3
Significant	2	1.7	8	9.6	8	6.8	18
Of Limited Significance	5	5.2	31	29.7	20	21.1	56
Little or No Significance	8	7.9	45	45.1	32	32.0	85
Column Total	15		86		61		162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=1.06$ Significance=.98

Table 22 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the issue of reorganizing small districts into larger districts.

Null Hypothesis Twenty. The reorganization of small districts into larger units of administration is an issue superintendents face and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 22 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The issues superintendents face

in organizing small districts into larger units are independent of school district classification.

Table 21
Decentralization of Large School Districts

Degree Of	Classification				Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III		
Of Great Significance	0	.8	5	4	9
Significant	5	1.7	4	9	18
Of Limited Significance	3	4.4	26	18	47
Little or No Significance	7	8.1	51	30	88
Column Total	15	86	61		162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=12.9$ Significance=.04

Table 23 illustrates the relationship between the superintendent and curriculum issues.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-One. Curriculum issues superintendents face are issues that are independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 23 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Curriculum issues superintendents face are independent of school district classification.

Table 22
Reorganization of Smaller Districts

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	2	14	16	32
Significant	7	32	24	63
Of Limited Significance	4	19	16	39
Little or No Significance	2	21	5	28
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=8.32$ Significance=.22

Table 24 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the issues of instruction.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-Two. Teaching and operation of educational programs are issues superintendents face and are independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 24 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Operation of educational programs is an issue faced by the superintendents and is independent of school district classification.

Table 23
Changing Priorities In Curriculum

Degree Of	Classification				Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III		
Of Great Significance	3	12	10	25	25
Significant	9	53	29	91	91
Of Limited Significance	3	20	20	43	43
Little or No Significance	0	1	2	3	3
Column Total	15	86	61	162	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=4.32$ Significance=.63

Table 25 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the financing of schools.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-Three. Financing the educational program is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 25 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The issue of financing schools that superintendents face is independent of school district classification.

Table 24
Ways of Teaching or Operating Educational Programs

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	8	20	13	41
Significant	7	40	33	80
Of Limited Significance	0	24	15	39
Little or No Significance	0	2	0	2
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=11.53$ Significance=.07

Table 26 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the issue of educational outcomes.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-Four. Accountability of the educational program is an issue that faces the superintendent and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 26 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The issues of educational outcome superintendents face are independent of school district classification.

Table 25
Financing Schools

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	12.6 14	72.2 75	51.2 47	136
Significant	2.2 1	12.7 10	9.0 13	24
Of Limited Significance	.2 0	1.1 1	.8 1	2
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=4 Critical $\chi^2=9.49$ Calculated $\chi^2=3.88$ Significance=.42

Table 27 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the support for non-public schools.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-Five. Growing support for non-public schools is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 27 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The issue of non-public schools that superintendents face is independent of school district classification.

Table 26
Assessing Educational Outcomes

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	3	8	6	17
Significant	9	51	29	89
Of Limited Significance	3	23	22	48
Little or No Significance	0	4	4	8
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=5.05$ Significance=.54

Table 28 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the issue of federal involvement in public education.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-Six. Federal involvement in education is an issue that superintendents face and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 28 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The issue of growing federal involvement in public education superintendents face is independent of school district classification.

Table 27
Support of Non-Public Schools

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	2	13	7	22
Significant	6	27	18	51
Of Limited Significance	6	29	20	55
Little or No Significance	1	17	16	34
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=3.28$ Significance=.77

Table 29 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the caliber of persons that are elected or removed from boards of education.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-Seven. Membership on the board of trustees of local school districts is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 29 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 43 percent of the respondents

felt the issue of persons serving on the board was of significance.

Table 28
Growing Federal Involvement

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	0	8	5	13
Significant	4	33	21	58
Of Limited Significance	9	33	25	67
Little or No Significance	2	12	10	24
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=3.54$ Significance=.74

Table 30 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the issue of declining student enrollments.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-Eight. Decline in student enrollment is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 30 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 66 percent of the

superintendents responding to the survey felt the issue was of limited significance to significant.

Table 29
Caliber of Local Boards of Education

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	6	5.2 30	29.7 20	21.1 56
Significant	8	6.5 33	37.2 29	26.4 70
Of Limited Significance	1	2.3 15	13.3 9	9.4 25
Little or No Significance	0	1.0 8	5.8 3	4.1 11
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=4.4$ Significance=.62

Table 31 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and their visibility.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-Nine. Greater visibility of the superintendent is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 31 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 74 percent of all

superintendents responding to the survey felt the issue of visibility was of limited significance to significant.

Table 30
Decreasing Student Enrollments

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	2	20	17	39
Significant	5	32	21	58
Of Limited Significance	7	23	20	50
Little or No Significance	1	11	3	15
Colum Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical X =12.59 Calculated X =5.48 Significance=.48

Table 32 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the issue of attacks on superintendents.

Null Hypothesis Thirty. Increasing attacks on the superintendent are independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 32 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 66 percent of the

superintendents responding to the survey felt the issue of attacks on superintendents was of limited significance to significant.

Table 31
Visibilty of Superintendent

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	1	11	13	25
Significant	11	41	27	79
Of Limited Significance	3	22	17	42
Little or No Significance	0	12	4	16
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=8.53$ Significance=.20

Table 33 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the issue of drugs in the schools.

Null Hypothesis Thirty-One. Use of drugs in the schools is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 33 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 76 percent of the

superintendents responding to the survey felt the issue of drugs in the school was of limited significance to significant.

Table 32
Attacks On Superintendent

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	2.4 1	13.8 14	9.8 11	26
Significant	4.4 2	25.5 24	18.1 22	48
Of Limited Significance	5.5 11	31.3 30	22.2 18	59
Little or No Significance	2.7 1	15.4 18	10.9 10	29
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=11.3$ Significance=.08

Table 34 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and students values and behavioral norms.

Null Hypothesis Thirty-Two. Change of student values and norms is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 34 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 79 percent of the

superintendents surveyed felt the issue of student values and behavioral norms was of limited significance to significant.

Table 33
Drugs In The Schools

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	1.6 1	9.0 10	6.4 6	17
Significant	6.0 8	34.5 37	24.5 20	65
Of Limited Significance	5.4 4	30.8 29	21.8 25	58
Little or No Significance	2.0 2	11.7 10	8.3 10	22
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=3.5$ Significance=.74

Table 35 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the issue of employing qualified teachers.

Null Hypothesis Thirty-Three. Obtaining qualified teachers is an issue superintendents face and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 35 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of

significance. Approximately 82 percent of all superintendents responding to the survey felt the issue of employing qualified teachers was of great significance to significant.

Table 34
Students Values And Behavioral Norms

Degree Of	Class I	Classification Class II	Class III	Row Total
Of Great Significance	2.4 2	13.8 13	9.8 11	26
Significant	7.2 7	41.4 45	29.4 26	78
Of Limited Significance	4.6 6	26.5 23	18.8 21	50
Little Or No Significance	.7 0	4.2 5	3.0 3	8
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=2.97$ Significance=.81

Table 36 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the employment of qualified support staff.

Null Hypothesis Thirty-Four. Employment of qualified support staff is an issue facing superintendents and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 36 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 67 percent of the superintendents responding to the survey felt the issue of employing qualified support staff was of great significance to significant.

Table 35
Employment of Qualified Teachers

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	7	34	26	67
Significant	7	34	24	65
Of Limited Significance	1	15	7	23
Little or No Significance	0	3	4	7
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=3.41$ Significance=.75

Table 37 describes the relationship between superintendents and social issues that would cause them to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Thirty-Five. Social issues such as race relations, integration or segregation will cause

superintendents to leave the position and are independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 37 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. All superintendents responding to the survey felt the social issues facing superintendents would not cause them to leave the position.

