IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Digital Repository

Retrospective Theses and Dissertations

Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations

1990

An examination of the morale level of the Iowa school superintendent and factors related to morale

Leland E. Morrison
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd

 Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation
Morrison, Leland E., "An examination of the morale level of the Iowa school superintendent and factors related to morale " (1990). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 9866.
https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/9866

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

www.manaraa.com

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9110539

An examination of the morale level of the Iowa school superintendent and factors related to morale

Morrison, Leland E., Ph.D.

Iowa State University, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

NOTE TO USERS

THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT RECEIVED BY U.M.I. CONTAINED PAGES WITH POOR PRINT. PAGES WERE FILMED AS RECEIVED.

THIS REPRODUCTION IS THE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

An examination of the morale level of the Iowa school superintendent and factors related to morale

by

Leland E. Morrison

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Educational Administration)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Research Questions	6
Purpose of the Study	9
Research Hypotheses.	10
Basic Assumptions.	12
Delimitations of the Study	13
Definitions of Terms	13
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	15
Introduction	15
The Development of the Superintendency	15
Morale	20
Level of Decision-Making Authority	25
Job Security Issues Facing Superintendents	30
Issues and Challenges Facing Superintendents	33
The Reform Movement.	34
Societal Change.	37
The Changing Nature of the Job	40
Effects of School District Size.	42
Summary.	46

CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES. 47

Selection of the Sample. 47

Instrumentation. 48

Procedures 50

Analysis of the Data 51

CHAPTER IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 52

Demographic Descriptive Data 52

Profile of the Respondents. 52

Study Variables Descriptive Data 64

Level of Morale of Superintendents. 64
Level of Authority. 64
Feelings of Job Security. 65
Educational Issues Challenging the Superintendent 67

Hypothesis Testing 74

CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 108

Summary. 108

Conclusions and Discussion 112

Level of Morale. 113

Morale and Master Contract Coverage. 114

Job Security Issues and Morale 115

Educational Issues as Challenges and Morale. 116

Size and Morale. 119

Size and the Job Security and Educational Issues 120

Level of Authority 122

Limitations of the Study 123

Recommendations for Further Research 123

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 125

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. 133

APPENDIX A: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL. 135

APPENDIX B: LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT. 137

APPENDIX C: FOLLOW-UP LETTER 139

APPENDIX D: SURVEY ITEMS USED FOR DATA ANALYSIS. 141

APPENDIX E: THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT. 143

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1	Profile of superintendent respondents.	53
TABLE 2	Profile of superintendents' career path.	54
TABLE 3	Profile of school districts.	56
TABLE 4	1989-90 salary of superintendents.	56
TABLE 5	Level of superintendent job satisfaction	57
TABLE 6	Superintendents' planned retirement.	59
TABLE 7	Superintendents' perceptions of collective bargaining coverage by a master contract agreement.	60
TABLE 8	Value of type of superintendent preparation.	62
TABLE 9	Identified needs by superintendents for professional development	63
TABLE 10	Superintendents preferred source for professional development.	63
TABLE 11	Level of morale for superintendents.	64
TABLE 12	Level of authority accorded superintendents.	65
TABLE 13	Job security issues.	66
TABLE 14	Student, teacher, program, planning and relationship issues reported as challenges by Iowa superintendents	68
TABLE 15	Comparison of districts covered by a master contract agreement and those not covered by a master contract agreement with respect to level of morale of superintendents	75
TABLE 16	A comparison of the level of superintendent morale between superintendents in small, medium, and large size school districts.	75

TABLE 17 Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which nine specific job security issues are perceived as challenges. 77

TABLE 18 Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which eleven specific student issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents. 78

TABLE 19 Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which eight specific teacher issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents. 79

TABLE 20 Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which twelve specific program issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents 80

TABLE 21 Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which eight planning issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents. 82

TABLE 22 Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which five specific relationship issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents 83

TABLE 23 Correlation between the level of superintendent morale and the perceived level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents 84

TABLE 24 Tests for significant differences in the extent to which nine specific job security issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in school districts of small, medium, and large size school districts. 85

TABLE 25 Correlations between the level of decision-making authority accorded superintedents and job security challenges they face. 88

TABLE 26 Tests for significant differences in the extent to which eleven specific student issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large size school districts. . . 89

TABLE 27 Tests for significant differences in the extent to which eight specific teacher issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large size school districts 92

TABLE 28 Tests for significant differences in the extent to which program issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large size school districts. 95

TABLE 29 Tests for significant differences in the extent to which eight specific planning issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large size school districts. . . 98

TABLE 30 Tests for significant differences in the extent to which five specific relationship issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts. 101

TABLE 31 Correlations between the extent to which eleven student issues are perceived as challenges and the perceived level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents 102

TABLE 32 Correlations between the extent to which eight teacher issues is perceived as challenges by superintendents and the level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents. 104

TABLE 33 Correlations between the extent to which superintendents perceive twelve specific program issues as challenges and the level of decision-making authority accorded them 105

TABLE 34 Correlations between the extent to which superintendents perceive eight planning issues as challenges and the level of decision-making authority accorded them 106

TABLE 35 Correlations between the extent to which superintendents perceive five relationship issues as challenges and the level of decision-making authority accorded them 107

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Superintendents of some 14,000 public school districts in the United States are responsible for the supervision of more than 4 million employees and the expenditure of over 140 billion dollars. Superintendents of schools have enormous impact in our country. Superintendents manage and supervise the instructional programs for nearly 47 million children who attend public schools. "Truly, superintendents of schools perform dual roles vital to a democratic society and a prosperous economy -- effective educational leadership combined with efficient management of human and financial resources" (Educator Opinion Poll, 1985, p. 1).

The superintendency has evolved into a powerful position. The American school superintendency was born in 1837. The first two superintendents in America were appointed in the cities of Buffalo and Louisville. Adoption of the superintendency by city school districts spread gradually during the next fifty years, until by 1890 all the larger cities had superintendents. The formation in 1865 of the National Association of School Superintendents, now the American Association of School Administrators, indicated the beginning of professional consciousness among early superintendents and faith in the potentialities of the position (Grieder et al., 1969). An Iowa superintendents association was formed in 1891.

It should be noted that Iowa began its educational system in 1846. In the next decade as school systems grew in size school superintendencies began to appear in the state. The responsibilities of the early

superintendents varied widely, depending on how school boards perceived their problems. Some schools wanted superintendents to manage school business and building problems. Others wanted leadership in instruction and training of teachers. Whatever function they chose, many members of early school boards maintained direct participation in details of administration. Problems of those early years seem far less complex than those of today. Most children attended school for only a few years; buildings were smaller; relations with state agencies were minimal and with the federal government, nonexistent; subjects to be taught and the materials needed to teach them were far less complex and more stable (Educational Policies Commission, 1965).

The duties assigned to the early superintendency seemed to be more or less clerical. All that seemed to be needed in the early days was some record keeping because the direction for the school was still in the hands of the school committees. The first annual reports giving a glimpse of the duties and specific challenges facing superintendents came from the Annual Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools of the State of New York in 1845. Here is the way the State Superintendent of Common Schools presented a job description of rural superintendents:

> These officers are required to visit, either separately, or in conjunction with the town superintendent, all the schools within their jurisdiction respectively, as often in each year as may be practicable, with reference to the number of districts under their charge; to inquire into all matters relating to the government, course of instruction, books, studies, discipline and conduct of such schools, and the condition of the school houses and of the districts generally; to advise and counsel with the trustees and other officers of the district in relation to their duties, particularly in relation to the erection of school houses; to recommend to trustees and teachers the proper studies, discipline and

> conduct of the schools, the course of instruction to be pursued, and the books of elementary instruction to be used; to examine and grant certificates of qualification to teachers, either generally, authorizing them to teach in any school within the jurisdiction of such superintendent, while such certificate remains in force and unrevoked, or special, limiting the candidate to a particular town, and for one year only; to annul such certificates granted by the town superintendent, whenever the teacher holding such certificate shall be found deficient (EPC, 1965 p. 61).

As the position grew more prominent the problems and challenges facing the superintendent began to appear more clearly in the annual reports filed in the mid 1850s. Superintendents complained of parent apathy, that people thought schools were spending too much money, and of not enough time to do tasks assigned to them. Other problems listed by the superintendents included such things as school committee members who would sacrifice the public image to enhance their own, pupil absenteeism, textbooks, grouping pupils, what age children should start school, corporal punishment, building repairs, quality of teachers, in-service training, not enough time for supervision, teaching methods and modes of teaching as the blackboard was just as new at the time (Blumberg, 1985). The issues and challenges facing superintendents over 150 years ago sound themes familiar today. It appears that the problems of the superintendency are not totally new but rather have been with us a long time.

The growth in size and complexity of institutions of learning in the United States, Iowa included, has brought with it many new problems and challenges for the superintendent. The 1950s and '60s saw collective bargaining for public school employees evolve nationally. Statewide collective bargaining was approved in Iowa in 1974. Else (1977) stated

that "it is not clear relative to the superintendent, what will be the result of teacher collective bargaining. One thing is apparent, however, and that is that superintendents do expect their traditional roles to change as a result of collective bargaining" (p. 35).

Another almost everpresent concern is the level of authority that superintendents have to make decisions that affect their own school districts. As the chief executive officer, the superintendent's relationship with the board of education or policy makers is a critical factor that can contribute to or detract from the efficient operation of a school district. School board/superintendent relations have long been a topic of discussion for board members, superintendents, and researchers of educational administration. Analysis of findings from a 1982 national survey, indicate that serious tensions exist between boards and superintendents in many communities (American Association of School Administrators, 1982).

Looking at new problems, additional challenges, varying levels of authority to deal with these problems and challenges, as limited by the onset of collective bargaining and interference by boards of education it also becomes important to define the level of morale of these individuals. How they feel about their jobs and themselves will effect the quality of administration in our schools (Chand, 1982).

Statement of the Problem

The school superintendency has grown in importance in its 152 years of existence. School superintendents today provide leadership for our nation's potentially most essential industry...education. Along with

growth in importance of the position itself, the problems relative to job security and challenges facing the school superintendent have become more complex. Blumberg (1985) stated,

> The extremely visible role of the superintendent as chief guardian of the sacred function of educating the community's children, together with the almost necessary politicization of the relationship between a superintendent and his or her board, guarantees that living with conflict, much of it heated and public is a built-in element of the job. Amid a nationwide concern for educational quality, with increasing numbers of groups staking claims about the public schools, the local school superintendent's accessibility and visibility argue strongly for an issue and tension-filled environment for sometime to come (p. 14).

The past decade, especially the five years since the publication of A Nation at Risk by the National Commission on Excellence in Education has been marked by perhaps the most concentrated attention that American education has ever received. The 1983 report was quickly followed by a series of additional "national reports," each driven by a particular point of view and all calling for improvement of the educational systems (Doud, 1989).

School superintendents play a vital role in implementing school reforms and achieving excellence for the young people of this nation. In Iowa more than 360 superintendents are charged with the responsibility of providing educational opportunities for over 480,000 young people. New state standards, open enrollment legislation, sharing programs, and teacher performance incentive legislation, collective bargaining, and board involvement have created role changes and tremendous demands for the superintendents in this state. Yet despite the superintendent's importance and these tremendous challenges, there is little research to

answer the complex questions about the level of morale of individual superintendents and factors related to superintendent morale, i.e.: level of decision making authority, job security related issues threatening superintendents, and educational issues challenging superintendents. It is also important to know how the previously mentioned variables are affected by school district size, and coverage by a master contract agreement. Most of the research centers on what superintendents do and how they do it. There is a need to conduct research that will provide information that will help superintendents face the challenge of leadership in the 1990s and provide information valuable to policymakers, professional associations, and those who provide inservice and train superintendents.

Research Questions

Little research has been done on the morale level of the Iowa school superintendent. This investigation will focus on areas of great concern to superintendents and those who provide training and inservice for superintendents. The study will focus on (1) level of morale of superintendents and factors related to superintendent morale, i.e., (2) the level of decision making authority accorded superintendents, (3) the job security issues threatening superintendents, and (4) specific challenges that Iowa superintendents face. Below are the major research questions which framed the study:

1. What is the profile of the Iowa school superintendent?
2. What is the morale level of the Iowa school superintendent?
3. Is there a relationship between level of morale of superintendents

and coverage by a master contract agreement?

4. Is there a significant difference in the level of morale of superintendents in small, medium and large school districts?
5. What are the specific issues posing a problem relative to the job security of Iowa superintendents?
6. What are the specific educational issues that will present a challenge the Iowa superintendent?
7. Is there a relationship between the the level of superintendent morale and the security issues posing a threat for superintendents?
8. Is there a relationship between the level of morale of superintendents and the student issues facing superintendents?
9. Is there a relationship between the level of morale of superintendents and the teacher issues facing superintendents?
10. Is there a relationship between the level of morale of superintendents and the program issues facing superintendents?
11. Is there a relationship between the level of morale of superintendents and the planning issues facing superintendents?
12. Is there a relationship between the level of morale of superintendents and the relationship issues facing superintendents?
13. Is there a relationship between the level of morale of superintendents and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions?
14. Is there a relationship between between the perceived problems facing the superintendent relative to his/her own job security and school district size?

15. Is there a relationship between the extent to which student issues are perceived as challenges and school district size?
16. Is there a relationship between the extent to which teacher issues are perceived as challenges and school district size?
17. Is there a relationship between the extent to which planning issues are perceived as challenges and school district size?
18. Is there a relationship between the extent that planning issues are perceived as challenges and school district size?
19. Is there a relationship between the extent that relationship issues are perceived as challenges and school district size?
20. What is the perceived level of decision-making authority accorded Iowa superintendents?
21. Is there a relationship between the perceived problems facing the superintendent relative to one's own job security and the level of authority accorded them to make decisions?
22. Is there a relationship between the extent that superintendents perceive student issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions?
23. Is there a relationship between the extent that superintendents perceive teacher issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions?
24. Is there a relationship between the extent that superintendents perceive program issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions?
26. Is there a relationship between the extent that superintendents

perceive planning issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions?

27. Is there a relationship between the extent that superintendents perceive relationship issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the level of morale of Iowa superintendents, and factors related to superintendent morale, i.e.; the perceived level of decision making authority accorded superintendents, job security issues that create problems for superintendents, and the specific educational issues that provide a challenge for Iowa school superintendents. The research investigates whether school district size, and coverage of the district by a master contract agreement affect the above mentioned variables.

This study will provide important information to colleges, universities, professional organizations, current superintendents, and individuals preparing for the superintendency, as they focus on training and improvement programs. It should have implications for those who design and conduct preservice and inservice programs.

This study will provide boards of education with a better understanding of the superintendency and helps them determine if they are providing sufficient support for the individuals occupying these positions. It will provide current superintendents with a reference point to determine the similarities and differences between their own situations and those of their colleagues. This study will provide the State

Department of Education with valuable information as they set policies that effect education in the future.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were used to examine the research questions in the areas of the study.

1. There is a significant difference in the level of morale of superintendents in districts covered by a master contract agreement and superintendents in districts not covered by a master contract agreement.
2. There is a significant difference in the level of morale of superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts.
3. There are significant relationships between the level of morale of superintendents and the extent to which nine job security issues are perceived as challenges.
4. There are significant relationships between the level of morale of superintendents and the extent to which eleven student issues are perceived as challenges.
5. There are significant relationships between the level of morale of superintendents and the extent to which eight teacher issues are perceived as challenges.
6. There are significant relationships between the morale of superintendents and the extent to which twelve educational program issues are perceived as challenges.
7. There are significant relationships between the level of morale of superintendents and the extent to which eight planning issues are

perceived as challenges.

8. There are significant relationships between the level of morale of superintendents and the extent to which five relationship issues are perceived as challenges.
9. There is a significant relationship between the level of morale of superintendents and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.
10. There is a significant difference in the superintendents' perceptions of nine job security issues in small, medium, and large school districts.
11. There is a significant relationship between superintendents perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions and the extent to which nine job security issues are perceived as challenges.
12. There is a significant difference in the extent to which eleven student issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium and large school districts.
13. There is a significant difference in the extent to which eight teacher issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts.
14. There is a significant difference in the extent to which twelve program related issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts.
15. There is a significant difference in the extent to which eight planning issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts.

16. There is a significant difference in the extent to which five relationship issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts.
17. There is a significant relationship between superintendents perceptions of ten student issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.
18. There is a significant relationship between superintendents' perceptions of eight teacher issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.
19. There is a significant relationship between superintendents perceptions of twelve program issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.
20. There is a significant relationship between superintendents perceptions of eight planning issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.
21. There is a significant relationship between superintendents perceptions of five relationship issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.

