



12-1-1973

An Analysis of Superintendent Turnover in Unitary School Divisions in the Province of Manitoba and its Relationship to Methods of Selection and Processes of Employment

Raymond A. F. Constant

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Constant, Raymond A. F., "An Analysis of Superintendent Turnover in Unitary School Divisions in the Province of Manitoba and its Relationship to Methods of Selection and Processes of Employment" (1973). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3590.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3590>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

AN ANALYSIS OF SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER IN UNITARY SCHOOL DIVISIONS
IN THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO METHODS OF
SELECTION AND PROCESSES OF EMPLOYMENT

by

Raymond A. F. Constant

Bachelor of Science, University of Manitoba, 1960
Bachelor of Education, University of Manitoba, 1966
Master of Education, University of North Dakota, 1970

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Grand Forks, North Dakota

December
1973

1973

2760

Copyright by
Raymond A. F. Constant
1973

This dissertation submitted by Raymond A. F. Constant in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Alfred M. Morris
(Chairman)

Walter D. Dahl

John L. Williams

Ernest Brunson

John S. Rowe

Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

AN ANALYSIS OF SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER IN UNITARY SCHOOL
DIVISIONS IN THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA AND ITS RELATIONSHIP
Title TO METHODS OF SELECTION AND PROCESSES OF EMPLOYMENT

Department Center for Teaching and Learning

Degree Doctor of Philosophy

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature Raymond Constant

Date November 19, 1973

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to the people who contributed to the success of this study.

Special appreciation is expressed to Dr. Clyde Morris, scholar, motivator, and friend for his guidance and professional assistance as committee chairman in this study.

Acknowledgment is given to Dr. John D. Williams for his counsel and criticism.

In addition, recognition is given to Dr. Ivan J. K. Dahl, Dr. Quinn Brunson, and Dr. John Rowe for their help and encouragement.

Finally, and most importantly, the writer wishes to express his special gratitude to his wife, Jocelyne, for the unselfish cooperation and understanding she has given him throughout his graduate education. Without her patience, perseverance, and support this study could not have been completed. A special thanks is also befitting to the writer's found treasures, Simone, Gilbert, Monique and Hélène for their tolerance and love. Un chaleureux MERCI à tous.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| ABSTRACT | xi |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| The Rationale of the Study | |
| Purpose of the Study | |
| Limitations | |
| Definition of Terms | |
| Significance of the Study | |
| Organization of the Remainder of the Study | |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH | 8 |
| Historical Development of the Superintendency | |
| Qualities Required of Superintendents | |
| The Selection Process | |
| III. METHODOLOGY | 32 |
| Sampling Procedures | |
| Instruments Used | |
| Method of Obtaining Data | |
| Method Used in Data Analysis | |
| IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA | 38 |
| The Hypotheses | |
| The Research Questions | |
| V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . | 95 |
| Summary | |
| Discussion and Conclusions | |
| Recommendations | |
| Recommended Guidelines for the Selection Process | |
| APPENDIX A. School Board Instrument | 116 |
| APPENDIX B. Superintendent Instrument | 120 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX C. Superintendent Letter | 125 |
| APPENDIX D. School Board Letter | 127 |
| APPENDIX E. Follow-Up Letter | 129 |
| REFERENCES | 131 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Regression Analysis of Variance of Specific Board Policy Statement, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 40 |
| 2. Regression Analysis of Variance of Discussions Regarding Salary and Fringe Benefits, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 41 |
| 3. Regression Analysis of Variance of Organization Notified of the Vacancy, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 41 |
| 4. Stepwise Backward Examination Procedure for Manner Reference Checks are Conducted on Finalists, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion (N=60) . . . | 42 |
| 5. Stepwise Backward Examination Procedure for Manner Institutions and/or Organizations are Notified of the Vacancy, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion (N=65) | 43 |
| 6. Correlations of School Boards' Selection Variables, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 44 |
| 7. Regression Analysis of Variance of Board Satisfaction with Services of Former Superintendent, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 46 |
| 8. Regression Analysis of Variance of Teacher Training in Manitoba, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 46 |
| 9. Stepwise Backward Examination Procedure for Manner Former Superintendent was Released, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion (N=65) . . . | 47 |
| 10. Stepwise Backward Examination Procedure for Major Problems at Time when New Superintendent was Hired, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion (N=65) | 48 |
| 11. Stepwise Backward Examination Procedure for Major Problems at Present Time, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion (N=65) | 49 |

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 12. | Stepwise Backward Examination Procedure for Agent Responsible for Recruiting and Selecting the Assistant Superintendent, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion (N=65) | 50 |
| 13. | Stepwise Backward Examination Procedure for Degree Status of Superintendent when First Appointed, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion (N=42) | 50 |
| 14. | Stepwise Backward Examination Procedure for Present Degree Status of Superintendents, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion (N=42) | 51 |
| 15. | Stepwise Backward Examination Procedure for Number of Years of Administrative Experience, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion (N=42) | 52 |
| 16. | Stepwise Backward Examination Procedure for Status Prior to Becoming Superintendent, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion (N=42) | 52 |
| 17. | Correlations of Selected Demographic and Educational Variables, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 53 |
| 18. | Setwise Backward Elimination Procedure for Selection Procedures and Processes of Employment, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 57 |
| 19. | Chi-Square Values for Type of School Division, with Specific Board Policy Statement as the Criterion | 59 |
| 20. | Chi-Square Values for Institution Notified of Vacancy, with Specific Board Policy Statement as the Criterion | 60 |
| 21. | Chi-Square Values for Use of a Definite Plan and Timetable, with Specific Board Policy Statement as the Criterion | 60 |
| 22. | Chi-Square Values for Use of a Recruitment Committee, with Specific Board Policy Statement as the Criterion | 61 |
| 23. | Chi-Square Values for Agent Responsible for Conducting Preliminary Interview, with Specific Board Policy Statement as the Criterion | 61 |
| 24. | Chi-Square Values for Official Confirmation of Appointment at Public Meeting, with Specific Board Policy Statement as the Criterion | 62 |

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 25. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of Major Problems when New Superintendent was First Appointed, by Superintendents and School Boards | 64 |
| 26. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of Major Problems at Present Time, by Superintendents and School Boards | 65 |
| 27. | Chi-Square Values for Type of School Division, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 67 |
| 28. | Chi-Square Values for Organization Notified of Vacancy, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 68 |
| 29. | Chi-Square Values for Institution Notified of Vacancy, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 68 |
| 30. | Chi-Square Values for Use of a Specific Board Policy Statement, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 69 |
| 31. | Chi-Square Values for Use of a Recruitment Committee, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 70 |
| 32. | Chi-Square Values for Use of a Recruitment Brochure, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 71 |
| 33. | Chi-Square Values for Broad, Public Search Conducted, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 71 |
| 34. | Chi-Square Values for Use of a Ranked List of Candidates, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 72 |
| 35. | Chi-Square Values for Agent Responsible for Conducting Preliminary Interview, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 73 |
| 36. | Chi-Square Values for Participation of Recruitment Committee in Final Interview, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 73 |
| 37. | Chi-Square Values for Uniform Method of Evaluating Finalist Candidates, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 74 |
| 38. | Chi-Square Values for Official Confirmation of Appointment at a Public Board Meeting, with Definite Plan and Timetable as the Criterion | 75 |
| 39. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of Party Responsible for the Recruitment and Selection of an Assistant Superintendent, by Superintendents and School Boards | 77 |

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 40. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of Media Utilized to Announce the Vacancy, by Superintendents and School Boards | 78 |
| 41. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of Manner in Which School Board Acknowledged Applications, by Superintendents and School Boards | 79 |
| 42. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of Use of Recruitment Brochure, by Superintendents and School Boards | 79 |
| 43. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of Nature of Outside Professional Assistance, by Superintendents and School Boards | 81 |
| 44. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of Whether Unsuccessful Candidates are Advised by School Boards, by Superintendents and School Boards | 82 |
| 45. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of School Boards Requiring more than One Interview from Each Candidate, by Superintendents and School Boards | 82 |
| 46. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of Whether more than One Finalist Candidate was Interviewed at a Board Meeting, by Superintendents and School Boards | 83 |
| 47. | Chi-Square Values for Respondent's Perceptions of School Board Using Uniform Method for Evaluating Finalist Candidates, by Superintendents and School Boards | 84 |
| 48. | Means and Standard Deviations for Selected Demographic Data (N=65) | 86 |
| 49. | Means and Standard Deviations for Selected Superintendent Educational Data (N=42) | 87 |
| 50. | Setwise Backward Elimination Procedure for Selected Demographic Variables; with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 89 |
| 51. | Correlations of Selected Demographic Variables with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 91 |
| 52. | Setwise Backward Elimination Procedure for Selected Educational Variables, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 92 |
| 53. | Correlations of Selected Educational Variables, with Superintendent Turnover as the Criterion | 93 |

ABSTRACT

Problem

This study was concerned with current methods of selection and processes of employment utilized by school boards in hiring a superintendent of schools. The primary purpose was to identify and analyze methods of selection and processes of employment as perceived by school board members and their respective superintendents. In conjunction with the analyses, the relationship between perceived methods of selection and processes was investigated. A secondary purpose was to examine the predictability of superintendent turnover from selected demographic and educational variables.

Procedure

The population of the study was limited to 32 school divisions in the Province of Manitoba, as well as responses from 42 superintendents of schools. School board members having been involved in the selection of a superintendent, and superintendents, were requested to complete separate questionnaires designed for this study relating to methods of selection and processes of employment as utilized by school boards during the past six years.

The statistical techniques utilized were analysis of variance by regression, stepwise and setwise backward analysis of regression, and chi-square analysis. The .05 level of significance was selected a priori for the determination of significance in the analysis.

Conclusions

The following conclusions, as limited by the research population, were drawn from the major findings of the study:

1. Significant differences were found between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures for the recruitment and selection of a superintendent of schools.

2. Significant differences existed between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures on the basis of selected demographic and educational variables.

3. Significant differences occurred between the presence or absence of a specific board policy statement and its effects on selected board processes and procedures.

4. There were no significant differences found between the perception of school boards and superintendents relating to the major problems in schools prior to the appointment of the new superintendent. However, significant differences were found between school boards' and superintendents' views on the major problems at the present time.

5. Significant differences were found between the use or neglect of a definite plan and timetable and its effects on selected board processes and procedures.

6. Significant differences occurred between methods of selection and processes of employment as perceived by school boards and superintendents.

7. Major problems at the time the new superintendent was appointed was the single best predictor of all demographic variables tested for predicting superintendent turnover.

8. Teacher training in Manitoba was the single best predictor of all educational variables tested for predicting superintendent turnover.

Recommendations

1. The Manitoba Association of School Trustees should provide leadership for its members by conducting workshops for the purpose of orienting boards as to recommended policies and procedures to be used in the selection of a superintendent.

2. The Manitoba Association of School Trustees should provide its membership with a set of systematic and objective procedures patterned after professionally prepared guidelines to assist boards which are seeking a new superintendent.

3. The major professional educational organizations and/or institutions in the Province of Manitoba should all play a more active role through the recommendation of potential candidates to school boards searching for a new superintendent.

4. This study should be replicated and extended to cover a larger geographical base. This should be done to see if the findings of this study can be duplicated in provinces other than Manitoba.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale of the Study

This study was concerned with current methods of selection and processes of employment utilized by school boards in hiring a superintendent of schools. The primary purpose was to identify and analyze methods of selection and processes of employment as perceived by school board members and their respective superintendents. In conjunction with the analyses, the relationship between perceived methods of selection and processes was investigated. A secondary purpose was to examine the predictability of superintendent turnover from selected demographic and educational variables.

Each year about 2000 school boards in the United States, and an equally proportionate number in Canada, look for, and select, a new superintendent of schools. Within the limits of state and provincial license requirements and local policies, the selection is clearly up to the board. It is perhaps the most important task board members are ever called upon to make. On this decision hinges the character of leadership of the school systems affected for years to come.

The superintendency of schools is one of the most crucial and perhaps most difficult public positions today. The occupant of this position, more than any other single person in the community, influences the shape of public education. Thus he has a basic role in determining what will become of the young people in his community and, through them, what his community and the nation will become (National Education Association of the United States and American Association of School Administrators, 1965, p. 1).

Such was the complexity of the superintendency as it was viewed by a major educational organization over eight years ago. Since 1965, a number of additional forces have surged to the foreground--student unrest, teacher militancy, negotiations, increasing financial problems, accountability, along with others--adding to the crucial aspect of the position.

Hence, for any school division, the implications for educational growth within the community inherent in the selection of a chief executive officer are such that it is vitally important that boards of education use, in their approach to the selection, those procedures which carry the greatest promise for assuring the selection of the most capable administrator available.

Most of the time a board of education strives to retain the services of a competent executive. But, from time to time, a vacancy does occur, and then the board must search for, select, and employ a new superintendent. As public education has become more and more complex, its management has become more and more difficult. Increasingly, greater skill is required for the successful management of modern schools. Nothing that a board does is more important than employing and retaining a professionally prepared and dedicated superintendent (American Association of School Administrators [AASA], 1968, p. v).

The need for criteria and procedures that a board of education can employ when it comes face-to-face with the task of selecting a new superintendent is apparent. Of course no one can guarantee that such principles and procedures will result in a wise choice. But some practices have been identified that more often than not result in an intelligent decision (AASA, 1968, p. vi).

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to identify and analyze the current methods of selection and processes of employment in hiring superintendents of schools in Unitary School Divisions in the Province of Manitoba. A secondary purpose was to examine the predictability of superintendent turnover from selected demographic and educational variables.

Aspects of methods of selection and processes of employment were analyzed by testing the following null hypotheses:

1. There were no significant differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures for the recruitment and selection of a superintendent.
2. There were no significant differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures on the basis of selected demographic and educational variables.
3. There were no significant differences between the presence or absence of a specific board policy statement in regard to hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures.
4. There was no significant difference in board and superintendent views on the major problems in their school system prior to, and after, the hiring of a new superintendent.
5. There was no significant difference between the use or neglect of a plan and definite timetable in regard to hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures.

6. There were no significant differences between methods of selection and processes of employment as reported by school board members and superintendents of schools.

To examine the feasibility of predicting superintendent turnover, the following research questions were generated:

1. Which of the sets of selected demographic variables obtained from school boards contributed most to the predictability of superintendent turnover?
2. Which of the sets of selected educational variables obtained from superintendent responses contributed most to the predictability of superintendent turnover?

Limitations

1. The population was limited to school board members and superintendents of schools of Unitary School Divisions in the Province of Manitoba;
2. The study was also limited to the methods of selection and processes of employment utilized by such school boards for the period extending from September, 1966 to December, 1972;
3. The study was further limited by the ability of the instruments to be used in the study to measure what they purport to measure.

Definition of Terms

Instrument.--An instrument is a systematic compilation of printed questions which will produce specific information.

Non-Unitary School Division.--Non-Unitary School Division refers to a Manitoba school division in which responsibility for education, K-12, is divided between several elected boards. The division board is responsible for the secondary education in the division, but the responsibility for the elementary division, is divided between one or more elected district boards. The voters in these divisions rejected consolidation in 1967, and all subsequent elections to the present day. The boundaries might or might not coincide with municipal boundaries.

Rural-Urban.--Refers to all towns and cities with a population over 2500 people.

Superintendent of Schools.--A superintendent is the administrative head of a school division maintaining both elementary and secondary schools.

Tenure.--Tenure is used to mean (1) length of service in a particular position, and (2) time spent in school administration in Manitoba.

Turnover.--Turnover denotes a change in the number of persons hired within a period to replace those leaving a position.

Unitary School Division.--A Unitary School Division refers to a Manitoba school division which is a result of consolidation of two or more school divisions. All aspects of education, K-12, are administered by one elected board. The new division which was voted on in 1967 or later might or might not coincide with municipal boundaries.

Significance of the Study

The selection of a new superintendent of schools represents one of the most significant responsibilities of a school board. The choice entails the selection of the most competent individual available, not

only to administer the schools, but also to give leadership in development and improvement of the educational program. Thus careful preparation, definition of orderly and effective procedures, conformity with ethical practices, use of considered judgment, and adequate financing are critical in recruiting a new superintendent. Whatever decision is arrived at by school board members will ultimately affect the entire educational program of the school division.

Accordingly, this investigation has identified and delineated factors which related to the recruitment and selection procedures utilized in hiring a new superintendent of schools.

The study has continued the exploration of meaningful variables that could significantly contribute to the predictability of superintendent turnover. Varied statistical techniques were utilized to gain fresh insights into the problem under investigation.

In essence, the significance of the study resulted from (1) its contribution to continuing research in the areas of recruitment and selection of superintendents of schools; (2) its contribution to participating school boards in providing them useful information and assistance in the evaluation and selection of candidates; and (3) its contribution to examining related variables and their usage in future methods of selection and processes of employment.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

A review of related literature and research was presented in Chapter II. The review included material on the historical development of the superintendency in the United States and in Canada, research related to the qualities required of superintendents; and, the methods

of selection and processes, of employment utilized by board of education in hiring a superintendent of schools.

Chapter III included the research design, methodology, population description, and the description of the instruments and statistical tools utilized in the analyses.

Analyses of the data were presented in Chapter IV. Discussions of the analyzed data were accompanied by appropriate tabular presentations.

Chapter V consisted of a summary, a discussion of the conclusions, recommendations of the study, and development of basic guidelines for the selection process. An Appendix and References followed this chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The review of literature and research was confined to facets of methods of recruiting and selecting a new superintendent of schools as related to the purposes of this investigation set forth in Chapter I.

The writer has attempted to center the review of literature and research around three main areas, namely: (1) a brief history of the superintendency in the United States and in Canada; (2) research related to the qualities required of superintendents; and (3) methods of selection and processes of employment utilized by boards of education in hiring a superintendent of schools.

Historical Development of the Superintendency

The school superintendent is a newcomer to the professional scene. Unlike his fellow practitioners in medicine, law, and the church, he cannot draw upon centuries of tradition and long established canons of professional conduct. The scope and nature of his work in the matrix of society have not yet been clearly defined through the long history.

The position of superintendent of schools is one of the most important positions in American public education today; yet it has not always been so. In fact, American education existed for 200 years before the first superintendent was appointed, and it was another 60 years before any appreciable number of cities saw fit to follow the lead of pioneers in the development of the superintendency (Griffiths, 1966, p. 1).

From an inauspicious beginning, the position has grown to one of considerable responsibility and authority, although there still is doubt as to the actual power held by school superintendents.

The position of local school superintendent in the United States came into being about 135 years ago. Buffalo, New York, and Louisville, Kentucky, are credited with creating such a position in 1837. Following suit in rapid succession, most major cities in the nation had created such a position by 1890 (Reller, 1935, p. 81). By the turn of the century, the local school superintendency was an established part of school district organization.

The superintendency evolved out of attempts by lay citizens to exercise supervisory and administrative authority over the schools. From the earliest days of public education, some form of supervision was thought necessary. This early supervision was exercised by the school committees, appointed by town selectmen, and charged with the responsibility of overseeing the schools. Later, as schools became larger and more numerous and school affairs more involved, the school committees felt obliged to parcel out specific responsibilities to subcommittees in an effort to handle the administrative details of operating the schools. The subcommittee plan of operation proved unsatisfactory, and the school committees turned to other avenues in their efforts to meet their responsibilities of supervising and administering. One of the avenues was the designation of a committee member as the committee's representative in overseeing the schools. The person so designated became the executive officer of the school committee or board, as the committee had come to be called, and was given

specific duties to perform (American Association of School Administrators, 1960b, pp. 49-52).

This development did not come easily. During the century required for its establishment, the concept of superintendent met all shades of opposition, ranging from mild resistance to open hostility to periods of abolishment (Wilson, 1959, p. 10). Many voices were raised in objection to the idea of appointing a superintendent on the grounds of cost. Economy-minded citizens opined that expensive overseers had not been necessary in the past, and they saw no reason for the luxury now (American Association of School Administrators, 1960b, p. 10).