Table 36
Employment of Qualified Support Staff

Degree Of	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Of Great Significance	4	25	11	40
Significant	7	34	30	71
Of Limited Significance	3	21	16	40
Little or No Significance	1	6	4	11
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=2.78$ Significance=.84

Table 38 describes the relationship between superintendents and the issues of school staff relations that would cause a superintendent to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Thirty-Six. Issues of negotiations, strikes, sanctions or some form of teacher militancy will cause superintendents to leave the position and are independent of school district classification.

Table 37
Social-cultural Issues and Classification

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0
No Response	15 15.0	86 86.0	61 61.0	162
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=0.0$ Significance=.999

The data shown in Table 38 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 93 percent of the respondents felt it was not an issue that would cause them to leave the position.

Table 39 describes the relationship between the superintendent and the issues of student activism that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Thirty-Seven. Issues of a student underground newspaper and student strikes will cause the

Table 38
Issues In School Staff Relations

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	1	7	3	11
	1.0	5.8	4.2	
No Response	14	79	58	151
	13.9	80.2	56.9	
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=.59$ Significance=.69
superintendent to leave the position and are independent of
school district classification.

Table 39
Student Activism

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0	1	0	1
	.1	.5	.4	
No Response	15	85	61	161
	14.9	85.5	60.6	
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=.89$ Significance=.63

The data shown in Table 39 were the basis for
retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of

significance. All but one respondent indicated it was not an issue that would force superintendents to leave the position.

Table 40 describes the relationship between the superintendent and the issue of delegating authority to subordinates that will cause the superintendent to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Thirty-Eight. Decentralization in the school district will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

Table 40
Decentralization of Authority

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0	1	0	1
No Response	15	85	61	161
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2. Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=.89$ Significance=.63

The data shown in Table 40 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. All but one respondent indicated decentralization of authority is not an issue that would

cause a superintendent to leave the position.

Table 41 describes the relationship between superintendents and the issue of reorganizing smaller districts into larger units which would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Thirty-Nine. The reorganization of school districts will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

Table 41
Reorganization of Small Districts

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0	5	10	15
No Response	15	81	51	147
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=6.44$ Significance=.04

The data shown in Table 41 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Reorganization of small districts into larger units will cause superintendents to leave the position and is dependent on school district classification. The smaller the size of the school

district, the greater the chance the issue will cause the superintendent to leave.

Table 42 describes the relationship between superintendents and the issues of changing priorities in curriculum that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Forty. Curriculum issues are issues that will cause a superintendent to leave the position and are independent of school district classification.

Table 42
Changing Priorities In Curriculum

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0	0	1	1
No Response	15	86	60	161
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=1.67$ Significance=.44

The data shown in Table 42 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. All but one of the respondents felt the changing priorities in curriculum would not cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 43 describes the relationship between superintendents and issues of teaching and operating educational programs that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Forty-One. Teaching and operation of educational programs are issues that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and are independent of school district classification.

Table 43
New Ways of Teaching and Operating Educational Programs

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0	0	1	1
No Response	15	86	60	161
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=1.67$ Significance=.44

The data shown in Table 43 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. One respondent felt the issue would cause them to leave the position.

Table 44 describes the relationship between superintendents and the issue of financing schools which would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Forty-Two. Financing the educational schools is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

Table 44
Financing Schools

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	3 2.6	21 16.0	6 11.4	30
No Response	11 11.4	65 69.0	55 49.6	131
Column Total	14	86	61	161

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=5.08$ Significance=.08

The data shown in Table 44 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 81 percent of the respondents felt financing schools would not cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 45 describes the relationship between superintendents and assessing educational outcomes that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Forty-Three. Accountability is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the

position and is independent of school district classification.

Table 45
Assessing Educational Outcomes

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0	0	1	1
No Response	15	86	60	161
Column Total	15	86	61	161

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=1.67$ Significance=.44

The data shown in Table 45 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. With the exception of one respondent, all others felt assessing educational issues would not cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 46 describes the relationship between superintendents and the growing pressure to support non-public schools that will cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Forty-Four. Growing support of non-public schools is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

Table 46
Support of Non-Public Schools

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	1	3	4	8
No Response	14	83	57	154
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=.82$ Significance=.65

The data shown in Table 46 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis. Approximately 95 percent of the respondents indicated support for non-public schools would not cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 47 describes the relationship between superintendents and the federal involvement in education that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Forty-Five. Involvement of the federal government in education is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 47 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 98 percent of all respondents

felt federal involvement in education would not cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 47
Federal Involvement In Education

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	1	0	3	4
No Response	14	86	58	158
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=4.79$ Significance=.09

Table 48 describes the relationship between superintendents and the caliber of persons elected to or removed from local boards of education that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Forty-Six. Membership on the board of trustees of the local school district is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 48 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 71 percent of the respondents felt the caliber of persons elected to or removed from

local boards would not cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 49 describes the relationship between superintendents and decreasing student enrollments that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 48
Elected To or Removed From Local Boards of Education

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	3 4.4	26 24.9	18 17.7	47
No Response	12 10.6	60 61.1	43 43.3	115
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=.66$ Significance=.68

Null Hypothesis Forty-Seven. Declining student enrollment is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 49 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 92 percent of the respondents felt declining student enrollments would not cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 50 describes the relationship between superintendents and the visibility of superintendents that will cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 49
Decreasing Student Enrollments

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	1.2 1	6.9 5	4.9 7	13
No Response	13.8 14	79.1 81	56.1 54	149
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=1.59$ Significance=.46

Null Hypothesis Forty-Eight. Greater visibility is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 50 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 98 percent of the respondents felt greater visibility of the superintendent would not cause the superintendents to leave the position.

Table 51 describes the relationship between superintendents and the increasing attacks on

superintendents that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 50
Visibility of Superintendent

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0	2	2	4
No Response	15	84	59	158
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=.55$ Significance=.69

Null Hypothesis Forty-Nine. Increasing attacks on the superintendent are an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 51 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 72 percent of the respondents felt increasing attacks on superintendents would not cause the superintendents to leave the position.

Table 52 describes the relationship between superintendents and the use of drugs in the schools that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 51
Attacks on Superintendent

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	3 4.2	22 23.9	20 16.9	45
No Response	12 10.8	64 62.1	41 44.1	117
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=1.42$ Significance=.50

Null Hypothesis Fifty. Use of drugs in the schools is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

Table 52
Drugs In The Schools

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0 .1	1 .5	0 .4	1
No Response	15 14.9	85 85.5	61 60.6	161
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=.89$ Significance=.63

The data shown in Table 52 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 99 percent of the respondents felt the use of drugs in the schools would not cause the superintendents to leave the position.

Table 53 describes the relationship between superintendents and student values that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Fifty-One. Change of student values and norms is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

Table 53
Students Values and Behavioral Norms

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0	3	5	8
No Response	15	83	56	154
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=2.54$ Significance=.28

The data shown in Table 53 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of

significance. Approximately 95 percent of the respondents felt student values would not cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 54 describes the relationship between superintendents and the employment of qualified teachers that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Fifty-Two. Obtaining qualified teachers is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

Table 54
Employment of Qualified Teachers

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0 .7	2 3.7	5 2.6	7
No Response	15 14.4	84 82.3	56 58.4	155
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=3.72$ Significance=.15

The data shown in Table 54 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 96 percent of the respondents felt the employment of qualified teachers would not cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 55 describes the relationship between superintendents and the employment of qualified support staff that would cause superintendents to leave the position.

Null Hypothesis Fifty-Three. Employment of qualified support staff is an issue that will cause the superintendent to leave the position and is independent of school district classification.

Table 55
Employment of Qualified Support Staff

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	0	0	1	1
No Response	15	86	60	161
Column Total	15	86	61	162

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=1.67$ Significance=.44

The data shown in Table 55 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 99 percent of the respondents felt the employment of qualified support staff would not cause superintendents to leave the position.

Table 56 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and maintaining effective in-service programs.

Null Hypothesis Fifty-Four. Maintaining effective in-service programs is independent of school district classification.