Basic Assumptions

The study was predicated on the following basic assumptions:

1. Respondents to the survey instruments provided accurate information.
2. The survey instrument and data collection method used in this study are reliable and valid.
3. The superintendents completed each survey instrument independently.
4. The superintendents responding to the survey instrument were a

representative sample of all superintendents employed by school districts in Iowa.

Delimitations of the Study

The following factors limited the scope of the investigation.

1. The study was conducted with only school superintendents from the state of Iowa who voluntarily completed the survey instruments.
2. This study was limited in potential participants to the administrators holding superintendencies in public schools in the state of Iowa during the 1988-89 school year.
3. The survey was conducted under the auspices of the School Administrators of Iowa group which may affect the attitude of the respondents.
4. All assistant superintendents and superintendents with principal duties were excluded from the study.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions of terms give clarity to their use and meaning in this study:

1. School superintendent- -the chief administrative officer employed by the board of education of a local school district in Iowa.
2. Collective bargaining- -the process by which teachers of the school district can negotiate their terms of employment as a group with the board of education. Specifically, collective bargaining in this study, refers to the authority and regulation of teacher bargaining activities permitted by the Iowa Public Employment Act of 1974.

3. Security related issues- -those issues which threaten the feeling of job security of the school superintendent.
4. Job satisfaction- -the level of satisfaction attained by the individual as a result of his or her work.
5. Morale- -the level of contentment, zeal, and loyalty that an individual expresses about his/her job situation.
6. Challenges- -those specific factors, programs, groups of individuals, issues and concerns that present a challenge and will occupy the attention and time of the superintendent in the near future. Examples for the study are: student issues, teacher issues, educational program issues, planning issues, and relationship issues.
7. Level of authority- -the level of autonomy or power the local superintendent has to make decisions concerning the local school district.
8. Master contract- -the written document which delineates the terms of employment which have been agreed to through the collective bargaining procedure.
9. Size- -the school district's actual enrollment in grades K-12 on the third Friday in September of 1988. Examples for the study: small=1-499, medium=500-1999, and large=2000+
10. Type- -how one would describe or characterize the geographic classification of the community. Examples for this study are urban, suburban, small town and rural.

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The volume of literature related to the school superintendency is extensive. It was, therefore, necessary to narrow the focus and limit the examination of the literature to areas of particular importance to this study.

The review of the literature and related research focuses on five major areas: (1) the development of the school superintendency, (2) morale and job satisfaction, (3) level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents, (4) issues and challenges facing superintendents, and (5) the relationship between school district size and other variables examined in this study.

The Development of the Superintendency

A brief overview of the development of the superintendency is instructive for those who study the issues and challenges that affect superintendents. In 1965, the Educational Policies Commission noted that the superintendency is one of the most crucial and possibly most difficult positions in the world of work. "The occupant of this position, more than any other single person in the community, influences the shape of public education" (p. 1). Griffiths (1966) agreed, "the position of superintendent of schools is one of the most important positions in American education" (p. 1). While research can not prove the position that is most important, or yields the most influence in public education there is little doubt the superintendency has grown in power, influence and importance.

The school superintendent has not always been powerful or influential. American school systems operated for almost 200 years without the position of superintendent, largely because districts were very small. It was approximately another 50 years before the superintendency became anchored in educational systems (Griffiths, 1966). It came into being only after attempts at administering schools on the part of lay school boards had failed. For a time, lay school boards ran the day-to-day operations of the school systems, but school systems grew too large for lay boards to govern and they turned to a professional educator, later to be called the superintendent, to manage the school. The first superintendencies were established in Buffalo, New York, and Louisville, Kentucky, in 1837 (AASA, 1982). By 1860, some 23 years later, twenty-seven cities had created superintendencies. By 1890, all of the larger school systems in the U.S. had employed superintendents (Greider et al., 1969).

What were the expectations and roles of the early superintendents? A Boston subcommittee when making its recommendation to the Boston School Board to hire a superintendent set forth the expectations it had for Boston's first superintendent:

> There is now no one whose duty it is to find the best and most economical plans for schoolhouses, their ventilation and warming, and their apparatus, seats, desks, and other furniture.
>
> There is no one to look out for the best teacher, when a vacancy occurs, or in preparation for a vacancy.
>
> There is no one to find out what is the most successful teaching in all the schools, and to point it out for the benefit of all; or to aid, advise, or cooperate with any teacher who is pursuing, or who may wish to pursue, an improved but untried plan of instruction and discipline.
>
> There is no one to make, from the wisdom of the most

> experienced, suggestions to those who are aiming at perfection; to know, by comparison, the deficiencies of teachers, and to point out the means of supplying them.
>
> There is no one to see that proper and sufficient philosophical apparatus is supplied, and that it is properly and economically made, used and kept.
>
> There is no one whose special duty it is to see whether the best course of studies is pursued, or to suggest improvement from the experience of the best schools elsewhere.
>
> There is no one to see whether the schools are adopted to the population, and all classes of children brought into them.
>
> There is no one to see that all important business is duly brought before the meetings of the board.
>
> There is no one to supervise the transfer of children from school to school, and from one set of schools to another.
>
> There is no one to oversee the organization of new schools.
>
> There is no one to collect documents appertaining to the Boston and other analogous schools, and to give full information in regard to them.
>
> There is no one to instruct strangers in regard to them.
>
> There is no one to say what libraries should be in the schools, for teachers or for pupils.
>
> There is now no individual or body to exercise the complete supervision of the schools which is needed, or to examine them as thoroughly as they require (Reller, 1935, pp. 113-114).

Though over 150 years have passed since the time of the Boston School Board Sub-committee report these tasks could very well be part of a superintendent's job description in United States schools in 1989.

The responsibilities of the early superintendents appeared to vary widely depending on the needs of the local community. Some school districts wanted leadership in teacher training and instruction; some wanted superintendents to manage business and building problems. Whatever function they chose, school boards maintained direct control of the school system and participated daily in school system administration. School boards were reluctant to grant power to superintendents, at least in the early days, because of an anti-executive feeling that got started in the

colonial period when early Americans felt the abuses of power by the British King (Knezevich, 1975). People did not want to place trust in one individual to make decisions that would impact a great number of citizens.

Griffiths (1966) reported that the development of the superintendency up to the mid 1900s was in three periods:

1. 1837-1910. During this period the superintendent was essentially instruction oriented.
2. 1910-1945. During this period the superintendent was essentially a businessman more interested in the budget than instruction.
3. 1945-1960. The superintendent has now entered a period wherein his position is viewed as that of a professional school administrator (p. 2).

According to Griffiths, superintendents during the first period were to concern themselves with instruction and not financial matters. Other early duties included screening applicants for teaching positions, attending board meetings, and assisting in planning new buildings. The second period in the development of the superintendency saw business ideology influencing education. The principles of scientific management were used to make school systems more efficient. The superintendent now had moved more toward being a businessman than an educator (Griffiths, 1966). The third period of development of the superintendency was described by Griffiths as "one in transition". That might well describe all periods of development for the superintendency. However the teacher organization movement, the Russian launching of Sputnik, the civil rights movement, huge government grants, and a great interest in public education transformed the educational setting and created new challenges for the superintendency (Moore, 1964). This period moved the superintendent away from being a businessman, but not back to the scholar-philosopher

superintendent of the first period. The superintendent was becoming more of a professional educator.

By the 1950s, the prestige, status and power of the school superintendent was quite well established (AASA, 1982). More than 85 percent of superintendent respondents in an AASA study done in 1952 reported that they felt fully recognized as the chief executive officer of the school board. Only 1 percent of superintendents in 1952 still saw themselves as clerks of the board of education (AASA, 1952).

All things were not well for superintendents even after authority was acquired. Problems reported as challenges today were evolving then, such as: increasing taxpayer resistance, growing teacher dissatisfaction, rising costs, and forced resignations for superintendents (AASA, 1952). The 1952 AASA report on the superintendency warned that superintendents were in trouble and jobs were not secure.

> School superintendents never appeared more expendable than at this mid-century...unless increased protection is provided for superintendents undeservably attacked, there is danger that a flight from the superintendency might occur leaving the field to a generation of political 'yes-men' (p. 62).

While Griffiths identified three periods of development in 1966, Campbell et al. (1987) identified four stages of superintendency development: (1) stage one, essentially clerical; (2) stage two, the superintendent as an educator, the person relied on for educational leadership; (3) stage three, brought on by the growth in size as well as problems of finance, the superintendent as businessperson and educator. Superintendents during this stage were budget builders, property managers,

school plant specialists as well as stewards of the curriculum.

The fourth stage, according to Campbell, is evolving. The school district's chief executive during the 1970s was operating in a turbulent environment, feeling the pressures of powerful interest groups, boards of education, parents, teachers, and students. The 1980s, perhaps a fifth stage of development, probably will be rememberd by educational historians as the accountability/reform movement and will be detailed later in this chapter under the subsection "Issues and Challenges Facing Superintendents."

The development of the superintendency in the state of Iowa progressed slightly behind the eastern half of the United States. However the first state constitution in 1846 called for a system of free public education (Hart, 1954). Iowa is and was largely a rural state. The schools of the 1800s were set up within walking distance for most students. The superintendency developed later in Iowa along parallel lines with the rest of the nation, starting with superintendencies in the larger city districts and including rural systems as they consolidated in the 1900s (Hart, 1954).

Morale

Morale was defined in Chapter I as the level of contentment and zeal, and loyalty that an individual expresses about his/her job situation. Fawcett (1964) defines morale as the extent to which an individual has actually identified his or her personal hopes, desires, and ambitions with the goals of the organization for which he or she works. He further concludes, "high morale is a term used to describe the individual's

willingness to stay with the organization to exert maximum effort to complete the tasks assigned, to develop his or her skills, attitude, and knowledge so that he or she can be of greater service to an organization and to study the problems of the organization to the end that it can more clearly accomplish its goals" (p. 205).

Gardner (1987) highlights the importance of high morale in educational administration:

> Our society gives individuals a chance to be what they can be. It gives our institutions, profit and nonprofit, but institutions don't make themselves dynamic. The process starts with individuals (p. 16).

It seems important that superintendents have high morale. Gerla (1987) noted, "there is no more significant economic investment than the one a school district makes in its executive. The success of a school district depends in large part on the people who lead it" (p. 10). He later writes that in the "Era of Excellence" the quality and style of a chief executive officer or superintendent puts an imprint on the whole organization and the morale of that leader is important to the success of the school.

While research points to the need for high staff, teacher, and student morale and the need for the superintendent to ensure conditions that are conducive to high levels of morale for these groups, little mention is made as to the level of superintendent morale.

Caplow's (1976) work suggests that high morale is easier for superintendents to attain, "In most organizations, morale is correlated with rank. The higher the rank, the higher the morale, if only because leaders of an organization have a larger stake in the success or failure

of its program and identify more closely with it" (p. 129).

Many who have written about morale have noted that morale levels seem to be related to productivity. Wendel and Bryant (1988), for example, noted, "mutual assistance, cooperative work relationships, an opportunity to feel that one's efforts are contributing to the achievement of the goals of the organization, and participation in goal setting are key elements of high productivity" (p. 10).

There have been some studies of superintendent morale. Sistrunk (1988) studied the affects of the 104 page Education Reform Act of 1982 on the morale of superintendents. Below is one rationale for the study:

> These changes have come very rapidly, often with little warning and with little input from the public school personnel who were affected by them. It was thought, therefore, that a survey of the superintendents' perceptions of the impact of educational reform might be useful information (p. 1).

The Sistrunk study included all 150 superintendents employed by the school districts in the state of Mississippi. He devised a survey instrument composed of 14 questions concerning the impact of educational reform on the superintendents and their school districts. Sistrunk asked superintendents to indicate the impact of educational reform on their individual morale. One hundred seventeen of the 150 Mississippi superintendents responded to the survey. While seventy-seven percent responded that educational reform was having a positive impact on education in general, the Sistrunk study yielded the following results concerning impact of educational reform on superintendent morale:

1) 61 percent reported negative impact on morale

2) 15 percent reported no change in morale

3) 24 percent reported a positive impact on their morale (p. 20).

Research defines job satisfaction as closely related to level of morale. Chand (1982) provides a rationale for studying the job satisfaction of Iowa superintendents. She states:

> studies of statewide job satisfaction of superintendents should be conducted in each state and additional variables, if any, affecting the job satisfaction should be taken into consideration in an effort to improve the level of job satisfaction. The job satisfaction of superintendents has a hearing on the overall success of the educational program under their supervision (p. 7).

Research on job satisfaction shows generally a high level of satisfaction by superintendents regarding their work. The Educator Opinion Poll was commissioned by Educational Research Associates in 1985. One section of that poll assessed job satisfaction of superintendents with their current superintendency and their chosen career of administration. They found "62 percent were satisfied with their current superintendency, 28 percent were moderately satisfied and only 8 percent were either moderately dissatisfied or dissatisfied with their current positions. Eighty-two percent reported that they would 'work in administration as long as they can'" (p. 70).

Chand (1982) studied job satisfaction of Alaska superintendents using the following rationale:

> Research as well as experience tends to indicate that where people have high levels of occupational satisfaction, there are also high levels of productivity and organizational success (p. 12).

The intent of her study was to identify the general nature of satisfaction/dissatisfaction among Alaska school superintendents. She also sought to determine the level of job satisfaction among school

superintendents in Alaska. The sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in her research were called "task variables."

Her study yielded two sets of results. Most of the superintendents in Alaska (83.4%) had high overall job satisfaction. She found the strongest correlations between high overall job satisfaction and the following ten task variables:

1.	Sense of achievement	.765
2.	Methods used to evaluate their performance	.622
3.	Time spent on their relationship with the non-certified staff	.521
4.	Opportunity for personal growth	.514
5.	Time spent on their relationship with principals	.471
6.	Time spent on their relationship with the community	.461
7.	Renewal of contract	.457
8.	Number of hours put in at their work per week	.432
9.	Time spent on their relationship with the teachers	.428
10.	Attitude of parents towards education (p. 25).	.416

Five of ten high correlations in the Chand study dealt with time spent working on positive relationships of groups or individuals. Chand also found overall satisfaction with the superintendency to be high at 83.4 percent. Eighty percent of superintendents reported they would be superintendents if they were to choose a career again.

Willower and Fraser (1979) conducted research to find out how school superintendents feel about their work. They chose superintendents because they felt superintendent's work is one of the most demanding jobs in American Administration. They posited that superintendents were a publicly vulnerable lot, "because they work with many people and projects, including taxpayers, parents, and other individuals with axes to grind,

sometimes acting as individuals, but often in organized groups" (p. 7). A random selection process yielded 50 Pennsylvania superintendents to be interviewed about their work.

Superintendents were surveyed on items such as, what they liked and disliked doing, what they felt was important and unimportant, what they wanted to do more or less of, what they felt was beyond their control, and what they felt most in control of and the biggest problem they currently faced in their work, as well as other major problems being dealt with, their level of pressure on the job, whether or not they would make the career choice of the superintendency again and moments of most and least pride on the job.

They drew an empirical picture that "showed superintendents dealing with a wide range of problems, irked by paperwork, feeling uneasy about not being closer to instruction and the classroom, feeling real job pressures, but a willingness to do it over again if they could" (Willower and Fraser, 1979, p. 9). Willower and Fraser concluded from the 1979 study that "it seems to us that superintendents are not as beleaguered as is sometimes claimed, and when they are, they have come to grips with it rather well, often with good humor" (p. 10).

Level of Decision-Making Authority

How much authority should the school superintendent have and how much does he or she really have are questions that have not been answered since the time of their origin in 1837. "From an inauspicious beginning the position has grown to one of considerable responsibility and authority, though there is still some doubt as to the actual power held by school

superintendents" (Griffiths, 1966, p. 1).

There is a historical sense in the emergence of the superintendent's power. In 1895, a conflict over power and authority to make decisions became public issue. At a 1895 superintendents' meeting, the now famous "Committee of Fifteen" met in Cleveland and issued a report concerning the power of the superintendent and the role of the school board. The report called for enhanced superintendent decision-making authority and a diminished role for the school board (Blumberg, 1985).

The entire issue of the next American School Board Journal responded to the challenge of the roles of school boards and superintendents. Excerpts from the editorial page of that issue set the stage for what continue to be a volatile area for school administration, the question of who governs the schools.

The editorial warned:

> The school board is to consist of a few harmless gentlemen with merely sufficient ability to audit salary accounts and a superintendent who shall have the arbitrary power to govern the entire school system...and there is a line of promotion to be made the czar of the American public schools. The American people want to be in touch with their schools. They want to be represented. The school board is the only agency that can represent them. It can be made and unmade by the people. If it does not carry out the wishes of the constituency and keep abreast with educational progress it is retried, as it should be, by the people. The public is not yet prepared for the 'one man power' idea, and we predict that it never will be. (p. 24)

A struggle has persisted for approximately one hundred years. During the 1900s, superintendents had been given more authority to make decisions. What is the authority of the board vis a vis that of the superintendent in the operation and management of a school district?" Ross (1987) describes superintendents' authority as most educational

leadership textbooks do. The school board sets the district policy or general rules about what is to be done and hires a superintendent responsible for implementing board policy. Ross continues, "a board has a responsibility to give direction to its chief executive and then permit the superintendent enough operating room to implement the board's policies. This is a challenging role, overseeing while not interfering, but it's a role good boards fill with skill and diplomacy" (p. 6).