Human emotions found the innovation of the early superintendents sometimes known as school managers, visitors, or headmasters, more than any other single factor. On the one hand, school committeemen distrusted the plan of having a specialist usurp their prerogatives. Cries of "one-man rule" were heard. Some thought such a move would take the responsibility out of the hands of the people who supported the schools. Conscientious board members worried that they might be shirking their obligations (American Association of School Administrators, 1960b, p. 11).

Teachers and principals also subverted the scheme openly and behind the scenes. Principals, in particular, were more active in fighting the establishment of a superior officer and many displayed sufficient strength in certain communities to prevent boards of education from giving the new superintendent authority over them. In numerous instances, principals continued to have direct access to the board, with the superintendent being granted limited duties of accounting and reporting.

An equally strong obstacle to its progress resulted from the fact that no one was professionally equipped to perform the task. Universities did not attempt to provide specialized training for the preparation of superintendents until long after the position had become established in the 20th century (AASA, 1966b, p. 11).

→ Still another obstacle to the speed with which stature was built into the position, and which has continued as a deterrent until the present decade, was the unwillingness of boards of education and communities to recognize the importance of the superintendency enough to assess it with a dollar value commensurate with their expectations. The history of public education support is marked with the attitude of getting the most results from the least expenditure. This unrealistic dream was no less applicable to the superintendency. Only since World War II have large numbers of boards realized that if they are to secure from their executive officer the kind of service they want, they must make the position sufficiently attractive from a financial viewpoint.

Despite this complex period of evolution, by the end of the 19th Century, the superintendent began to establish more semblance of order out of numerous chaotic conditions. He worked diligently toward improving school buildings, curricula, student classifications, student achievement reporting systems, board-superintendent communications, school-community relations, board meeting procedures, the business-management aspects of education, and many other areas of concern that plagued the local school committees (Reller, 1935, p. 301). It was primarily because of this diligent attention given to pressing school problems by the superintendent that the office earned respectability and acceptance.

During the next fifty years (1900-1950), the position of superintendent became more professional. The clerk of the board and advisor to principals and teachers' image was replaced by that of chief executive school officer (Grieder, 1969, p. 136). The superintendent was given the responsibility and authority to administer the schools under the general rules of the board. Grieder stated that this professional status was derived from many factors. He stated that this advance to professional status came about because of changes in society and education, as well as a direct response to recognized needs of boards of education (Grieder, 1969, p. 136). He lists the following as major contributors to this professional image:

1. Increased student enrollment, due to compulsory attendance laws and normal population growth, created problems concerning school facilities, staff and staff recruitment, and student personnel services.
2. Curriculum development and its implementation into the school day and society.
3. New concepts in learning, teaching methods, child growth and development, and the explosion of knowledge.
4. The fact that the schools had become big business not only in buying school supplies but also in the employment of millions of people.
5. The complicated financing of schools because of the introduction of other tax-supported services and the expansion of governmental activities.
6. The development of the idea that the relationship between the home and the school was a partnership leading to

communication between the two that could not be handled by the average non-trained person.

7. The recognition of the state's responsibility for education and the creation of many problems between the state office and the local school district which called for trained personnel.
8. The recognition that administration is more than just common sense, but is, rather, a science and an art.

During the last two decades, the realm of superintendent has taken on even broader concepts of professionalism. The superintendent now finds himself deeply involved in the consideration of such complex concepts as computer-assisted instruction, far-reaching research in all fields, federal financial support of specific phases of education, and numerous theories of staff relations and intergroup education. While the early superintendency was created primarily to handle the clerical and business details of operating a school system, the growth in size and complexity of the school program has broadened the responsibilities and increased the stature of the superintendency until today it is clearly executive (Dykes, 1965, p. 70).

In a 1958 publication, Flower discusses the nature of a superintendent of schools in Canada. As with most elements of educational organization and operation in Canada, it is extremely difficult to arrive at a precise statement which will fit all ten provinces. While the term "superintendent" is used in some provinces, others prefer "inspector," and Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island use the term "supervisor" (Flower, 1958, p. 83). For practical purposes, however,

it is possible to consider a superintendent of schools in Canada to be the senior official directly concerned with instruction in one or more school systems.

As of September, 1956, there were about 750 "superintendents of schools" in Canada. Of these, the great majority, 86 per cent were then employed by a provincial department of education; the remainder were employed by local school boards in larger urban and suburban centers. This reflects the fact that, over the years, the provinces have "inspected" schools both to ensure that adequate programs of instruction were being carried out by local boards, and to provide competent professional advice to those local school systems. With the rapid growth of school population and larger school areas, however, together with a steadily-increasing professionalization of teaching staff, the sheer "inspection" function of the superintendent has dwindled in importance, giving place to increasing emphasis on guidance, stimulation and coordination (Flower, 1958, p. 83).

Each year the number of locally-employed superintendents is increasing. Many educators are convinced that the trend is a desirable one. Authorities of larger and wealthier districts are thus given the opportunity to employ not only a superintendent of schools or director of education, but also other supervisory officials so that these school systems can enjoy the benefits of continuous on-the-spot instructional leadership.

On the Manitoba scene, the position of superintendent of schools was officially established and recognized in 1967 by the provincial Department of Education. The trend toward increased consolidation of small districts into larger school divisions, as well as increased

financial incentives on the part of the provincial Government has had a direct bearing upon the ever-increasing number of superintendents of schools being employed by local school boards. As of December, 1972, 45 school divisions employed the services of a superintendent of schools. The remainder, as a result of repeated rejection by the electoral vote, still retain their status as non-unitary school districts.

Despite the growth in stature and its broadened functions, the office of the superintendent in the United States and in Canada does not appear to have reached its greatest development. The growing complexity of the educational program, the increasing importance of education, an informed and educationally-demanding public, and the expanding responsibilities of the office all point to increasingly professional functions for the superintendency. The years to come will no doubt refine the position of the superintendent in a modern society, his training, personal and professional qualifications, and the manner in which he will be selected.

Qualities Required of Superintendents

The actual process involved in selecting a superintendent of schools has also undergone evolutionary transformation. Formerly, the appointment of the superintendent was the responsibility of the city council or resulted from the popular vote of the electorate. Today, boards of education are primarily responsible for this task. There has been a change also from the election of the "favorite son" to superintendent of schools to the more sophisticated procedure that attempts to select the most competent individual available, not only to administer the schools, but also to give leadership in development and improvement of the educational program.

This is not to say that currently all superintendents' appointments are based upon the candidates' ability to handle the position. Unfortunately, many appointments are still due to the practice of the spoils system where the appointment is secured by "pull" or by knowing the right person (Campbell, 1967, p. 178). Many boards of education mistakenly appointed a superintendent because the candidate looked like a superintendent, had a strong academic background, had good recommendations, was a successful principal, coach or teacher, or possessed a few of the many traits that were recognized as necessary to make a good superintendent (Karrick, 1966, p. 36). The board does not perform its duty adequately if it simply appoints the most readily available person. Only careful study of the situation and a planned program would appear to assure selection of the best individual.

If boards of education are to approach the selection of a superintendent in a logical and rational manner, what criteria should they employ? What are some of the recognized qualities required of superintendents of schools? It is generally recognized by authorities in the field that no lists of suggested qualities are necessarily appropriate in their entirety for every school board. However, there are some which should help to guide a board's action. Baker (1952, p. 57) advocated the following qualities which board members may wish to consider:

1. Ability to make decisions.
2. Knowledge, skills, and understanding of the purposes and processes of education.
3. Ability to assume and delegate responsibility.
4. Ability to take initiative and to stimulate others to drive toward educational goals.
5. Ability to select and to improve personnel.
6. Ability to communicate well with others.
7. Disposition to cooperate.
8. Good health and high energy output.
9. Professional preparation.
10. Demonstration of effective leadership.

Grieder (1969, pp. 169-170) maintained that personal qualities of a good superintendent were very important and that they ought to be given primary consideration during the selection process. He advocated that, by virtue of their position, superintendents usually have a great influence on their associates and, as such, more significance is attached to their actions than to those of others. He listed the foremost personal qualities of a superintendent as follows:

1. Integrity, absolute reliability, and strict honesty; refusal to suppress unfavorable conditions in the schools.
2. Commitment to the principles of democracy, to the belief in the dignity and worth of each individual.
3. A liking for children and young people, and dedication to the task of serving their needs and interests.
4. Ability to work constructively with others; frankness combined with tact; ability to accept criticism and differences of opinion without becoming resentful; to give credit where it is due and, to inspire confidence.
5. Initiative: the ability to recommend or make decisions with reasonable promptness but not too impulsively.
6. Sincere interest in and enthusiasm for one's work, and a willingness to "take the rough with the smooth," to pay the price for the satisfactions derived.
7. Objectivity and impartiality; freedom from prejudice and passion.
8. Above-average intelligence.
9. Good command of oral and written English; effectiveness as a speaker.
10. An interest in affairs outside the realm of education.
11. Wholesome and balanced philosophy of life; an adherence to high standards of values, with tolerance for and understanding of others who may not be able to observe the same standards.
12. Good judgment and common sense.

In a 1970 publication, the Public Education Association in New York (pp. 1-2, Appendix C), listed the following personal attributes and professional experience to be considered by school boards in the selection of a superintendent of schools.

Personal attributes

- Good judgment and common sense
- Emotional maturity and tact; ability to mediate and work

with sometimes opposing factions including students, teachers, parents, politicians, unions, community action groups; willingness to admit mistakes.

- Accessibility; willingness to discuss problems.
- Ability to communicate effectively; ability to understand and be understood by a wide range of individuals.
- Initiative and leadership; ability to choose a course of action and to get people to work toward it in an organized manner.
- Courage and self-confidence; willingness to make decisions and to take responsibility for their consequences.
- Ability to work under great pressure.
- Honesty and integrity.

Professional experience

- A record in imaginative and successful approaches to difficult problems.
- A workable philosophy of education.
- A record of success in managing a large organization with a substantial budget.
- Experience in dealing with unions.
- A record of effective working relationships with large government organizations.

The usual method of defining the professional qualifications desired of an individual in an administrative position is in listing the specifications of both the formal education requirements and the work experience requirements. Generally, the weighing of these qualifications by boards of education will vary from one board to another, but it had become apparent that the recency of the candidate's professional training has become very important.

Knezevich (1962, pp. 262-263) reported that in 1922, only about 35 per cent of the urban school superintendents had earned a master's or doctor's degree. In other words, 65 per cent had attained only a bachelor's degree or less. At that time, 51.9 per cent had a bachelor's degree and 13 per cent had no degree. In contrast, a 1962 study by the AASA and the NSBA (AASA, 1968, pp. 4-5) reported that 95.2 per cent of the administrators had earned a master's or doctor's degree. Only 2.4 per cent had merely a bachelor's degree; 2.0 per cent were classified

under miscellaneous; and, 0.4 per cent had no degree. It is also interesting to note that by 1962, the number of superintendents holding a doctor's degree had increased to 21.3 per cent and nearly all of these had majored in educational administration.

Work experience is also considered a very important item by boards of education when considering professional qualifications. The AASA (1968, p. 5) reported that 88.1 per cent of the superintendents who participated in the study indicated that they had served as a teacher in the classroom; 22.8 per cent had served as an elementary principal and 15.6 per cent had been assistant superintendent of schools.

Morris (1957, pp. 262-263) in a study involving careers of 554 public school superintendents in eleven midwest states, reported that the initial administrative position of superintendents was generally preceded by about five years of teaching experience; the predominant types of initial administrative positions were secondary school principalships and superintendencies; the average tenure in the first administrative position was about four years; more than 88 per cent of all superintendents held a master's degree upon taking their last reported position; and there were four times as many who held a doctor's degree as there were who held a bachelor's degree.

In concluding this section, a quotation is taken from a study conducted in Pennsylvania and Alberta by Fast (1969, p. 8):

Thus, in selecting superintendents, school boards need not consider the candidates' age or length of experience as important criteria. Rather, they should examine carefully the quality of the candidate's previous performance, his ability as a strong educational leader, and his knowledge about education generally, and more specifically of the administrative and supervisory processes. Furthermore, they should evaluate their own system in terms of their objectives and the problem facing them and select the candidate who would best meet their needs. They

should be willing to make a substantial financial remuneration to the person they feel is right for the system. Finally, once employed, the board must place its complete faith and confidence in the superintendent and seek neither subservience from him, nor attempt to interfere with or restrict him.

Considerable progress is being made by universities in building the preparatory programs needed to produce this ideal superintendent. Impetus was given to the design by action of the American Association of School Administrators which sparked nearly all states to upgrade requirements for a superintendent's certificate to a full year of training beyond the master's degree, which, in turn, is moving universities into their sixth-year programs. These curricula permit breadth and realism of learning experiences in proportion to the needs of the superintendency.

The Selection Process

In reviewing the literature related to the selection procedures used in hiring superintendents, it is evident that many professional educators and school boards are interested in finding better ways of selecting their chief executive officer, the superintendent. In recent years, some boards of education have approached this problem in a systematic and objective manner, but, unfortunately, there are still many who still employ hit-and-miss methods which are generally ineffective (Reeves, 1954, p. 246). Through the introduction of specific procedures in the selection process, it was hoped that boards of education would have more success at finding the person best suited for their particular district. One of the major problems in early quests for objectivity in the selection process was the lack of adequate guidelines that could be used by boards of education. Professional

educators recognized the need for better selection procedures and began to formulate recommended guidelines to help direct the efforts of boards of education in securing a competent and effective superintendent.

As early as 1929, a booklet prepared for city school board members (Mendenhall, 1929, pp. 9-11) recommended that a board's selection procedure should include the following considerations:

1. Send inquiries to leading universities and teachers' colleges for names of candidates whom they could recommend.
2. Request that reputable teachers' agencies submit names of candidates.
3. Make inquiries of leading educators and superintendents.
4. Conduct a search for candidates of unquestioned morals and integrity; good health; scholarship; special training in school administration; desirable experience; tact; courage; and, good business ability.
5. Conduct a personal interview with choice candidates. Pay expenses incurred by candidates to attend the meeting.
6. Select best candidate for the position.
7. After appointment, school board should determine, as definitely as possible, what shall be the duties of the board and the duties of the new superintendent.

In 1933, the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association (DSNEA, 1933, p. 300) extended these selection procedures to include the following:

1. There should be a definite understanding on the part of all board members that a vacancy does in fact exist and that qualified candidates should be sought.
2. The board should formulate a comprehensive statement of qualifications (educational, personal, business, etc.) they desire their superintendent to possess.
3. The board should formulate a plan to secure qualified candidates.
4. The board should delegate the responsibility for eliminating all candidates who do not meet the board's specified requirements to a screening committee, a consultant or some other individual or group of individuals.
5. The board should select a limited number of candidates (not more than five or six) to be interviewed in executive session.
6. The board should develop a plan to orient two or three of the most promising candidates to the community, that is, its educational and social groups.
7. The board should select the best candidate and inform all other candidates of their selection.

In a handbook published in 1940 (Overn, pp. 68-69), it is advocated by the author that it would be reasonable to publicly announce vacancies for the position of superintendent of schools by advertising in the important educational magazines. Although the practice of announcing vacancies in such a manner had not become a custom in the United States, Overn felt that it would seem to be a great improvement in helping to eliminate politics from the appointments and keep them free in competition. The board paying the greater salaries could then request the greatest minimum training and experience from the candidates they would accept. Thus, a very high standard of professional qualifications might be maintained and announced for the benefit of the younger members of the profession. In regard to the importance of using objective standards in the selection of a superintendent, Overn advocated that the school board should lay careful plans before it selects a new superintendent. The board, in his opinion, should set up ideal standards of personal ability, experience, and types and amounts of training. Those should be reasonable of attainment and objective enough to be easily judged. The safest standards for the school board to defend, he argued, are the amount and kind of training, the amount and kind of experience, and any objective acts which the candidate has performed which show his ability, imagination, or integrity.

In a 1946 publication, the AASA (1946, pp. 77-79) broadened the selection procedures by including the following:

1. The board should construct a set of desired qualifications for the new superintendent.
2. The board should seek qualified applicants within, as well as outside of the system.

3. The board should appoint a screening committee to screen the candidates and recommend a small number to the board for final selection.
4. The board should provide the screening committee adequate personnel and work space.
5. The board should direct the committee to actively search for qualified candidates.
6. The board should request that all applicants' papers go to the screening committee.
7. The board should discourage application in person until the screening committee has had an opportunity to review the qualifications and recommendations.
8. The screening committee should seek supplemental information on each candidate if more data is needed.
9. The screening committee should invite the most promising candidates for a personal interview and pay the candidates' expenses.
10. The screening committee should visit the most promising candidates' communities.
11. The screening committee should present to the board a few of the top ranking candidates and the board should call these candidates back for an interview with the whole board.

Reeves (1954, pp. 246-247) listed, in his selection procedures, many of the same points already mentioned above, but he also included: (1) the establishment of a calendar of dates incorporating announcement of vacancy, the cut-off date for new applications, the completion of preliminary screening, the interviewing of candidates, and the like; (2) the setting of the time and place for special board meetings to be devoted to the selection of the superintendent; (3) the adoption of an information form to be completed by each applicant; (4) the consideration of a policy prohibiting applicants from making personal application to individual board members; and, (5) the requirement that, after selection of the new superintendent, all confidential papers and related correspondence be returned to all unsuccessful candidates.

On the basis of an extensive study reported in the February, 1956, issue of Administrator's Notebook, Baker (1952) developed a tentative guide for use by school boards that contains the following fourteen steps which appear important in selecting an administrator:

1. Announce the vacancy publicly.
2. Name the person to whom application should be made.
3. Make it clear that applicants will be interviewed only by the board as a whole.
4. Develop a list of qualifications for the position.
5. ~~Ask the directors~~ of several placement bureaus to furnish, without the knowledge of the candidates, the credentials for three or four candidates who meet the qualifications established by the board.
6. Ask several successful school leaders who are not likely to be interested in the job themselves to nominate qualified candidates.
7. Invite applications from qualified local staff members, but emphasize that selection will be made upon the basis of the candidate's qualifications for the position.
8. Obtain the credentials of all persons who apply and any others the board wishes to consider.
9. Screen the candidates to identify the ten or twelve who are best qualified.
10. Invite each of the best qualified candidates to an extended interview with the whole board and pay their expenses. (Invite only one candidate for any single interview period).
11. Plan the interview to obtain the evidence concerning the degree to which the candidate possesses the qualifications desired by the board. A record should be kept of every interview.
12. After all the best qualified candidates have been interviewed, select three or four for final consideration. (In this process, the board may obtain each candidate's written reactions to school policies and problems, visit the candidate's school and community, check carefully all of his references, etc.).
13. Recall the most promising candidates for a second interview.
14. Make a final, unanimous selection and agree on the terms of employment. (The contract should be for more than one year.)

Morris (1965, pp. 22-24) recommended the following procedures as a guide to board members in setting up a planned program for the selection of a superintendent:

1. **Announcement of the vacancy:**
As soon as a superintendent's resignation has been accepted by a board, the vacancy thus created should be announced publicly. A release to newspapers, radio and TV will convey this information. The effective date of resignation should be included.
2. **Establishment of qualifications for the position:**
A board should agree on the general qualifications for the post, such as educational training and experience and general age bracket.
3. **Establishment and announcement of procedures for applicants:**
A board should outline the steps to be taken by an applicant for the position. Because applications are recommended, appropriate forms should be provided every qualified applicant after he has declared his interest in the vacancy.
4. **Advertisement of the acceptance of application:**
Notice of the vacancy and a list of qualifications for the position should be sent to several university placement services. A deadline should be set for the acceptance of applications.
5. **Screening the applications:**
A board may appoint a screening committee or function as a committee of the whole in reviewing applications. Those applicants whose qualifications meet the standards set by a board should be asked to submit their confidential placement papers in the event they have not already been received. Unqualified applicants should not be encouraged to pursue their candidacy.
6. **Review and selection of qualified candidates:**
When the screening process has revealed the qualified candidates, the entire board should review the papers and secure such additional information as will either reinforce the applicants' candidacy or eliminate them from competition.
7. **Selection and interview of candidates:**
A board should prepare a schedule for the initial interview of the ten or twelve most promising candidates. They should be invited at board expense, and not more than two for any one occasion, to meet with it in a carefully planned session designed to determine more fully their qualifications for the position. A full record of each interview should be kept.