Table 56
In-Service Programs

Response	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Yes	9 4.6	26 26.2	14 18.3	49
No	6 10.4	60 59.8	46 41.7	112
Column Total	15	86	60	161

df=2 Critical $\chi^2=5.99$ Calculated $\chi^2=7.62$ Significance=.02

The data shown in Table 56 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Maintaining effective in-service programs is dependent on school district classification. The larger the size of the school district, the greater the need is to maintain effective in-service programs.

Table 57 describes the relationship between superintendents and the hours per week they devote to the position.

Null Hypothesis Fifty-Five. The hours per week the superintendent devotes to the position are independent of school district classification.

Table 57
Hours In A Week Devoted To Superintendency

Hours	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
36-40	0	4	1	5
41-45	0	7	4	11
46-50	4	27	16	47
51-55	3	20	16	39
56-60	5	20	17	42
61-65	2	4	2	8
66-70	0	1	4	6

Table 57 (Continued)
Hours In A Week Devoted To The Superintendency

Hours	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
71+	0	.3 2	1.6 1	1.1 3
Column Total	15	85	61	161

df=14 Critical $\chi^2=23.68$ Calculated $\chi^2=10.1$ Significance=.75

The data shown in Table 57 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 53 percent of the respondents devote between 46 and 55 hours a week to the position of superintendent.

Table 58 describes the relationship between superintendents and the number of evenings per week devoted to the position.

Null Hypothesis Fifty-Six. The number of evenings per week a superintendent devotes to the position is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 58 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 69 percent of the respondents devote between two and three evenings per week to the superintendency.

Table 58
Evenings Devoted To Superintendency

Evenings	Classification				Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III		
1	1	12	7	20	20
2	3	30	23	56	56
3	7	31	16	54	54
4	3	8	11	22	22
5	1	3	1	5	5
6	0	0	1	1	1
7	0	0	1	1	1
Column Total	15	84	60	159	

df=12 Critical $\chi^2=21.03$ Calculated $\chi^2=10.5$ Significance=.58

Table 59 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the number of Saturdays devoted to the position.

Null Hypothesis Fifty-Seven. The number of Saturdays in a month that the superintendent devotes to the position is independent of school district classification.

Table 59
Saturdays Devoted To Superintendency

Saturdays	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
1	1.9 1	12.1 15	9.0 7	23
2	4.1 7	25.8 24	19.1 18	49
3	3.5 3	22.1 23	16.4 16	42
4	3.4 2	21.0 19	15.6 19	40
Column Total	13	81	60	154

df=6 Critical $\chi^2=12.59$ Calculated $\chi^2=5.39$ Significance=.49

The data shown in Table 59 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 59 percent of the respondents devote between two and three Saturdays per month to the position.

Table 60 describes the relationship between superintendents and the number of Sundays per month devoted to the position.

Null Hypothesis Fifty-Eight. The number of Sundays in a month that the superintendent devotes to the position is independent of school district classification.

Table 60
Sundays Devoted To Superintendency

Sundays	Classification				Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III		
1	5	33	18	3.8 32.7 19.5	56
2	0	12	9	1.4 12.3 7.3	21
3	0	3	1	.3 2.3 1.4	4
4	1	4	3	.5 4.7 2.8	8
Column Total	6	52	31		89

df=6 Critical $X^2=12.59$ Calculated $X^2=3.4$ Significance=.76

The data shown on Table 60 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Approximately 63 percent of the 89 respondents devote one Sunday per month to the position.

Table 61 describes the relationship between superintendents and plans.

Null Hypothesis Fifty-Nine. Plans of the superintendent are independent of school district classification.

Table 61
Plans of Superintendent

Plans	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
Will Continue Until Retirement Age	4.3 5	24.3 29	17.4 12	46
Will Probably Continue Until Retirement Age	8.8 9	49.6 48	35.6 37	94
Will Probably Leave To University	.1 0	.5 1	.4 0	1
Will Probably Leave Education	.7 0	3.7 3	2.7 4	7
Impossible Position	.1 0	.5 1	.4 0	1
Will Remain	1.1 1	6.3 3	4.5 8	12
Column Total	15	85	61	161

df=10 Critical $\chi^2=18.31$ Calculated $\chi^2=10.5$ Significance=.39

The data in Table 61 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Approximately 87 percent of the respondents will continue or probably continue until retirement age.

Table 62 describes the relationship between superintendents and the years remaining in the superintendency.

Null Hypothesis Sixty. Years remaining in the superintendency before reaching minimum retirement age is independent of school district classification. The data shown in Table 62 were the basis for retaining the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Table 62
Years Remaining Before Minimum Retirement

Years	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
1 - 3	3 1.9	15 11.8	5 9.3	23
4 - 6	3 2.0	10 12.3	11 9.7	24
7 - 9	4 2.4	16 14.9	9 11.7	29
10-12	0 1.9	10 11.8	13 9.3	23

Table 62 (Continued)
Years Remaining Before Minimum Retirement

Years	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
13-15	0	1.1 8	6.7 5	5.3 13
16-18	0	.7 3	4.6 6	3.6 9
Column Total	10	62	49	121

df=10 Critical $X^2=18.31$ Calculated $X^2=14.2$ Significance=.16

Approximately 63 percent of the respondents have less than 10 years remaining in the superintendency before they reach the minimum retirement age.

Table 63 illustrates the relationship between superintendents and the professional memberships they hold.

Null Hypothesis Sixty-One. Membership the superintendent has in a professional organization is independent of school district classification.

The data shown in Table 63 were the basis for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Membership that superintendents have in professional organizations is dependent of school district classification. The Organizations of choice for Class I superintendents are equally spread amongst the American

Association of School Administrators, Association of Curriculum Development and Phi Delta Kappa. The organization of choice for Class II and III superintendents is the American Association of School Administrators.

Table 63
Professional Membership

Organizations	Classification			Row Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	
AASA	5 9.2	53 45.3	27 30.6	85
NAASP	0 1.0	2 4.8	7 3.2	9
NAESP	0 .3	2 1.6	1 1.1	3
ASCD	5 3.7	14 18.1	15 12.2	34
PDK	5 .9	3 4.3	0 2.9	8
Colum Total	15	74	50	139

df=8 Critical $\chi^2=15.51$ Calculated $\chi^2=36.15$ Significance=.00

Interpretation

In reporting the results of the tested null hypotheses, Table 64 presents a summary of those hypotheses. The

hypotheses are presented by category. Also shown is the Critical Chi Square and the Calculated Chi Square for each hypothesis. Those hypotheses that were significant at the .05 level of significance are indicated by an asterisk.

Table 64
Summary Of Null Hypotheses

Hypotheses	Critical χ^2	Calculated χ^2
Superintendents Personal And Professional Characteristics:		
Hypothesis 1 - Years In Current Position	15.51	12.51
Hypothesis 2 - Age Of Superintendent	21.03	*26.0
Hypothesis 3 - Gender Of Superintendent	5.99	5.16
Hypothesis 4 - Classroom Teaching Experience	15.51	9.27
Hypothesis 5 - Prior Administrative Experience	18.3	*19.1
Hypothesis 6 - Mobility Patterns Of First Superintendency	12.59	*15.13
Mobility Of Second Superintendency	12.59	3.17
Mobility Of Third Superintendency	12.59	5.87
Hypothesis 7 - Total Years Of Experience As Superintendent	15.51	13.99
Hypothesis 8 - Total Years Of Educational Experience As Superintendent	18.3	*28.2