Most conflict between boards and superintendents relative to decision-making authority appears to stem from failure to understand, or honor each other's jurisdictions. It is frequently difficult to define issues as legislative or executive. Therefore, it is not always easy to determine whether a given issue should be handled by the board of education or the superintendent.

There is research that explains what boards and superintendents want in the way of authority to make decisions. In the spring of 1985, the American School Board Journal, in cooperation with Virginia Tech, surveyed a national sample of school board members and superintendents to identify where they agree and disagree about their respective roles in local school decision making. The school board survey looked at four major areas of the school system: (1) personnel, (2) curriculum and instruction, (3) administration and governance, and (4) financial management. The board members and superintendents were asked who should and who actually does handle each of 27 real-life situations reflective of those encountered in most school districts. The respondents were asked to estimate the board's and superintendent's share of responsibility for the 27 situations (Alvey

and Underwood, 1985).

Results indicated that, "board members would like more authority on every issue examined in the survey and that superintendents were willing to concede a small portion of what they believe is their authority, but seldom as much as board members want them to" (p. 21). The researchers also concluded that for the most part disagreement over appropriate levels of authority centers around issues pertaining to personnel.

Examination of "what is" and "what ought to be" as answered by both board members and superintendents yields the following results as categorized by the four areas of the study:

1. Personnel: Board members responded that superintendents have 49 percent of the responsibility pertaining to personnel matters. Superintendents say they hold 50 percent of the responsibility over personnel matters and say they should have 52 percent of the responsibility. Board members want the superintendent's share of authority over personnel matters reduced to 43 percent.
2. Curriculum and instruction: Board members say superintendents have 52 percent of the authority on curriculum matters, but should only have 42 percent. Superintendents say they have 54 percent of the authority, but are willing to reduce their share of authority in curriculum matters to 47 percent.
3. General Administration and governance: Board members say superintendents have 52 percent of the authority over general administration of the schools, but feel they should have 41 percent of the authority. Superintendents say they have 54 percent of the authority in the area of general administration, but should have 47 percent.
4. Financial management: Boards say superintendents have 52 percent of the authority pertaining to financial matters, but should only have 44 percent. Superintendents say they have 60 percent of the responsibility in the area of finance, but should have 57 percent (Alvey and Underwood, 1985, p. 25).

A survey conducted by the National Association of School Boards (NASB) in February of 1986, in which 1433 board members responded to a

survey on general feelings of school board members, found that, "the majority, 64 percent of male board members and 54 percent of female board members, agreed that the superintendent should be the absolute manager of the school system" (Luckett et al., 1987, p. 23).

The 1985 Educator Opinion Poll conducted by Educational Research Service asked superintendents "to what degree do you consider your board's involvement in the administration of the district to have been a problem during the past school year?" The following results were reported: (1) Forty-two percent respond that the school board's involvement in the administration of the school district has been no problem during the past school year, 30 percent a slight problem, 20 percent a moderate problem, and 7 percent a severe problem (Educator Opinion Poll, 1985, p. 52). Typically when school board involvement is perceived to be a problem, superintendents report it is with an individual board member (95 percent of respondents) and only 10 percent reported problems with the board as a whole.

Research also suggests that conflicts over level of authority are not limited to the board of education and the superintendent. "The superintendent is beset by conflicting cross-currents of pressure" (Hentges, 1985, p. 5). Parents, community members, teachers and students, according to Hentges, also enter into the decision-making arena where policy issues such as finance, school closings, construction of facilities, desegregation and civil rights are concerned. He posits, "public opinion is seen as carrying as much weight in these policy issues, if not more so, than the technical expertise of the superintendents or the

school board authority" (p. 12). It has also been suggested that school boards have become concerned, uneasy and more aggressive recently, not always to the benefit of the educational institutions for whom they are responsible. It also appears that a relationship may exists between board make up and diminishing levels of superintendent authority. School board membership used to be unofficially limited to owners of local industry and business executives. Now greater proportions of women and workers from various fields including professionals, teachers, and laborers serve on school boards. It appears that when shop owners and business executives served on school boards they may have been more willing to allow the superintendents make decisions. A combination of more aggressive board members, public concern over issues confronting schools today may account for a closer inspection of the decision making process by the board (Genck, 1983).

Genck (1983) mentioned other issues that will be examined later in this chapter as potential challenges to the superintendent. These include changing attitudes toward authority, parents less respectful of educators, the negative impact of declining enrollment, attitudes of concern and suspicion on the part of taxpayers, and continuing media attention to performance problems. He and other authors noted that encroachment on the decision-making authority of the local school districts by state and federal government is also on the rise.

Job Security Issues Facing Superintendents

Superintendents "are high employment opportunities which offer good salary benefits although stressful working conditions" (Shepard, 1986, p.

4). How perilous is the superintendency? All offices must eventually change hands, with the school superintendency there tend to be more frequent switches (Carlson, 1972). Superintendents according to Carlson "have infinitely more chances to make enemies than friends and they must be re-elected by an ever-changing school board; thus they do not ordinarily last long even if they want to" (p. 144). Heller and Conway (1987) reviewed the results of the 1984 Executive Educator study relative to job security and found 51 percent of the superintendents reported they felt very secure in their jobs. However, 39 percent of the superintendent respondents reported feeling "only somewhat secure" in their jobs and 9 percent report "little or no job security."

The AASA (1982) study on the status of the superintendency compared the 1971 and 1982 responses to the question, "What educational issues, if intensified, would cause superintendents to leave the field?" The results were as follows:

Issues 1971

1. Attacks on the superintendent
2. Negotiations, strikes & sanctions
3. Low caliber of board members
4. Financing schools
5. Student unrest
6. Social/cultural ferment

Issues 1982

1. Negotiations, strikes and sanctions
2. Low caliber of board members
3. Administrator-board relations
4. Financing schools
5. Attacks on the superintendent
6. Consolidation
7. Social/cultural ferment (p. 63)

The personal issues seem to weigh heavily on the minds of

superintendents as they consider their future. Relations with teachers, board, and administrators and personal attacks on the superintendent are near the top of the list. Financing the schools has long lasted as a major concern for superintendents.

The 1982 AASA study also asked superintendents to rank issues that inhibit their effectiveness. Inadequate financing of the schools, was reported as the number one detriment to their effectiveness. "Rounding out the top five were: 2) too many insignificant demands upon the superintendent, 34 percent; 3) lack of time, 22 percent; (4) collective bargaining, 17 percent; and 5) too much added responsibility, 12 percent" (p. 64).

Conflict can become a job security issue. "No superintendent is immune to conflict. Even the superintendent who for years has been perceived as highly successful can suddenly be accused of inadequately performing his or her job" (Hayden, 1986, p. 17). Hess (1986) says, "failure to work effectively with school boards as a number one cause of dismissal followed by: (2) lack of honesty and integrity, and (3) failure to exercise staff leadership (p. 14). Hentges (1985) found single issue board members to be a threat to superintendent job security. They can rally the troops and soon have the superintendent on the defensive.

Reasons for feeling less secure in the superintendency are still some of the same things we have long believed to be stumbling blocks to successful tenures as superintendents. Engel (1985) speaks of a 1950 survey where he surveyed board presidents to assess the performance of Iowa superintendents who changed jobs that year. His conclusion:

> Many intangibles contribute to the failure of superintendents. In Iowa in 1950, the number one problem was lack of tact; others included failure to keep the board informed, poor community relations, and inability to maintain the respect of the faculty (p. 40).

Issues and Challenges Facing Superintendents

This section reviews the literature on issues and challenges facing school superintendents. The events of the past decade have led some researchers to conclude that formidable challenges confront superintendents. Volp noted, "the role expectations and challenges of the superintendency have nearly outstripped the individual's capacity to fill them" (p. 1). Erion (1986) stated, "issues impacting the superintendency have never reached the level of complexity as seen now by the combination of issues and pressures impacting modern education" (p. 25).

The American Association of School Administrators has conducted a study of the superintendency every ten years for the past sixty years. The 1982 survey asked superintendents to rank the issues and challenges facing them. The ten issues that received highest ranking in 1982 a year prior to the reform movement were:

Issues and Challenges	Rank	Percentage
Financing Schools	1	94.4
Planning and goal setting	1	77.5
Assessing educational outcomes	3	76.9
Accountability/credibility	4	73.8
Staff and administrator evaluation	5	72.2
Administrator/board relations	6	71.5
Special education/Public Law 94-142	7	70.6
Obtaining timely and accurate information for decision making	8	68.1
Issues such as negotiations, strikes	9	62.9
Rapidly decreasing/increasing		

enrollments	10	60.9

(p. 60)

The results of the 1982 AASA study and the review of the literature reveal three themes pervade the challenges facing school superintendents. The themes are: (1) The Reform Movement, (2) Societal change, and (3) The changing nature of the job. These themes will be discussed in this section.

The Reform Movement

During most of the 1980s, the state educational reform movement has been a major concern of superintendents. State reform became a national phenomenon in 1983. The movement brought to the forefront a variety of issues and concerns relative to the state of the American educational system.

There have been reform movements in our nation's history. Finn (1986) suggested that "the 1980's movement has been different from previous reform movements in three ways: (1) the focus has been primarily on measurable outcomes; (2) even though it has been a national effort, the impetus has been at the state and local level; and (3) the prime movers have been elected officials and lay leaders, not educators" (p. 14).

Most observers date the reform movement with the 1983 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education and the subsequent widespread publicity and acceptance of its contents. The report entitled A Nation at Risk would begin thorough investigation of the schools in America and produce many reforms that would challenge American schools and

their leaders. The Commission made it clear that perilous times were ahead. Their report opened with the following warning:

> Our Nation is at risk. Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world.... We report to the American people that while we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people (National Commission, 1983, p. 3).

A second warning was directly aimed at school administrators in a joint publication between the American Association of School Administrators and the Far West Laboratory entitled "Making it Happen."

> The time has come for action. The focus of the nation and it's leaders is now on the public schools. The public's expectations are high, and they are encouraging us to make our schools more effective. We cannot rest on our laurels as educational leaders and concerned citizens. Our ability to act effectively while public attention is focused on the schools will shape our destiny for decades to come (Spady and Marx, 1984, p. 22).

The report contained three essential messages which were in large measure echoed by the many reports that followed. Kimbrough and Nunnery (1988) suggest "the central message from the report is: (1) Our educational system is characterized by mediocrity; (2) there is a close tie between the quality of a nations educational system and its security, economic well-being and quality of life; (3) the nation must and can provide a better educational system" (p. 225).

The commission's recommendations included increasing attention to computer science, English, mathematics, and science; raising pupil performance standards and expectations; increasing instructional time, and

attracting more academically able persons to teaching. What happened to American education in addition to the erection of thousands of committees and the writing of more status reports in the period after A Nation at Risk pushed American Education into the national limelight.

Sergiovanni and Moore (1989) reported the following changes four years after reform took hold of American Education:

> --45 states and the District of Columbia have altered their reported requirements for earning a standard high school diploma, and these changes have universally been increases in required courses.
> --34 states and the District of Columbia had minimum requirements in 1980 and have added to that number.
> --Mathematics requirements were increased in 42 states. . . .
> --34 states changed their science requirements.
> --18 states modified their language arts requirements.
> --Social studies requirements were changed in 26 states.
> --Physical education and health requirements changed in 14 states.
> --Computer literacy is now a requirement in six states.
> --(As for the National Commission on Educational Excellence's "Five New Basics,") 15 states meet the English guideline; 10 clearly meet the science recommendation; 15 meet the social studies guideline; none meet the foreign language requirements; and six states require some kind of computer science.
> --School attendance age has been changed in 15 states. Six have added years at the end of mandatory schooling; six start students younger; three do both.
> --Six states increased the length of the school year; seven states decreased it.
> --The length of the school day has not undergone a major shift. (p. 17).

Following the publication of A Nation At Risk the National Commission of the States counted no fewer than 275 state and local task forces at work on educational issues (Williams, 1987). Three major reports were published on the status of Iowa schools. They include: Educational Excellence for Iowa, Renewing the Commitment: A Plan for Quality Education in Iowa, and Strategies for Excellence. The Iowa

legislature responded with a new set of state educational standards that would need to be implemented by July 1, 1989. These standards would call for increased course requirements, programs for at-risk students, a minimum school day and year, emphasis on early childhood education, academic learning time audits, and curriculum revision. The new standards created many new challenges for school superintendents in their roles as educational leaders.

Societal Change

The changes in our society have created many challenges for our schools and their leaders. There will be no shortages of challenging opportunities to radically alter the world in which we live and work. The leadership opportunities for school superintendents will continue to grow as our society undergoes drastic changes (Kouzes and Posner, 1988). Reflecting on societal trends will help educational leaders to meet the challenges of the future, and develop strategies to confront new problems (Clodi and Jacobson, 1989).

The portrait of the American family is continuing a rapid transformation according to researchers who study demographic trends. A former high-level official in the federal Department of Education, compiled a startling portrait of the United States school population. In 1985, Hodgkinson wrote:

> There is a tendency to think of the typical American family in terms of an old Norman Rockwell magazine cover, the working husband, the housewife, and two school children. Today, the description fits only 7 percent of American households. Consider the implications of these realities about today's children:

1. 14 percent are illegitimate.
2. 40 percent will be living with a single parent by their 18th birthday.
3. 30 percent are latchkey children.
4. 20 percent live in poverty.
5. 15 percent speak another language.
6. 15 percent have physical or mental handicaps.
7. 10 percent have poorly educated parents. (p. 3)

Trends toward decreased family stability, increased divorce rates, more childless couples and single parent families will continue. Women will continue to participate in the work force at increasing rates (Clodi and Jacobson, 1989). The growing number of families with working parents and single parent families is an aspect of contemporary living that is changing the ways in which schools relate to their communities. Child care, comprehensive health education programs, programs dealing with substance abuse, sex education programs dealing with AIDS, and programs designed to combat teen-age pregnancy will flourish in the expanded role of the school (Iowa Association of School Boards Committee on Strategies for Excellence, 1987). Breakfast programs, programs for latchkey children, day care, preschool and extensive health care programs are representative of the solutions necessary to keep our society stable and insure an equal opportunity to learn for all our children (Guthrie et al., 1988). "These changes in the environment of public schooling will mean that an increasing proportion of children will bring more problems to school, and that schools will be under pressure to increase the range of services they offer" (Elmore, 1988, p. 9).

A potentially dangerous and crippling detraction from healthy living and success in the classroom is student drug use. In 1987, one in six high school students had tried cocaine and 54 percent said it would be

fairly easy for them to obtain. The United States has the highest rate of teen drug use of any industrialized nation. In the 1986 Gallop poll on education, drug use was for the first time seen as the number one problem facing our nation's schools (Bennett, 1988). The 1982 AASA survey studying the status of superintendents found two societal issues of the list of eighteen top challenges facing superintendents. Changes in values and norms was a major concern of 53 percent of superintendents. Fifty-three percent were also concerned about the use of drugs and alcohol by pupils.

Population trends will continue to provide challenge for our school leaders. The population of the United States is predicted to decline slightly or remain stable according to different reports. Researchers (Clodi and Jacobson, 1989; Guthrie et al., 1988) predict that the population will experience a mild decline in the last decade of the 1990s. Jacobson and Clodi report that in the late 1990s, people over 85 years of age will outnumber teenagers. Nationwide only 40 percent of the voting population have children in school (Guthrie et al., 1988). These population declines will affect the local school districts and the challenges facing their leaders. Superintendents will have to work hard to claim their share of resources for support of the public schools. They will have to strive to increase support for the school system among the 60 percent of the electorate that do not have children in school. "The entire population will feel these changes, especially in the rural areas of Iowa" (Nassif-Ajluni and Baldwin, 1986, p. 26). Decisions will be made with the leadership of the superintendent that could bring negative

reactions from the people for and with whom he or she works, such as cuts in staff, administration, programs, facilities and even consolidation of whole districts. Superintendents will need to explore creative alternatives such as sharing programs, staff, students, and facilities (Nassif-Ajluni and Baldwin, 1986).

These previously mentioned societal changes will translate into programming challenges for school superintendents. Schools will meet the needs brought about by vast societal change if they can have proper leadership, keenly aware of the developing issues that are affecting schools (Clodi and Jacobson, 1989).