8. Selection of the top candidates:

After completion of the initial interview, the eight or ten most outstanding candidates should be invited, one at a time and again at board expense, for a second interview. This, too, must be a carefully planned meeting, and a record kept of the proceedings. In the second session there is an additional opportunity for a board to assess the candidate's qualifications and to explore in greater detail the candidate's viewpoint.

At this time all conditions of employment, such as salary, yearly increments, vacation and fringe benefits, should be made perfectly clear. It might be well, also, to determine whether or not the candidate would accept the position if it were offered.

At the time of the second interview, invite the candidate's wife to be a guest at an informal luncheon during which time she and the board members are afforded an opportunity to get acquainted. Good taste would, of course, govern conduct of this aspect of the selection process.

9. Final selection of the superintendent:

When a board has completed the second interview of the top two or three candidates, the records of the first and second meetings should be reviewed. The candidate of first choice should be unanimously agreed upon. At the same time, a second choice should be determined. In the event that the first candidate should decline the offer, a board should then extend the offer to its second choice candidate.

10. Announcement and notification of appointment:

When the new chief executive officer has been named, the board should release an appropriate announcement to the press, radio and TV indicating something about his background and the date on which his duties will be assumed. At the same time, the unsuccessful candidates should be notified by letter that the position has been filled and by whom. Placement bureaus should also receive this information.

Griffiths (1966, pp. 61-63) also listed in his selection procedures many of the same points previously mentioned, but he added: (1) the need for a board to meet with those persons who can offer advice; namely, state education personnel, educational consultants, and in rare instances, management consultants; (2) the stipulation that the present superintendent should not be consulted in the selection of a new superintendent; (3) the necessity to establish a calendar of events; setting

deadlines for each step in the selection process; the possibility for choice candidates to meet and talk with teachers, administrators, and a few laymen from the community; and, (4) the importance of requesting the successful candidate to undergo a complete physical examination prior to appointment.

In a 1968 publication, Selecting a School Superintendent, the AASA (1968, pp. 2-8), poses questions relative to the selection of a chief administrator:

If the choice of a new superintendent is to be made with wisdom, board members must find answers to a number of questions, such as: (a) What are the essential steps in an effective selection procedure? (b) Who should be involved in the selection process? (c) What should the board expect from the outgoing superintendent? (d) How can able people be attracted? (e) What will the applicants want to know about the board and the school district? (f) How do you find out whether applicants possess the desired qualifications? (g) How do you select the "right" one? (h) At what points in the selection process should public announcements be made?

This same publication also contains a statement of, and an elaboration upon, ten steps which it maintains are usually involved in an "adequate" procedure, that is: (1) know what you want; (2) determine evaluative procedures; (3) announce the vacancy; (4) examine local candidates; (5) develop a list; (6) narrow the field; (7) interview the best; (8) visit the candidate's community; talk with members of the community; (9) make a choice; and, (10) work with the press, radio and television.

A recent document, prepared jointly by the California School Boards Association and the California Association of School Administrators (1970, pp. 1-5), was completed to facilitate extensive reference by board members, advisors selected to assist the boards, and those appointed to screening committees. It was believed that the

procedures outlined below would materially assist school boards engaged in the selection of a new superintendent:

1. Obtain outside, objective, professional assistance.
2. Prepare preliminary procedures, calendar, and tentative budget.
3. Receive report of advisor and approve contents of brochure.
4. Select professional screening committee and finalize procedures.
5. Meet with the screening committee.
6. Interview finalist candidates for superintendency.
7. Visit community of finalist candidate/candidates.
8. Discuss superintendent's contract with advisor.
9. Meet with prospective superintendent.
10. Release press information simultaneously.

Simultaneously in 1970, the Public Education Association in New York (1970, pp. 3-13) developed a handbook, "Selecting a Superintendent," based on extensive interviews with the then local school board members, community representatives and school personnel throughout the City of New York. The Association recommended the following criteria for consideration by school boards faced with the task of searching for a new superintendent of schools:

1. Adopt a general policy statement.
2. Adopt a position description and list of qualifications.
3. Decide whether professional assistance is needed.
4. Appoint a recruitment committee.
5. Develop a recruitment plan and timetable.
6. Determine whether the present district superintendent wishes to be considered.

7. Identify candidates.
8. Contact candidates.
9. Evaluate resumes.
10. Conduct initial interviews.
11. Check references.
12. Rank the candidates.
13. Conduct final interviews.
14. Choose the best candidate.
15. Take a formal vote.
16. Formally notify appointee.
17. Arrange medical examination.
18. Sign employment contract.
19. Introduce the superintendent to the community.

In a recent article, Dowler (1970, pp. 29-31) discussed the steps taken by a school board in Tulsa, Oklahoma, in their particular search for a superintendent of schools. The approach employed by this board, responsible for a school population of 80,000, could be applied to cities of similar size or, for that matter, adapted a bit and used by smaller school systems. The Tulsa school board employed the following steps "to bring home a winner":

1. Set up a plan with a definite timetable.
2. Determine how to locate applicants.
 - a. Adhere to ethical standards.
 - b. Provide for responsible individuals or groups in the community to nominate candidates.
 - c. Design an attractive brochure telling about the opening and the community. Your money will be well spent.
3. Put qualifications desired in the new superintendent in writing.
 - a. Give the writing assignment to one board member.

- b. Require approval by the entire board.
 - c. Provide for comments and suggestions by responsible citizens.
4. Select a coordinator responsible to make the following arrangements.
 - a. Set up a filing system.
 - b. Make announcement of the vacancy and disseminate information.
 - c. Carry on correspondence including:
 - (1) Acknowledging all materials received.
 - (2) Returning materials after choice is made.
 - (3) Informing all candidates of the outcome.
 - d. Collect information on each candidate.
 - e. Set up a time and place for interviews and arrange for candidates to come for interviews.
 - f. Meet candidates who come, show them about the city, and show them the administrative office building, as well as selected schools.
 - g. Arrange for payment of their expenses.
 - h. Take them to the interviews.
 5. Develop a uniform method of evaluating each of the candidates.
 6. Permit only board members to be present at the interviews.
 7. Hold interviews in some location other than the administration building.
 8. Keep information about names of candidates and their qualifications locked up and available only to board members, to the retiring superintendent, and to the coordinator.
 9. Keep the news media informed of progress, giving out statistical data but not the names of candidates nor their home addresses. Advise the press periodically about how far along the selection process has gone toward completion.
 10. Check not only papers that show experience, transcripts that show training, references that show success, but also investigate the home communities of the finalists.
 11. Require the coordinator to answer every letter promptly and courteously.

The selection procedures listed thus far are by no means exhaustive. However, it is interesting to note that the writings of Reeder (1954, pp. 24-55), Tuttle (1963, pp. 300-304), Karrick (1966, pp. 26-34), McCarty (1967), pp. 5-7), Spears (1968, pp. 64-66), Grieder (1969, pp.

148-151), and Johnson (1971, pp. 35-36) have all listed definite selection procedures for hiring a superintendent with objectivity and systematic procedures as important factors in the selection process. These statements are corroborated by many writers in the field. One of the major goals of the selection process is the securing of the best candidate available for the post, and one of the best ways appears to be through a good selection process that follows a systematic set of procedures patterned after professionally prepared guidelines.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Sampling Procedures

The population from which the sample was taken consisted of all Unitary School Divisions throughout the Province of Manitoba. Names of all school divisions for the 1972-73 school year were obtained from the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, Winnipeg, Manitoba. Names of all incumbent superintendents of schools were obtained from the Document Section, Manitoba Department of Education, Winnipeg, Manitoba. This information formed the basis for the study.

All incumbent superintendents of schools of Unitary School Divisions were requested to participate in the study. Further, the sample was limited to school board members of such Unitary School Divisions who had themselves been involved in the recruitment and selection of a new superintendent of schools since 1966.

As of December 1972, Unitary School Divisions in the Province of Manitoba encompassed 45 such school divisions. Out of these, all but one school division was directly involved in the eventual appointment of a superintendent of schools. The remaining school division has a superintendent of schools but the incumbent is a civil servant, and, as such, is an employee of the Manitoba Department of Education. Thus, the study was limited to the 44 remaining Unitary School Divisions whose elected school board members are responsible for the administration of all

aspects of education from K-12, as well as the direct appointment of a school superintendent. The appointed superintendent of school maintains responsibility of both elementary and secondary schools.

Instruments Used

Two survey instruments were developed to gather data on methods of selection and processes of employment used in Manitoba Unitary School Divisions. Instrument I was designed for school board members having been involved in the recruitment and selection of a new superintendent of schools. Instrument II was developed for incumbent superintendents of schools of said school divisions (see Appendices A and B).

The National Education Association (1930) suggested several criteria which were useful in the preparation of the two instruments:

1. The questionnaire should preferably deal with matters of fact.
2. Ask only for data which respondent can and will give.
3. The questionnaire should be as short as possible.
4. Questions should be simple and clearly worded.
5. The questionnaire should require a minimum of writing.
6. Responses should lend themselves to tabulation.
7. The questionnaire should meet certain standards of mechanical form.
8. The purpose of the investigation should be stated.

Assistance in revision and finalization of the instruments, prior to mailing, was obtained from the committee chairman for this study, as well as prominent research-oriented educators and fellow colleagues in educational administration.

In addition to numerous major and minor changes subsequently recommended, a change incorporated in the final form reduced the number of items to be included. Efforts were exerted to make the directions for completing the two instruments as simple and easy to understand as possible. Final refinements were again made prior to printing.

Each instrument consisted of six specific areas.

The first area was designed to gather demographic information, namely: type and size of school system; student and staff count; number of years as a school board member or as a school superintendent; highest level of education and year last degree was granted; number of years as a school teacher and as a school administrator before accepting the first superintendency; number of superintendents hired in a particular school division since 1966; and, duration of present superintendent's contract.

The second area focused upon reported processes as utilized by school boards, namely: announcement of vacancy; media employed; institutions and organizations notified of the vacancy; time of year vacancy was announced; and, the manner in which applications were acknowledged by boards of education.

The third area was patterned to identify the particular steps involved in the selection process, namely: the presence or absence of a specific board policy; the presence or absence of a plan and definite timetable; the appointment of a recruitment committee; the availability of a recruitment brochure; the use of professional assistance; the extent of a public search; and, the participation of interested community groups, teachers and administrators.

The fourth area converged upon the preliminary screening aspects while the fifth area disclosed the preliminary interviewing stages considered by boards of education.

The sixth, and final, area revealed the steps undertaken by boards of education while interviewing finalist candidates.

It is to be noted that both instruments contained some items for which more than one answer per item was possible. Further, it can be noted that Table 26 and Table 43 report instances where the expectancy levels are arithmetically less than 1. The writer recognizes that elimination of such expectancies would have lowered the chi-square values but to a level yet above .05, or that acceptable for this study.

Method of Obtaining Data

During the second week of February, 1973, the superintendents and school board members of all Unitary School Divisions were mailed a letter requesting them to participate in the study (see Appendices C and D). Included with the letter was the appropriate instrument to be completed. The letter outlined the purpose and significance of the study. Self-addressed, pre-paid envelopes were provided for the return of the documents.

A follow-up letter, mailed March 19 (see Appendix E), was designed to encourage a response from those school divisions who had not yet replied to the first letter.

Of the 44 Superintendent Instruments mailed, 42 (95.45 per cent) were completed and returned. Of all the School Board Instruments mailed to the 44 Unitary School Division Boards of Education, 35 school divisions (79.55 per cent) responded favorably. The total number of school board members responding was 65, or an average of 2.03 respondents per Unitary School Division since only board members having been previously involved in the recruitment and selection of a new superintendent of schools were requested to participate in the study. Of the data received from school superintendents, all (100 per cent) were usable, while that of

32 school divisions (72.73 per cent) were acceptable from division school board members. Three school divisions replied that they had not hired a new superintendent of schools since 1966.

Method Used in Data Analysis

Responses from each survey instrument, together with an identification letter and card number identification, were coded on an IBM code sheet. The data were then punched on IBM cards for statistical treatment by an IBM 360-40 computer available through the University of North Dakota Computer Center. The key punch cards were verified for accuracy and precision prior to statistical treatment by the computer.

The first two null hypotheses were tested by a one-way analysis of variance using the multiple linear regression and stepwise backward analysis of regression techniques to determine F-ratios. A level of .05 was selected a priori to test for significance. The data were then presented in Chapter IV, Analysis of the Data.

The third, fourth, fifth and sixth null hypotheses were tested by utilizing the Chi-square statistical technique. Program SPSSG was used to obtain the required Chi-square values. Significance was measured at the .05 level of probability.

The two research questions generated by the investigation were examined by utilizing a setwise backward multiple linear regression approach. Significance was measured at the .05 level of probability. Succeeding sets of variables were eliminated from a prediction equation until the best predictor remained (Williams and Lindem, 1971). Levels of significance were reported at each step of elimination.

Conclusions and recommendations were drawn from the data and were presented in Chapter V, Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations. In addition, basic guidelines for the selection process were developed and also presented.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter is divided into two sections, the first deals with the hypotheses to be tested, while the second pertains to the research questions as stated in Chapter I.

Section one is divided into six subsections which correspond to the six hypotheses under investigation. The first subsection reports the results of board responses regarding selection processes and procedures of employment as utilized in the recruitment and selection of superintendents in the Province of Manitoba. The second subsection deals with superintendent responses as related to selected demographic and educational variables. Subsections three and five report differences among boards utilizing a specific policy statement and a definite plan and timetable in their search for a new school superintendent, while the fourth and sixth subsections report the results of comparisons between boards and superintendents regarding their perceptions of major problems in their school systems, as well as the methods employed in hiring a new superintendent of schools. Chi-square statistical treatments were applied in all but the first and second subsections where multiple regression methods were utilized.

The second section is divided into two subsections which correspond to the order and number of research questions generated by the study. Both subsections report the results of a setwise backward

multiple linear regression procedure employed to isolate the best set of demographic and educational data used to predict superintendent turnover. Accordingly, the second section reports demographic and educational data as collected from both Board and Superintendent Instruments.

The population of this study consisted of the 44 Unitary School Divisions in the Province of Manitoba as of December 1972. Each Division Board, through representation of one or more of its board members, along with its incumbent superintendent of schools, reported its perceptions of the selection processes and procedures of employment in hiring a new school superintendent. Conjunctively, demographic and educational data were collected from each school board member and superintendent comprising the population.

The Hypotheses

Hypothesis Number One

The first hypothesis, stated in null form, was as follows:

There were no significant differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures for the recruitment and selection of a superintendent.

The data examined by this hypothesis are presented in Tables 1 to 6. The tables indicate that there were differences, significant at the .05 level and beyond, among school boards relative to selection processes and procedures of employment, with superintendent turnover as the criterion variable.

Table 1 depicts the regression analysis of variance, with use of a specific board policy statement as the predictor and superintendent turnover as the criterion. An F ratio of 14.03 proved to be significant

at the .01 level, thereby indicating that school boards utilizing a specific board policy statement appeared to have a significantly lower superintendent turnover ($R=-.428$).

TABLE 1

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SPECIFIC BOARD POLICY STATEMENT,
WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER USED AS THE CRITERION

| Source of Variation | df | SS | MS | F Value |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------------|------|--------------------|
| Attributable to Regression | 1 | 3.93 | 3.93 | 14.03 ^a |
| Deviation from Regression | 63 | 17.52 | .28 | |
| Total | 64 | 21.45 | | |

^aSignificant at the .01 level.

An F ratio of 3.99 was required to establish significance at the .05 level.

Table 2 reports the regression analysis of variance between school boards which initiated discussions regarding salary and fringe benefits during the preliminary interview, with superintendent turnover as the criterion. The resulting F ratio of 4.02 was significant at the .05 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards which initiated discussions regarding salary and fringe benefits appeared to have a significantly lower superintendent turnover ($R=-.242$).

Table 3 presents the regression analysis of variance with Organization notified of the vacancy used as the predictor and superintendent turnover as the criterion. The F ratio of 4.34 proved to be significant at the .05 level, thereby indicating that school boards which notified the Manitoba Association of School Superintendents of the vacancy appeared to have a significantly higher superintendent turnover ($R=.255$).

TABLE 2

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DISCUSSIONS REGARDING SALARY
AND FRINGE BENEFITS, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS
THE CRITERION

| Source of Variation | df | SS | MS | F Value |
|----------------------------|----|-------|------|-------------------|
| Attributable to Regression | 1 | 1.26 | 1.26 | 4.02 ^a |
| Deviation from Regression | 63 | 19.53 | .31 | |
| Total | 64 | 20.79 | | |

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

An F ratio of 3.99 was required to establish significance at the .05 level.

TABLE 3

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ORGANIZATION (M.A.S.S.) NOTIFIED
OF VACANCY, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER USED AS THE CRITERION

| Source of Variation | df | SS | MS | F Value |
|----------------------------|----|-------|------|-------------------|
| Attributable to Regression | 1 | 1.39 | 1.39 | 4.34 ^a |
| Deviation from Regression | 63 | 20.05 | .32 | |
| Total | 64 | 21.44 | | |

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

An F ratio of 3.99 was required to establish significance at the .05 level.

The stepwise backwards regression for board selection processes and procedures of employment, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, are presented in Tables 4 and 5. In reading the tables of the results of the stepwise backward examination procedure, each step

includes all subsequent variables and excludes the variables listed as the variable eliminated plus all previously listed variables. The last step in these tables was the single best predictor of the criterion.

The stepwise backward examination procedure for the manner in which reference checks are conducted on finalist candidates, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, was presented in Table 4. It was observed that most of the multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to top it was noted that the remaining variable "Mail" was significant at step 5. It is to be noted that the variable "Does not Apply" was dropped from the analysis, thereby reducing the original N from 65 to 60 responses.

TABLE 4

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR MANNER REFERENCE CHECKS
CONDUCTED ON FINALISTS, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE
CRITERION (N=60)

| Step | Variable Eliminated | R | F |
|------|----------------------------|------|-------------------|
| 1 | None | .350 | 1.92 |
| 2 | Other | .550 | 2.57 |
| 3 | Telephone | .326 | 3.40 ^a |
| 4 | In Person | .312 | 6.26 ^a |
| | (Remaining Variable: Mail) | | |

^aSignificant at .05 level.

Examination of Table 5 indicates that the single best predictor of superintendent turnover relative to Institutions and/or Organizations notified of the vacancy was the variable "Manitoba Association of School

Superintendents" ($R=.255$). All multiple correlations (R) were significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 5

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR MANNER INSTITUTIONS AND/OR ORGANIZATIONS NOTIFIED OF VACANCY, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION (N=65)

| Step | Variable Eliminated | R | F |
|------|---|------|-------------------|
| 1 | None | .503 | 2.75 ^a |
| 2 | Man. Ass'n. of School Trustees | .502 | 3.25 ^b |
| 3 | Manitoba Teacher's Society | .497 | 3.88 ^b |
| 4 | Other | .490 | 4.74 ^b |
| 5 | University of Brandon | .487 | 6.31 ^b |
| 6 | Department of Education | .441 | 7.51 ^b |
| 7 | University of Manitoba | .255 | 4.37 ^a |
| | (Remaining Variable: Man. Ass'n. of School Superintendents) | | |

^aSignificant at .05 level.

^bSignificant at .01 level.