Table 64 (Continued)
Summary Of Null Hypotheses

Hypotheses	Critical χ^2	Calculated χ^2
Superintendents Personal And Professional Characteristics:		
Hypothesis 9 - Salary Received By Superintendents	26.3	*111.5
Hypothesis 10 - States Where Superintendent Has Served	9.49	8.12
Hypothesis 11 - Length Of Superintendent's Contract	9.49	*15.4
Hypothesis 12 - Noneducational Employment Of Superintendent	9.49	1.31
Hypothesis 13 - Career Choices Of Superintendent	12.59	1.3
Formal Educational Preparation:		
Hypothesis 14 - Educational Preparation Of Superintendents	15.51	*35.58
Hypothesis 15 - Satisfaction Of Course Work Leading To Certification	12.59	6.31
Educational Issues Faced By Superintendents:		
Hypothesis 16 - Social-Cultural	12.59	7.43
Hypothesis 17 - School Staff Relations	12.59	1.71
Hypothesis 18 - Student Activism	12.59	1.06
Hypothesis 19 - Decentralizing Large Districts	12.59	*12.9

Table 64 (Continued)
Summary Of Null Hypothesis

Hypothesis	Critical χ^2	Calculated χ^2
Educational Issues Faced By Superintendents:		
Hypothesis 20 - Reorganizing Smaller Districts Into Larger Units	12.59	8.32
Hypothesis 21 - Curriculum	12.59	4.32
Hypothesis 22 - Instruction	12.59	11.53
Hypothesis 23 - Financing	9.49	3.88
Hypothesis 24 - Accountability Of Programs	12.59	5.05
Hypothesis 25 - Support For Non-public Schools	12.59	3.28
Hypothesis 26 - Federal Involvement In Education	12.59	3.54
Hypothesis 27 - Caliber Of Persons Serving On Local Boards Of Education	12.59	4.4
Hypothesis 28 - Declining Student Enrollment	12.59	5.48
Hypothesis 29 - Visibility Of Superintendent	12.59	8.53
Hypothesis 30 - Increasing Attacks On Superintendent	12.59	11.3
Hypothesis 31 - Use Of Drugs In Schools	12.59	3.5
Hypothesis 32 - Changing Student Values And Norms	12.59	2.97
Hypothesis 33 - Obtaining Qualified Teachers	12.59	3.41

Table 64 (Continued)
Summary Of Null Hypothesis

Hypothesis	Critical χ^2	Calculated χ^2
Educational Issues That Will Cause Superintendents To Leave:		
Hypothesis 34 - Employment Of Qualified Support Staff	12.59	2.78
Hypothesis 35 - Social-Cultural	5.99	.99
Hypothesis 36 - School Staff Relations	5.99	.59
Hypothesis 37 - Student Activism	5.99	.89
Hypothesis 38 - Decentralizing Large Districts	5.99	.89
Hypothesis 39 - Reorganizing Smaller Districts Into Larger Units	5.99	*6.44
Hypothesis 40 - Curriculum	5.99	1.67
Hypothesis 41 - Instruction	5.99	1.67
Hypothesis 42 - Financing	5.99	5.08
Hypothesis 43 - Accountability Of Programs	5.99	1.67
Hypothesis 44 - Support For Non-public Schools	5.99	.82
Hypothesis 45 - Federal Involvement In Education	5.99	4.79
Hypothesis 46 - Caliber Of Persons Serving on Local Boards Of Education	5.99	.66
Hypothesis 47 - Declining Student Enrollment	5.99	1.59

Table 64 (Continued)
Summary Of Null Hypothesis

Hypothesis	Critical χ^2	Calculated χ^2
Educational Issues That Will Cause Superintendents To Leave:		
Hypothesis 48 - Visibility Of Superintendent	5.99	.55
Hypothesis 49 - Increasing Attacks On Superintendent	5.99	1.42
Hypothesis 50 - Use Of Drugs In Schools	5.99	.89
Hypothesis 51 - Changing Student Values And Norms	5.99	2.54
Hypothesis 52 - Obtaining Qualified Teachers	5.99	3.72
Hypothesis 53 - Employment Of Qualified Support Staff	5.99	1.67
Maintaining In-Service Programs:		
Hypothesis 54 - Importance Of Effective In-Service Programs	5.99	*7.62
Time Spent On The Job As Superintendent:		
Hypothesis 55 - Hours Per Week Devoted To Superintendency	23.68	10.1
Hypothesis 56 - Number Of Evenings Per Week Devoted To Superintendency	21.03	10.5
Hypothesis 57 - Number Of Saturdays Per Month Devoted To Superintendency	12.59	5.39

Table 64 (Continued)
Summary Of Null Hypothesis

Hypothesis	Critical χ^2	Calculated χ^2
Time Spent On The Job As Superintendent:		
Hypothesis 58 - Number Of Sundays Per Month Devoted To Superintendency	12.59	3.4
Future Plans:		
Hypothesis 59 - Plans Of The Superintendent	18.31	10.5
Hypothesis 60 - Years Remaining Before Reaching Minimum Retirement Age	18.31	14.2
Professional Membership:		
Hypothesis 61 - Memberships That Superintendents Hold	15.51	*36.15

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the study and presents conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data. Recommendations for further study and for action are also presented.

Summary

The problem of this study was two-fold: (1) to determine whether a relationship exists among tenure, mobility, experience as a superintendent, total educational experience, age, educational preparation, salary, membership in professional organizations, gender, educational issues and future plans of employment as district superintendents in Class I, II and III school districts in the state of Montana; and (2) to determine the manpower needs for the position of district superintendent in Class I, II and III districts in the state of Montana through the year 2000.

Related literature was reviewed in Chapter 2 under two major headings. These topics were: Tenure in position, and Supply and demand.

The survey instrument used in this study was a modified instrument developed by the American Association of School Administrators. The instrument was field tested by practicing public school superintendents to see if there were any ambiguous questions or formatting problems that would distract from filling out the instrument.

Respondents were asked to identify some personal and professional information about themselves and educational issues that they may or may not encounter and the degree of significance placed on those issues. They were also asked to respond to the same educational issues and determine if such issues would cause them to leave the position. The concluding part of the survey focused on time issues of the position, future plans and memberships in professional organizations.

The population used in the study consisted of 188 public school superintendents who were employed in the state of Montana during the 1986-1987 school year. In November 1986, a cover letter describing the study and the importance of returning the completed survey was mailed along with the survey instrument and a self-addressed stamped envelope for the return of the survey. Two weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up letter was sent to the superintendents who had not responded to the survey. Four weeks after the initial mailing, a phone call was made to non-respondents asking for the return of the completed

survey. Eventually, 162 superintendents responded and returned the survey.

The following personal and professional characteristics of superintendents were found to be dependent on school district classification:

- Age of the superintendent

- Prior administrative experience

- Mobility patterns of first superintendency

- Total years of educational experience as a superintendent

- Salary received by superintendents

- Length of superintendent's employment contract.

Under formal preparation, there was one significant finding that was dependent and significantly related to school district classification:

- Educational preparation of superintendents.

The following educational issue faced by superintendents was found to be dependent and significantly related to school district classification:

- Decentralizing in school districts.

The one issue that was significantly dependent on school district classification and would cause superintendents to leave the position was:

- Reorganizing smaller districts into larger units.

In the maintenance of in-service programs, there was a significant finding:

Effective in-service programs are important.

The concluding issue that was significant and dependent on school district classification was:

Professional memberships of superintendents.

Conclusions

The researcher has reached the following conclusions based on the analysis of the data and information collected in this study.

1. The chronological age of superintendents is not independent of school district classification. Up until the age of 50 there is a stair-stepping relationship relative to the age of superintendents. Class III districts have the youngest superintendents. Class II districts employ a higher percentage of superintendents that are in their late thirties and middle forties and Class I districts employ more superintendents that are in their late forties. As superintendents approach their middle and late 50's, there are a higher percentage of Class II districts employing this age group.

2. An individual that has aspirations of becoming a public school superintendent will enhance his or her opportunities for such employment by having had prior

experience as a building principal. Approximately 50 percent of all superintendents responding to the questionnaire had prior building principal experience. The percentage was somewhat higher for Class II superintendents with 55 percent.