The Changing Nature of the Job

The literature reports one more theme regarding the issues and challenges facing the superintendent and that is the changing nature of the job. Penning (1987) comments on how Arthur Wise sees the challenges of school leaders today in a one word quote, "madness" (p. 32). Penning names educational trends of site based management, decentralization of authority, community control, professionalization of teachers, and collective bargaining as major forces in changing the nature of the position of superintendent of schools.

Teachers are the single largest employee group the superintendent works with. The teacher challenges confronting superintendents are the ramifications of collective bargaining that began in the 1960s and the teacher empowerment movement of the 1980s. In 1982, Duckworth and DeBevoise noted, "though the influence of organized teachers may be important in the areas of salary and working conditions their increased

participation in educational policy decision making is more striking still" (p. 8). They suggest that teachers have taken a major step to earn a say about issues such as: inservice training, professional development, class size, student discipline policies, reduction-in-force policies, and transfer procedures. Teachers are becoming involved in the important decisions that affect their students, their classrooms, and their schools (Rist, 1989). To school superintendents accustomed to controlling and directing the educational process; allowing teachers to devise their own approaches to teaching and learning might sound chaotic even irresponsible. However Behrens (1989) reminds superintendents that:

> successful leaders are more concerned with power to help people become more successful, to accomplish the things they think are important, and to experience a greater sense of efficacy. They understand that teachers need to be empowered to act - to be given the necessary responsibility that releases their potential and make their actions and decisions count. They do not view teachers as workers to be programmed and supervised, but as professionals to be inspired and held accountable to shared values and commitments (p. 18).

Superintendents have had to adapt to increased citizen participation in the decision making process since the 1970s. A substantial increase has been noted in the number of task forces and advisory councils in the past decade. The 1982 AASA survey on the status of the superintendency found that 58 percent of superintendents believe that citizen participation in 1982 was more important than a decade earlier. Nine out of ten superintendents believe community interest in public schools is increasing (AASA, 1982).

The 1982 AASA survey asked superintendents to identify the areas in which parents and citizens are involved in a planning or advisory

capacity. There responses are as follows:

1. Objectives and priorities for the school--69%
2. Program changes, new programs--64%
3. Fund raising--60%
4. Student activities--48%
5. Evaluation of programs--41%
6. Student behavior, rights and responsibilities--40%
7. Finance and budget--35% (p. 76)

Effects of School District Size

Most of the literature dealing with school district size addresses the controversial topic of optimum size of school district. Little available research examines the officeholders of superintendencies in school districts of various size to determine if they have different motivations, opinions, priorities, morale levels or different sets of issues and challenges facing them.

The available research fails to explicate if superintendents face different challenges, or have different morale levels. Some authors do, however, speculate that school district size might make a difference in the specific challenges or issues facing superintendents. Wilson (1960) speculated that school system size effects the duties of the school superintendent. He suggests that the general responsibilities of administering a large school system are the same as in a small consolidated system but substantial differences might exist in the actual work day and the major issues facing the chief executive officer. Large school systems have assistants to help the superintendent in speciality

areas, whereas, the small school superintendent personally performs all the duties expected of the superintendent. Wilson further compares the large and small school superintendencies to business:

> The differences in the two superintendents in a large and small school system are similar to the differences between the functions of the president of United States Steel Company and the owner of a small metal processing plant just getting started. Both organizations have similar tools, machines, personnel, processes of operation and goals. In the smaller plant, the owner might sell the product, assist in its production, purchase ingredients, keep the books, hire personnel and compose his own advertisments. The President of U.S. Steel is to coordinate the efforts of a corps of steel specialists who actually perform the various services (p. 28).

In a doctoral dissertation completed in 1977 measuring the perceived long range affects of collective bargaining Else speculated that the size of the Iowa school district might make a difference in the opinions concerning bargaining:

> There are 346 public school districts in Iowa. Excluding the Des Moines Public School District, they range in total enrollment size from less than 200 to more than 32,000 students. Certainly, with this large a range in school district enrollment size, the question as to whether teachers, superintendents, and board members in large districts may have different opinions from those held by teachers, superintendents, and board members in small districts raises some speculation (p. 88).

Else also found that superintendents in small school districts were less pessimistic regarding long-range effects of collective bargaining on teachers and education than were their large school counterparts. He concluded that school district size made a difference in the Iowa superintendents perception of collective bargaining.

Glass and Sclafani (1988) in their study of skills necessary to succeed in the school superintendency in the state of Texas were surprised

to learn that unlike past perceptions that superintendents are similar, if not monolithic, superintendents in different size school districts held differing views on the skills necessary to succeed as superintendents. The researchers concluded:

> By contrast the Texas survey found that superintendents in small rural school systems are likely to have different priorities than their colleagues in big, urban school systems. And these differences can be so basic that it might be accurate to look at the superintendency of the small school system, say, as a different kind of job from the superintendency of a large system (p. 19).

Bennett and Slater (1980) in their study of superintendents' perceptions of importance of the duties of their individual jobs reported, that variables related to the organization and size of a school district accounted for the majority of the difference among superintendents' ratings of the importance of job activities. They suggested that it would seem normal to expect differences in the challenges facing superintendents in varying sized school districts:

> They (superintendents) work in systems ranging in size from fewer than 1,000 to systems with more than 200,000 students. As we could imagine conditions and tasks vary tremendously across these situations; but in one way or another all district administrators face big problems. In the smaller districts they frequently carry out several functions with few resources, and in the larger districts they are constantly dealing with conflicts and crisis and large financial and personnel issues through an elaborate bureaucracy of specialists. The large the school system the greater the chances for misunderstandings and disagreements (p. 162).

Some issues affect all school districts, but in differing magnitude and with differing results. Nearly all Iowa school districts are feeling the effects of declining enrollments. However, Edelman and Knudsen (1986) suggest that the majority of enrollment decline has taken place in the

extremely small districts and the largest urban centers. People see declining enrollments as the first step to building closings in larger districts, school reorganization and the end of a town in the smaller districts (Nassif-Ajluni and Baldwin, 1986).

What does the research say about the differences in challenges faced by school superintendents serving varying sizes of school districts? Educational Research Service polled superintendents in 1985 to find out "what are the three biggest problems facing you in your district superintendency." Educator Opinion Poll (1985) reports three problems proving the most challenging to superintendents, namely:

1. inadequate financing
2. too much paperwork
3. collective bargaining (p. 9).

The three greatest challenges for small district superintendents were:

1. too much paperwork
2. inadequate financing
3. insufficient time/opportunity to keep up with new developments in education (p. 8).

The editors of the ERS report noted that large school district challenges are quite different from small school district challenges because small school superintendents work closely with parents, teachers, principals, and patrons while large school superintendents dealt with issues through the complexities associated with urban and suburban settings.

Glass and Sclafani (1988) support the position that large and small districts are significantly different. They suggest:

> Given the differences in priorities and skills needed between superintendents from varying kinds of school systems, large and small, it seems a mistake to look at the superintendency as a single occupation and the superintendents as a monolithic group that can be served following a single recipe. Instead of focusing on a single program for the superintendency, perhaps we should run professional development programs appropriate to the size and type of school district a perspective superintendent hopes to lead (p. 25).

Summary

The literature examines and defines the importance of a high level of morale on the part of the superintendent if he or she is to provide quality leadership and administer a productive school. It also seems that the superintendency has grown to a position of power and influence; however many checks are in place to assure that it does not allow one individual total control of the school but does allow enough autonomy to get the job done. Job security issues have been present since the inception of the position. When one individual is in charge of an organization that touches the lives of so many: students, staff, citizens, and the taxpayers, feelings of insecurity will arise from time to time. Challenges were present with the first superintendents over 150 years ago, and as far as the futurists can see the superintendency will be presented with new challenges as each new year approaches. Finally given the variance in school district size it seems probable that the issues and challenges facing superintendents might vary according to school district size.

CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the methods and procedures used to assess: 1) the level of morale of superintendents, 2) perceived level of authority accorded superintendents to make decisions, 3) the extent to which job security issues pose a problem for superintendents, 4) the extent to which educational issues are challenging superintendents and the relationship between, 5) master contract coverage and morale, and 6) school district size and the morale, job security issues and educational issues challenging superintendents.

This chapter, which describes the methods and procedures used to gather and analyze the data required for the study, has been divided into three major sections. The first section, the "selection of the sample" describes the population from which respondents were selected for the study. The second section "instrumentation" describes the instrument used to gather data for this study. The last section "analysis of data" reviews the statistical methods used in the treatment of the data selection of the sample.

Selection of the Sample

The population investigated for this study consisted of 258 of the 454 superintendents surveyed by the School Administrators of Iowa Status Study conducted in the Spring, 1989. This study was limited to only those superintendents who served as chief administrator of a K-12 school district. Superintendent/principals and assistant superintendents were excluded from the study.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to gather data for this study, The Iowa School Superintendent Status and Opinion Study survey, was one of three separate instruments developed by the investigator for the School Administrators of Iowa (SAI) organization in the Fall of 1988. SAI sought information about the status of the elementary principalship, the secondary principalship and the superintendency in the public schools across the entire state of Iowa. These instruments were developed using the National Association of Elementary School Principals 1988 survey instrument as a model. The data were gathered by administration of a mailed survey instrument. The School Administrators of Iowa organization provided funding for development and dissemination of the survey instruments.

The data for this study were collected from the survey on the status of the superintendency and will be discussed later in this chapter. The 78 questions of the SAI superintendents' survey instrument were modified and developed with counsel of professors from Iowa State University, and University of Northern Iowa, and the Executive Director of School Administrators of Iowa. The first draft of the survey instrument was submitted to the following persons for review and suggestions:

Dr. Jim Sweeney, Professor of Educational Administration, Iowa State University

Dr. Jerry Herman, Associate Professor of Educational Administration, Iowa State University

Dr. Jim Doud, Professor of Educational Administration, University of Northern Iowa

Dr. Robert Decker, Associate Professor Educational Administration, University of Northern Iowa

Dr. Gaylord Tryon, Executive Director School Administrators of Iowa

Their suggestions were refined to develop the survey which was used for this study.

The SAI superintendent's survey instrument contained nine major areas. The first section asked status questions (title, age, and job satisfaction). The following sections contained questions dealing with (2) individual district demographics (enrollment, geographic type, coverage by a master contract, and morale), (3) experience and preparation, (4) conditions of employment, (5) responsibility and authority, (6) problems of the superintendency (job security issues), (7) challenges of the superintendent (educational issues), (8) career support, and (9) the administrator and technological preparedness. The survey instrument appears in its entirety in the Appendix E.

Four areas are the object of this study. They dealt specifically with the level of morale of superintendents, (2) the extent of challenge posed by educational issues facing superintendents, (3) the extent to which job security issues are a problem, and (4) level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents. Responses to several questions on the SAI survey instrument which address these variables were analyzed to address the questions of the current study. (See Appendix D.)

The level of morale of superintendents was measured by question number 29 which asked superintendents to to best describe their own level of morale by using the following response categories: (1) Very bad, (2)

Bad, could be worse, (3) Good, could be better, and (4) Excellent.

Question 64 presented superintendents with a list of ten job security issues. Superintendents were asked to indicate the extent to which each of the ten items was currently or potentially within the next year a problem relative to their own feeling of job security using the following response categories: (1) no problem, (2) minor problem, and (3) major problem. Nine of the ten job security issues were selected for data analyses for the current study. Question 66 presented superintendents with a list of forty-seven educational issues. Superintendents were asked to indicate the extent to which each of the forty seven issues presented them a challenge using the following response categories: (1) no challenge, (2) minor challenge, (3) major challenge. Forty-four of the educational issues were selected for data analysis in the current study. Survey question number fifty-seven was selected to measure superintendents perceived level of authority. They were asked to define the level of authority as (1) high, (2) moderate or (3) low.

Additional questions were selected to determine (1) whether or not the district was covered by a master contract agreement (question 27), and (2) the actual K-12 school district enrollment for the 1988-89 school year (question 14).

Procedures

The survey instrument was developed, disseminated, and collected by School Administrators of Iowa. A cover letter assuring anonymity and a survey instrument were mailed to each subject. An accurate account of the replies from the subjects was maintained and approximately two weeks after

the initial mailing, a follow up letter was sent to each nonrespondent. Two hundred and ten responded to the initial request. The follow-up letter increased the number of respondents to 300 -- a total return of 66 percent. The 258 respondents who served only as superintendents were pulled from the 300 to provide data for this study.

Analysis of the Data

After the instruments were received by School Administrators of Iowa they were turned over to this investigator. All survey instruments were coded and delivered to the Iowa State Statistics Lab for key punching. The data were then transferred to the Iowa State Computation Center. Statistical treatment of the data was completed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Norusis, 1983). Descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, and standard deviations) were computed to study the relative value of the study variables. Appropriate tests of statistical significance were selected in order to test the null hypotheses presented in this study. The specific tests chosen to address each of the hypothesis are the following:

Hypothesis 1 was tested by using an independent t test.

Hypotheses 2, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, were tested using the single classification analysis of variance procedure. The Scheffe Range procedure was used for the pair wise comparison of the means when a significant difference was found.

For hypotheses 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, the Pearson Product-moment correlation was used to assess whether a relationship existed between the two variables of interest.

CHAPTER IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to examine the level of morale of Iowa superintendents and selected factors related to superintendent's level of morale, i.e.: the perceived level of decision making authority accorded Iowa superintendents, job security issues, and educational issues which provide a challenge to superintendents. The study investigated whether independent variables such as school district size, and coverage by a master contract agreement, are related to morale, and how the selected factors were related to morale.

The results of the study are presented in three sections: (1) demographic descriptive data, (2) study variable descriptive data, and (3) hypothesis testing.

Demographic Descriptive Data

Profile of the Respondents

The data were collected from 258 Iowa school superintendents in February of 1989. The superintendents represented districts enrolling from 98 to 30,000 students, from all locations in the state of Iowa. They were asked to provide information about themselves and about specific aspects of their jobs. While there appears to be no such thing as an average Iowa superintendent, these data can be used to develop a profile of the Iowa public school superintendent in 1989. Below is a description of what can be called a typical Iowa superintendent.

The typical Iowa school superintendent is white male; 96.5 percent of superintendents were male (see Table 1). All 258 were Caucasian. The

range of ages for the superintendents is from 34 to 67 years of age with the median being 51 years (see Table 1).

Most superintendents had been in education in education for 10 to 15 years prior to becoming a superintendent. The age range at the time of their appointment to their first superintendency was 24 years to 61 years, with a mean starting age of 36 years (see Table 1). The majority of superintendents hold a specialist degree in educational administration or a six year certificate. Twenty-four percent hold a doctorate degree (see Table 2). Most Iowa superintendents have held their current position less than ten years. Forty-six percent have not worked outside their current district as a superintendent and most (87%) have spent their careers as superintendents in Iowa (see Table 2).

TABLE 1. Profile of superintendent respondents

Variables	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Sex			
Male	248	96.5	96.5
Female	9	3.5	100.0
Age range of superintendents			
30-39	21	8.2	8.2
40-49	92	35.8	44.0
50-59	115	44.7	88.7
60-69	30	11.3	100.0
Median Age 51 years			
Range 34-67 years			

TABLE 1 (continued)

Variables	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Age range for first superintendency			
20-24	2	.8	.8
25-29	35	13.9	14.7
30-34	60	23.9	38.6
35-39	78	31.1	69.7
40-44	48	19.1	88.8
45-49	21	8.4	97.2
50+	7	2.8	100.0

TABLE 2. Profile of superintendents' career path

Variables	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Highest degree held			
Masters	62	24.5	24.5
CAS/Specialists	130	51.4	75.9
Doctorate	61	24.1	100.0
Years in current school			
0-5	122	48.0	48.0
6-10	41	16.2	64.2
11-15	38	14.9	79.1
16-20	28	11.1	90.2
21-25	20	7.8	98.0

TABLE 2 (continued)

Variables	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
26+	5	2.0	100.0
Years in other Iowa Districts			
0	116	45.7	45.7
1-5	63	24.9	70.5
6-10	45	17.6	88.2
11-15	20	7.9	96.1
16-20	6	2.3	98.4
21-25	4	1.6	100.0
26+	0	.0	100.0
Mean 4.08			
Years out of state			
0	221	87.0	87.0
1-5	21	8.2	95.3
6-10	7	2.7	98.0
11-15	3	1.2	99.2
16-20	2	.8	100.0

The majority of superintendents (62%) serve in medium size districts with enrollments of 500-1999 students (see Table 3) and categorize the districts they serve as small towns (see Table 3).

TABLE 3. Profile of school districts

Variables	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
School District Enrollment			
Small 1-499	70	27.1	27.1
Medium 500-1999	160	62.0	89.1
Large 2000+	28	10.9	100.0
Community Geographic Type			
Urban/suburban	38	14.7	14.7
Small town	139	53.9	68.6
Rural	81	31.4	100.0

The Iowa superintendent works an average of 9 hours per day and puts in an additional 11 hours per week at night and during the weekend. For this 56-hour work week Iowa superintendents earn a median yearly salary of $47,882. The salary, without fringe benefits, ranges from $31,469 in one of the smaller districts to $80,000 per year in one of the larger districts (see Table 4).