Correlations of school boards' selection variables, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, were presented in Table 6. As was inferred by the stepwise backward regression analysis (see Table 4), variable 1a, "Mail," was, by itself, significant at the .02 level. ($R=.312$). Further examination indicated that no other variables were significant.

The stepwise backward regression analysis (see Table 5) inferred that variable 2c, "Manitoba Association of School Superintendents," was,

by itself, significant at the .05 level ($R=.255$). Further examination indicated that no other variables were significant.

TABLE 6

CORRELATIONS OF SCHOOL BOARD'S SELECTION VARIABLES, WITH
SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION

| Predictor Selection Process | Criterion Superintendent Turnover |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Reference Checks on Finalists | |
| a) Mail | -.312 ^a |
| b) Telephone | -.153 |
| c) In Person | .016 |
| d) Other | .057 |
| 2. Institutions/Organizations Notified of Vacancy | |
| a) University of Manitoba | -.208 |
| b) University of Brandon | -.203 |
| c) Manitoba Association of School Superintendents | .255 ^b |
| d) Manitoba Association of School Trustees | .072 |
| e) Manitoba Teacher's Society | .215 |
| f) Department of Education | .023 |
| g) Other | .054 |

^aSignificant at .02 level.

^bSignificant at .05 level.

Therefore, Hypothesis One, there are no significant differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures of

employment for the recruitment and selection of a superintendent, was rejected at the .05 level and beyond for the following 5 of 24 variables tested:

Specific Board Policy Statement ($F=14.03$, $P < .01$); Salary and Fringe Benefits ($F=4.02$, $P < .05$); Organizations Notified of the Vacancy ($F=4.34$, $P < .05$); Checks conducted on Finalist Candidates ($F=6.26$, $P < .05$); and Organizations and/or Institutions Notified of the Vacancy ($F=4.37$, $P < .05$).

Hypothesis Number Two

The second hypothesis, stated in null form, was as follows:

There were no significant differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures on the basis of selected demographic and educational variables.

The data examined by this hypothesis are reported in Tables 7 to 18. The tables indicate that there were differences, significant at the .05 level and beyond, among boards relative to superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures on the basis of selected demographic and educational variables.

Table 7 presents the regression analysis of variance, with board satisfaction with services of former superintendent as the selected predictor variable, and superintendent turnover as the criterion variable. The F ratio of 15.38 proved to be significant at the .01 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards, satisfied with the services of former superintendents, appeared to have a significantly lower superintendent turnover ($R=.443$).

TABLE 7

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF BOARD SATISFACTION WITH SERVICES OF FORMER SUPERINTENDENT, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION

| Sources of Variation | df | SS | MS | F Value |
|----------------------------|----|-------|------|--------------------|
| Attributable to Regression | 1 | 4.20 | 4.20 | 15.38 ^a |
| Deviation from Regression | 63 | 17.24 | .27 | |
| Total | 64 | 21.44 | | |

^aSignificant at the .01 level.

An F ratio of 3.99 was required to establish significance at the .05 level.

Table 8 reports the regression analysis of variance with teacher training in Manitoba used as the selected predictor variable, and superintendent turnover as the criterion. An F ratio of 5.55 proved to be significant at the .05 level of probability, thereby indicating that superintendent turnover does not appear to be significantly related to teacher training in Manitoba ($R = -.350$).

TABLE 8

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHER TRAINING IN MANITOBA, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION

| Source of Variation | df | SS | MS | F Value |
|----------------------------|----|------|-----|-------------------|
| Attributable to Regression | 1 | .71 | .71 | 5.55 ^a |
| Deviation from Regression | 40 | 5.12 | .13 | |
| Total | 41 | 5.83 | | |

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

An F ratio of 4.08 was required to establish significance at the .05 level.

The stepwise backward regression for the manner in which the former superintendent was released, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, was presented in Table 9. It was observed that all of the multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to top, it was noted that the remaining variable "Dismissed" was significant at step 4.

TABLE 9

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR MANNER FORMER SUPERINTENDENT WAS RELEASED, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION (N=65)

| Step | Variable Eliminated | R | F |
|------|------------------------------------|------|--------------------|
| 1 | None | .645 | 10.68 ^a |
| 2 | Asked to Resign | .593 | 11.06 ^a |
| 3 | Does not Apply | .560 | 14.13 ^a |
| 4 | Permitted to Resign | .348 | 8.68 ^a |
| | (Remaining Variable: Dismissed) | | |

^aSignificant at the .01 level.

The stepwise backward regression for the major problems at the time when the new superintendent was hired, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, was presented in Table 10. It was observed that most of the multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to top, it was noted that the remaining variable "Curriculum" was not significant, therefore, none of the variables by themselves were significantly related to superintendent turnover. Hence, the only significant relationships resulted from the different

combinations of variables. The most significant combination of variables was noted at step 4 and included "Personnel," "Building Program," and "Curriculum."

TABLE 10

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR MAJOR PROBLEMS AT TIME NEW SUPERINTENDENT WAS HIRED, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION (N=65)

| Step | Variable Eliminated | R | F |
|------|-------------------------------------|------|-------------------|
| 1 | None | .485 | 2.98 ^a |
| 2 | Staff Morale | .484 | 3.62 ^b |
| 3 | Finance | .471 | 4.27 ^b |
| 4 | Other | .442 | 4.97 ^b |
| 5 | Personnel | .297 | 2.99 |
| 6 | Building Program | .198 | 2.59 |
| | (Remaining Variable: Curriculum) | | |

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

^bSignificant at the .01 level.

The stepwise backward regression for the major problems at the present time, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, was presented in Table 11. It was observed that most of the multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to top, it was noted that the remaining variable "Building Program" was not significant, therefore none of the variables by themselves were significantly related to superintendent turnover. Hence the only significant relationships resulted from the different combinations of variables, that is, at step 4, "Finance" and "Building Program."

TABLE 11

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR MAJOR PROBLEMS AT PRESENT TIME, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION (N=65)

| Step | Variable Eliminated | R | F |
|------|--|------|-------------------|
| 1 | None | .381 | 1.99 |
| 2 | Curriculum | .380 | 2.55 ^a |
| 3 | Other | .379 | 3.46 ^a |
| 4 | Personnel | .376 | 5.13 ^b |
| 5 | Finance | .241 | 3.89 |
| | (Remaining Variable: Building Program | | |

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

^bSignificant at the .01 level.

The stepwise backward regression for the agent responsible for recruiting and selecting an Assistant Superintendent, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, was presented in Table 12. It was observed that most of the multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to top, it was noted that the remaining variable, "Superintendent," was significant at step 4.

The stepwise backward regression for the degree status of the superintendent when he was appointed, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, was presented in Table 13. It was observed that two of the four multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to top, it was noted that the remaining variable "Master's Degree other than M.Ed." was significant at step 4.

TABLE 12

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR AGENT RESPONSIBLE
FOR RECRUITING AND SELECTING THE ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT,
WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION (N=65)

| Step | Variable Eliminated | R | F |
|------|---|------|-------------------|
| 1 | None | .419 | 3.20 ^a |
| 2 | Other | .416 | 4.26 ^b |
| 3 | Recruitment Committee | .389 | 5.52 ^b |
| 4 | School Board | .291 | 5.84 ^a |
| | (Remaining Variable: Superintendent) | | |

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

^bSignificant at the .01 level.

TABLE 13

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR DEGREE STATUS OF
SUPERINTENDENT WHEN APPOINTED, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER
AS THE CRITERION (N=42)

| Step | Variable Eliminated | R | F |
|------|---|------|-------------------|
| 1 | None | .423 | 2.01 |
| 2 | Bachelor's Degree other than B.Ed. | .422 | 2.75 |
| 3 | Bachelor of Education | .414 | 4.03 ^a |
| 4 | Master of Education | .372 | 6.43 ^a |
| | (Remaining Variable: Master's Degree other than M.Ed.) | | |

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

The stepwise backward regression for the degree status of the incumbent superintendent at the present time, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, was presented in Table 14. It was observed that two of the five multiple correlations (R) were significant. Reading the table from bottom to top, it was noted that the remaining variable, "Master's Degree other than M.Ed." was significant at step 5.

TABLE 14

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR PRESENT DEGREE STATUS OF SUPERINTENDENTS, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION (N=42)

| Step | Variable Eliminated | R | F |
|------|--|------|-------------------|
| 1 | None | .404 | 1.41 |
| 2 | Earned Doctorate | .403 | 1.80 |
| 3 | Master of Education | .403 | 2.46 |
| 4 | Bachelor's Degree other than B.Ed. | .398 | 3.67 ^a |
| 5 | Bachelor of Education | .372 | 6.43 ^a |
| | (Remaining Variable: Master's Degree other than M.Ed.) | | |

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

The stepwise backward regression for number of years of administrative experience of superintendents, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, was presented in Table 15. It was observed that there was no significance in this area.

The stepwise backward regression for status prior to becoming superintendent, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, was

presented in Table 16. It was observed that there was no significance in this area.

TABLE 15

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR NUMBER OF YEARS OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION (N=42)

| Step | Variable Eliminated | R | F |
|------|---|------|------|
| 1 | None | .203 | .396 |
| 2 | Supervisor | .201 | .534 |
| 3 | Principal | .184 | .682 |
| 4 | Assistant Superintendent | .138 | .778 |
| | (Remaining Variable: Assistant Principal) | | |

TABLE 16

STEPWISE BACKWARD EXAMINATION PROCEDURE FOR STATUS PRIOR TO BECOMING SUPERINTENDENT, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION (N=42)

| Step | Variable Eliminated | R | F |
|------|--|------|------|
| 1 | None | .316 | .780 |
| 2 | Teacher | .320 | 1.06 |
| 3 | Supervisor | .320 | 1.45 |
| 4 | Assistant Principal | .320 | 2.23 |
| 5 | Principal | .271 | 3.17 |
| | (Remaining Variable: Assistant Superintendent) | | |

Correlations of selected demographic and educational variables, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, were presented in Table 17.

TABLE 17

CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC AND EDUCATIONAL VARIABLES, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION

| Predictor Demographic and Educational | Criterion Superintendent Turnover |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Manner Former Superintendent Released: | |
| a) Asked to Resign | -.023 |
| b) Permitted to Resign | .347 ^a |
| c) Dismissed | .348 ^a |
| d) Does not Apply | .124 |
| 2. Major Problems When New Superintendent Hired: | |
| a) Curriculum | -.199 |
| b) Personnel | -.055 |
| c) Finance | .255 ^c |
| d) Staff Morale | .246 ^c |
| e) Building Program | .172 |
| f) Other | .143 |
| 3. Major Problems at Present Time: | |
| a) Curriculum | .090 |
| b) Personnel | .191 |
| c) Finance | -.064 |
| d) Staff Morale | .00 |
| e) Building Program | -.241 |
| f) Other | .162 |

TABLE 17--Continued

| Predictor Demographic and Educational | Criterion Superintendent Turnover |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 4. Agent Responsible for Recruiting and Selecting the Assistant Superintendent: | |
| a) School Board | .289 ^c |
| b) Superintendent | .260 ^c |
| c) Recruitment Committee | .219 |
| d) Other | .063 |
| 5. Degree Status When First Appointed Superintendent: | |
| a) Ed.D. Degree | .00 |
| b) M.A. or M.Sc. Degree | .372 ^b |
| c) M.Ed. Degree | -.234 |
| d) B.A. or B.Sc. Degree | -.201 |
| e) B.Ed. Degree | .129 |
| 6. Present Degree Status: | |
| a) Ed.D. Degree | -.069 |
| b) M.A. or M.Sc. Degree | .372 ^b |
| c) M.Ed. Degree | -.100 |
| d) B.A. or B.Ed. Degree | -.021 |
| e) B.Ed. Degree | -.021 |
| 7. Years of Administrative Experience Prior to Becoming Superintendent: | |
| a) Assistant Superintendent | .123 |
| b) Principal | -.126 |
| c) Assistant Principal | .138 |
| d) Supervisor | .041 |

TABLE 17--Continued

| Predictor Demographic and Educational | Criterion Superintendent Turnover |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 8. Status Prior to Becoming Superintendent: | |
| a) Assistant Superintendent | .271 |
| b) Principal | -.022 |
| c) Assistant Principal | -.100 |
| d) Supervisor | -.145 |
| e) Teacher | -.124 |

^aSignificant at .01 level.

^bSignificant at .02 level.

^cSignificant at .05 level.

As was inferred by the stepwise backward regression analysis (see Table 9), variable 1c, "Dismissed," was, by itself, significant at the .01 level ($R=.348$). Further examination indicated that variable 1b, "Permitted to Resign," was, by itself, significant at the .01 level ($R=.347$).

The stepwise backward regression analysis (see Table 10) inferred that variable 2a, "Curriculum," was not, by itself, significant at the .01 level ($R=-.199$). Further examination indicated that variable 2c, "Finance" ($R=.255$), and variable 2d, "Staff Morale" ($R=.246$) were, by themselves, significant at the .05 level.

The stepwise backward regression analysis (see Table 11) inferred that variable 3e, "Building Program," was not, by itself, significant at

at the .05 level ($R=-.241$). Further examination indicated that none of the other variables were significant.

As was inferred by the stepwise backward regression analysis (see Table 12), variable 4b, "Superintendent," was, by itself, significant at the .05 level ($R=.260$). Further examination revealed that variable 4a, "School Board," was, by itself, significant at the .05 level ($R=.289$).

The stepwise backward regression analysis (see Table 13) inferred that variable 5b, "Master's Degree other than M.Ed.," was, by itself, significant at the .02 level ($R=.372$). Further examination indicated that none of the other variables were significant.

The stepwise backward regression analysis (see Table 14) inferred that variable 6b, "Master's Degree other than M.Ed.," was, by itself, significant at the .02 level ($R=.372$). Further examination indicated that none of the other variables were significant.

The stepwise backward regression analysis (see Table 15) inferred that variable 7c, "Assistant Principal," was not, by itself, significant at the .05 level ($R=.138$). Further examination revealed that none of the other variables were significant.

The stepwise backward regression analysis (see Table 16) inferred that variable 8, "Assistant Superintendent," was not significant at the .05 level. However, the correlation of this variable (see Table 17), with superintendent turnover as the criterion, was found to be significant at the .05 level ($R=.271$). Further examination indicated that none of the other variables were significant.

The results of a setwise backward multiple regression analysis for selection processes and procedures of employment, with superintendent

turnover as the criterion, were presented in Table 18. In reading the table of the results of the setwise elimination procedure, each step includes all subsequent sets and excludes the variable listed as the set eliminated plus all previously listed sets. The last step in this table was the single best predictor of the criterion.

TABLE 18

SETWISE BACKWARD ELIMINATION PROCEDURE FOR SELECTION PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES OF EMPLOYMENT, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION

| Step | Set Eliminated | Multiple Correlation | Significance Level |
|------|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | None | .901 | P<.01 |
| 2 | Preliminary Screening | .877 | P<.01 |
| 3 | Selection Process | .838 | P<.01 |
| 4 | Preliminary Interviewing | .682 | P<.05 |
| 5 | Interviewing Finalist Candidates | .528 | P>.05 |
| 6 | Announcement of Vacancy | | |

The results in Table 18 indicated a multiple correlation for the full model of .901, which was significant at the .01 level of probability. Each succeeding step, excluding step 6, also resulted in a significant correlation. Step 6, "Announcement of the Vacancy," produced a multiple correlation of .528 found non-significant at the .05 level.

Therefore, Hypothesis Two, there are no significant differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures, on the basis of selected demographic and educational variables, was rejected at the .05 level and beyond in the following 8 of 16 variables tested:

Board Satisfaction with Services of Former Superintendent ($F=15.38$, $P<.01$), Teacher Training in Manitoba ($F=5.55$, $P<.05$), Manner Former Superintendent was Released ($F=8.68$, $P<.01$), Major Problems at Time When New Superintendent was Appointed ($F=4.97$, $P<.01$), Major Problems at the Present Time ($F=5.13$, $P<.01$), Agent Responsible for Recruiting and Selecting Assistant Superintendent ($F=6.95$, $P<.05$), Degree Status of Superintendent When First Appointed ($F=6.43$, $P<.05$), and Present Degree Status of Superintendent ($F=6.43$, $P<.05$).

Hypothesis Number Three

The third hypothesis, stated in null form, was as follows:

There were no significant differences between the presence or absence of a specific board policy statement in regard to hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures.

The data examined by this hypothesis are reported in Tables 19 to 24. The tables indicate that there were differences, significant at the .05 level and beyond, between school boards having a specific board policy statement, and those not having such a policy statement, relative to selected board processes and procedures of employment in hiring a new superintendent of schools.

In Table 19 are found the chi-square values for responses of boards and superintendents regarding the type of school division, with the use of a specific board policy statement as the criterion. The contribution of one cell, Board Policy-Urban, contributed most to the table value of 15.12, significant at the .005 level of probability.

TABLE 19

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR TYPE OF SCHOOL DIVISION, WITH SPECIFIC BOARD POLICY STATEMENT AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | | | N |
|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| | Largely Agricultural and Rural | Rural/ Urban | Urban | Suburban | |
| Area: Type of School Division-Board Policy | | | | | |
| Board Policy | O = 3 E = 7.15 $\chi^2 = 2.41$ | O = 2 E = 3.22 $\chi^2 = 0.46$ | O = 6 E = 2.24 $\chi^2 = 8.03$ | O = 4 E = 1.96 $\chi^2 = 2.12$ | 15 |
| No Board Policy | O = 51 E = 46.85 $\chi^2 = 0.37$ | O = 21 E = 19.78 $\chi^2 = 0.07$ | O = 10 E = 13.76 $\chi^2 = 1.31$ | O = 10 E = 12.04 $\chi^2 = 0.35$ | 92 |
| Total | 54 | 23 | 16 | 14 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 15.12$. Significant at .005 with 3 df; table value 12.80.

In Table 20 are found the chi-square values for board and superintendent responses regarding the Institution (University of Brandon) notified of the vacancy, with the use of a specific board policy statement as the criterion. It was observed that the chi-square value of 4.03 was significant at the .05 level of probability.

In Table 21 are found the chi-square values for board and superintendent responses regarding the use of a definite plan and timetable, with use of a specific board policy statement as the criterion. It was observed that the chi-square value of 12.54 was significant at the .001 level of probability.

TABLE 20

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR INSTITUTION (UNIVERSITY OF BRANDON) NOTIFIED OF VACANCY, WITH SPECIFIC BOARD POLICY STATEMENT AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|---|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Institution Notified-Board Policy | | | |
| Board Policy | 4 | 11 | 15 |
| No Board Policy | 6 | 86 | 92 |
| Total | 10 | 97 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 4.03$. Significant at .05 with 1 df; table value 3.84.

TABLE 21

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR USE OF A DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE, WITH SPECIFIC BOARD POLICY STATEMENT AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Plan and Timetable-Board Policy | | | |
| Board Policy | 11 | 4 | 15 |
| No Board Policy | 22 | 70 | 92 |
| Total | 33 | 74 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 12.54$. Significant at .001 with 1 df; table value 10.83.

In Table 22 are found the chi-square values for board and superintendent responses regarding the use of a recruitment committee in the selection of a new superintendent, with use of a specific board policy statement as the criterion. It was observed that the chi-square value of 4.12 was significant at the .05 level of probability.

TABLE 22

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR USE OF A RECRUITMENT COMMITTEE, WITH SPECIFIC BOARD POLICY STATEMENT AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|--|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Recruitment Committee-Board Policy | | | |
| Board Policy | 11 | 4 | 15 |
| No Board Policy | 38 | 54 | 92 |
| Total | 49 | 58 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 4.12$. Significant at .05 with 1 df; table value 3.84.

In Table 23 are found the chi-square values for board and superintendent responses regarding the agent responsible for conducting the preliminary interview of candidates, with use of a specific board policy statement as the criterion. It was observed that the chi-square value of 6.99 was significant at the .01 level of probability.