3. Class III superintendents have fewer continuous years of employment in their first superintendency than do Class I and Class II superintendents. Class II superintendents have fewer continuous years of employment in their first superintendency than do Class I superintendents. For the first superintendency, the larger the size of the school district, the more continuous employment the superintendent has.

4. The larger the school district, the higher the total educational experience the superintendent has. Approximately 53 percent of Class I superintendents have 26 years or more of total educational experience. For the same amount of experience, the percentages decrease for Class II and III, 33 and 18 percent, respectively.

5. The larger the school district is, the longer the employment contract is for the superintendent. Forty percent of the Class I superintendents had three year contracts while 34 percent of Class II superintendents had a contract of the same length. The percentage of Class III superintendents having a three year contract was less than half the number of Class II superintendents, 16 percent.

6. Class I superintendents receive substantially higher salaries than do Class II and III superintendents. Forty percent of the Class I superintendents receive \$56,000 or more while three percent of the Class II superintendents receive a commensurate wage. No one at the Class III level of superintendents receives such a wage.

7. The larger the school district is, the more educational preparation the superintendent has. Approximately 30 percent of the Class I superintendents have an Educational Specialist degree or higher while the percentage sharply declines for Class II and Class III superintendents, 10 and four percent respectively.

8. The issue of decentralizing large school districts is given a higher degree of significance by Class I superintendents than by Class II and III superintendents. Thirty-three percent of the Class I superintendents rated the issue as being significant while 10 and 21 percent of the Class II and III superintendents, respectively, gave the issue a rating of significant to great significance.

9. An issue that would cause superintendents to leave the position was reorganizing smaller school districts into larger school districts. Sixteen percent of Class III superintendents felt the issue would cause them to leave the superintendency while five percent of the Class II superintendents felt the same way. Class I superintendents

felt it was not an issue that would force them to leave the position.

10. In the maintenance of in-service programs, the larger in size of the school district, the greater the need is to maintain effective in-service programs.

11. There is a higher percentage of Class II and III superintendents that belong to the American Association of School Administrators than there are of Class I superintendents. Professional membership for Class I superintendents is equally distributed among the American Association of School Administrators, Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development and Phi Delta Kappa.

12. Notwithstanding other variables that might cause a superintendent to leave the position, 99 practicing superintendents have from one to 12 years left before reaching the minimum number of years before they can retire (Table 62). Coupled with the mobility charted out for superintendents (Table 65), the public schools in the state of Montana will turn over in excess of 50 percent of the current practicing school superintendents by the year 2000. With the ever increasing demands upon the position of superintendent, it is imperative that training institutions give instruction and experiences relative to the position.

The mobility patterns of superintendents in Montana (Table 65) are similar to those in Louisiana (Blackman & Petley, 1976), West Virginia (Martin & Andes, 1979) and

Illinois (Burlingame, 1977). The 10-year upward vertical movement of superintendents in Class III school districts into Class II school districts numbered 22, approximately 32 percent. For the same period of time, four Class II superintendents moved into the chief administrators position in Class I districts, approximately four percent. There was no upward vertical movement of Class III superintendents into Class I school districts.

The 10-year mobility study of Montana superintendents showed a small amount of downward mobility, movement from a larger district to a smaller district. One Class I superintendent moved to a Class II district and seven Class II superintendents moved to a Class III district.

For the most part, Montana superintendents are place-bound. Vertical movement to a larger district is minimal with Class III superintendents ten times more likely to move into Class II districts than Class II superintendents are likely to move into Class I districts.

13. Two unexpected findings and issues that the researcher felt would cause superintendents to leave the position were, the caliber of persons serving on local boards of education and obtaining qualified teachers. Neither issue was significant. Superintendents, at the time this study was conducted, did not feel that either issue would cause them to leave the position.

Recommendations for Further Study

The researcher recommends the following additional research:

1. The study should be replicated on an annual basis in order to keep the data updated.
2. Studies using other educational issues that might be of concern to practicing superintendents and/or which might force them out of the position should be considered.
3. Consideration should be given to studies of the superintendent using one classification of school district.
4. A study should be implemented to determine the effects that the lateral mobility of superintendents has on education in Montana.

Recommendations for Action

Based on the findings of this study that better than 50 percent of the practicing school superintendents could, if for no other reason, retire at the minimum retirement age and in that it is the responsibility of the universities to train school administrators, the researcher recommends that following actions be taken:

1. An assessment center for current and potential school administrators should be studied, planned and developed. The Center would offer individuals a means of self-assessment, interviews and skill testing to determine

their professional knowledge and skill level. Skills to be tested would include interpersonal, political and management skills. Recommendations for further study for the individuals could be recommended based upon the assessment

2. A three quarter minimum internship be required for all persons aspiring to be school superintendents

3. A review of required course work in the preparation for certification of superintendents be undertaken by contacting practicing administrators. This will enhance the ability of aspiring superintendents to more adequately handle educational issues. Also, consideration could be given to providing workshops to practicing superintendents who would like retrofitting in order to more adequately deal with current issues.

REFERENCES CITED

REFERENCES CITED

- American Association of School Administrators, Guidelines for the preparation of school administrators. (1982). (2nd edition). American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, VA.
- American Educators Encyclopedia. (1982). Greenwood Press, Westport, CT.
- Barker, Bruce O. (1983). Research finding on K-12 and 1-12 rural school district in the United States Division of Continuing Education, Brigham Young University, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 234 973)
- Barker, Bruce O. (1985). Research focus on rural schools in Oklahoma Division of Continuing Education, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 536)
- Blackmon, C. Robert & Petley, Carol T. (1976). The Louisiana public school superintendent: 1975 Bureau of Educational Materials and Research, College of Education, LA State University, Baton Rouge, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176 314)
- Blumberg, Arthur. (1985). The school superintendent. Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Burlingame, Martin. (1977). An exploratory study of turnover and career mobility of public school superintendents in the State of Illinois from 1960-1976 University of IL at Urbana-Champaign, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 152 462)
- Burlingame, Martin. (1979). Win some, lose some: Small rural district superintendents University of IL at Urbana-Champaign, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 168 776)
- Cambron-McCabe, Nelda H. & Odden, Allan. (1982). The changing politics of school finance. Ballinger Publishing Company, Cambridge, MA.
- Carlson, Richard O. (1972). School superintendents: Career and performance. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Charter, W. W., Jr. (1972). In-state migration of Oregon superintendents: Base-line data, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of OR, Eugene, OR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 065 930)

Directory of Montana Schools, 1985-1986. (1985). Office of Public Instruction, Ed Argenbright, Superintendent, Helena, Montana.

Dolce, Carl J. (1976). Superintendents under siege - Get the leader American Association of School Administrators, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 122 362)

Downey, Gregg W. (1985). Leadership. Executive Education, 7, 8A-10A.

Encyclopedia of Education. (1971). Volume 6, The MacMillan Company and The Free Press.

Gerardi, Robert J. (1981). Superintendents - Movers or stayers? Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 604.

Good, Carter V. (1973). Dictionary of Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Hersey, P.W. (1971). NASSP'S assessment center-From concept to practice. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 61, 74-76.

Jones, Effie H. & Montenegro, Xenia P. (1983). Women and minorities in school administration: Strategies for making a difference, Office of Minority Affairs, American Association of School Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 607)

Katz, Malcolm. (1985). Match working styles, and find your way to board/superintendent harmony. American School Board Journal, 172, 33-34.

Kerlinger, Fred N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research. (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Lutz, Robert George. (1963). Factors associated with short tenure of school superintendents in Michigan (Doctoral dissertation, University of MI). Dissertation Abstracts International, 24, 590-1.