TABLE 4. 1989-90 salary of superintendents

Variables	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
30,000-34,999	5	2.0	2.0
35,000-39,999	24	9.5	11.5
40,000-44,999	67	26.6	38.1
45,000-49,999	53	21.0	59.1

TABLE 4 (continued)

Variables	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
50,000-54,999	47	18.7	77.8
55,000-59,999	32	12.7	90.5
60,000-64,999	12	4.7	95.2
65,000+	12	4.8	100.0
Range 31,469-80,000			
Mean 48,520			

When asked how satisfied they were with their current superintendency, 46 percent said they were very satisfied (see Table 5). Forty-eight percent said if they could choose their career path again they certainly would become superintendents (see Table 5). When asked if the superintendency was their final occupational goal, 74 percent responded "yes", while 23 percent are considering other career opportunities (see Table 5). Thirty-nine percent of those considering leaving the superintendency would look to careers out of education. Twenty-one percent would consider careers in Higher Education (see Table 5).

TABLE 5. Level of superintendent job satisfaction

Satisfaction Variables	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Satisfaction with current superintendency			
Very Dissatisfied	0	0.0	0.0
Dissatisfied	7	2.7	2.7

TABLE 5 (continued)

Satisfaction Variables	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Neutral	21	8.2	10.9
Satisfied	110	42.8	53.7
Very Satisfied	119	46.3	100.0
Would pursue superintendency again			
Certainly would not	8	3.1	3.1
Probably would not	42	16.5	19.6
Probably would	83	32.5	52.1
Certainly would	122	47.8	100.0
Superintendency final goal?			
Yes	188	73.7	73.7
No	67	26.3	100.0
Ultimate Career Goal			
Secondary teacher	2	3.0	3.0
College teacher	21	31.8	34.8
Asst. Superintendent	2	3.0	37.9
Central office position	2	3.0	40.9
Outside education	26	39.4	80.3
Other	13	19.7	100.0

Reports have alerted school boards to the graying of their administrators and possible shortages of superintendents in the near future. Iowa superintendents plans for retirement parallel national

trends. Seventy-one percent plan to retire by age 62 with 16 percent reporting planned retirement at age 60. Thirty-three percent of Iowa superintendents plan to retire by 1995 (see Table 6). Age 62 is the most popular retirement age target for Iowa superintendents.

TABLE 6. Superintendents' planned retirement

Variable	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Planned retirement age			
45-49	1	.4	.4
50-54	5	2.0	2.4
55-59	44	17.8	20.2
60-64	141	57.1	77.3
65-69	54	21.9	99.2
70+	2	.8	100.0
Mode 62			
Superintendents retiring in next 7 years			
1989	11	4.4	4.4
1990	12	4.8	9.2
1991	9	3.6	12.8
1992	12	4.8	17.6
1993	13	5.2	22.8
1994	8	3.2	26.0
1995	18	7.3	33.3
Total	83	33.3	33.3

Collective bargaining has been an element of public school administration in Iowa since 1975. Ninety-two percent of the superintendents surveyed serve in a district covered by a collective bargaining agreement for teachers (see Table 7). Fourteen years after the inception of collective bargaining in Iowa, 62 percent of superintendents say it is having a negative effect on the quality of public education in Iowa. Another 32 percent report little if any effect (see Table 7). Sixty-nine percent report that they feel collective bargaining in public education does have a negative effect on public opinion concerning education generally (see Table 7).

TABLE 7. Superintendents' perceptions of collective bargaining coverage by a master contract agreement

Variable Coverage	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	236	92.2	92.2
No	20	7.8	100.0
Missing cases	2	.0	100.0
Total	258	100.0	100.0
Effect of collective bargaining on educational quality			
Don't Know	7	2.8	2.8
Bad	157	62.3	65.1
Little	80	31.7	96.8
Good	8	3.2	100.0

TABLE 7 (continued)

Variable Coverage	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Effect of collective bargaining on public opinion			
Don't Know	7	2.8	2.8
Bad	173	68.7	71.4
Little	70	27.8	99.2
Good	2	.8	100.0

Considering the issues and challenges facing Iowa superintendents, superintendents were asked to indicate: (1) the value of types of professional preparation programs and experiences, (2) the areas of greatest need for professional development, and (3) where they felt they could get the best assistance in relation to their needs for professional development. Preparation of school superintendents has long been recognized as an important activity. Yet, the respondents rated "on the job experience" as having the most value in preparing them for the superintendency. Experience as a principal and experience as a teacher were the next most significant help in job preparation (see Table 8). In terms of their own needs for professional development the superintendents indicated that their three most prominent needs were 1) strategic planning, 2) improving staff performance, and 3) coping with political forces influencing the school (see Table 9). They feel they can get the best assistance in professional development from 1) School Administrators

of Iowa, 2) Area Education Agencies, and 3) The Iowa Association of School Boards (see Table 10).

TABLE 8. Value of type of superintendent preparation (Percentages were figured on valid answers only.)

Type of preparation	RATING OF VALUE		
	much	some	little value
On the job experience	241	2	3
as a superintendent	98.0	.8	1.2
Experience as a	204	24	14
principal	84.4	9.9	5.8
Experience as a	167	83	5
teacher	65.5	32.5	2.0
Local and state	131	110	12
meetings	51.8	43.5	4.7
In-service study	94	118	23
and training	40.0	50.2	9.8
Graduate Education	125	114	16
	49.0	44.7	6.3
Experience as an	24	6	76
Assistant Superintendent	22.6	5.7	71.7
National meetings of	46	125	58
superintendents	20.1	54.6	25.3
Internship in school	21	35	78
administration	15.7	26.1	58.2

TABLE 8 (continued)

Scale:	1 = of little value 2 = of some value 3 = of much value

TABLE 9. Identified needs by superintendents for professional development

Professional Development Need	Percent
Strategic Planning	40.3
Improving Staff Performance	39.1
Coping With Political Forces influencing the school	27.8
Planning and Implementation of curricular Goals	27.1
Assessment/Evaluation of the Instructional Program	24.4

TABLE 10. Superintendents preferred source for professional development

Organization	Percent
School Administrators of Iowa	66.7
Area Education Agency	55.8
School Board Association	51.7
College or University	44.9
National Association for Administrators	19.0
Local District	12.0

Study Variables Descriptive Data

Descriptive data were collected from the survey instrument from 258 participating superintendents related to each of the four major study variables. The four major study variables will be briefly discussed and mean scores and frequencies presented for each.

Level of Morale of Superintendents

The superintendents were asked to describe their own level of morale using the following response categories: (4) Excellent, (3) Good, could be better, (2) bad, could be worse, and (1) Very bad. Superintendents' level of morale is reported in Table 11. None of the superintendents reported their level of morale as "very bad." Ninety-seven percent of the responding superintendents reported their level of morale as either good or excellent. Eight individuals or 3 percent described levels as bad.

TABLE 11. Level of morale for superintendents

Variables	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Superintendents level of morale			
Excellent	112	43.5	43.4
Good, could be better	138	53.5	96.9
Bad, could be worse	8	3.1	100.0
very bad	0	0.0	100.0

Level of Authority

The Iowa superintendents by law and by current practice are the chief

executive officers of the school district. The debate as to who actually governs the school, the board or the superintendent has been waged on since the inception of the superintendency. With this in mind the researcher posed the question, "how would you describe the level of authority accorded you to make decisions concerning your district." Superintendents indicated that their level of authority was either high, moderate or low. Most (88%) reported a high level of authority (see Table 12). Only two superintendents (1%) reported a low level of authority to make decisions.

TABLE 12. Level of authority accorded superintendents

Level of Authority	N	Percent	Cumulative Percent
High	222	88.4	88.4
Moderate	27	10.8	99.2
Low	2	.8	100.0

Feelings of Job Security

Nine job security issues were identified by the researcher as likely to have a major impact on the superintendents' feelings relative to job security. The superintendents were asked to indicate the extent to which each of the nine specific job security issues presented a problem relative to their own job security. The results are shown in Table 8. Poor personal performance evaluation was reported as having a major effect on their perceptions of job security by 25%. Another 31% expressed minor

concerns about poor personal performance evaluation. Reorganization of school districts was also perceived as a serious threat to job security; 21 percent of the superintendents reported it is currently or would be a major problem within the next year and an additional (40%) indicated minor concern over school district reorganization. Reduction in force due to declining enrollments was viewed as the least threatening job security issue with 81 percent responding "no problem." Conflicts between personal and board philosophy was reported as a major problem by only 3 percent of responding superintendents (see Table 13).

TABLE 13. Job security issues (Percentages were figured on valid answers only. Missing cases were not reported.)

		Rating of Importance		
Security Issues	Statistic	Major	Minor	No Problem
Poor personal performance evaluation	n	65	78	113
	%	25.4	30.5	44.1
Reorganization of schools districts	n	55	103	99
	%	21.4	40.1	38.5
Conflicts with teachers	n	30	135	90
	%	11.6	52.9	35.3
Lack of liability insurance	n	30	91	135
	%	11.6	35.5	52.7
Unsatisfactory student Performance	n	19	113	124
	%	7.4	44.1	48.1

TABLE 13 (continued)

Security Issues	Statistic	Rating of Importance Major	Minor	No Problem
Personal deficiencies in some skill areas	n	10	60	118
	%	4.0	23.7	72.3
Conflicts with principals	n	8	88	158
	%	3.1	34.6	61.2
Conflicts between my philosophy with board	n	7	63	186
	%	2.7	24.6	72.7
Reduction in force due to declining enrollment	n	5	44	206
	%	2.0	17.3	80.8

Educational Issues Challenging the Superintendent

Superintendents were provided a list of major issues and asked to respond to the level of challenge presented by each issue. Forty-four issues were provided in the survey and superintendents had the opportunity to list other issues. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which each issue" was currently or potentially within the next year a major or minor challenge" in their districts.

The forty-four educational issues comprised five major categories or issue types. The major categories were: student issues, teacher issues, educational program issues, planning issues and relationship issues. Table 14 shows the results.

The most challenging student issue reported was use of alcoholic beverages by students. Fifty-one percent of responding superintendents

identified it as a major challenge and another 44 percent responded that it was a minor challenge. Phase III incentives were rated the most challenging teacher issue; (50%) of the respondents indicated it was a major challenge. State initiatives and regulations ranked highest on the list of educational program issues. Seventy-seven percent of superintendents rated this issue as a major challenge. When considering future planning issues for the individual district 72 percent rated "financing the district" as a major challenge and 20 percent reported a minor challenge with school finance. The relationship issue "school and community relations" was rated as the major relationship challenge facing superintendents. Seventeen percent of responding superintendents said it was a major challenge and an additional (51%) reported a minor with the issue of school/community relations.

TABLE 14. Student, teacher, program, planning, and relationship issues reported as challenges by Iowa superintendents

Issue Types	Rating of Challenge					
	Major	Minor	No	Mean	SD	Rank
Student Issues						
Use of alcoholic	126	108	14	2.45	.60	4
beverages by students	50.8	43.5	5.6			
Level of parental	56	159	37	2.08	.60	10
involvement	22.2	63.1	14.7			
Use of drugs by pupils	50	165	35	2.06	.58	23
	20.0	66.0	14.0			

TABLE 14 (continued)

	Rating of Challenge					
	Major	Minor	No	Mean	SD	Rank
Pupil absenteeism	44	126	81	1.85	.69	26
	17.5	50.2	31.4			
Changing composition	33	87	129	1.61	.71	29
of student body	13.3	34.9	51.8			
Managing student	30	141	78	1.81	.63	31
behavior	12.0	56.6	31.3			
Sexual behavior of	26	139	87	1.76	.63	34
pupils	10.3	55.2	34.5			
Child abuse	23	159	69	1.82	.58	39
	9.2	63.3	27.5			
Complying with student	10	119	121	1.56	.57	41
records regulations	3.9	46.1	46.9			
Violence in the	6	62	181	1.30	.51	42
schools	2.4	24.9	72.7			
Vandalism	5	118	128	1.51	.54	44
	2.0	47.0	51.0			

N ranged from 248-252.

Teacher Issues	Major	Minor	No	Mean	SD	Rank
Phase III	126	106	20	2.42	.64	5
	50.0	42.1	7.9			

TABLE 14 (continued)

Teacher Issues	Major	Minor	No	Mean	SD	Rank
Teachers union activities	82 32.7	126 50.2	43 17.1	2.16	.69	12
Evaluating teachers	77 31.0	136 54.8	35 14.1	2.17	.65	13
Level of teacher performance	77 30.6	148 58.7	27 10.7	2.20	.61	14
Teacher empowerment	61 24.3	133 53.0	57 22.7	2.02	.69	18
Staff morale	52 21.0	153 61.7	43 17.3	2.04	.62	21
Teacher absenteeism	29 11.6	139 55.4	83 33.1	1.79	.63	32
Dismissing incompetent staff	10 4.0	119 47.6	121 48.4	2.02	.71	39
N ranged from 248-252						
Coping with state regulation initiatives	193 76.6	50 19.8	9 3.6	2.73	.52	
Providing programs for At-Risk learners	133 53.0	100 39.8	18 7.2	2.46	.63	3
Coping with federal regulations	108 43.4	107 43.0	34 13.7	2.30	.70	8

TABLE 14 (continued)

	Rating of Challenge					
	Major	Minor	No	Mean	SD	Rank
Providing programs for underachievers	97 38.6	121 48.2	33 13.1	2.26	.67	9
Increased interest in pre-kindergarten programs	86 34.1	113 44.8	53 21.0	2.13	.73	11
Providing programs for gifted and talented students	68 27.2	118 47.2	64 25.6	2.02	.73	17
Mesh routine instruction/ academic pull-out programs	55 21.9	154 61.4	42 16.7	2.05	.62	20
Inadequate availability of Technology	52 20.6	117 46.4	83 32.9	1.89	.72	22
Special needs of latchkey children	47 18.7	160 63.5	45 17.9	2.01	.61	24
Providing programs for handicapped learners	46 18.3	130 51.8	75 29.9	1.88	.69	25
Declining test scores	26 10.3	130 51.6	96 38.1	1.72	.64	33
Programs for Non-English speaking students	5 2.0	55 22.1	189 75.9	1.26	.48	43

N ranged from 249-252.

TABLE 14 (continued)

Planning Issues	Major	Minor	No	Mean	SD	Rank
Financing the district	182	49	21	2.64	.63	2
	72.2	19.4	8.3			
Declining enrollment	115	90	46	2.28	.75	6
	45.8	35.9	18.3			
Planning or goal setting	111	116	24	2.35	.65	7
	44.2	46.2	9.6			
Shared programs	89	107	56	2.13	.75	10
	35.3	42.5	22.2			
Shared employees	76	108	66	2.04	.75	15
	30.4	43.2	26.4			
Restructuring boundaries	75	79	98	1.91	.83	16
	29.8	31.3	38.9			
Site-based management	31	136	83	1.79	.64	30
	12.4	54.4	33.2			
Increasing enrollment	16	30	204	1.25	.56	38
	6.4	12.0	81.6			

N ranged from 250-252.

Relationship Issues	Major	Minor	No	Mean	SD	Rank
School/community relations	42	128	80	1.85	.68	27
	16.8	51.2	32.0			

TABLE 14 (continued) (N ranged from 249-251.)

Relationship Issues	Major	Minor	No	Mean	SD	Rank
Administrator/employee relations	39 15.5	147 58.6	65 25.9	1.90	.64	28
Board/superintendent relations	23 9.2	111 44.2	117 46.6	1.63	.65	35
Superintendent/other administrator relations	16 6.4	103 41.2	131 52.4	1.54	.62	37
Central office involvement in building decisions	11 4.4	108 43.4	130 52.2	1.50	.58	40

Percentages were figures on valid answers only.

When considering the 44 challenges altogether, state regulations or initiatives was identified as the top challenge facing superintendents with 76 percent of respondents rating this specific challenge as major and another 20 percent responded that this issue would present a minor challenge. Financing the district, programs for at risk students, alcohol consumption by students, and Phase III round out the list of the top five major challenges facing superintendents (see Table 14).

The five least challenging issues are: (1) dealing with non-English speaking students, (2) vandalism, (3) violence in the schools, (4) alcoholic consumption by staff members, and (5) complying with student records regulations (see Table 14).

Hypothesis Testing

To answer each of the research questions presented in this study, a specific hypothesis was stated in the null form and tested. The 21 null hypotheses are presented and discussed in the order of the research questions presented in Chapter I. Each null hypothesis was tested with alpha set at .05.