TABLE 23

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR CONDUCTING A PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW, WITH SPECIFIC BOARD POLICY STATEMENT AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|--|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Preliminary Interview-Board Policy | | | |
| Board Policy | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| No Board Policy | 66 | 26 | 92 |
| Total | 71 | 36 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 6.99$. Significant at .01 with 1 df; table value 6.64.

In Table 24 are found the chi-square values for board and superintendent responses regarding official confirmation of the appointment at a public board meeting, with use of a specific board policy statement as the criterion. It was observed that the chi-square value of 5.28 was significant at the .025 level of probability.

TABLE 24

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR OFFICIAL CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT AT PUBLIC MEETING, WITH SPECIFIC BOARD POLICY STATEMENT AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|--|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Official Confirmation-Board Policy | | | |
| Board Policy | 15 | 0 | 15 |
| No Board Policy | 62 | 30 | 92 |
| Total | 77 | 30 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 5.28$. Significant at .025 with 1 df; table value 5.02.

Therefore, Hypothesis Three, there are no significant differences between the presence or absence of a specific board policy statement in regard to hiring a new superintendent and its effects on selected board processes and procedures, was rejected at the .05 level and beyond in the following 6 of 24 variables tested: Type of School Division ($\chi^2 = 15.12$, $P < .005$); Institution Notified of the Vacancy ($\chi^2 = 4.03$, $P < .05$); Use of a Definite Plan and Timetable ($\chi^2 = 12.54$, $P < .001$); Use of a Recruitment Committee in the Selection of a New Superintendent ($\chi^2 = 4.12$, $P < .05$); Agent Responsible for Conducting the Preliminary Interview of Candidates ($\chi^2 = 6.99$, $P < .01$); and, Official Confirmation of Appointment at a Public Board Meeting ($\chi^2 = 5.28$, $P < .025$).

Hypothesis Number Four

The fourth hypothesis, stated in null form, was as follows:

There was no significant difference in board and superintendent views on the major problems in their school system prior to, and after, the hiring of a new superintendent.

The data examined by this hypothesis are reported in Tables 25 and 26. Table 25 indicates that there were no significant differences, at the .05 level and beyond, between school boards and superintendents regarding their perceptions of the major problems when the new superintendent was appointed. Table 26 indicates that there were differences, significant at the .05 level of probability, between school boards and superintendents regarding their perceptions of the major problems at the present time.

In Table 25 are found the chi-square values for responses of boards and superintendents regarding their perceptions of the major problems in their school system at the time when the new superintendent was appointed.

While the contribution of three cells, Superintendent-Curriculum, Superintendent-Building Program, and Board-Curriculum contributed the most to the value of 4.54, it proved to be non-significant at the .05 level of probability.

In Table 26 are found the chi-square values for responses of boards and superintendents regarding their perceptions of the major problems in their school system at the present time.

The contribution of four cells, Superintendent-Curriculum, Superintendent-Other, Superintendent-Staff Morale, and Board-Curriculum, contributed most to the value of 13.03, significant at the .025 level of probability.

TABLE 25

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF MAJOR PROBLEMS WHEN NEW SUPERINTENDENT WAS APPOINTED, BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | Chi-Square Value | | | | | | N |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| | Curriculum | Personnel | Finance | Staff Morale | Building Program | Other | |
| Area: Major Problems When Superintendent Appointed | | | | | | | |
| Superintendent | O = 3 E = 5.49 $\chi^2 = 1.13$ | O = 13 E = 14.52 $\chi^2 = .16$ | O = 3 E = 3.53 $\chi^2 = .08$ | O = 3 E = 1.96 $\chi^2 = .55$ | O = 12 E = 9.42 $\chi^2 = .71$ | O = 8 E = 7.06 $\chi^2 = .13$ | 42 |
| School Board | O = 11 E = 8.51 $\chi^2 = .73$ | O = 24 E = 22.48 $\chi^2 = .10$ | O = 6 E = 5.47 $\chi^2 = .05$ | O = 2 E = 3.04 $\chi^2 = .36$ | O = 12 E = 14.58 $\chi^2 = .46$ | O = 10 E = 10.94 $\chi^2 = .08$ | 65 |
| Total | 14 | 37 | 9 | 5 | 24 | 18 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 4.54$. Non-significant at .05 with 5 df; table value 11.07.

TABLE 26

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF MAJOR PROBLEMS AT PRESENT TIME, BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | Chi-Square Value | | | | | | N |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----|
| | Curriculum | Personnel | Finance | Staff Morale | Building Program | Other | |
| | Area: Major Problems Today | | | | | | |
| Superintendent | O = 6 E = 3.14 $\chi^2 = 2.60$ | O = 7 E = 5.89 $\chi^2 = .21$ | O = 23 E = 23.55 $\chi^2 = .02$ | O = 2 E = .79 $\chi^2 = 1.88$ | O = 4 E = 6.28 $\chi^2 = .83$ | O = 0 E = 2.36 $\chi^2 = 2.36$ | 42 |
| School Board | O = 2 E = 4.86 $\chi^2 = 1.68$ | O = 8 E = 9.11 $\chi^2 = .14$ | O = 37 E = 36.45 $\chi^2 = .02$ | O = 0 E = 1.22 $\chi^2 = 1.22$ | O = 12 E = 9.72 $\chi^2 = .54$ | O = 6 E = 3.64 $\chi^2 = 1.53$ | 65 |
| Total | 8 | 15 | 60 | 2 | 16 | 6 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 13.03$. Significant at .025 with 5 df; table value 12.80.

Therefore, Hypothesis Four, there are no significant differences in board and superintendent views on the major problems in their school system prior to, and after, the hiring of a new superintendent was, in part, retained and, in part rejected at the .05 level of probability. The initial portion of the hypothesis, pertaining to the major problems in the school systems prior to the appointment of the new superintendent, was retained at the .05 level, whereas the latter portion of the hypothesis, regarding the major problems in school systems at the present time, was rejected at the .05 level of probability.

Hypothesis Number Five

The fifth hypothesis, stated in null form, was as follows:

There was no significant difference between the use or neglect of a definite plan and timetable in regard to hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures.

The data examined by this hypothesis are reported in Tables 27 to 38. The tables indicate that there are differences, significant at the .05 level and beyond, between school boards making use of a definite plan and timetable and those that did not, relative to selected board processes and procedures.

In Table 27 are found the chi-square values for responses of school boards and superintendents regarding the type of school division, with use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

The contribution of two cells, Plan/Timetable-Urban and No Plan/No Timetable-Urban, contributed most to the value of 13.60, significant at the .005 level of probability.

TABLE 27

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR TYPE OF SCHOOL DIVISION, WITH DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | | | N |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-----|
| | Largely Agricultural and Rural | Rural/ Urban | Urban | Suburban | |
| Area: Type of School Division-Plan and Timetable | | | | | |
| Plan/ Timetable | O = 11 E = 16.65 $\chi^2 = 1.92$ | O = 5 E = 7.09 $\chi^2 = .62$ | O = 10 E = 4.93 $\chi^2 = 5.21$ | O = 7 E = 4.32 $\chi^2 = 1.66$ | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | O = 43 E = 37.35 $\chi^2 = .85$ | O = 18 E = 15.97 $\chi^2 = .28$ | O = 16 E = 11.07 $\chi^2 = 2.32$ | O = 7 E = 9.68 $\chi^2 = .74$ | 74 |
| Total | 54 | 23 | 26 | 14 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 13.60$. Significant at .005 with 3 df; table value 12.80.

In Table 28 are found the chi-square values for responses of school boards and superintendents regarding the Organization (Manitoba Association of School Trustees) notified of a vacancy, with use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 4.60 was significant at the .05 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards with a definite plan and timetable appeared to notify the Manitoba Association of School Trustees of such a vacancy.

In Table 29 are found the chi-square values for responses of school boards and superintendents regarding the Institution (University of Manitoba) notified of a vacancy, with use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

TABLE 28

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR ORGANIZATION (MANITOBA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES) NOTIFIED OF VACANCY, WITH DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|--|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Organization Notified-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 14 | 19 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 15 | 59 | 74 |
| Total | 29 | 78 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 4.60$. Significant at .05 with 1 df; table value 3.84.

TABLE 29

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR INSTITUTION (UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA) NOTIFIED OF VACANCY, WITH DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|---|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Institution Notified-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 8 | 25 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 2 | 72 | 74 |
| Total | 10 | 97 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 10.08$. Significant at .005 with 1 df; table value 7.88.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 10.08 was significant at the .005 level of probability, thereby indicating that school

boards with a definite plan and timetable appeared to notify the University of Manitoba of such a vacancy.

In Table 30 are found the chi-square values for responses of school boards and superintendents regarding the use of a specific board policy statement, with use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 12.54 was significant at the .001 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards with a definite plan and timetable appeared to have a specific board policy statement.

TABLE 30

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR USE OF A SPECIFIC BOARD POLICY STATEMENT, WITH
DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Board Policy-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 11 | 22 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 4 | 70 | 74 |
| Total | 15 | 92 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 12.54$. Significant at .001 with 1 df; table value 10.83.

In Table 31 are found the chi-square values for the use of a recruitment committee in the recruitment of a superintendent, with use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

TABLE 31

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR USE OF A RECRUITMENT COMMITTEE WITH DEFINITE PLAN
AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|--|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Recruitment Committee-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 22 | 11 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 27 | 47 | 74 |
| Total | 49 | 58 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 7.21$. Significant at .01 with 1 df; table value 6.63.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 7.21 was significant at the .01 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards with a definite plan and timetable appeared to utilize a recruitment committee.

In Table 32 are found the chi-square values for the use of a recruitment brochure, with use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 10.35 was significant at the .005 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards with a definite plan and timetable appeared to use a recruitment brochure.

In Table 33 are found the chi-square values for boards having conducted a broad, public search, with use of a definite plan and timetable used as the criterion.

TABLE 32

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR USE OF A RECRUITMENT BROCHURE, WITH DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|---|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Recruitment Brochure-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 10 | 23 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 4 | 70 | 74 |
| Total | 14 | 93 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 10.35$. Significant at .005 with 1 df; table value 7.88.

TABLE 33

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR BROAD, PUBLIC SEARCH CONDUCTED WITH DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | U |
|--|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Public Search-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 29 | 4 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 28 | 46 | 74 |
| Total | 57 | 50 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 20.99$. Significant at .001 with 1 df; table value 10.83.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 20.99 was significant at the .001 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards with a definite plan and timetable appeared to conduct such a broad, public search.

In Table 34 are found the chi-square values for school boards having access to a ranked list of candidates, with use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 4.80 was significant at the .05 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards with a definite plan and timetable appeared to have access to such a ranked list of candidates.

TABLE 34

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR USE OF RANKED LIST OF CANDIDATES WITH DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Ranked List-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 23 | 10 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 33 | 41 | 74 |
| Total | 56 | 51 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 4.80$. Significant at the .05 level with 1 df; table value 3.84.

In Table 35 are found the chi-square values for the agent responsible for conducting the preliminary interview of candidates, with use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 10.74 was significant at the .005 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards with a definite plan and timetable do not appear to conduct the preliminary interview of candidates.

TABLE 35

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR CONDUCTING A PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW, WITH DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|--|------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| | School Board | Recruitment Committee | |
| Area: Preliminary Interview-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 14 | 19 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 57 | 17 | 74 |
| Total | 71 | 36 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 10.74$. Significant at .005 with 1 df; table value 7.88.

In Table 36 are found the chi-square values for participation of the recruitment committee in the final interview, with use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

TABLE 36

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR PARTICIPATION OF RECRUITMENT COMMITTEE IN FINAL INTERVIEW, WITH DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|---|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Participation of Recruitment Committee-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 21 | 12 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 25 | 49 | 74 |
| Total | 46 | 61 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 7.13$. Significant at .01 with 1 df; table value 6.64.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 7.13 was significant at the .01 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards with a definite plan and timetable appeared to have the recruitment committee participate in the final interview.

In Table 37 are found the chi-square values for the use of a uniform method of evaluating finalist candidates, with use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

TABLE 37

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR UNIFORM METHOD OF EVALUATING FINALIST CANDIDATES,
WITH DEFINITE PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|--|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Evaluation of Finalist Candidates-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 20 | 13 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 27 | 47 | 74 |
| Total | 47 | 60 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 4.46$. Significant at .05 with 1 df; table value 3.84.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 4.46 was significant at the .05 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards with a definite plan and timetable appeared to utilize a uniform method of evaluating finalist candidates.

In Table 38 are found the chi-square values for the official confirmation of the new superintendent's appointment at a public school board meeting, with the use of a definite plan and timetable as the criterion.

TABLE 38

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR OFFICIAL CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENT AT A PUBLIC BOARD MEETING, WITH PLAN AND TIMETABLE AS THE CRITERION

| Criterion | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|--|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Official Confirmation-Plan and Timetable | | | |
| Plan/Timetable | 31 | 2 | 33 |
| No Plan/ No Timetable | 46 | 28 | 74 |
| Total | 77 | 30 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 9.90$. Significant at .005 with 1 df; table value 7.88.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 9.90 was significant at the .005 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards with a definite plan and timetable appeared to officially confirm the new superintendent's appointment at a public board meeting.

Therefore, Hypothesis Five, there are no significant differences between the use or neglect of a definite plan and timetable by school boards in regard to hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures, was rejected at the .05 level and beyond, in the following 12 of 24 variables tested: Type of School Division ($\chi^2 = 13.60$, $P < .005$); Organization Notified of the Vacancy ($\chi^2 = 4.60$, $P < .05$); Institution Notified of the Vacancy ($\chi^2 = 10.08$, $P < .005$); Use of a Specific Board Policy Statement ($\chi^2 = 12.54$, $P < .001$); Use of a Recruitment Committee in Recruiting a New Superintendent ($\chi^2 = 7.21$, $P < .01$); Use of a Recruitment Brochure ($\chi^2 = 10.35$, $P < .005$); A Broad Public Search Conducted ($\chi^2 = 20.99$, $P < .001$); Use of a Ranked List of

Candidates ($\chi^2 = 4.80, P < .05$); Agent Responsible for Conducting Preliminary Interview ($\chi^2 = 10.74, P < .005$); Participation of the Recruitment Committee in the Final Interview ($\chi^2 = 7.13, P < .01$); Use of a Uniform Method of Evaluating Finalist Candidates ($\chi^2 = 4.46, P < .05$); and, Official Confirmation of Appointment at a Public Meeting ($\chi^2 = 9.90, P < .005$).

Hypothesis Number Six

The sixth hypothesis, stated in null form, was as follows:

There were no significant differences between methods of selection and processes of employment as reported by school board members and superintendents of schools.

The data examined by this hypothesis are reported in Tables 39 to 47. The tables indicate that there are differences, significant at the .05 level and beyond, between methods of selection and processes of employment as reported by school boards and superintendents of schools.

In Table 39 are found the chi-square values for the party responsible for the recruitment and selection of the Assistant Superintendent, according to the responses of superintendents and school boards. The contribution of four cells, Superintendent-School Board, Superintendent-Other, School Board-School Board, and School Board-Other, contributed most to the value of 37.82, significant at the .001 level. It is to be noted that the variable "Other" was identified as: School Board-Superintendent jointly; Superintendent-Recruitment Committee jointly; and, consulting firms.

In Table 40 are found the chi-square values for the media utilized to announce the vacancy, according to responses of superintendents and

TABLE 39

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF PARTY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RECRUITMENT
AND SELECTION OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | School Board | Chi-Square Value | | | | N |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|-----|
| | | Superintendent | Recruitment Committee | Does Not Apply | Other | |
| Area: Recruitment and Selection of Assistant Superintendent | | | | | | |
| Superintendent | O = 3 E = 15.09 χ^2 = 9.69 | O = 3 E = 4.53 χ^2 = .52 | O = 3 E = 1.89 χ^2 = .65 | O = 21 E = 16.22 χ^2 = 1.41 | O = 13 E = 5.28 χ^2 = 11.29 | 43 |
| School Board | O = 37 E = 24.91 χ^2 = 5.87 | O = 9 E = 7.47 χ^2 = .31 | O = 2 E = 3.11 χ^2 = .40 | O = 22 E = 26.78 χ^2 = .85 | O = 1 E = 8.72 χ^2 = 6.83 | 71 |
| Total | 40 | 12 | 5 | 43 | 14 | 114 |

χ^2 37.82. Significant at .001 with 4 df; table value 18.645.

school boards. The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Other and School Board-Other, contributed most to the value of 36.99, significant at the .001 level. It is to be noted that the variable "Other" was identified as: circular letter; school board member; a personal telephone call; and, School Inspector.

TABLE 40

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF MEDIA UTILIZED TO ANNOUNCE THE VACANCY, BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | Chi-Square Value | | | N |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|-----|
| | Newspaper | National Publications | Other | |
| Area: Media Utilized to Announce Vacancy | | | | |
| Superintendent | O = 27 E = 37.06 $\chi^2 = 2.73$ | O = 0 E = 2.48 $\chi^2 = 2.48$ | O = 22 E = 9.48 $\chi^2 = 16.53$ | 49 |
| School Board | O = 63 E = 52.94 $\chi^2 = 1.91$ | O = 6 E = 3.52 $\chi^2 = 1.75$ | O = 1 E = 13.52 $\chi^2 = 11.59$ | 70 |
| Total | 90 | 6 | 23 | 119 |

$\chi^2 = 36.99$. Significant at .001 with 2 df; table value 13.815.

In Table 41 are found the chi-square values for the manner in which school boards acknowledged applications, according to the responses of superintendents and school boards. The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Other and School Board-Other, contributed most to the table value of 31.17, significant at the .001 level. It is to be noted that the variable "Other" was identified as personal contact.

TABLE 41

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF MANNER IN WHICH SCHOOL BOARD ACKNOWLEDGED APPLICATIONS, BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | Letter | Chi-Square Value | | | N |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----|
| | | Postcard | Telephone | Other | |
| Area: Manner School Boards Acknowledged Applications | | | | | |
| Superintendent | O = 18 E = 29.33 $\chi^2 = 4.38$ | O = 2 E = 2.26 $\chi^2 = .03$ | O = 11 E = 7.53 $\chi^2 = 1.60$ | O = 13 E = 4.89 $\chi^2 = 13.43$ | 44 |
| School Board | O = 60 E = 48.67 $\chi^2 = 2.63$ | O = 4 E = 3.74 $\chi^2 = .02$ | O = 9 E = 12.47 $\chi^2 = .97$ | O = 0 E = 8.11 $\chi^2 = 8.11$ | 73 |
| Total | 78 | 6 | 20 | 13 | 117 |

$\chi^2 = 31.17$. Significant at .001 with 3 df; table value 16.268.

In Table 42 are found the chi-square values for the use of a recruitment brochure, according to the responses of superintendents and school boards.

TABLE 42

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF USE OF RECRUITMENT BROCHURE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Use of Recruitment Brochure | | | |
| Superintendent | 1 | 41 | 42 |
| School Board | 13 | 52 | 65 |
| Total | 14 | 93 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 5:50$. Significant at .02 with 1 df; table value 5.412.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 5.50 was significant at the .02 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards and superintendents appeared to differ in their perceptions regarding the use of a recruitment brochure.

In Table 43 are found the chi-square values for the nature of outside professional assistance, according to the responses of superintendents and school boards. The contribution of two cells, Superintendent-Professional Educator and School Board-Professional Educator, contributed most to the table value of 11.16, significant at the .025 level.

In Table 44 are found the chi-square values for advising unsuccessful candidates, according to the responses of superintendents and school boards.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 7.91 was significant at the .005 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards and superintendents appeared to differ in their perceptions regarding unsuccessful candidates being advised by school boards.

In Table 45 are found the chi-square values for school boards requiring more than one interview from each candidate, according to the responses of superintendents and school boards.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 4.73 was significant at the .05 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards and superintendents appeared to differ in their perceptions regarding the number of interviews conducted by school boards for each candidate.