- Maienza, Janice Grow. (Spring 1986). The female superintendent: Another perspective, Journal of NAWDAC, 30-36.
- Martin, James A. & Andes, John O. (1979). Supply and demand of public school administrators in West Virginia 1978-1980, Department of Education Administration, College of Human Resources and Education, WV University, Morgantown, WV. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 175 124)
- McCarthy, Martha; Kuh, George, & Zent, Amy. (1981). An investigation of supply and demand for school administrators in six states between 1975-76 and 1979-80, IN University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210 798)
- Paddock, Susan. (1978). Careers in educational administration: Are women the exception? College of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 149 468)
- Peters, Mervin G. (1978). Superintendent dismissals in rural Illinois public schools: A study of two contrasting models of explanation (Doctoral dissertation, University of IL, Urbana-Champaign). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 7095-A.
- Sales, M. Vance & Taylor, Joseph C. (1984). The Arkansas school superintendent--1983. Research bulletin, AR State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 453 344)
- School Laws of Montana. (1985). Published by Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ed Argenbright, Helena, Montana.
- Valenti, Jasper J. (1983). Investigation of five southern university programs of educational administrators relating to the recommendations of the NCPEA Futurism 1985 Committee. Unpublished manuscript, Lyola University of Chicago.
- Walden, John. (1976). Antecedents to incumbent defeat and superintendent turnover, Auburn University. Auburn, AL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 119 378)

Weischadle, David E. (1977). Tenure for superintendents. A report, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, NJ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 150 675)

Williams, Frederick. (1979). Reasoning with statistics, (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wilson, Alfred P. & Heim, John M. (1984). Turnover of rural Kansas school superintendents from 1978-1984, KS State University, Manhattan, KS. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 338)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
COVER LETTER

November 17, 1986

Dear

In this day and age, what is the role of a public school superintendent and what are the numbers of superintendents needed in the years to come? The purpose of this survey is to gather data to look at that role, based upon school district classification, and to make some type of forecast of manpower needs for that position through the year 2000. This data gathering instrument is being sent to 188 public school superintendents in the state of Montana to assist in making a such a forecast.

I realize it is an imposition upon your time to fill out such a survey but I feel the instrument will make available some important data and assist in making some projections for the position of superintendent in the next two decades. In the field study of this enclosed instrument, 20 minutes was the average time needed to fill out the instrument.

Please be assured, names of individuals and school districts will not be mentioned in the dissertation.

If possible, would you please return the completed survey to me within the next two weeks in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Should you have any questions about the survey, please do not hesitate to call me. You can call me collect at school, 323-2402, and I will reimburse my district or you can call me at home, 323-2165, in the evening. Thank you for your patience and time in filling out this instrument.

Sincerely

J. Jay Erdie

APPENDIX B
SURVEY

Department of Educational Services

Directions: Please answer each question and return the completed instrument in the enclosed envelope. Estimates may be used when precise data is not available. Thank you for providing information important to this study that will shed light on what is happening to superintendents in Montana.

1. Name _____
 (Last) (First) (Middle)

2. Title or Position _____

3. Name of School District _____ :

4. Address of School District _____

5. Type of School District:
 (a) Elementary-Secondary District _____
 (b) Elementary District _____
 (c) Secondary District _____

6. Classification of District:

(a) Class I _____
(b) Class II _____
(c) Class III _____

7. Present Student Enrollment _____. (When answering this question, the figure should be reflected in the type of district-Question 5.)

8. Age (nearest birthday) _____

9. Gender: Female _____
Male _____

*Designed by the AASA Commission of Preparation of Professional School Administrators and reported in the AASA Research Study, The American School Superintendents 1982.
Permission granted by the AASA for its use.

10. In what type of community did you spend most of your life prior to enrolling in a college or university? Check type and size which describes your home community:

Type:

Size:

- | | |
|---|---|
| ____ (a) Rural | ____ (e) Under 2,500 in population |
| ____ (b) Town or small city | ____ (f) 2,500 to 9,999 in population |
| ____ (c) Suburban city in a metropolitan area | ____ (g) 10,000 to 99,999 in population |
| ____ (d) Large urban center | ____ (h) 100,000 or more population |

IV. CAREER DATA:

11. At what age were you employed in your first full-time position in public education? _____

12. Describe your first full-time position in education:

(1) Type of School	(2) Teaching field(s) or Grade Level(s)	(3) Extracurricular Responsibilities if any (type of coach, advisor, etc.)
____ (a) Elementary	(d) _____	(g) _____
____ (b) Secondary	(e) _____	(h) _____
____ (c) Other: (Specify)	(f) _____	(i) _____

13. How many years of classroom teaching experience did you have prior to spending a major portion of your time in administration or supervision? _____

14. (a) At what age were you appointed to your first public school administrative or supervisory position other than the superintendency? _____

(b) Age at appointment to second such position? _____

(c) Age at appointment to third such position? _____

15. What was the nature of your first administrative or supervisory position? (Check only one)

____ (a) Assistant Principal	____ (d) Director
____ (b) Principal	____ (e) Assistant Superintendent
____ (c) Supervisor	____ (f) Other: (Specify)

16. (a) At what age were you appointed to your first public school superintendency (chief school administrator)? _____

(b) Age appointed to your second superintendency? _____

(c) Age appointed to your third superintendency? _____

(d) Age appointed to your fourth superintendency? _____

(e) Age appointed to your present superintendency? _____

17. (a) What was the total pupil enrollment in the district where and when you were appointed to you first public school superintendency? _____
 (b) Total pupil enrollment at start of second superintendency? _____
 (c) Total pupil enrollment at start of third superintendency? _____
 (d) Total pupil enrollment at start of fourth superintendency? _____
 (e) Total pupil enrollment at start of present superintendency? _____
18. In how many districts have you served as public school superintendent (count your present position)? _____
19. (a) What was your starting salary in your first public school superintendency? _____
 (b) What was your starting salary in your second public school superintendency? _____
 (c) What was your starting salary in your third public school superintendency? _____
 (d) What was your starting salary in your fourth public school superintendency? _____
 (e) What was your starting salary in your present public school superintendency? _____
 (f) What is your present salary? _____
20. Please list the different states where you have served as superintendent, starting with the state where you had your initial public school superintendency:
- (a) _____ (1st State) _____ (3rd State)
 (b) _____ (2nd State) _____ (4th State)
21. (a) In how many states have you served as a public school superintendent (include present one)? _____
 (b) In how many states have you served as an administrator or supervisor other than at the superintendent level? _____
22. For how many years have you held your present public school superintendency (count present year)? _____
23. How many years did you serve in each of your superintendencies?
- _____ (1st) _____ (3rd) _____ (5th)
 _____ (2nd) _____ (4th) _____ (6th)
24. How many years of experience in all have you had as a superintendent (count present year)? _____
25. What is the length, in years, of the full term of your present contract with the school board in your district?
- _____ (a) 1 year _____ (b) 2 years _____ (c) 3 years
 _____ (d) 4 years _____ (e) 5 or more _____ (f) indefinite

26. On the line at the end of this question, please trace your career pattern in different educational patterns starting with classroom teacher, other administrative or supervisory positions and then various superintendencies using the following letters to identify the positions:

- | | |
|--|--|
| (a) classroom teacher
(elementary or secondary) | (S1) rural community superintendent
(with population under 1,000) |
| (b) vice or assistant principal | (S2) small town superintendent
(with population of in excess
of 1,000 but less than 6,500) |
| (c) principal | (S3) city superintendent (with
population in excess of 6,500
but less than 10,000) |
| (d) supervisor | (S4) suburban area superintendent |
| (e) director | (S5) large urban city
superintendent |
| (f) assistant superintendent | (T) college or university |
| (g) other (specify)
_____ | |

(Example: A person who went directly from being a teacher to a superintendent in a community with less than 1,000 people would place, in the space below, "a----->S1." A career pattern of teacher, to assistant principal, to principal, to assistant superintendent, to superintendent of a suburban area would look like this, "a----->b----->c----->f----->S4."

Your career pattern: _____

27. Did your movement from one educational position to another occur: (please check which of the following apply)

- (a) Within one (the same) district or system _____
(b) In more than one school district _____

28. How long were you employed in non-educational positions for a period of one year or more since graduating from college? (Place total years in each of the fields that apply and a zero in those that do not.)