The reader should note that the correlational measure of relationship in each case was low in magnitude indicating a weak relationship. However, since the correlations are based on a large number of subjects, the observed relationships are probably reflective of population values. The same will hold true for all succeeding hypotheses tested by correlation coefficients. All data used in this study were examined for range restrictions and range restrictions were evident for all hypotheses tested by correlation coefficients.

Ho 1 There is no significant difference in the level of morale of superintendents in districts covered by a master contract agreement and superintendents in districts not covered by a master contract agreement.

This hypothesis was tested using an independent t-test. As Table 15 shows the level of the superintendents morale in the contract-covered districts was .16 lower than that of the non-contract districts. The null hypothesis was not rejected ($t=-1.21$, $<.23$) since no significant difference was found between the level of morale of superintendents in districts covered by a master contract agreement and superintendents in districts not covered by a master contract agreement.

TABLE 15. Comparison of districts covered by a master contract agreement and those not covered by a master contract agreement with respect to level of morale of superintendents

Master Contract Coverage	n	Mean	SD	t	Two-tailed probability
Yes	236	3.39	.56	-1.21	.23
No	20	3.55	.51		

Scale: 1 = Very bad
2 = Bad, could be worse
3 = Good, could be better
4 = Excellent

Ho 2 There is no significant difference in the level of morale of superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts.

This hypothesis was formulated to determine if there are different levels of morale of superintendents in school districts of three different size categories. The data are presented in Table 16.

The probability of .97 of the observed F statistic indicates that morale levels of superintendents in small, medium, and large school did not vary significantly. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

TABLE 16. A comparison of the level of superintendent morale between superintendents in small, medium, and large size school districts

Statistic	District Size 1-499	500-1999	2000+	F	df	p
N	70	160	28	.03	2/255	.97
Mean	3.40	3.40	3.43			

TABLE 16 (continued)

Statistic	District Size 1-499	500-1999	2000+	F	df	p
SD	.36	.37	.19			

Scale: 1 = Very Bad
2 = Bad, could be worse
3 = Good, could be better
4 = Excellent

Ho 3 There are no significant relationships between the level of morale of superintendents and the extent to which nine job security issues are perceived as challenges.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not level of morale of superintendents was related to each of nine specific job security issues. This hypothesis was tested by examining nine different correlation coefficients (see Table 17).

A significant negative correlation was found between five of nine specific job security issues and level of superintendent morale: specifically, conflicts with teachers, conflicts between personal and board philosophy, reorganization of school districts, poor personal performance evaluation, and conflicts with principals. The correlation between superintendent morale and conflicts with teachers ($r=-.21$, $p<.01$) was the strongest. The null hypothesis was rejected for five of nine job security issues.

TABLE 17. Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which nine specific job security issues are perceived as challenges

Job Security Issues	r	n	p
Unsatisfactory student performance	-.02	256	.80
Conflicts with teachers	-.21	255	.00*
Conflicts with personal philosophy and the boards	-.13	256	.04*
Lack of liability insurance	-.02	255	.80
Reduction in force due to declining enrollment	-.02	257	.74
Reorganization of school districts	-.18	256	.00*
Poor personal performance evaluation	-.17	253	.01*
Personal deficiencies in skill areas	-.12	254	.06
Conflicts with principals	-.13	256	.00*

*Significant at the .05 level.

Ho 4 There are no significant relationships between the level of morale and the extent to which eleven student issues are perceived as challenges.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the level of morale of superintendents is related to the extent to which superintendents perceived eleven specific student issues as challenging. This hypothesis was addressed by examining eleven different correlation coefficients (see Table 18).

A significant negative relationship with level of superintendent morale was found for two of eleven student issues: specifically, use of drugs by pupils and vandalism. The null hypothesis was rejected for two of eleven specific student issues.

TABLE 18. Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which eleven specific student issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents

Student Issues	r	n	p
Managing student behavior	-.11	249	.09
Use of drugs by pupils	-.12	250	.05*
Use of alcoholic beverages by students	-.08	248	.19
Pupil absenteeism	-.05	251	.45
Changing composition of student body	.01	249	.82
Complying with student records regulation	-.03	250	.62
Vandalism	-.13	251	.03*
Violence in the schools	-.07	249	.21
Sexual behavior of pupils	-.01	252	.85
Child abuse	-.05	251	.45
Level of parental involvement	-.09	252	.36

*Significant at the .05 level.

Ho 5 There are no significant relationships between the level of morale of superintendents and the extent to which eight teacher issues are perceived as challenges.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the level of morale of superintendents was related to the extent to which superintendents perceived eight specific teacher issues to be challenging. This hypothesis was addressed by examining eight different correlation coefficients (see Table 19).

A significant negative relationship was found with level of superintendent morale for four of eight teacher issues: specifically, teacher union activities, Phase III incentives, dismissing incompetent staff, and staff morale. The correlation between the level of superintendent morale and staff morale ($r=-.27$, $p<.01$) was the strongest. The null hypothesis was rejected for four of eight specific teacher issues.

TABLE 19. Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which eight specific teacher issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents

Teacher Issues	r	n	p
Teacher union activities	-.15	251	.01*
Level of teacher activities	-.08	252	.21
Phase III incentives	-.13	252	.04*
Teacher empowerment	-.10	251	.11
Teacher absenteeism	-.07	251	.30
Dismissing incompetent staff	-.15	252	.02*
Evaluating teachers	-.05	248	.39
Staff morale	-.27	248	.00*

*Significant at the .05 level.

Ho 6 There are no significant relationships between the level of morale of superintendents and the extent to which twelve program issues are perceived as challenges.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the level of morale of superintendents was related to the extent to which superintendents perceived twelve specific educational program issues to be challenging. This hypothesis was addressed by examining twelve different correlation coefficients (see Table 20).

A significant negative relationship was found for only one of the twelve educational program issues: specifically, coping with state regulations and initiatives. The null hypothesis was rejected for one of twelve specific educational program issues.

TABLE 20. Correlations beteen the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which twelve specific program issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents

Program Issues	r	n	p
Declining test scores	-.06	252	.32
Programs for gifted and talented	-.01	250	.93
Programs for underachievers	-.00	251	1.00
Programs for handicapped learners	-.09	251	.15
Programs for at-risk students	-.07	251	.25
Mesh routine classroom instruction/pullout	-.02	251	.70
Special needs of latchkey children	-.01	252	.82
Coping with federal regulations	-.03	249	.61

TABLE 20 (continued)

Program Issues	r	n	p
Coping with state regulations/ initiatives	-.15	252	.01*
Interest in pre-kindergarten programs	-.06	252	.35
Inadequate availability of computers, etc.	-.02	252	.77
Non-English speaking students	-.04	249	.57

*Significant at the .05 level.

Ho 7 There are no significant relationships between the level of morale of superintendents and the extent to which eight planning issues are perceived as challenges.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the level of morale of superintendents was related to the extent to which superintendents pereceived eight specific planning issues to be challenging. This hypothesis was addressed by examining eight different correlation coefficients (see Table 21).

A significant negative relationship with level of superintendent morale was found for only one of eight planning issues: specifically, restructuring school boundaries. The hypothesis was rejected for one of eight specific planning issues.

TABLE 21. Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which eight planning issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents

Planning Issues	r	n	p
Financing district	-.03	252	.62
Shared programs	-.10	252	.13
Shared employees	-.10	250	.13
Planning or goal setting	-.04	251	.56
Declining enrollment	-.07	251	.29
Increasing enrollment	-.05	250	.45
Restructuring boundaries	-.12	252	.05*
Site-based management	-.04	250	.52

*Significant at the .05 level.

Ho 8 There are no significant relationships between the level of morale of superintendents and the extent to which five relationship issues are perceived as challenges.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the level of morale of superintendents was related to the extent to which superintendents perceived five specific relationship issues to be challenging. This hypothesis was addressed by examining five different correlation coefficients (see Table 22).

A significant negative relationship with superintendent morale was found for four of five relationship issues: specifically, central office involvement in building decisions, board superintendent relations, administrator/other employee relations, and superintendent/other employee relations. The correlation between level of superintendent morale and

school/community relations (r=-.27, p<.01) was the strongest. The hypothesis was rejected for four of five specific relationship issues.

TABLE 22. Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the extent to which five specific relationship issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents

Relationship Issues	r	n	p
Central Office involvement in building decisions	-.14	249	.02*
School/Community relations	-.27	251	.00*
Board/Superintendent relations	-.02	250	.72
Administrator/employee relations	-.12	251	.05*
Superintendent/other administrator relations	-.15	250	.02*

*Significant at the .05 level.

Ho 9 There is no significant relationship between the level of morale of superintendents and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the level of morale of superintendents was related to the level of authority accorded them to make decisions. This hypothesis was addressed by examining one correlation coefficient (see Table 23).

A significant relationship with superintendent morale was found with the level of authority accorded them to make decisions (p=.00). The null Hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 23. Correlations between the level of superintendent morale and the perceived level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents

r	n	p
-.19	251	.00*

*Significant at the .05 level.

Ho 10 There is no significant difference in superintendents' perceptions of job security issues in small, medium, and large school districts.

The hypothesis was examined by conducting an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with size as the independent variable for each of the nine specific job security issues.

The results of the analyses are shown in Table 24. As can be seen, the null hypothesis was rejected for two of the nine job security issues: namely, unsatisfactory student performance and school district reorganization. For each of these, the Scheffé test was carried out to determine which differences were significant.

With regard to unsatisfactory student performance, superintendents from large size school districts viewed unsatisfactory student performance as significantly more of a challenge than did superintendents from medium or small size school districts. The means and the results of the analysis of variance are shown in Table 24.

Superintendents from small school districts viewed school district reorganization as significantly more of a challenge than did superintendents from medium and large school districts.

TABLE 24. Tests for significant differences in the extent to which nine specific job security issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in school districts of small, medium, and large size school districts

	District Size					
Security challenges	1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Unsatisfactory student performance						
N	69	159	28	3.99	2/253	.02*
Mean	1.59	1.53	1.89			
SD	.65	.57	.79			
Teacher conflicts						
N	69	159	27	.34	2/252	.71
Mean	1.71	1.79	1.78			
SD	.67	.64	.65			
No liability insurance						
N	69	158	28	2.09	2/252	.13
Mean	1.30	1.17	1.21			
SD	.58	.39	.42			
Reduction in force						
N	69	160	28	2.72	2/254	.07
Mean	1.97	1.74	1.96			
SD	.73	.76	.74			

*Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 24 (continued)

Security challenges	District Size 1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
School district reorganization						
N	69	159	28	11.50	2/253	.00*
Mean	2.14	1.75	1.36			
SD	.79	.80	.62			
Poor performance evaluation						
N	69	156	28	1.55	2/250	.21
Mean	1.41	1.29	1.21			
SD	.60	.54	.42			
Personal deficiencies						
N	69	157	28	.08	2/251	.92
Mean	1.39	1.42	1.39			
SD	.52	.58	.50			
Principal conflicts						
N	69	159	28	.39	2/253	.68
Mean	1.26	1.31	1.36			
SD	.53	.50	.56			
	.39					
Board Philosophy conflicts						
N	69	159	28	.20	2/25	.82*
Mean	1.55	1.60	1.64			
SD	.63	.71	.73			

TABLE 24 (continued)

Scale:	1 = no challenge 2 = minor 3 = major

Ho 11 There is no significant relationship between superintendents' perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions and the extent to which nine job security issues are perceived as challenges.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the extent to which nine job security issues were perceived as challenges was related to the level of authority accorded superintendents to make decisions. This hypothesis was addressed by examining nine different correlation coefficients (see Table 25).

A significant positive relationship between job security issues and level of authority was found for five of nine job security issues: namely, conflicts with personal and board philosphy, reorganization of school districts, poor personal evaluation, personal deficiencies in the skill areas and conflicts with principals. The correlation between level of decision-making authority and conflicts with personal and board philosophy ($r=.34$, $p<.01$) was the strongest. The null hypothesis was rejected for five of nine specific job security issues.

TABLE 25. Correlations between the level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents and the job security challenges they face

Security Issues	r	n	p
Unsatisfactory student performance	.00	249	.98
Conflicts with teachers	.11	249	.09
Conflicts with personal philosophy and the boards	.34	249	.00*
Lack of liability insurance	.03	248	.63
Reduction in force due to decling enrollment	.01	250	.84
Reorganization of school districts	.13	249	.04*
Poor personal performance evaluation	.22	246	.00*
Personal defiencies in skill areas	.19	247	.00*
Conflicts with principals	.15	249	.02*

*Significant at the .05 level.

Ho 12 There is no significant difference in the extent to which ten student issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts.

The hypothesis was examined by conducting an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with size as the independent variable for each of eleven specific student issues.

The results of the analyses are shown in Table 26. As can be seen the null hypothesis was rejected for only one of the eleven specific student issues: namely, changing composition of the student body. For this variable, the Scheffé Range Test was carried out to find out which differences were significant.

Superintendents from small school districts reported changing composition of the student body as significantly more of a challenge than did superintendents from medium and large school districts.

TABLE 26. Tests for significant differences in the extent to which eleven specific student issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large size school districts

Student Issues	District Size					
	1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Managing student behavior						
N	68	157	24	.51	2/246	.60
Mean	1.76	1.81	1.92			
SD	.65	.62	.65			
Use of drugs by pupils						
N	68	157	24	2.70	2/247	.07
Mean	2.04	2.02	2.31			
SD	.63	.56	.55			
Use of alcoholic beverages by students						
N	67	155	26	.50	2/245	.61

TABLE 26 (continued)

Student Issues	District Size					
	1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Mean	2.40	2.46	2.54			
SD	.63	.61	.51			
Pupil absenteeism						
N	69	156	26	.36	2/248	.70
Mean	1.84	1.84	1.96			
SD	.68	.70	.72			
Changing composition of student body						
N	69	154	26	3.25	2/246	.04*
Mean	1.80	1.54	1.58			
SD	.80	.65	.76			
Complying with student records regulations						
N	69	155	26	2.96	2/247	.054
Mean	1.70	1.51	1.46			
SD	.60	.56	.51			
Vandalism						
N	69	157	26	.01	2/248	.99
Mean	1.51	1.51	1.50			
SD	.56	.54	.51			

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 26 (continued)

Student Issues	District Size					
	1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Violence in the schools						
N	68	155	26	2.58	2/246	.08
Mean	1.31	1.26	1.50			
SD	.50	.49	.58			
Sexual behavior of pupils						
N	69	157	26	.88	2/249	.92
Mean	1.74	1.77	1.73			
SD	.61	.61	.78			
Child abuse						
N	69	156	26	.01	2/248	.99
Mean	1.83	1.81	1.8			
SD	.62	.55	.			
Level of parental involvement						
N	69	157	26	.31	2/249	.73
Mean	2.04	2.08	2.15			
SD	.53	.63	.67			

Scale: 1 = major
2 = minor
3 = no challenge

Ho 13 There is no significant difference in the extent to which eight teacher issues are perceived as challenges in small, medium, and large school districts.

The hypothesis was examined by conducting an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with size as the independent variable for each of eight specific student issues.

The results of the analyses are shown in Table 27. As can be seen the null hypothesis was not rejected. No two groups were significantly at the .05 level when examining any of the eight specific student issues.

TABLE 27. Tests for significant differences in the extent to which eight specific teacher issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large size school districts

Teacher Issues	District Size 1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Teacher Union activities						
N	69	156	26	.30	2/248	.74
Mean	2.10	2.18	2.15			
SD	.75	.68	.61			
Level of teacher performance						
N	69	157	26	.46	2/249	.46
Mean	2.25	2.19	2.12			
SD	.65	.60	.59			
Phase III incentives						
N	69	157	26	2.62	2/249	.07
Mean	2.57	2.38	2.31			
SD	.58	.65	.62			
Teacher empowerment						
N	69	156	26	.54	2/248	.58

TABLE 27 (continued)

Teacher Issues	District Size 1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Mean	1.96	2.02	2.13			
SD	.70	.69	.65			
Teacher absenteeism						
N	68	157	26	12.01	2/248	.95
Mean	1.76	1.79	1.81			
SD	.55	.76	.87			
Dismissing incompetent staff						
N	69	157	26	1.47	2/249	.23
Mean	2.01	2.06	1.81			
SD	.70	.73	.57			
Evaluating teachers						
N	69	153	26	.02	2/245	.98
Mean	2.16	2.17	2.19			
SD	.56	.68	.75			
Staff morale						
N	68	154	26	.69	2/245	.50
Mean	2.06	2.01	2.15			
SD	.68	.61	.54			

Scale: 1 = no challenge
2 = minor
3 = major

Ho 14 There is no significant difference in the extent to which twelve program issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium and large school districts.

The hypothesis was examined by conducting an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with school district size as the independent variable for each of twelve specific educational program issues.