TABLE 43

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF NATURE OF OUTSIDE PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | Chi-Square Value | | | | | N |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| | Executive Recruitment Firm | Management Consulting Firm | Professional Educator | Other | Does Not Apply | |
| Area: Nature of Outside Professional Assistance | | | | | | |
| Superintendent | O = 0 E = 1.16 $\chi^2 = 1.16$ | O = 1 E = .39 $\chi^2 = .98$ | O = 4 E = 1.55 $\chi^2 = 3.88$ | O = 3 E = 1.94 $\chi^2 = .58$ | O = 33 E = 35.97 $\chi^2 = .24$ | 41 |
| School Board | O = 3 E = 1.84 $\chi^2 = .73$ | O = 0 E = .61 $\chi^2 = .62$ | O = 0 E = 2.45 $\chi^2 = 2.45$ | O = 2 E = 3.06 $\chi^2 = .37$ | O = 60 E = 57.03 $\chi^2 = .15$ | 65 |
| Total | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 93 | 106 |

81

$\chi^2 = 11.16$. Significant at .025 with 4 df; table value 11.10.

TABLE 44

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER UNSUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES ARE ADVISED BY SCHOOL BOARDS, BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|---|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Unsuccessful Candidates Advised by School | | | |
| Superintendent | 16 | 26 | 42 |
| School Board | 44 | 21 | 65 |
| Total | 60 | 47 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 7.91$. Significant at .005 with 1 df; table value 7.88.

TABLE 45

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL BOARDS REQUIRING MORE THAN ONE INTERVIEW FROM EACH CANDIDATE, BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|---|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Board Requiring More Than One Interview Per Candidate | | | |
| Superintendent | 6 | 36 | 42 |
| School Board | 23 | 42 | 65 |
| Total | 29 | 78 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 4.73$. Significant at .05 with 1 df; table value 3.841.

In Table 46 are found the chi-square values for school boards in regard to whether more than one finalist candidate was interviewed at a single board meeting, according to the responses of superintendents and school boards.

TABLE 46

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER MORE THAN ONE FINALIST CANDIDATE WAS INTERVIEWED AT A SINGLE BOARD MEETING, BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|---|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Finalist Candidates Interviewed at a Single Board Meeting | | | |
| Superintendent | 15 | 27 | 42 |
| School Board | 38 | 27 | 65 |
| Total | 53 | 54 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 4.41$. Significant at .05 with 1 df; table value 3.841.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 4.41 was significant at the .05 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards and superintendents appeared to differ in their perceptions regarding the number of finalist candidates interviewed at a single board meeting.

In Table 47 are found the chi-square values for school boards using a uniform method for evaluating finalist candidates, according to the responses of superintendents and school boards.

It was observed that the chi-square value of 23.58 was significant at the .001 level of probability, thereby indicating that school boards and superintendents appeared to differ in their perceptions regarding the use of a uniform method for evaluating finalist candidates.

Therefore Hypothesis Six, there are no significant differences between methods of selection and processes of employment as reported by school boards and superintendents of schools, was rejected at the .05 level and beyond, in the following 9 of 28 variables tested: Party

TABLE 47

CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL BOARDS USING
A UNIFORM METHOD FOR EVALUATING FINALIST CANDIDATES, BY
SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

| Respondent | Chi-Square Value | | N |
|--|------------------|----|-----|
| | Yes | No | |
| Area: Uniform Method of Evaluating Finalist Candidates | | | |
| Superintendent | 5 | 37 | 42 |
| School Board | 42 | 23 | 65 |
| Total | 47 | 60 | 107 |

$\chi^2 = 23.58$. Significant at .001 with 1 df; table value 10.827.

Responsible for the Recruitment and Selection of an Assistant Superintendent ($\chi^2 = 37.82$, $P < .001$); Media Utilized to Announce the Vacancy ($\chi^2 = 36.99$, $P < .001$); Manner in Which School Boards Acknowledged Applications ($\chi^2 = 31.17$, $P < .001$); Use of a Recruitment Brochure ($\chi^2 = 5.50$, $P < .02$); Nature of Outside Professional Assistance ($\chi^2 = 11.16$, $P < .025$); Unsuccessful Candidates Advised by School Boards ($\chi^2 = 7.91$, $P < .005$); Boards Requiring More Than One Interview from Each Candidate ($\chi^2 = 4.73$, $P < .05$); Whether More Than One Finalist Candidate was Interviewed at a Single Board Meeting ($\chi^2 = 4.41$, $P < .05$); and, Use of a Uniform Method of Evaluating Finalist Candidates ($\chi^2 = 23.58$, $P < .001$).

The Research Questions

The two research questions generated by this study examined the feasibility of predicting superintendent turnover from selected sets of demographic and educational information. Specifically, the first research

question was concerned with which of the sets of selected demographic variables obtained from school boards contributed most to the predictability of superintendent turnover, while the second research question dealt with which of the sets of selected educational variables obtained from superintendent responses contributed most to the predictability of superintendent turnover. Each research question had as its common base the information collected from section A of both the School Board and Superintendent Instruments. The means and standard deviations are presented in Tables 48 and 49.

Since the research questions were concerned with sets of data, the information was classified into six distinct sets for the first research question, namely: (1) Type of school system, variable 1; (2) Student population, variable 2; (3) Number of superintendents hired within a school division since 1966, variable 3; (4) Duration of present superintendent's contract, variable 4; (5) Major problems when the new superintendent was hired, variable 5; and, (6) Major problems at the present time, variable 6. Similarly, the data for the second research question were classified into nine distinct sets, namely: (1) Age when first appointed superintendent, variable 1; (2) Degree status when first appointed superintendent, variable 2; (3) Present degree status, variable 3; (4) Year last degree granted, variable 4; (5) Major at graduate level, variable 5; (6) Teacher training in Manitoba, variable 6; (7) Years as a teacher prior to becoming a superintendent, variable 7; (8) Years of administrative experience, variable 8; and, (9) Status prior to becoming a superintendent, variable 9.

TABLE 48

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC DATA (N=65)

| No. | Variable Descriptor | Mean or Proportion | Standard Deviation |
|-----|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Type of School System | | |
| | - Largely Agricultural and Rural | .492 | .504 |
| | - Rural/Urban | .215 | .414 |
| | - Mostly Urban | .169 | .378 |
| | - Suburban | .108 | .312 |
| 2 | Student Population | 3899.77 | 3654.68 |
| 3 | Number of Superintendents Hired Within School Division | .585 | .635 |
| 4 | Duration of Superintendent's Contract (months) | 19.754 | 10.698 |
| 5 | Major Problems When New Superintendent Hired | | |
| | - Curriculum | .169 | .378 |
| | - Personnel | .369 | .486 |
| | - Finance | .092 | .292 |
| | - Staff Morale | .031 | .174 |
| | - Building Program | .185 | .364 |
| 6 | Major Problems at Present Time | | |
| | - Curriculum | .031 | .174 |
| | - Personnel | .123 | .331 |
| | - Finance | .569 | .499 |
| | - Staff Morale | .000 | .000 |
| | - Building Program | .185 | .391 |
| | - Other | .092 | .292 |

TABLE 49

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SELECTED SUPERINTENDENT EDUCATIONAL DATA (N=42)

| No. | Variable Descriptor | Mean or Proportion | Standard Deviation |
|-----|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Age When First Appointed Superintendent | 39.905 | 6.878 |
| 2 | Degree Status When First Appointed Superintendent | | |
| | - Ed.D. Degree | .00 | .00 |
| | - M.A. or M.Sc. Degree | .071 | .261 |
| | - M.Ed. Degree | .214 | .415 |
| | - B.A. or B.Sc. Degree | .452 | .504 |
| | - B.Ed. Degree | .571 | .501 |
| 3 | Present Degree Status | | |
| | - Ed.D. Degree | .024 | .154 |
| | - M.A. or M.Sc. Degree | .071 | .261 |
| | - M.Ed. Degree | .238 | .431 |
| | - B.A. or B.Sc. Degree | .452 | .504 |
| | - B.Ed. Degree | .548 | .504 |
| 4 | Year Last Degree Granted | 1963 | 5 |
| 5 | Major at Graduate Level | | |
| | - Educational Administration | .548 | .504 |
| | - Secondary Education | .095 | .297 |
| | - Elementary Education | .00 | .00 |
| | - Counseling and Guidance | .095 | .297 |
| | - English | .000 | .000 |
| | - Mathematics | .048 | .216 |

TABLE 49--Continued

| No. | Variable Descriptor | Mean or Proportion | Standard Deviation |
|-----|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| | - Science | .071 | .261 |
| | - Physical Education | .000 | .000 |
| | - Language | .048 | .216 |
| | - Other | .143 | .354 |
| 6 | Teacher Training in Manitoba | .762 | .431 |
| 7 | Years as Teacher Prior to Becoming Superintendent | 6.738 | 5.324 |
| 8 | Years of Administrative Experience | | |
| | - Assistant Superintendent | .619 | 1.396 |
| | - Principal | 6.429 | 5.128 |
| | - Assistant Principal | 2.333 | 4.525 |
| | - Supervisor | .786 | 2.343 |
| 9 | Status Prior to Becoming Superintendent | | |
| | - Assistant Superintendent | .190 | .397 |
| | - Principal | .595 | .497 |
| | - Assistant Principal | .048 | .216 |
| | - Supervisor | .095 | .297 |
| | - Teacher | .071 | .261 |

Once the data were classified into appropriate sets, a setwise backward multiple regression analysis was begun. This procedure eliminated sets of data from a prediction equation until the best predictor remained.

Research Question Number One

The first research question was stated as follows:

Which of the sets of selected demographic variables obtained from school boards contributed most to the predictability of superintendent turnover?

The results of the setwise backward multiple regression analysis were presented in Table 50. In reading the table of the results of the setwise elimination procedure, each step includes all subsequent sets and excludes the variable listed as the set eliminated plus all previously listed sets. The last step in this table was the single best predictor of the criterion.

TABLE 50

SETWISE BACKWARD ELIMINATION PROCEDURE FOR SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES, WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION

| Step | Set Eliminated | Multiple Correlation | Significance Level |
|------|--|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | None | .760 | P < .01 |
| 2 | Student Population | .758 | P < .01 |
| 3 | Duration of Superintendent's Contract | .737 | P < .01 |
| 4 | Type of School System | .704 | P < .01 |
| 5 | Major Problems Today | .661 | P < .01 |
| 6 | Superintendent Hired Within System | .485 | P < .05 |
| 7 | Major Problems When Superintendent First Appointed | | |

Table 50 evidences significant multiple correlations for the setwise backward regression, with superintendent turnover as the criterion. As the results indicate, the full model, which included all of the selected demographic variables, had a multiple correlation of .760 ($P < .01$). Significant correlations were obtained throughout the setwise elimination process. Major problems when the superintendent was first appointed emerged as the single best predictor ($R = .485$, $P < .05$).

Correlations of selected demographic variables, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, were presented in Table 51. As was inferred by the setwise backward regression analysis (see Table 50, variable 5, Major problems when the new superintendent was first appointed, was, by itself, significant in the case of superintendent turnover. Further examination indicated that variable 3, Number of superintendents hired within a school division, variable 4, Duration of superintendent's contract, and, variable 6, Major problems at the present time, were, by themselves, significant in the case of superintendent turnover.

Research Question Number Two

The second research question was stated as follows:

Which of the sets of selected educational variables obtained from superintendent responses contributed most to the predictability of superintendent turnover?

As in the previous analysis, the setwise backward multiple regression approach was utilized. It should be noted again that the multiple correlation for any given step was the correlation between the criterion variable and all the sets in subsequent steps, but

TABLE 51

CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WITH SUPERINTENDENT
TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION

| Predictor Demographic | Criterion Superintendent Turnover |
|--|---|
| 1 Type of School System | |
| - Largely Agricultural | -.088 |
| - Rural/Urban | .071 |
| - Mostly Urban | -.056 |
| - Suburban | .177 |
| 2 Student Population | .216 |
| 3 Superintendents Hired Within School Division | .472 ^a |
| 4 Duration of Superintendent's Contract | -.294 ^b |
| 5 Major Problems When New Superintendent Hired | |
| - Curriculum | -.199 |
| - Personnel | .054 |
| - Finance | .255 ^c |
| - Staff Morale | .246 ^c |
| - Building Program | -.172 |
| - Other | .143 |
| 6 Major Problems at Present Time | |
| - Curriculum | .091 |
| - Personnel | .191 |
| - Finance | .064 |
| - Staff Morale | .00 |
| - Building Program | .241 ^c |
| - Other | .162 |

^aSignificant at .001 level

^bSignificant at .02 level

^cSignificant at .05 level

excluded the variable labeled set eliminated and all previously eliminated sets.

The results of the setwise backward elimination procedure for selected educational variables, with superintendent turnover as the criterion, are presented in Table 52. As the results indicate, the full model, which included all of the selected educational variables, had a multiple correlation of .717 ($P > .05$). Non-significant correlations were also obtained throughout the setwise elimination procedure except for the last step, step 10, Teacher training in Manitoba. When the full model was restricted to include only Teacher training in Manitoba (step 10), the multiple correlation of .350 proved significant at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE 52

SETWISE BACKWARD ELIMINATION PROCEDURE FOR SELECTED EDUCATIONAL VARIABLES,
WITH SUPERINTENDENT TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION

| Step | Set Eliminated | Multiple Correlation | Significance Level |
|------|--|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | None | .717 | $P > .05$ |
| 2 | Years as Teacher Prior to Accepting First Administrative Position | .722 | $P > .05$ |
| 3 | Age When First Appointed Superintendent | .721 | $P > .05$ |
| 4 | Degree Status When First Appointed Superintendent | .718 | $P > .05$ |
| 5 | Year Last Degree Granted | .712 | $P > .05$ |
| 6 | Major at Graduate Level | .700 | $P > .05$ |
| 7 | Present Degree Status | .627 | $P > .05$ |
| 8 | Years of Administrative Experience | .481 | $P > .05$ |
| 9 | Administrative Status Prior to Becoming Superintendent | .350 | $P < .05$ |
| 10 | Teacher Training in Manitoba | | |

Correlations of selected educational variables with superintendent turnover as the criterion, were presented in Table 53. As was inferred by the setwise backward regression analysis (see Table 52), variable 6, Teacher training in Manitoba, was, by itself, significant at the .05 level of probability ($R=-.350$). Further examination indicated that variable 2, Degree status when first appointed superintendent, and variable 3, Present degree status, were, by themselves, significant at the .02 level of probability ($R=.372$ respectively).

TABLE 53

CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED EDUCATIONAL VARIABLES, WITH SUPERINTENDENT
TURNOVER AS THE CRITERION

| Predictor Educational | Criterion Superintendent Turnover |
|---|---|
| 1 Age When First Appointed Superintendent | .050 |
| 2 Degree Status When First Appointed Superintendent | |
| - Ed.D. Degree | .00 |
| - M.A. or M.Sc. Degree | .372 ^a |
| - M.Ed. Degree | .234 |
| - B.A. or B.Sc. Degree | .021 |
| - B.Ed. Degree | .129 |
| 3 Present Degree Status | |
| - Ed.D. Degree | .069 |
| - M.A. or M.Sc. Degree | .372 ^a |
| - M.Ed. Degree | .100 |
| - B.A. or B.Ed. Degree | .021 |
| - B.Ed. Degree | .021 |

TABLE 53--Continued

| Predictor Educational | Criterion Superintendent Turnover |
|---|---|
| 4 Year Last Degree Granted | .057 |
| 5 Major at Graduate Level | |
| - Educational Administration | -.107 |
| - Secondary Education | .073 |
| - Elementary Education | .00 |
| - Counseling and Guidance | .290 |
| - English | .00 |
| - Mathematics | -.100 |
| - Science | .00 |
| - Physical Education | .124 |
| - Language | .00 |
| - Other | -.100 |
| 6 Teacher Training in Manitoba | -.350 ^b |
| 7 Years as Teacher Prior to Becoming Superintendent | -.099 |
| 8 Years of Administrative Experience | |
| - Assistant Superintendent | .124 |
| - Principal | -.126 |
| - Assistant Principal | .138 |
| - Supervisor | .041 |
| 9 Status Prior to Becoming Superintendent | |
| - Assistant Superintendent | .271 |
| - Principal | -.022 |
| - Assistant Principal | -.100 |
| - Supervisor | -.145 |
| - Teacher | -.124 |

^aSignificant at .02 level.

^bSignificant at .05 level.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was concerned with current methods of selection and processes of employment utilized by school boards in hiring a superintendent of schools. The primary purpose was to identify and analyze methods of selection and processes of employment as perceived by school board members and superintendents of schools of Unitary School Divisions in the Province of Manitoba. In conjunction with the analyses, the relationship between perceived methods of selection and processes was investigated. A secondary purpose was to examine the predictability of superintendent turnover from selected sets of demographic and educational variables.

Two survey instruments were developed to gather data on methods of selection and processes of employment used in Manitoba Unitary School Divisions. Instrument I was designed for school board members having been involved in the recruitment and selection of a new superintendent of schools. Instrument II was developed for incumbent superintendents of schools of said school divisions. All instruments were mailed, during the second week of February, 1973, to participating school boards and superintendents of Unitary School Divisions in the Province of Manitoba. Efforts were exerted to make the directions for completing the two instruments simple and easy to understand.

The population consisted of all Unitary School Divisions throughout the Province of Manitoba. Of the 44 Superintendent Instruments mailed, 42 (95.45 per cent) were completed and returned. Of all the School Board Instruments mailed to the 44 Unitary School Division Boards, 35 school divisions (79.55 per cent) responded. The total number of school board members responding was 65, or an average of 2.03 respondents per Unitary School Division participating in the study. Of the data received from school superintendents, all (100 per cent) were usable. Of the data received from the 35 school divisions participating in the study, that of 32 (72.73 per cent) were acceptable and utilized in the analysis.

Aspects of methods of selection and processes of employment were analyzed by testing the following null hypotheses:

1. There were no significant differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures for the recruitment and selection of a superintendent.
2. There were no significant differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures on the basis of selected demographic and educational variables.
3. There were no significant differences between the presence or absence of a specific board policy statement in regard to hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures.
4. There was no significant difference in board and superintendent views on the major problems in their school system prior to, and after, the hiring of a new superintendent.

5. There was no significant difference between the use or neglect of a definite plan and timetable in regard to hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures.
6. There were no significant differences between methods of selection and processes of employment as reported by school board members and superintendents of schools.

To examine the feasibility of predicting superintendent turnover, the following research questions were generated:

1. Which of the sets of selected demographic variables obtained from school boards contributed most to the predictability of superintendent turnover?
2. Which of the sets of selected educational variables obtained from superintendent responses contributed most to the predictability of superintendent turnover?

Responses from the survey instruments, together with an identification letter and card number identification, were coded and punched on IBM cards.

The statistical techniques utilized for this study were analysis of variance by regression, stepwise backward analysis of regression, backward elimination setwise regression and chi-square treatment. The first two null hypotheses were tested by a one-way analysis of variance using the multiple linear regression and stepwise backward analysis of regression techniques to determine F-ratios. The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth null hypotheses were tested by utilizing the chi-square statistical procedure. The setwise backward elimination procedure was used to analyze the two research questions.

The findings of the study may be summarized as follows:

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis, stated in the null form, was that there were no significant differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures for the recruitment and selection of a superintendent. The analysis revealed that there were significant ($P < .05$ and beyond) differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures in the areas of Specific Board Policy, Questions Related to Salary and Fringe Benefits, Organizations Notified of the Vacancy, Checks Conducted on Finalist Candidates, and, Organizations and/or Institutions Notified of the Vacancy. No other areas were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level of probability.

Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis, stated in null form, was that there were no significant differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures on the basis of selected demographic and educational variables. The analysis revealed that there were significant ($P < .05$ and beyond) differences between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures in the areas of Board Satisfaction with Services of Former Superintendent, Teacher Training in Manitoba, Manner Former Superintendent was Released, Major Problems at Time when the New Superintendent was Appointed, Major Problems at the Present Time, Agent Responsible for Recruiting and Selecting Assistant Superintendent, Degree Status of Superintendent when First Appointed, and,

Present Degree Status of Superintendent. No other areas were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level of probability.

Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis, stated in null form, was that there were no significant differences between the presence or absence of a specific board policy statement in regard to hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures. The analysis revealed that there were significant ($P < .05$ and beyond) differences between the presence or absence of a specific board policy statement and its effect on selected board processes and procedures in the areas of Type of School Division, Institution Notified of the Vacancy, Use of a Definite Plan and Timetable, Use of a Recruitment Committee in the Selection of a New Superintendent, Agent Responsible for Conducting the Preliminary Interview of Candidates, and Official Confirmation of Appointment of New Superintendent at a Public Board Meeting. No other areas were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level of probability.

Hypothesis Four

The fourth hypothesis, stated in null form, was that there was no significant difference in board and superintendent views on the major problems in their school system prior to, and after, the hiring of a new superintendent. The analysis revealed that there were no significant ($P < .05$) differences in board and superintendent views on the major problems in their school system prior to the hiring of the new superintendent. However, the analysis further revealed that there were significant ($P < .025$) differences in board and superintendent views on the major problems in their school system at the present time.

Hypothesis Five

The fifth hypothesis, stated in null form, was that there was no significant difference between the use or neglect of a definite plan and timetable in regard to hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures. The analysis revealed that there were significant ($P < .05$ and beyond) differences between the use or neglect of a definite plan and timetable in hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes in the areas of Type of School Division, Organization Notified of the Vacancy, Institution Notified of the Vacancy, Use of a Specific Board Policy Statement, Use of a Recruitment Committee in Recruiting and Selecting a New Superintendent, Use of a Recruitment Brochure, A Broad, Public Search Conducted, Use of a Ranked List of Candidates, Agent Responsible for Conducting Preliminary Interview, Participation of the Recruitment Committee in the Final Interview, Use of a Uniform Method of Evaluating Finalist Candidates, and Official Confirmation of Appointment at a Public Board Meeting. No other areas were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level of probability.

Hypothesis Six

The sixth hypothesis, stated in null form, was that there were no significant differences between methods of selection and processes of employment as reported by school board members and superintendent of schools. The analysis revealed that there were significant ($P < .05$ and beyond) differences between methods of selection and processes of employment as reported by school board members and superintendents of schools in the areas of Party Responsible for the Recruitment and Selection of

an Assistant Superintendent, Media utilized to Announce the Vacancy; Manner School Boards Acknowledged Applications, Use of a Recruitment Brochure, Nature of Outside Professional Assistance; Unsuccessful Candidates Advised by School Boards, Boards Requiring More than One Interview from Each Candidate, Boards Requiring More than One Finalist Candidate to be Interviewed at a Board Meeting, and, Use of a Uniform Method of Evaluating Finalist Candidates. No other areas were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level of probability.

Research Question One

The first research question was concerned with which of the sets of selected demographic variables obtained from school boards contributed most to the predictability of superintendent turnover. The analysis revealed that the single best predictor of superintendent turnover was "Major Problems When the New Superintendent was First Appointed." Further analysis of the remaining sets of variables revealed significant ($P < .01$) multiple correlations in each instance, that is, for: the Full Model ($R=.760$); Student Population ($R=.758$); Duration of Superintendent's Contract ($R=.737$); Type of School System ($R=.704$); Major Problems Today ($R=.661$); and, Number of Superintendents Hired from Within the System ($R=.485$).

Research Question Two

The second research question was concerned with which of the sets of selected educational variables obtained from superintendent responses contributed most to the predictability of superintendent turnover. The analysis revealed that the single best predictor of superintendent turnover related to educational variables was "Teacher Training in Manitoba."

The multiple correlations (R) of all other sets in the analysis were not found to be statistically significant at the .05 level.

Discussion and Conclusions

The following conclusions, as limited by the research population, were drawn from the major findings of this study.

1. Since significant differences occurred between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures for the recruitment and selection of a superintendent, hypothesis one was rejected.

It may be concluded that those school boards that experienced a significantly lower superintendent turnover: (a) utilized a specific board policy statement, (b) initiated questions related to salary and fringe benefits, (c) notified educational organizations and/or institutions of their vacancy, and (d) conducted checks on finalist candidates.

2. Significant differences existed between superintendent turnover and board processes and procedures on the basis of selected demographic and educational variables and, as such, hypothesis two was rejected.

It may be concluded that those school boards that experienced a significantly lower superintendent turnover: (a) reported satisfaction with the services of their former superintendent, (b) hired superintendents trained in the Province of Manitoba, (c) permitted their former superintendent to resign, (d) experienced major problems in areas other than Personnel, Building Program and Curriculum at the time when the new superintendent was hired, and (e) have major problems today in areas other than Building Program and Finance. In addition, school boards, which were assisted by the incumbent superintendent in the recruitment and selection of an Assistant Superintendent, and which hired

superintendents with a master's degree in education, also experienced a significantly lower superintendent turnover.

3. Since significant differences occurred between the presence or absence of a specific board policy statement in regard to hiring a superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures, hypothesis three was rejected.

It may be concluded that those school boards which made use of a specific board policy statement in the search for a new superintendent of schools, were: (a) urban in type, (b) notified the University of Brandon, (c) used a definite plan and timetable, (d) appointed a recruitment committee for the selection of a new superintendent, (e) delegated the responsibility for conducting the preliminary interview of candidates to a recruitment committee, and (f) officially confirmed the appointment of the new superintendent at a public meeting of the board.

4. Since there were no significant differences between board and superintendent views on the major problems in school systems prior to the hiring of the new superintendent, it may be concluded that the two groups perceived such problems in a similar fashion. To this end, hypothesis four was retained in part.

Since significant differences were found between board and superintendent views on the major problems at the present time, hypothesis four was also rejected in part. It may be concluded that the superintendents' reported perception, of Curriculum being the major problem at the present time, was significantly different from that reported by school boards.

5. Since significant differences occurred between the use or neglect of a definite plan and timetable in regard to hiring a

superintendent and its effect on selected board processes and procedures, hypothesis five was rejected.

It may be concluded that school boards, which made use of a definite plan and timetable in the search for a new superintendent of schools, were: (a) urban in type, (b) notified the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, (c) notified the University of Manitoba, (d) had a specific board policy statement, (e) appointed a recruitment committee, (f) prepared a recruitment brochure, (g) conducted a broad, public search, (h) utilized a ranked list of candidates, (i) delegated the responsibility of conducting the preliminary interview to a recruitment committee; (j) permitted the recruitment committee to participate in the final interview of candidates, (k) used a uniform method of evaluating finalist candidates, and (l) officially confirmed the appointment of the new superintendent at a public board meeting.

6. Significant differences occurred between methods of selection and processes of employment as reported by school boards and superintendents of schools and, as such, hypothesis six was rejected.

It may be concluded that school boards and superintendents were in disagreement in regard to: (a) the party responsible for the recruitment and selection of an Assistant Superintendent, (b) the media utilized to announce the vacancy, (c) the manner school boards acknowledged applications, (d) the use of a recruitment brochure, (e) the nature of outside professional assistance, (f) unsuccessful candidates being advised by school boards, (g) school boards requiring more than one interview from each candidate, (h) whether school boards interviewed more than one finalist candidate at a single board meeting, and (i) the use of uniform method of evaluating candidates.

7. The best set of demographic variables, as limited by the instrument, for predicting superintendent turnover, consisted of the variable identified as major problems at the time the new superintendent was first appointed.

It may be concluded that school boards, which hired a superintendent who, subsequently, was unable to resolve the major problems of the school division, experienced a significantly higher superintendent turnover.

8. The best set of educational variables, as limited by the instrument, for predicting superintendent turnover, was identified as the variable Teacher Training in Manitoba.

It may be concluded that school boards, which hired superintendents trained in the Province of Manitoba, experienced a significantly lower superintendent turnover.

Recommendations

The results of the study lead to the following recommendations.

1. The Manitoba Association of School Trustees should provide leadership for its membership by conducting area or regional workshops for the purpose of orienting school boards as to recommended policies and procedures to be used in the selection of a new superintendent of schools.

2. The Manitoba Association of School Trustees should provide its membership with a set of systematic and objective procedures patterned after professionally prepared guidelines to assist school boards which are seeking a new superintendent of schools.

3. The major professional organizations and/or institutions in the Province of Manitoba, such as the Manitoba Teacher's Society, the Department of Education, the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba, the Faculty of Education at the University of Brandon, and l'Institut Pédagogique at Le Collège de St-Boniface, should all play a more active role through the recommendation of potential candidates to school boards searching for a new superintendent of schools.

4. This study should be replicated and extended to cover a larger geographical base. This should be done to see if the findings of this study can be duplicated in provinces other than Manitoba.

Recommended Guidelines for the Selection Process

The search for, and the final selection of, a chief executive officer of a school division is permeated with problems of real proportion, problems which can eventually produce deep satisfactions or which can burst forth with agonizing results both immediate and long range. In spite of its sincerity, the search for such an administrator, too often, ends in the eventual selection of a "favorite son," that is, in the actual appointment being secured by "pull" or by knowing the right person at the appropriate time.

The implications are clear. It is incumbent upon any school board, wishing to obviate to as great a degree as possible any negative results, to approach the selection process fully aware of exactly what it wants in a new superintendent and fully knowledgeable about the procedures most likely to locate the man or woman best suited for the position. It is, therefore, imperative that school boards, faced with this task, make every conceivable effort to guarantee that the selection process does not become a hurried activity.

Research supports the use of a systematic set of objective procedures patterned after professionally prepared guidelines (Baker, 1952; Reeves, 1954; Morris, 1965; Griffiths, 1966; Karrick, 1966; American Association of School Administrators, 1968; Grieder, 1969; California School Boards Association, 1970; Dowler, 1970; and, Public Education Association, 1970).

Analysis of related literature and research, combined with the findings of this study, have lead the writer to develop and to recommend to school boards the following guidelines. Two sections are presented: A - General Policies, designed to provide school boards with a basic foundation on which to build an effective selection process and, B - Criteria for the Selection Process, designed to provide school boards with a systematic and objective approach to the selection process.

A - General Policies

1. Adoption of a board policy statement to provide for a recruitment and screening committee.

It is recommended that school boards appoint a recruitment and screening committee to spearhead the search for a qualified candidate. Such a committee should include the board chairman and two or three board members. Cooperatively with the professional advisor, if one is secured, the committee should: (a) make all arrangements for the various steps in the recruitment effort; (b) handle all correspondence related to the search; (c) prepare the contents of the recruitment brochure; (d) carefully review all applications and eliminate participants which do not meet the established qualifications; (e) conduct the preliminary screening; and (f) prepare a ranked list of candidates for board consideration.

Of necessity, adequate office space and secretarial assistance should be available to the committee and its advisor.

2. Adoption of a board policy statement to provide for outside, objective, professional assistance.

The selection of a new superintendent of schools is not only the most important decision made by a school board, it is also the most difficult. As a result, many school boards have found it invaluable to seek outside professional assistance. Such a policy has helped to ensure fair and ethical procedures. Under no circumstances should members of the school division staff be used as advisor or secretarial assistant in the search for a new superintendent. Rather, it is recommended that school boards secure the services of either an executive recruitment firm, a managing consulting firm, or a professional educator. The role of the advisor, in this instance, could include the following: (a) assisting the board in the re-evaluation of its role in policy-making; (b) identifying the needs and resources of the school division and the community; (c) defining the desired personal and professional qualifications of the successful candidate; (d) aiding in the search for qualified and experienced candidates; (e) helping in the development of an appropriate recruitment brochure; (f) assisting in contacting and advising professional institutions and organizations of the vacancy, as well as requesting their advice; (g) assisting in the securing and evaluating of the credentials of candidates; and, (h) helping to conduct the preliminary interviews and screening of candidates.

3. Adoption of a board policy statement that would ensure a reassessment of board and community needs whenever a new superintendent was being sought.

A major task of the advisor would be to assist the board in formulating guiding criteria for the selection process. The board may wish the advisor or its appointed committee to interview representatives of interested community groups to discuss sensitive areas. This process would give the board an unparalleled opportunity to involve the community as a basis for determining the necessary and desired qualifications of the new superintendent. It is recommended that the committee and its advisor make themselves readily available to the members of the board as a whole, to key administrative personnel, as well as to representatives of teacher, community, and parent organizations. It is further recommended that delegations from the above-mentioned groups or organizations be encouraged to submit written summaries of suggestions as to the special problems a new superintendent would face, an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the current school program, and the criteria they deem important to the qualifications of the new superintendent.

4. Adoption of a board policy statement that would promote the preparation of a recruitment brochure.

It is recommended that a job description and a list of criteria for selecting the new superintendent be incorporated in a recruitment brochure and made readily available to aspiring candidates. The contents of the brochure would be based upon a comprehensive analysis and inventory of the school division and community needs as originally prepared by the recruitment committee and its advisor. Problem areas, as well as positive statements about the school division and community,

should be included in the brochure. The brochure might include the following information: (a) a statement of the selection procedure; (b) information required of applicants; (c) address where applications should be forwarded; (d) the cut-off date for new applications; (e) a statement of required personal and professional qualifications; (f) terms of employment; (g) information regarding the community; (h) a description of the school division: size, number of schools; enrollments, educational programs, financial status, characteristics of student body, caliber of teaching personnel, etc.; and, (i) an assessment of current and projected educational programs and needs.

5. Adoption of a board policy statement that would ensure the use of a definite plan and timetable to guide the selection process.

The board should adopt a policy statement that would establish a calendar of dates and provide direction to the selection process. Allowing for considerable flexibility, the calendar should incorporate the following: (a) the announcement of the vacancy, (b) the cut-off date for new applications, (c) the completion date of preliminary interviews and screening of candidates, (d) the setting of the time and place for special board meetings to be devoted to the selection of the new superintendent, and the date the new superintendent would be expected to take office.

Responsibility for carefully planning the steps to be taken in conducting the search and establishing a timetable for completing each step should rest with the recruitment committee and its advisor. After adoption by the board as a whole, each board member should be given a copy of the plan.

6. Adoption of a board policy statement that would ensure a broad, public search.

It is recommended that school boards adopt a policy statement that would not only encourage local personnel to submit an application, but also qualified administrators from outside the school system as well. School boards must protect the schools against complacency, stagnation, and, especially, politics. Yet, at the same time, boards must reward superior service with promotion if they wish enthusiasm for personal and professional growth to permeate the staff. Thus, the board should systematically review the qualifications of local staff members to determine which ones meet the criteria set by the board. At the same time, the board must remain objective in its thinking and assure equal opportunity to all aspiring candidates.

7. Adoption of a board policy statement that would provide adequate financial support for the selection process.

The board should arrange to meet with the members of its recruitment committee, as well as its advisor, to carefully examine the recommended procedures and the approximate budget judged reasonable and necessary to carry out its search efficiently. Among the expenditures to be covered by such funds are: (a) general office and personnel expenses; (b) advisor fee and travel expenses; (c) expenses related to the announcement of the vacancy; (d) interview expenses, including travel expenses of candidates summoned; and, (e) attorney fee for the legal preparation of a contract.

8. Adoption of a board policy statement that would ensure equal opportunity to both men and women.

Almost invariably, school boards today limit the field of selection, either consciously or unconsciously, by failing actively to seek as candidates, not only men but women as well. That women are excluded is borne out by the fact that the writer is aware of only one woman who is acting in the capacity of superintendent of schools in the entire Province of Manitoba. This situation is equally true of other provinces in the Dominion of Canada, as well as in the United States of America.

9. Adoption of a board policy statement that would request the successful candidate to undergo a thorough medical examination before appointment.

The position of superintendent of schools is known to exert continued great pressure on the incumbent, necessitating good health and high energy output. Thus, it is recommended that school boards adopt a policy statement requesting the choice candidate to undergo a thorough medical examination from an impartial physician chosen by the board. School boards may elect to arrange the physical examination through an organization which specializes in preemployment medical examinations.

10. Adoption of a board policy statement that would set the salary range, as well as the duration of the superintendent's initial contract.

It is recommended that school boards establish a salary range within which it expects to remunerate its chief executive officer. This policy would facilitate the task of the recruitment and its advisor in the preparation of the recruitment brochure and the announcement of the vacancy. Barring provincial statutes to the contrary, school boards should also adopt a policy statement

stating the length of the initial contract. An initial contract of two to three years appears to be both customary and desirable.

B - Criteria for the Selection Process

1. Appointment of a recruitment committee and a professional advisor.

As soon as a vacancy exists, school boards should appoint a recruitment committee and decide if a professional advisor is needed. The appointed committee's first task is to establish the needs and resources of the school division and the community.

2. Preparation of a recruitment brochure.

Having established the needs and resources of the school division and the community, the appointed committee should set forth to prepare a recruitment brochure that would incorporate a comprehensive statement of desired qualifications (professional, personal, business, etc.). Final approval, by the board as a whole, should be secured before distribution.

3. Formulation of a definite plan and timetable.

The board, through its appointed committee and advisor, should formulate a calendar of events setting deadlines for each step in the selection process. Further, a tentative budget should be agreed upon at this time.

4. Announcement of the vacancy.

As soon as the afore-mentioned steps have been executed, the vacancy should be announced publicly. A release to newspapers, radio and television will help to convey this information. Further, information should be disseminated to placement bureaus, leading universities, administrator's and teacher's organizations, as well as other

professional institutions. The announcement should indicate the availability of a recruitment brochure.

5. Preliminary screening and interviewing.

The board should delegate, to its appointed committee, the responsibility for eliminating all candidates who do not meet the board's specified requirements. The board should also provide the committee with adequate personnel and work space. When the screening process has identified the most qualified candidates, the board as a whole should review all confidential papers. Supplemental information on each candidate should be sought by the appointed committee if more data is needed. The five or six most promising candidates should, thereafter, be interviewed in executive session. They should be invited, at board expenses, to meet with the board to determine more fully their qualifications for the position. A record should be kept of every interview. It is imperative that a uniform method of evaluating each of the candidates be developed and utilized.

6. Interviewing finalist candidates.

Subsequent to the preliminary screening and interviewing of candidates, the appointed committee should recommend no more than three or four of the top ranking candidates to the board. The board should recall the choice candidates for a second interview, again at board expense. At this point, the board may wish to obtain each candidate's written reactions to school policies and problems and check, further, all references. Every conceivable effort should be made to visit the community of choice candidates before a final selection is made.

7. Final selection of the new superintendent.

The records of the top ranking candidates, collected during the first and second interviews, should again be reviewed by the entire board. A final, unanimous selection should be made and the terms of employment should be agreed upon. It is recommended that a second choice be determined at this time in the event that the first candidate should decline the offer. The successful candidate should then be formally notified and requested to meet the board to discuss the terms of employment. Prior to appointment, the successful candidate should be requested to undergo a thorough medical examination.

8. Announcement and notification of appointment.

As soon as the board has officially signed an employment contract with its new superintendent, it should release an appropriate announcement to the press, radio and TV indicating something about the new chief executive officer's background and the date on which his duties will be assumed. Simultaneously, the board should request its appointed committee to notify all unsuccessful candidates that the position has been filled and by whom. Finally, all confidential papers and related correspondence should be returned promptly to all unsuccessful candidates, as well as all placement bureaus.

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL BOARD INSTRUMENT

INSTRUMENT I-SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

DO NOT ANSWER THIS QUESTIONNAIRE UNLESS YOU HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN THE RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF A SUPERINTENDENT.

Answer all questions either by circling the correct response in the margin at the left or by placing a check-mark or by filling in the required information in the space provided. Note that Y is yes; N is no; and D is does not apply.