(1) Type	(2) Duration of Years
_____ (a) None	_____
_____ (b) Military	_____
_____ (c) Business	_____
_____ (d) Other (specify) _____	_____

29. Was the salary in your non-educational position equal to, less than or more than the salary in your next educational position?

- _____ (a) equal to
_____ (b) less than
_____ (c) more than

30. If you had to do it all over again, would you choose a career in:

- _____ (a) the school superintendency
_____ (b) another type of school administrative or supervisory
position (specify) _____
_____ (c) a non-educational field of work (specify)

V. PREPARATION DATA:

31. Please indicate your professional preparation pattern providing the degrees, dates, majors and institution granting degrees:

	Date	Major(s)	Institution
_____ (a) Bachelor's	_____	_____	_____
_____ (b) Master's	_____	_____	_____
_____ Sixth Year	_____	_____	_____
_____ (c) Specialist	_____	_____	_____
_____ (d) Doctorate	_____	_____	_____
_____ Additional	_____	_____	_____
_____ (e) Study	_____	_____	_____

32. Have you pursued a graduate program of studies in educational administration culminating in a master's, specialist or doctor's degree?

(a) _____ No (b) _____ Yes

If Yes, please add the following information for each degree?

	Sixth Year or Master's Specialist	Doctorate
(c) Age at the start of degree study	_____	_____
(d) Age at completion of degree study	_____	_____
(e) Number of different institutions attended while completing degree	_____	_____
(f) Did you receive a fellowship or assistantship?	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
(g) Indicate total amount of fellowship or assistantship stipend	_____	_____
(h) Did you receive sabbatical leave support from your district?	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
(i) How much do you estimate it cost to complete study for your degree? (tuition, books, extra room and board, but do not include wages not earned)	_____	_____
(j) GI or veterans benefits	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
(k) Years of administrative experience when degree was received	_____	_____
(l) Indicate number of semesters or quarters spent in full-time residence study	_____ Sem or _____ Qtr	_____ Sem or _____ Qtr
(m) Did you have to seek a loan to complete your study?	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
(n) If Yes, how much did you borrow for such purpose?	_____	_____

33. On the whole, how would you evaluate your program of graduate studies as preparation for the superintendency?

(a) _____ Excellent (b) _____ Good (c) _____ Fair (d) _____ Poor

34. What were the major strengths of your graduate study program?

35. What were the major weaknesses of your graduate study program?

36. Please rate the importance of each of the following graduate areas of study or experience to success in the superintendency using the following letter scale:
 (a) Of Great Importance; (b) Important; (c) Of Limited Importance;
 (d) Unimportant. Please use the letter (a, b, c and d) in the blank space in front of each item listed below which best reflects your opinion or judgment.

(A) Educational Administration Courses (B) Educational Foundations

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| ___ (1) Administrative Theory | ___ (12) Child Growth & Development |
| ___ (2) Human Relations | ___ (13) History of Education |
| ___ (3) Personnel Administration | ___ (14) Philosophy of Education |
| ___ (4) Public Relations | ___ (15) Psychology (Adolescent and Others) |
| ___ (5) School Finance | ___ (16) Research |
| ___ (6) School Business Management | ___ (17) Other (specify) _____ |
| ___ (7) Legal Aspects of Education | ___ (18) Other (specify) _____ |
| ___ (8) School Plant Planning | |
| ___ (9) The School Principalship | |
| ___ (10) Other (specify) _____ | |
| ___ (11) Other (specify) _____ | |

(C) Curriculum, Instruction & Supervision (D) Field Experience

- | | |
|--|---|
| ___ (19) Adult Education Courses | ___ (25) Internship |
| ___ (20) Elementary and/or Secondary School Curriculum | ___ (26) School Surveys |
| ___ (21) Physical Education | ___ (27) School Visits and Observations |
| ___ (22) Supervision | ___ (28) Other (specify) _____ |
| ___ (23) Teaching Methods Courses | |
| ___ (24) Other (specify) _____ | |

(E) Social Science Courses

- ___ (29) Anthropology
 ___ (30) Economics
 ___ (31) Political Science
 ___ (32) Sociology
 ___ (33) Social Psychology
 ___ (34) Other (specify) _____

(F) Technology

- ___ (35) Computer-assisted instruction
 ___ (36) Computer & data processing
 ___ (37) Multi-media, including TV
 ___ (38) Operations research
 ___ (39) PPBS or program budgeting
 ___ (40) Systems analysis
 ___ (41) Other (specify) _____

(G) Science and Mathematics

- ___ (42) Biological Science
 ___ (43) Mathematics, other than statistics
 ___ (44) Physical Sciences
 ___ (45) Statistics
 ___ (46) Other (specify) _____

(H) Humanities and Fine Arts

- ___ (47) Drama
 ___ (48) Music
 ___ (49) Literature or Great Books
 ___ (50) Art
 ___ (51) Speech
 ___ (52) Other (specify) _____

- (36. Cont.) Please rate the importance of each of the following graduate areas of study or experience to success in the superintendency using the following letter scales: (a) Of Great Importance; (b) Important; (c) Of Limited Importance; (d) Unimportant. Please use the letter (a, b, c and d) in the blank space in front of each item listed below which reflects your opinion or judgment.

(I) Miscellaneous

____ (53) Other (specify) _____ (55) Other (specify) _____

 _____ (54) Other (specify) _____ (56) Other (specify) _____

IV. ISSUES AND CHALLENGES FACING THE SUPERINTENDENT TODAY:

37. Please rank each of the following issues and challenges facing the superintendency today in you school district on the following letter scale: (a) Of Great Significance; (b) Significant; (c) Of Limited Significance; (d) Little of No Significance

Place a check in the blank spaces identified as columns a, b, c and d, to indicate the degree of significance you would attach to each of the following:

Great Signi- Limited Little
 ficant or No
 (a) (b) (c) (d)

_____	_____	_____	_____	(1) Social-cultural issues such as race relations, integration or segregation
_____	_____	_____	_____	(2) Issues in school staff relations such as negotiations, strikes, sanctions or some form of teacher militancy
_____	_____	_____	_____	(3) Student activism such as an underground newspaper and student strikes
_____	_____	_____	_____	(4) DeCentralization of large districts into smaller units of administration
_____	_____	_____	_____	(5) Reorganization of small districts into larger units of administration
_____	_____	_____	_____	(6) Changing priorities in curriculum such as introducing drug/alcohol courses or sex education or eliminating current priorities
_____	_____	_____	_____	(7) Demands for new ways of teaching or operating the educational program
_____	_____	_____	_____	(8) Financing schools to meet increasing current expenditures and capital outlay
_____	_____	_____	_____	(9) Assessing educational outcomes, such as the national assessment efforts
_____	_____	_____	_____	(10) Growing pressure for public support of non-public schools
_____	_____	_____	_____	(11) Growing federal involvement in education.
_____	_____	_____	_____	(12) Caliber of persons elected to or removed from local boards of education
_____	_____	_____	_____	(13) Rapidly decreasing student enrollments
_____	_____	_____	_____	(14) Greater visibility of the superintendent
_____	_____	_____	_____	(15) Increasing attacks on the superintendent
_____	_____	_____	_____	(16) Use of drugs in the schools
_____	_____	_____	_____	(17) Changes in students values and behavioral norms
_____	_____	_____	_____	(18) Employment of qualified teachers
_____	_____	_____	_____	(19) Employment of qualified support staff (hot lunch personnel, custodians, bus drivers, etc.)

38. Please indicate which of the following issues (repeated from Item No. 36.):
 (a) Should Be Included in courses or experience offered; (b) which issues
 were Included and Covered adequately; and (c) which issues were
Neglected or not included in your graduate preparation program for the
 school superintendency.

Place a check in the blank spaces provided (a, b, or c) to indicate:
 (a) issues which should be included; (b) issues which were included and covered
 adequately; and, (c) issues which were neglected or not included in your
 preparation program for the superintendency.