The results of the analyses are shown in Table 28. As can be seen, the null hypothesis was rejected for only one of the twelve educational program issues: namely, programs for Non-English speaking students. For this variable the Scheffé Range Test was carried out to determine which differences were significant.

Superintendents from the large school districts reported the provision of non-English speaking programs as significantly more of a challenge than did medium and small school districts. Superintendents from medium school districts reported significantly more of a challenge by the provision of programs for Non-English speaking students than small school superintendents but not as much of a challenge as reported by large school superintendents.

TABLE 28. Tests for significant differences in the extent to which program issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large size school districts

Program Issues	District Size 1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Declining Test Scores						
N	69	157	26	.94	2/249	.39
Mean	1.70	1.71	1.88			
SD	.63	.63	.71			
Programs for gifted and talented						
N	69	155	26	2.84	2/2480605	
Mean	2.19	1.94	2.04			
SD	.65	.75	.72			
Programs for underachievers						
N	69	156	26	2.06	2/248	.13
Mean	2.26	2.21	2.50			
SD	.68	.68	.58			
Programs for handicapped learners						
N	69	156	26	.66	2/248	.52
Mean	1.96	1.85	1.92			
SD	.63	.71	.69			
Programs for at-risk students						
N	69	156	26	2.84	2/248	.06
Mean	2.41	2.44	2.73			
SD	.65	.63	.45			

TABLE 28 (continued)

Program Issues	District Size 1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Mesh routine classroom instruction with pullout						
N	69	156	24	.81	2/248	.45
Mean	2.06	2.03	2.19			
SD	.62	.64	.49			
Special needs of latchkey children						
N	69	157	26	1.56	2/249	.21
Mean	1.90	2.05	2.04			
SD	.65	.61	.45			
Coping with federal regulations						
N	69	155	25	2.02	2/246	.14
Mean	2.42	2.27	2.12			
SD	.72	.69	.67			
Coping with state regulations/initiatives						
N	69	157	26	1.72	2/249	.18
Mean	2.83	2.70	2.65			
SD	.42	.54	.63			
Interest in pre-kindergarten programs						
N	69	157	26	1.39	2/249	.25
Mean	2.14	2.09	2.35			
SD	.69	.76	.63			

TABLE 28 (continued)

Program Issues	District Size 1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Inadequate availability of computers, etc.						
N	69	157	26	2.53	2/249	.08
Mean	1.78	1.87	2.15			
SD	.66	.74	.73			
Non-English speaking students						
N	69	156	24	9.89	2/246	.00*
Mean	1.10	1.28	1.58			
SD	.30	.49	.65			

*Significant at the .05 level

Scale: 1 = no challenge
2 = minor
3 = major

Ho 15 There is no significant difference in the extent to which eight planning issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts.

The hypothesis was examined by conducting an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with size as the independent variable for each of eight planning issues.

The results of the analyses are shown in Table 29. As can be seen, the null hypothesis was rejected for three of eight specific planning issues: namely, shared programs, shared employees, and declining enrollment. For each of these, the Scheffé Range Test was carried out to determine which differences were significant.

Superintendents from small school districts reported shared programs as significantly more of a challenge than did superintendents from medium and large school districts. Superintendents from medium school districts reported shared programs as significantly more of a challenge than did superintendents from large school districts, but not as much of a challenge as reported by superintendents in small school districts.

Superintendents from the small school districts reported shared employees as significantly more of a challenge than did superintendents from medium and large school districts.

Finally, the range test revealed that the superintendents from the small school districts reported declining enrollment as significantly more of a challenge than did superintendents from medium and large school districts. Examination of the resultant mean scores reveals that the smaller the school size the greater the challenge presented by declining enrollment.

TABLE 29. Tests for significant differences in the extent to which eight specific planning issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large size school districts

Planning Issues	District Size 1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Financing the District						
N	69	157	26	1.58	2/249	.21
Mean	2.62	2.61	2.85			
SD	.62	.67	.37			

TABLE 29 (continued)

Planning Issues	District Size 1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Shared programs						
N	69	157	26	13.71	2/249	.00*
Mean	2.42	2.10	1.58			
SD	.67	.74	.64			
F	13.71					
Shared employees						
N	69	155	26	18.96	2/247	.00*
Mean	2.39	1.99	1.42			
SD	.65	.75	.58			
Planning or goal setting						
N	69	156	26	1.45	2/248	.24
Mean	2.36	2.31	2.54			
SD	.59	.68	.58			
Declining enrollment						
N	68	156	26	12.01	2/248	.00*
Mean	2.62	2.17	1.96			
SD	.55	.76	.87			
Increasing enrollment						
N	69	155	26	2.67	2/247	.07
Mean	1.12	1.30	1.31			
SD	.37	.60	.68			

TABLE 29 (continued)

Planning Issues	District Size 1-499	500-1,999	2,000+	F	df	p
Restructuring boundaries						
N	69	157	26	2.26	2/249	.11
Mean	2.09	1.85	1.81			
SD	.84	.83	.75			
Site-based management						
N	68	156	26	.72	2/247	.49
Mean	1.81	1.76	1.92			
SD	.63	.62	.80			

Scale: 1 = no challenge
2 = minor
3 = major

* Significant at the .05 level.

Ho 16 There is no significant difference in the extent to which five relationship issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts.

The hypothesis was examined by conducting an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with size as the independent variable for each of five specific relationship issues.

The results of the analyses are shown in Table 30. The null hypothesis was not rejected for any of the five specific relationship issues. No two pairs of groups were significantly at the .05 level.

TABLE 30. Tests for significant differences in the extent to which five specific relationship issues are perceived as challenges by superintendents in small, medium, and large school districts

Relationship Issues	District Size 1-499	500-1999	2000+	F	df	p
Central office Involvement						
N	67	156	26	.37	2/246	.69
Mean	1.51	1.51	1.62			
SD	.64	.55	.64			
Board/Superintendent Relations						
N	68	157	26	1.62	2/248	.21
Mean	1.72	1.61	1.46			
SD	.73	.63	.51			
School/Community Relations						
N	68	156	26	.52	2/247	.59
Mean	1.90	1.81	1.92			
SD	.72	.68	.63			
Administrator/Employee Relations						
N	69	156	26	.33	2/248	.72
Mean	1.93	1.87	1.96			
SD	.65	.64	.60			
Superintendent/Other Employee Relations						
N	69	155	26	.22	2/247	.80
Mean	1.54	1.53	1.62			
SD	.65	.60	.64			

TABLE 30 (continued)

Scale:	1 = no challenge 2 = minor 3 = major

Ho 17 There is no significant relationship between superintendents' perceptions of eleven student issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the extent to which eleven specific student issues were perceived as challenges was related to the level of authority accorded superintendents to make decisions. The hypothesis was addressed by examining eleven different correlation coefficients (see Table 31).

None of the correlations was statistically significant when different from 0. The analysis failed to justify the rejection of the null hypothesis.

TABLE 31. Correlations between the extent to which eleven student issues are perceived as challenges and the perceived level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents

Student issues	r	n	p
Managing student behavior	-.02	242	.77
Use of drugs by pupils	-.06	243	.32
Use of alcoholic beverages by pupils	-.07	242	.25
Pupil absenteeism	-.01	245	.99

TABLE 31 (continued)

Student issues	r	n	p
Changing composition of the student body	-.11	243	.09
Complying with student records regulations	-.07	244	.30
Vandalism	-.01	245	.85
Violence in the schools	-.09	243	.18
Sexual behavior of pupils	-.05	245	.41
Child abuse	-.03	244	.60
Level of parental involvement	-.09	245	.15

Ho 18 There is no significant relationship between superintendents' perceptions of eight teacher issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the extent to which nine specific teacher issues were perceived as challenges was related to the level of authority accorded superintendents to make decisions. The hypothesis was adressed by examining nine different correlation coefficients. The correlation coefficients are shown in Table 32.

None of the statistical correlations was statistically significant when different from 0. The analysis failed to justify the rejection of the null hypothesis.

TABLE 32. Correlations between the extent to which eight teacher issues is perceived as challenges by superintendents and the level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents

Teacher issues	r	n	p
Teacher Union Activities	.09	245	.18
Level of teacher performance	.02	245	.76
Phase III	.09	245	.17
Teacher Empowerment	.06	244	.33
Teacher Absenteeism	.06	244	.37
Dismissing incompetent staff	.01	245	.93
Evaluating teachers	.10	242	.12
Staff morale	.06	242	.39
Teacher shortages	.07	245	.25

Ho 19 There is no significant relationship between superintendents' perceptions of twelve program issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the extent to which twelve educational program issues were perceived as challenges by superintendents was related to the level of authority accorded superintendents to make decisions. The hypothesis was addressed by examining twelve correlation coefficients. The correlation coefficients are shown in Table 33.

None of the correlations were statistically significant when different from 0. The analysis failed to justify rejection of the null hypothesis.

TABLE 33. Correlations between the extent to which superintendents perceive twelve specific program issues as challenges and the level of decision-making authority accorded them

Program issues	r	n	p
Declining test scores	-.05	245	.44
Providing programs for gifted and talented students	-.04	244	.56
Providing programs for underacheivers	-.03	244	.60
Providing programs for handicapped learners	-.03	244	.69
Providing programs for at-risk learners	-.00	244	.95
Mesh routine instruction and academic pull-out programs	-.06	244	.32
Special needs of latchkey children	-.03	245	.63
Coping with state regulations and initiatives	-.07	245	.25
Coping with federal regulations	-.03	242	.60
Increased interest in pre-kindergarten programs	-.04	245	.57
Inadequate availability of technology	-.05	242	.42
Programs for non-English speaking students			

Ho 20 There is no significant relationship between superintendents'perceptions of eight planning issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the extent to which eight planning issues were perceived as challenges by superintendents was related to the level of authority accorded them to make decisions. The hypothesis was addresseed by examining eight correlation coefficients. The correlation coefficients are shown in Table 34.

None of the correlations were statistically significant when different from 0. The analysis failed to justify the rejection of the null hypothesis.

TABLE 34. Correlations between the extent to which superintendents perceive eight planning issues as challenges and the level of decision-making authority accorded them

Planning issues	r	n	p
Financing the district	.00	245	1.00
Shared Programs	.06	245	.37
Shared Employees	.02	243	.70
Planning or goal setting	.11	244	.09
Declining enrollment	.05	245	.40
Increasing enrollment	.04	244	.50
Restructuring boundaries	.01	245	.65
Site-based management	.03	243	.68

Ho 21 There is no significant relationship between superintendents' perceptions of five relationship issues as challenges and the perceived level of authority accorded them to make decisions.

The hypothesis was designed to examine whether or not the extent to which five relationship issues were perceived by superintendents as challenges was related to the level of authority accorded them to make decisions. The hypothesis was addressed by examining five correlation coefficients. The correlation coefficients are shown in Table 35.

A significant positive relationship with level of authority was found with two of five relationship issues: namely, board/superintendent relations, and superintendent/other administrator relations. The correlation between the level of decision-making authority and board/superintendent relations ($r=.24$, $p<.01$) was the strongest. The null hypothesis was rejected for two of five relationship issues.

TABLE 35. Correlations between the extent to which superintendents perceive five relationship issues as challenges and the level of decision-making authority accorded them

Relationship Issues	r	n	p
Central office involvment in building decisions	.07	242	.14
Board/Superintendent relations	.24	244	.00*
School community relations	.05	243	.37
Administrator/employee relations	.12	244	.07
Superintendent/other administrator relations	.15	243	.02*

*Significant at the .05 level.

CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the following overarching areas: (1) the level of morale of superintendents and selected factors related to superintendent's level of morale, i.e., (2) the perceived level of decision making authority accorded Iowa superintendents, (3) job security issues, and (4) educational issues which provide a challenge to superintendents. The study investigated whether independent variables such as school district size and coverage by a master contract agreement are related to morale and how the selected factors were related to morale.

This chapter has been organized into the following sections: (a) a summary of the study, (b) discussion and conclusions, (c) limitations, and (d) recommendations for further research.

Summary

This study was limited to superintendents employed by Iowa school districts in the spring of 1989. Research questions were presented which dealt with (1) morale and factors relating to morale, (2) level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents, (3) job security issues, and (4) educational issues that present a challenge for superintendents. Additional questions dealt with the relationship of school district size and master contract coverage and the previously mentioned study variables.

Chapter Two offered a review of the relevant literature and research concerned with six separate areas. The first section of Chapter Two

discussed the literature related to the historical development of the superintendency. The remaining sections of Chapter Two discussed literature concerning morale, level of authority, job security issues, present educational issues, and school district size.

The methodology and procedures used in this study were presented in Chapter Three. A survey instrument, The Iowa School Superintendent Status and Opinion Study was used in the collection of data.

Chapter Four presented the findings. Descriptive results and statistical analysis of the data were presented. The major findings of this investigation are:

1. The "typical" Iowa School superintendent is 51 years old, male, holds a specialist degree in educational administration, has worked in a current school district for less than 5 years, is well satisfied with one's current superintendency (89 percent were either "very satisfied" or "satisfied" with their current position) and would pursue the superintendency again. Iowa superintendents indicated that strategic planning, improving staff performance and learning to cope with political forces influencing the schools are their top priorities for personal professional development.

2. The Iowa superintendent's self reported level of morale is relatively high--97 percent reported their morale was either good or excellent, with 54 percent reporting it was excellent.

3. Master contract coverage was not related to the Iowa superintendents level of morale. While only a few districts in Iowa do not have a master contract agreement, superintendents in those districts

with a master contract did not report significantly lower levels of morale than did their colleagues who are employed in districts not covered by a master contract agreement.

4. Three of nine job security issues were identified as currently or within the next year a major problem by Iowa school superintendents: (1) poor personal performance evaluation, (2) reorganization of school districts, and (3) conflicts with teachers. Those three issues, plus the issues of conflicts with board philosophy and conflicts with principals were related to the Iowa superintendents level of morale.

5. Five of forty-four educational issues were identified by superintendents as issues that presently or in the next three years will provide the most challenge: (1) coping with state regulations and initiatives, (2) financing the district, (3) providing programs for at-risk learners, (4) use of alcoholic beverages by students, and (5) Phase III teacher incentives. The following educational issues facing superintendents were related to morale levels of Iowa superintendents. Those related were: (1) staff morale, (2) school community relations, (3) teacher union activities, (4) dismissing incompetent staff, (5) coping with state regulations/initiatives, (6) superintendent/other administrator relations, (7) central office involvement in building level decisions, (8) Phase III teacher incentives, (9) vandalism, (10) use of drugs by pupils, (11) restructuring boundaries, and (12) superintendent/other employee relations.

6. School district size was not related to the Iowa superintendents level of morale.

7. School district size appeared to be related to two of nine job security issues: school district reorganization, and unsatisfactory student achievement. Unsatisfactory student achievement provided a significantly greater threat to job security for superintendents from large school districts than it did for superintendents employed in medium and large districts. School district reorganization provided a significantly greater threat to job security for superintendents in small school districts than it did for their colleagues employed in medium and large districts.

8. School district size was related to the extent to which superintendents perceived five specific educational issues as challenges. Changing composition of the student body, shared programs, shared employees, and declining enrollments provided a significantly greater challenge for superintendents in small districts than it did for superintendents in medium and large districts. The provision of programs for non-English speaking students provided a significantly greater challenge for superintendents from large school districts than it did for superintendents employed by small and medium districts.

9. The level of decision making authority accorded superintendents was related to the level of superintendent morale. While the level of perceived decision making authority was generally high for Iowa school superintendents, when levels of authority were lower, levels of morale were also lower.

10. Five specific job security issues were related to Superintendents decision-making authority: (1) conflicts with board

philosophy, (2) poor personal performance evaluation, (3) personal deficiencies in the skill areas, (4) conflicts with principals, and (5) reorganization of school districts.

11. Two specific educational issues which provide a challenge for superintendents were related to superintendent's decision-making authority. Board/superintendent relations and superintendent/other administrator relations were more of a challenge for superintendents with low levels of decision-making authority.

Conclusions and Discussion

The profile of the Iowa superintendent revealed few surprises. The typical Iowa superintendent is 51 years old, has a specialist degree in educational administration and has worked in his current district less than ten years. Superintendents indicate their greatest needs for professional development are in the areas of strategic planning, improving staff performance and learning to cope with political pressures within the school district. Eighty-nine percent of Iowa superintendents were either very satisfied or satisfied with their current superintendency, in spite of six years of change, reform and increased accountability. This supports research by Chand (1982) and the Educator Opinion Poll (1985) that found superintendents highly satisfied with their current superintendencies. Chand's Alaska study reported that 83 percent of Alaska superintendents were satisfied with their current position while the Educator opinion Poll found 64 percent of their sample of U.S. superintendents satisfied with their position.