A - Demographic Information:

1. How many years have you been a school trustee: (Include this year) _____
2. Is your school system _____ largely agricultural and rural? _____ about evenly distributed between rural and urban? _____ mostly urban? _____ suburban _____
3. Student enrollment in entire school division? _____
4. Staff count in entire school division? _____
5. How many years has it been since your school system last hired a new superintendent? _____
6. a) How many superintendents have been hired in your system since 1966? _____
b) How many of these were hired from within the school division? _____
- Y N 7. Were you, as a member of the board, satisfied with the services of the former superintendent?
D
8. Was the former superintendent _____ asked to resign at the request of the board? _____ permitted to resign? _____ dismissed? _____ does not apply.
9. What is the duration of the present superintendent's contract? _____ years
10. How would you classify the major problem in your school system at the time of the appointment of the new superintendent? _____ curriculum; _____ personnel; _____ finance; _____ staff morale; _____ building program; other (specify) _____
11. How would you classify the major problem in your school system at the present time? _____ curriculum; _____ personnel; _____ finance; _____ staff morale; _____ building program; other (specify) _____

12. Who is primarily engaged in the recruitment and selection of an assistant superintendent in your school system? _____ school board; _____ superintendent; _____ recruitment committee; _____ does not apply; _____ other (specify) _____

B - Announcement of Vacancy:

13. What media were utilized to publicly announce the vacancy? _____ newspaper; _____ national publications; _____ radio; _____ T.V.; _____ other _____
14. Which of the following institutions or organizations were notified of the vacancy? _____ University of Manitoba; _____ University of Brandon; _____ M.A.S.S.; _____ M.A.S.T.; _____ M.T.S.; _____ Dep't. of Education; _____ other (specify) _____
15. At what time of the year was the vacancy announced? _____ month.
16. How did the board acknowledge receipt of applications? _____ letter; _____ postcard; _____ telephone; _____ other (specify) _____

C - Selection Process:

- Y N 17. Does the board have a specific policy statement in regard to hiring a new superintendent?
- Y N 18. Was a plan and a definite timetable prepared in this search?
- Y N 19. Was a recruitment committee appointed for the selection?
- Y N 20. Was a recruitment brochure containing information about such things as the school system, the community and qualifications expected of a candidate prepared?
- Y N 21. a) Does the board seek outside professional assistance in the selection process?
- b) What was the nature of such professional assistance? _____ executive recruitment firm; _____ management consulting firm; _____ professional educator; _____ does not apply; _____ other (specify) _____
- Y N c) Was a broad, public search conducted?
- Y N d) Were representatives from interested community groups involved?
- Y N e) Were representatives from the administrative and teaching staffs involved in the selection process?

D - Preliminary Screening:

- Y N 22. Did the board or its representatives visit the community of its favored candidates before a final choice was made?
- Y N 23. Was the appointment of the choice candidate contingent upon the results of a standard preemployment medical examination?
- Y N 24. Were unsuccessful candidates advised of the board's decision prior to any official announcement?

E - Preliminary Interviewing:

- Y N 25. Was a ranked list of candidates prepared for board consideration?
- Y N 26. Are candidates, seriously being considered by the board, so advised?
27. Which of the following conducted the preliminary interviewing?
 _____ school board; _____ recruitment committee; _____ other
 (specify) _____
- Y N 28. Were candidates provided an opportunity to ask questions about the school system and the community during the interview?
- Y N 29. Did the board initiate discussions of such areas as salary and fringe benefits during this initial interview?

F - Interviewing Finalist Candidates:

- Y N 30. Did the board require more than one interview of any given candidates?
- Y N 31. Was more than one finalist candidate interviewed at one board meeting?
32. Reference checks on finalist candidates are done by: _____ mail;
 _____ telephone; _____ in person; _____ does not apply; _____ other
- Y N 33. Did the recruitment committee participate in the final inter-
 D viewing stages?
34. How many candidates were summoned for final interviews? _____
- Y N 35. Was a uniform method of evaluating finalists employed?
- Y N 36. Was the appointment officially confirmed at a public meeting of the school board?
37. How much time was given to the successful candidate to accept the position? _____

1872

APPENDIX B

SUPERINTENDENT INSTRUMENT

INSTRUMENT II-SUPERINTENDENTS

Answer all questions either by circling the correct response in the margin at the left or by placing a check-mark or filling in the required information in the space provided. Note that Y is yes; N is no; U is unknown; and D is does not apply.

A - Demographic Information:

1. Is your school division _____ largely agricultural and rural?
_____ about evenly divided between rural and urban? _____
mostly urban? _____ suburban?
2. Student enrollment in entire school division? _____
3. Staff count in entire school division? _____
4. a) Number of years as a superintendent (Include this year)

- b) Number of years as a superintendent in previous school
division _____
5. Number of years as a superintendent in present school
division _____
6. Age at which you accepted your first superintendency _____
7. Check the category that best describes your present degree
status: _____ earned doctorate; _____ master's degree other
than M.Ed.; _____ M.Ed.; _____ bachelor's degree other than
B.Ed.; _____ B.Ed.; _____ no degree
8. In what year was your last degree granted? _____
9. Check the category that best describes your degree status at
the time of your appointment to your present superintendency:
_____ earned doctorate; _____ master's degree other than M.Ed.;
_____ M.Ed.; _____ bachelor's degree other than B.Ed.; _____
B.Ed.; _____ no degree
10. What was your major at the graduate level? _____ Ed. Admin.;
_____ Sec. Ed.; _____ El. Ed.; _____ Counseling & Guidance;
_____ English; _____ Math; _____ Science; _____ Phy. Ed.; _____
Language; _____ other (specify) _____
- Y N 11. Did you undertake your teacher training in the Province of
Manitoba?
12. How many years were you a teacher before you accepted your
first administrative position?

13. How many years of administrative experience do you have as:
 _____ assistant superintendent; _____ principal; _____ ass't.
 principal; _____ supervisor
14. What was your status prior to your first appointment as super-
 intendent? _____ assistant superintendent; _____ principal;
 _____ ass't. principal; _____ supervisor; _____ teacher
15. How many different superintendencies have you held to date?

16. How would you classify the major problem in your present
 school division at the time of your appointment: _____ cur-
 riculum; _____ personnel; _____ finance; _____ staff morale;
 _____ building program; _____ other (specify) _____
17. What is the length of your present contract? _____
18. How would you classify the present major problem in your
 school division? _____ curriculum; _____ personnel; _____
 finance; _____ staff morale; _____ building program; _____
 other (specify) _____
19. Who is primarily engaged in the recruitment and selection of
 an assistant superintendent in your school division? _____
 school board; _____ superintendent; _____ recruitment committee;
 _____ does not apply; _____ other (specify) _____

B - Announcement of Vacancy:

20. How did you come to learn about the vacancy at the superin-
 tendent level? _____ newspaper; _____ national publications;
 _____ radio; _____ T.V.; _____ other _____
21. Which of the following institutions or organizations were
 notified of the vacancy? _____ University of Manitoba; _____
 University of Brandon; _____ M.A.S.S.; _____ M.A.S.T.; _____
 M.T.S.; _____ Dep't. of Education; _____ other (specify)

22. At what time of the year was the vacancy announced? (Month)

23. How was your application acknowledged by the board? _____
 letter; _____ postcard; _____ telephone; _____ other (specify)

C - Selection Process:

- Y N 24. Does your present school board have a specific board policy
 in regard to hiring a superintendent?
- Y N
- U 25. Was a plan and a definite timetable prepared for this search?

- Y N 26. Were you an employee of your present school board at the time of your appointment as superintendent?
- Y N 27. Was a recruitment committee organized to search for the new
U superintendent?
- Y N 28. Did you have access to any form of recruitment brochure when you applied for your present position?
- Y N 29. To your knowledge:
a) did the school board seek outside professional assistance in the selection process?

b) what was the nature of such professional assistance? _____ executive recruitment firm; _____ management consulting firm; _____ professional educator; _____ other (specify) _____; does not apply

c) was a broad, public search for candidates conducted?
Y N
U D
Y N
U d) were representatives from interested community groups involved?

e) were representatives from the administrative and teaching staffs involved in the selection process?
Y N
U

D - Preliminary Screening:

- Y N 30. Did the board or its representatives visit the community where
D you were employed prior to your appointment?
- Y N 31. Was your appointment contingent upon the results of a standard preemployment medical examination?
- Y N 32. Were unsuccessful candidates so advised prior to the official
U announcement of your appointment?

E - Preliminary Interviewing:

- Y N 33. Were you advised that you were seriously being considered for the position?
34. Which of the following conducted the preliminary interviewing?
_____ school board; _____ recruitment committee; _____ other
(specify) _____
- Y N 35. Was the interview conducted within school division boundaries?
- Y N 36. Were you given an opportunity to ask questions about the school system and the community at the time of the preliminary interview?
- Y N 37. Were discussions of such areas as salary and fringe benefits initiated by the school board at the time of the preliminary interview?

F - Interviewing Finalist Candidates:

- Y N 38. Did the school board require that you be interviewed more than once?
- Y N 39. Was more than one finalist candidate interviewed at one
U board meeting?
- Y N 40. Did the recruitment committee participate in this final
D interviewing stage?
- Y N 41. Was a uniform method of evaluating candidates employed?
U
- Y N 42. Was your appointment officially confirmed at a public
U meeting of the school board?
43. How much time did you have to decide whether to accept the position? _____

APPENDIX C

SUPERINTENDENT LETTER

February 8, 1973.

TO ALL SUPERINTENDENTS IN THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA:

A study, under the supervision of Dr. C. M. Morris, Professor of Education, Center for Teaching and Learning, University of North Dakota, is presently underway in the Province of Manitoba. The purpose of the study is to analyze superintendent turnover in Unitary School Divisions and its relationship to methods of selection and processes of employment. To this end, the professional assistance of each superintendent of schools as well as each school board member having been involved in the recruitment and selection process, is being sought. Your support in answering the accompanying questionnaire would be most appreciated.

The significance of the study is two-fold: (a) its contribution to participating school boards in providing them useful information and assistance designed to help them improve the recruitment and selection process; and, (b) its contribution to continuing research in the aforementioned areas. In addition, it is hoped that the study will prove of value to present and prospective superintendents of schools.

Since it is recognized that a superintendent's time is precious, every effort was made to keep the questionnaire short, thus making it possible for you to answer it in a few minutes. The study, as you fully realize, can be successful only with your help and cooperation. You are thus requested to answer all questions to the best of your knowledge. Rest assured that all of the information you provide will remain confidential and will not, in any manner, be identified with you or with your school division. Please do not include your name. The questionnaire is being coded for computer identification only.

Kindly return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope within the next two weeks.

Thank you for your kind assistance in this matter.

Yours very truly,

Raymond A. F. Constant
Graduate student, C. T. L.

Dr. C. M. Morris
Chairman, Advisory Committee

Dr. I. J. K. Dahl
Program Coordinator

APPENDIX D

SCHOOL BOARD LETTER

February 8, 1973

TO ALL SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA:

A study, under the supervision of Dr. C. M. Morris, Professor of Education, Center for Teaching and Learning, University of North Dakota, is presently underway in the Province of Manitoba. The purpose of the study is to analyze superintendent turnover in Unitary School Divisions and its relationship to methods of selection and processes of employment. To this end, the professional assistance of all school board members having been involved in the recruitment and selection of a superintendent as well as each superintendent of schools is being sought. If you already have had such an experience, would you lend your assistance to this study by answering the accompanying questionnaire?

The significance of the study is two-fold: (a) its contribution to participating school boards in providing them useful information and assistance designed to help them improve the recruitment and selection process; and, (b) its contribution to continuing research in the aforementioned areas.

Since it is recognized that a school trustees' time is precious, every effort was made to keep the questionnaire short, thus making it possible for you to answer it in a few minutes. The study, as you fully realize, can be successful only with your help and cooperation. You are thus requested to answer all questions to the best of your knowledge. Rest assured that all of the information you provide will remain confidential and will not, in any manner, be identified with you or with your school division. Please do not include your name. The questionnaire is being coded for computer identification only.

Kindly return the completed questionnaire to your Secretary-Treasurer within the next two weeks.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Yours very truly,

Raymond A. F. Constant
Graduate student, C. T. L.

Dr. C. M. Morris
Chairman, Advisory Committee

Dr. I. J. K. Dahl
Program Coordinator

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

March 19, 1973

School Board
School Division
City or Town

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On February 8 I mailed your Secretary-Treasurer a set of questionnaires related to a study that I am conducting on the manner school superintendents are hired by Manitoba school boards.

As of this date I have not received a response from your school division. As I indicated in my original letter to you, the study can only be successful with your help and full cooperation.

To this end, would you therefore look into this matter for me at your earliest convenience?

In the hope that I may hear from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

Raymond A. F. Constant

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- American Association of School Administrators. The school superintendent. The Association, Washington, D. C., Vol. 24, 1946.
- American Association of School Administrators. The American school superintendency. The Association, Washington, D. C., Vol. 30, 1952.
- American Association of School Administrators. The superintendent as an instructional leader. The Association, Washington, D. C. 35th Yearbook, 1957. 484 pp.
- American Association of School Administrators. Professional administrators for American schools. The Association, Washington, D. C., Vol. 38, 1960a.
- American Association of School Administrators. Profile of the school superintendent. The Association, Washington, D. C., 1960b. 126 pp.
- American Association of School Administrators. On selecting a school superintendent. The Association, Washington, D. C., 1962. 18 pp.
- American Association of School Administrators. Selecting a school superintendent. The Association, Washington, D. C., 1968.
- Andrews, Amy E. Status of County Superintendents in Minnesota. Unpublished Master of Education thesis, University of North Dakota, 1953.
- Ashby, Lloyd W. The effective school board member. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, 1968.
- Baker, John E. The selection of superintendents by boards of education. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1952.
- Blanchard, B. T. Tentative criteria in the selection of the superintendent. National Association of Secondary School Principal Bulletin, 40: 53-54, October, 1956.
- Bliss, Sydney M. Choosing a superintendent of schools. American School Board Journal, 116: 29-31, March, 1948.
- Boutuell, W. D. Board of education selecting a superintendent. P. T. A. Magazine, February, 1963, 57, 15.

- Briner, Conrad. The identification and definition of the criteria relevant to the selection of public school administrators. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1962.
- Burbank, Natte B. The superintendent of schools: His headaches and rewards. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1968.
- California School Boards Association. Boardmanship. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1961.
- California School Boards Association and the Association of California School Administrators. Selecting a superintendent. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1970.
- California School Boards Association and the Association of California School Administrators. The superintendent/board relationship. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1972.
- Campbell, Roald F., Corbally, John E., and Ramseyer, John A. Introduction to educational administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967.
- Carlson, Richard O. School superintendents: Careers and performance. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972.
- Cohodes, Aaron. How schoolmen get their jobs. The Nation's Schools, September, 1964, 74, 57-58.
- Davies, Daniel R., and Hosler, Fred W. The challenge of school board membership. New York, N. Y.: Chartwell House, Inc., 1954.
- Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Educational Leadership: Progress and possibilities. The Association, Washington, D. C., The 11th Yearbook, 1933.
- Dittman, E. Selecting a new superintendent. Phi Delta Kappan, 1959, 41, 53-56.
- Dowler, C. X. Out to bag a superintendent? Here's the method Tulsa used to bring home a winner. American School Board Journal, January, 1970, 157, 29-31.
- Downie, N. M., and Heath, R. W. Basic statistical methods. Evanston, Illinois: Harper & Row Co., 1970.
- Dykes, Archie R. School board and superintendent: Their effective relationship. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc., 1965.
- Edwards, Allen L. Experimental design in psychological research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1972.

- Exton, Elaine. Seventeen steps in selecting a superintendent. American School Board Journal, December, 1955, 131, 21-22.
- Fast, R. G. Some background factors of school superintendents as they relate to ratings of superintendent effectiveness. Bulletin of the Pennsylvania School Study Council, Vol. II, January, 1969.
- Fensch, Edwin A., and Wilson, Robert E. The superintendency team. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964.
- Flower, George E. The place of the superintendent in Canadian education. Toronto: W. J. Gage Limited, 1958.
- Freeborn, Robert M. School board change and the succession pattern of superintendents. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1966.
- Ganders, H. S. Citizens help choose the superintendent. The Nation's Schools, July, 1945, 36, 28-29.
- Goldhammer, Keith. The school board. New York, N. Y.: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964.
- Grieder, Calvin. Public school administration. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1969.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. Development of criteria of success in school administration. Report to the American Education Research Association. Atlantic City, N. J.: February, 1959.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. The school superintendent. New York, N. Y.: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.
- Gross, Neal. How to test a candidate for superintendent. School Management, J, 42-46, December, 1961.
- Gross, Neal, Mason, Ward, and McEachern, Alexander. Explorations in role analysis: Studies of the superintendency role. New York, N. Y.: Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Huggett, A. J. Professional advice in selecting a superintendent. American School Board Journal, July, 1944, 28, 14.
- Johnson, Carroll F. How to pick a new superintendent and shine up your image while you're at it. American School Board Journal, April, 1971, 158, 35-36.
- Karrick, Walter L. An analysis of policies and procedures used in hiring school superintendents and the development of guidelines for the selection. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1966.

- Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of public education. New York: Harper & Sons, 1962.
- McCarty, Donald J. How to select a superintendent. American School Board Journal, February, 1967, 154, 5-7.
- McCrary, Harold M. Superintendency tenure and turnover in Minnesota. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of North Dakota, 1953.
- McGinnis, William C. School administrative and supervisory organizations. Ohio: Teacher's College, 1929.
- McGrath, J. When it comes to hiring a superintendent. The Nation's Schools, 1957, 60, 80-81.
- Mendenhall, Edgar Nelson. The city school board member and his task. Kansas: College Inn Book Store, 1929.
- Miller, C. S. Faculty committees rate candidates in selecting a superintendent. The Nation's Schools, 1955, 54, 40-42.
- Morris, Clyde M. Careers of 554 public school superintendents in eleven midwest states. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1957.
- Morris, Clyde M. When the superintendent retires. College of Education Record, 1965, 51, 22-24.
- National Education Association Research Division. The Questionnaire. Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, Vol. VIII, Number 1, 1930, 18-24.
- National Education Association of the United States and American Association of School Administrators. The unique role of the superintendent of schools. Educational Policies Commission, Washington, D. C., 1965.
- Overn, Alfred V. Handbook for public school boards, Mt. Vernon, New York. New York State Boards Association, 1940.
- Public Education Association. Selecting a superintendent. The Association, New York, N. Y.: 1970.
- Reeder, Ward G. School boards and superintendents. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1954.
- Reeves, Charles E. School boards: Their status, functions, and activities. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Reller, Theodore L. The development of the city school superintendency of schools in the U.S.A. Philadelphia: The author, 1935.

- Siggelkow, R. A. What candidates and board members discuss when superintendents are interviewed. The Nation's Schools, July, 1959, 64, 46-48.
- Smith, G. C. How to choose our superintendent. The Nation's Schools, October, 1958, 62, 72-76.
- Spears, Harold. The precarious search: Hunting and finding a new school superintendent. The Nation's Schools, September, 1968, 82, 64-66.
- Tuttle, Edward M. School board leadership in America. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963.
- Williams, J. D. A regression approach to experimental design. Journal of Experimental Education, Winter, 1970, 89-90.
- Williams, J. D., and Houston, S. R. A potentially useful problem-solving technique for educational research: regression. College of Education Record, 1967, 52, 151-152.
- Williams, J. D., and Lindem, A. C. Setwise linear regression. UND Computer Center Special Report, 30, November, 1971.
- Wilson, K. The development of education in Manitoba. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1959.
- Wilson, Robert E. The modern school superintendent. New York: Harper & Sons, 1960.
- Woodring, P. Educational statemanship. Saturday Review, March, 1963, 46, 55.