Should Be Included (a)	Included And Covered (b)	Neglected (c)	
_____	_____	_____	(1) Social-cultural issues as race
_____	_____	_____	relations, integration or segregation
_____	_____	_____	(2) Issues in school staff relations such
_____	_____	_____	as negotiations, strikes, sanctions or
_____	_____	_____	some form of teacher militancy
_____	_____	_____	(3) Student unrest or activism such as
_____	_____	_____	underground newspaper and student
_____	_____	_____	strikes
_____	_____	_____	(4) Decentralization of large districts
_____	_____	_____	into smaller units of administration
_____	_____	_____	(5) Reorganization of small districts into
_____	_____	_____	larger units of administration
_____	_____	_____	(6) Changing priorities in curriculum such
_____	_____	_____	as introducing drug/alcohol courses
_____	_____	_____	or sex education or eliminating others
_____	_____	_____	(7) Demands for new ways of teaching or
_____	_____	_____	operating the educational programs
_____	_____	_____	(8) Financing schools to meet increasing
_____	_____	_____	current expenditures and capital
_____	_____	_____	outlay
_____	_____	_____	(9) Assessing educational outcomes, such
_____	_____	_____	as the national assessment effort
_____	_____	_____	(10) Growing pressure for public support
_____	_____	_____	of non-public schools
_____	_____	_____	(11) Growing federal involvement in
_____	_____	_____	education
_____	_____	_____	(12) Caliber of persons elected to or
_____	_____	_____	removed from local boards of
_____	_____	_____	education
_____	_____	_____	(13) Rapidly decreasing student
_____	_____	_____	enrollments
_____	_____	_____	(14) Greater visibility of the
_____	_____	_____	superintendent
_____	_____	_____	(15) Increasing attacks on the
_____	_____	_____	superintendent
_____	_____	_____	(16) Use of drugs in the school
_____	_____	_____	(17) Changes in student values and
_____	_____	_____	behavioral norms
_____	_____	_____	(18) Employment of qualified teachers
_____	_____	_____	(19) Employment of qualified support staff
_____	_____	_____	(hot lunch personnel, custodians, bus
_____	_____	_____	drivers, etc.)
_____	_____	_____	(20) Other (specify) _____
_____	_____	_____	(21) Other (specify) _____

39. Which of the issues listed in item 37 would cause you to leave the superintendency if the issue intensifies further in your school district?

(a) ☐ None
 (b) ☐ The following one alone (list number shown in item 37) _____
 (c) ☐ Two or more of the following (list numbers shown in item 37) _____

40. Do you believe your school system is staffed adequately at the administrative and supervisory levels to cope with critical issues facing the district?

(a) ☐ Yes (b) ☐ No

If no, then

(c) Approximately how many positions should be added? _____
 (d) What kinds of specializations are needed? (Please list)
 (1) _____
 (2) _____
 (3) _____
 (4) _____

41. Do you subcontract for certain services, or employ consultants to supplement your administrative staff?

(a) ☐ Yes (b) ☐ No

If yes, then

(c) How much is budgeted annually for these purposes? _____
 (d) How many such persons or firms do you employ in a typical year? _____

42. What new skills or information do you feel you need to maintain your effectiveness as an administrator?

(a) ☐ None
 (b) ☐ The following: _____

43. What is the status of the position of the superintendent as the educational or community leader in your school district? (Check One)

(a) ☐ Decreasing in importance and influence?
 (b) ☐ Remaining about the same as it was 10 years ago?
 (c) ☐ Increasing in importance and influence?

44. The following data will be useful in determining the work load of the superintendent of schools:
- (a) _____ What in your estimation is the number of hours that you devote to the superintendency during a typical week?
 - (b) _____ About how many evenings in a typical week do you obligate to work related to the superintendency?
 - (c) _____ About how many Saturdays in a typical month are devoted (whether for one hour or all day) to work related to the superintendency?
 - (d) _____ About how many Sundays in a typical month are devoted (whether for one hour or all day) to work related to the superintendency?
 - (e) _____ What time in the morning does your typical work day start?
 - (f) _____ What time does your typical work day end?
 - (g) _____ Other comments on your work load or day: _____

45. What prevents you from achieving even greater effectiveness as a chief school administrator? Please list.
- (a) _____
 - (b) _____
 - (c) _____
 - (d) _____
46. What are your future plans in the superintendency? Please check the one which reflects your thinking today.
- (a) _____ I definitely will continue in a superintendency whether in this district or another until normal retirement age of 65 or older.
 - (b) _____ I will continue (probably) in a superintendency, until I can qualify for minimum state retirement prior to age 65.
 - (c) _____ I will leave (probably) when I find a desirable position in a university.
 - (d) _____ I will leave (probably) when I find a desirable position outside of education.
 - (e) _____ This is an impossible position and I want to get out of the superintendency as soon as possible.
 - (f) _____ Will remain until a position outside the superintendency opens which allows me to make a greater contribution to education.
 - (g) _____ Other, please specify _____

47. How many years of service do you have remaining before you qualify for minimum retirement? _____
48. Please check the national professional organization(s) in which you are a member in good standing:
- (a) _____ AASA (b) _____ NASSP (c) _____ Elementary School Principals
 - (d) _____ Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
 - (e) _____ Others (specify) _____

Date: _____

Signed: _____

APPENDIX C
FOLLOWUP LETTER

December 2, 1987

Dear

Two weeks ago, November 20, a survey pertaining to superintendents of public schools in Montana was put in the mail and you should have received your copy shortly thereafter. As was mentioned in the cover letter that accompanied the survey, the information in the data gathering instrument will be used to look at the roles superintendents perform in carrying out their duties. Also, some projections will be made about manpower needs through the year 2000.

As yet, I have not yet received your survey. I realize, as a practicing administrator, the demands on ones time are great. Everybody, it seems, wants an audience with you. Some days the pace is more feverish than others. Nevertheless, if possible, would you please take about 20 minutes and complete the instrument. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed for the return of the survey.

Should you have any questions pertaining to the instrument, please call me collect and I will be glad to answer your questions. As I mentioned in the cover letter that accompanied the survey, information regarding a particular person and his or her school district name will remain confidential. If this assurance is not enough and you have reservations about affixing your name and your districts name to the survey, please leave those areas blank. The reason that they were included to begin with is that in the field study of the actual survey, conducted amongst Montana superintendents, it was not considered a problem.

Hopefully, other than the element of time, I have laid to rest any reservations you might have had about filling out the instrument. I would greatly appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely

J. Jay Erdie

APPENDIX D
ANALYSIS OF SUPERINTENDENT
SURVEY

ANALYSIS OF SUPERINTENDENT SURVEY

Directions: Upon completion of the survey, would you please take a few minutes and answer the following questions. Your comments are of great value to the effectiveness of the instrument.

1. Were any of the items confusing? ☐ Yes; ☐ No; If yes, please note the item(s) and state the confusion.

2. Were there any words in any items which confused you? ☐ Yes; ☐ No; If yes, please list the word(s) and identify the item in which the word(s) appear. _____

3. Were the directions for the various subsections unclear? ☐ Yes; ☐ No; If yes, please list what subsection(s) and the problem. _____

4. Were any of the items irrelevant? ☐ Yes; ☐ No; If yes, list which item(s) and why. _____

5. Were there any items you could not answer because you did not readily have the information? ☐ Yes; ☐ No; If yes, please list the item(s). _____

6. Is there any information that is not requested and you feel important to obtain? ☐ Yes; ☐ No; If yes, please elaborate. _____

7. Would you have preferred not to have identified yourself by name and district when filling out the survey? ☐ Yes; ☐ No.
8. Is this survey appropriate to use with superintendents in Montana? ☐ Yes; ☐ No; If no, please specify why. _____

9. How long did it take you to fill out the survey? _____

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1762 10022102 5