Level of Morale

The morale of Iowa superintendents was examined against a backdrop of major educational change in Iowa. The Iowa legislature had enacted legislation that mandated new state educational standards to be implemented at the local district level. Thus, superintendents were in a position where they were faced with locating additional resources and finding feasible solutions to new challenges. Despite these challenges this study found the level of morale of Iowa superintendents to be high, which leads this researcher to agree with Willower and Fraser, who following their 1979 study of Pennsylvania superintendents, concluded that "it seems that superintendents are not as beleaguered as it is sometimes claimed, and when they are, they come to grips with it rather well, often in good humor" (p. 10). Iowa superintendents have apparently that resiliency that allows them to prevail and maintain high morale in times of uncertainty, rapid change, and stress.

It was the supposition of this researcher that the new challenges and change might overwhelm superintendents and lower their morale. It's possible that new challenges may be more stimulating than overwhelming. Superintendents may see challenges as goals to be met rather than obstacles to be overcome.

Iowa Department of Education officials, Area Education Agency Officials, and others should not be overly alarmed as they travel the state and meet with superintendents and hear complaints about the challenges superintendents face. It seems likely that it is human nature to complain or show concern when facing challenges that are new and

unfamiliar.

Morale and Master Contract Coverage

The 1982 and 1971 the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) status studies on the superintendency reported negotiations and collective bargaining as the numbers one and two issues that might cause superintendents to consider leaving the superintendency. In the 1982 AASA study collective bargaining was ranked fourth as a major issue detrimental to the effectiveness of the superintendent. The results of this study indicate, however, that coverage by a master contract agreement does not significantly relate to the morale of the superintendent. It seems likely that while many superintendents in this study also report feeling that collective bargaining has a negative effect on educational quality and public opinion concerning education, they have grown up with it or gotten used to it as a way of doing business.

The collective bargaining law has been in existence for fourteen years in Iowa. The majority of superintendents in this study report having served in the superintendency for less than ten years, therefore they have never operated as a superintendent without a master contract. Collective bargaining has been part of the nature of the job, thus, they do not have to adjust to change. Another possible explanation might be that many of the thorny issues of the early bargaining years may have been settled making present collective bargaining more predictable. It is also possible that collective bargaining in Iowa is a rather low key activity in comparison to collective bargaining in other states. Finally, there may be little difference between the districts with a master contract and

those without with respect to their peripheral affects on superintendents because districts often provide nearly the same benefits and working conditions out of fear that their teachers might someday vote to utilize collective bargaining in their districts.

Job Security Issues and Morale

Superintendents identified three issues that currently or potentially within the next year will pose major problems relative to their job security: (1) poor performance evaluation, (2) reorganization of school districts, and (3) conflicts with teachers. It was surprising to find that one in four superintendents (25%) reported a current or potential major problem with poor performance evaluation. Fifteen percent of Minnesota superintendents did report problems with poor performance evaluations in Hayden's 1986 study. It is to be expected that superintendents would be threatened by poor performance evaluation because it could ultimately lead to loss of their jobs. The two remaining job security issues that pose major problems for Iowa superintendents were also to be expected. School district reorganization is an emotional issue that can spell trouble for the superintendent in the community if not handled properly. It is also not surprising that conflicts with teachers was rated as a strong threat to job security. Teachers are the largest employee group in school districts. The increased power and influence they have with the board of education, teachers apparently pose a threat to the job security of superintendents. Those who train and provide professional development for superintendents will need to continue to design training and development programs that emphasize the importance of

strengthening conflict resolution skills if they are to help superintendents deal with these job security issues.

Five job security issues were related to lower levels of superintendent morale. Those included the three major problems previously mentioned plus two others: conflicts with board philosophy and conflicts with principals. It is understandable that these issues were related to morale since four of the issues are related to conflict; three directly, conflicts with the school board, principals, teachers and one indirectly related to the kinds of things that occur in school districts. Hardly surprising is the finding that poor performance evaluation may lower morale.

Educational Issues as Challenges and Morale

Five educational issues were identified as major challenges for Iowa superintendents: (1) coping with state regulations and initiatives, (2) financing the district, (3) providing programs for at-risk learners, (4) use of alcoholic beverages by students, and (5) Phases III teacher incentives. Each of these challenges has a logical derivation. State regulations and initiatives have proliferated as a result of new state standards promulgated in 1989. Second on the list was the school finance issue. The literature indicated that school finance has been a major concern for 150 years (AASA 1982). It remains a major concern. Next, provision for programs for at-risk learners was the third major challenge facing superintendents. The new Iowa state educational standards also called for provision of programs for at-risk learners. While schools have always had children at-risk, the population of at-risk learners is growing

rapidly. Thus there is an intense, innovative and powerful emphasis on reaching at-risk students.

The superintendents identified use of alcohol by students as considerably more of a challenge than than they did the use of drugs. In the 1982 AASA survey, 53 percent of superintendents indicated that use of drugs and alcohol by students was of major concern to them. No distinction was made between the use of alcohol and drugs on the AASA survey. This study separated the two issues. Use of alcohol by students was fourth on the list of major challenges; 51 percent of the superintendents identified it as a major challenge. Drug use was twenty-third on the list, only 20 percent of superintendents reported it as a major challenge. It should be noted when relationships between educational issues and superintendent morale were examined; use of drugs was significantly related to superintendent morale, the use of alcohol was not. This perhaps can be explained by the age of the superintendents in the study. Sixty-six percent of the superintendents in this study are over age fifty. They apparently are more familiar with drinking as a problem in the public school and society but less familiar with drug use and possibly more frightened by a the drug problem that many contend is out of control.

Phase III teacher incentives were fifth on the list of major challenges for Iowa superintendents. Phase III was a product of the 1987 Excellence in Education act passed by the Iowa legislature. Superintendents played a major role in the negotiation and implementation of those Phase III plans. The first two Phase III plans had to be

implemented in a relatively short period of time with a minimum of guidance from the State Department of Education. It appears that Phase III created more work for the superintendent and perhaps even affected the work ethic of teachers in schools. Teachers who were once willing to do extra activities beyond the work day began demanding compensation for all activities outside the workday.

Twelve educational issues were related to superintendent morale. These issues were collapsed into four major challenge areas: (1) Relationship issues (i.e., staff morale) relationships between the superintendent and other administrators, and other employees, school and community relations, and central office involvement with building level decisions; (2) Student issues, i.e., drug use and vandalism; (3) Teacher issues (i.e., Phase III teacher incentives, teacher union activities, and dismissing incompetent staff); and, (4) Program issues (i.e., restructuring boundaries, and state initiatives). Those twelve issues related to superintendent morale were distributed among the following four areas: (a) relationship issues, 41%; (b) teacher issues, 25%; (c) student issues, 17%; and (d) program issues, 17%.

The issues relating to morale could also be categorized in another way. They either resulted from innovations or the emotional issues. When categorized this way the majority (9 of 12) of the issues relating to superintendent morale tended to be emotional issues; issues that tug at the heart and are personally upsetting, while the remaining three are innovations: Phase III teacher incentives, state initiatives and mandates, and restructuring school boundaries.

The two issues with the strongest correlation with superintendent morale were staff morale and school community relations. It is logical that if staff morale is low and school and community relations are strained that superintendent morale will also suffer. Staff and community are two very large and important groups that every superintendent has to please.

There are implications for the state Department of Education, Iowa colleges of education, administrator professional organizations, and area education agencies. They need to offer assistance through training, course work, consultation and support to help superintendents manage change, maintain effective relationships, and deal with emotional issues effectively.

Size and Morale

It was posited that school district size would make a difference for two reasons. The researcher assumed that morale would be highest in medium size school districts. All superintendents would experience much the same challenges but it was supposed that the magnitude and quantity of these challenges would be greater in large school districts. Also it seemed small school district superintendents while facing the same challenges as their colleagues in medium and large districts would feel more isolated and threatened when dealing with those challenges. The findings present a different picture. Morale was high for the majority of Iowa superintendents and size of district was not a significant factor in predicting level of superintendent morale. It is important that value judgments not be made without data. What seems likely often is not.

Size and the Job Security and Educational Issues

Size did relate to some educational issues identified by superintendents, but unlike Glass and Sclafani's (1988) research, which found school superintendents in large school districts indicating they needed different skills than those indicated by their colleagues in small school districts, results from this study indicated that size made a difference in only three out of nine job security issues and five of forty-four educational challenges facing superintendents.

School district size was related to the level of threat created by these job security issues: school district reorganization, and unsatisfactory student achievement. It is not surprising that school district reorganization was a greater threat to small district superintendents than to medium and large school district superintendents because medium and large school districts very seldom reorganize. It is also logical that unsatisfactory student achievement would be a greater problem for large school district superintendents than for superintendents in small and medium school districts in Iowa. Given the low socioeconomic status of many students in large school districts and the problems implicit with low socioeconomic makeup of large communities and the homogeneity of smaller communities it is understandable that larger districts have greater problems with student achievement. The State Department of Education should provide assistance to superintendents in small school districts in the area of school district reorganization. The State Department of Education and area education agencies should also continue an all-out effort to provide support and assistance to

superintendents in large school districts in their efforts to increase student achievement.

School district size also appeared to make a difference in the five issues identified as major challenges: (1) Shared programs, (2) shared employees, (3) declining enrollments, (4) changing composition of the student body, and (5) provision of programs for non-English speaking students.

It is reasonable to find that shared programs, shared employees, and declining enrollments are a greater challenge to small school districts superintendents. Declining enrollment hits the rural areas of the state, where most of the small schools are located, causing those districts to share programs and employees. It seems surprising at first glance, that small school superintendents would be more challenged by the changing composition of the student body than their colleagues in medium and large districts. It may be that larger school systems faced the challenge of changing student populations since the 1970s, whereas ethnic populations have just began migration to the rural areas. Finally, it seems easy to understand why superintendents from large school districts would be more likely to identify provision of programs for non-English speaking students as a major challenges. While superintendents in large districts have faced ethnically diverse populations, increasing numbers of students are enrolling who do not speak English. Even though the movement of ethnically diverse youngsters to smaller districts is beginning, apparently small and medium districts are not experiencing a significant increase of students who do not speak English.

Level of Authority

Higher levels of parent, teacher, community and board of education involvement could have been expected to influence the level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents. This was not the case in Iowa. The majority of Iowa superintendents reported a high level of authority to make decisions in their districts. When their level of authority decreased their morale also decreased.

Five of the issues that threatened job security appeared to be related to level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents: (1) conflicts with board philosophy, (2) poor personal evaluation, (3) personal deficiencies in skill areas, (4) conflicts with principals, and (5) reorganization of school districts. When the superintendent decision-making authority decreases it follows that conflicts with groups, activities, relationships, and professional criticism become more of a challenge.

Two educational issues were related to level of decision-making authority accorded superintendents. Specifically, board/superintendent relations and superintendent/other administrator relations. It's reasonable to expect that if the superintendent has little decision-making authority he/she will realize a greater challenge in working with the board of education and administrator colleagues. The superintendent has little control, influence, and credibility with both groups and finds it increasing difficult to be an effective leader. Boards of education need to provide sufficient levels of decision-making authority if they wish to retain their superintendent.

Limitations of the Study

In examining the findings and conclusions presented the reader should be aware of the following limitations imposed upon this investigation:

1. The survey was conducted under the auspices of the School Administrators of Iowa group which may affect the attitude of the respondents.

2. No attempt was made to measure social desirability bias with the items included in the survey instrument.

3. All assistant superintendents and superintendents with principal duties were excluded from the survey.

4. No attempt was made to measure differences or relationships between study variable between superintendents employed by only one district and superintendents employed by two districts.

5. Many variables not involved in this study likely affected the superintendent morale level.

6. Age, number of buildings within district, salary, and gender were not considered when examining relationships with the study variables.

Recommendations for Further Research

Below are the suggestions and recommendations for further research:

1. An examination of the perceptions of principals or other subordinates regarding the level of authority possessed by school district superintendents might prove interesting.

2. As education continues to undergo changes and educational reform, superintendent morale and the challenges facing the school superintendent

should continue to be examined with particular emphasis placed on examining morale during challenging periods.

3. A study of superintendent morale using facet measures instead of a direct measure method might provide better information for explaining superintendent morale and the relationship with the study variables; level of authority, job security issues, educational challenges, school district size and coverage by a master contract agreement. It would be advisable to use either a four or five point scale to measure all variables.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, J. (1987). The best lessons I've learned as a superintendent. The Executive Educator, 9 (3), 20-21.

Alvey, D. T. and Underwood, K. E. (1985). When boards and superintendents clash, it's over the balance of school power. The School Board Journal, 172 (10), 21-25.

American Association of School Administrators. (1982). The American Superintendency, 1982 A Full Report. Arlington: The American Association of School Administrators.

American Association of School Administrators. (1952). The American School Superintendency, Thirtieth Yearbook. Washington: The American Association of School Administrators.

Barker, B. O. and Muse, I. D. (1983). A research report of Small/Rural School Districts in Iowa Compared to school districts of similar size nationwide. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University. (ERIC ED 237 293)

Barnett, M. (1982). Perceptions of the leadership style Effectiveness of Superintendents in Mississippi. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC ED 016 635)

Behrens, R. L. (1989). Rally committment for your vision. The School Administrator, 3 (46), 16-22.

Bennett, A. & Slater, R. (1980). Superintendents' Job Priorities. Administrator's Notebook, 28 (1), 160-169.

Bennett, W. J. (1988). American Education Making It Work. A report to the President and the American People. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders The strategies for Taking Charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Black, J. A. (1986). What they don't tell you in schools of education about school administration. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing.

Blair, D. (1985). Where will you find your Next Superintendent. The Illinois School Board Journal, 8 (12), 17-21.

Blumberg, A. (1985). The School Superintendent Living with Conflict. New York: Teachers College Press.

Borg, W. R., and Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Brooks, K. (1980). Problems confronting Educational administrators--a projection of the next five years. Planning and Changing, 11 (2), 78-87.

Burbank, N. B. (1968). The Superintendent of schools: His headaches and rewards. Danville, IL: The Interstate.

Butterworth, J. E. (1926). Rural School Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Campbell, R. F., Bridges, E. M., and Nystrand, R. O. (1977). Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., and Bennion, J. W. (1987). A History of thought and practice in Educational Administration. New York: Teachers College Press.

Campbell, R. F. and Gregg, R. T. (1957). Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Caplow, T. (1976). How to Run any Organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Carlson, R. O. (1972). School Superintendents Careers and Performance. Columbus: Merrill Publishing.

Chand, K. (1982). Job Satisfaction of Alaska School Superintendents and its comparison with the nationwide American superintendency. Report of a study. Anchorage, AK. (ERIC ED 226 483).

Chand, K. (1983). The current trend of the job description of School Superintendents in the United States. Report of a study. Anchorage, AK. (ERIC ED 239 364)

Chand, K. (1988). Effectiveness, productivity, and excellence in American schools. (ERIC ED 302 949)

Clodi, D. R. and Jacobson, J. (1989). What do these trends mean for education. The School Administrator, 23 (6), 15-18.

Coleman, W. T. and Selby, C. C. (1983). Educating Americans for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C.: National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Columbus, S. (1979). Superintendents Job Priorities. Administrator's Notebook, 28 (1), 1-4.

Crowson, R. L. (1987). The local school superintendency: A puzzling administrative role. Educational Administration Quarterly, 23 (3), 49-69.

Cuban, L. (1985). Conflict and leadership in the superintendency. Phi Delta Kappan, 67 (1), 28-30.

Doud, J. L. (1989). The K-8 Principal in 1988. Alexandria: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Duckworth, K. and DeBevoise, W. (1982). The effects of collective bargaining on school administrative leadership. Proceedings of a conference held at the center for Educational Policy and Management, Eugene, OR. (ERIC ED 227 547)

Duigman, P. (1979). Administrative Behavior of School Superintendents: A descriptive study. Paper presented at the International Congress on Education, Vancouver, B.C. (ERIC ED 182 820)

Edelman, M. A. and Knudson, J. J. (1989). Iowa School Facts--1989. Ames, IA: Iowa State Extension Service.

Educational Policies Commission (EPC). (1965). The Unique Role of the School Superintendent. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Educator Opinion Poll. (1985). School Superintendents: Opinions and Status. Reston: Educational Research Service.

Elmore, R. F. (1988). Contested Terrain: The next generation of educational reform. (ERIC ED 300 927)

Else, H. E. (1977). Iowa teachers, superintendents, and board members expected outcomes of the Iowa Public Employment Relations Act. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Engel, R. A. (1985). Think you know what makes a great superintendent? Guess again. The Executive Educator, 17 (6), 39-40.

Erion, L. L. (1986). Perceptions of the leadership behavior of selected Iowa superintendents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Fawcett, C. W. (1964). School Personnel Administration. New York: Macmillan.

Finn, C. E. (1986). Unsolved problems for the excellence movement. The School Administrator, 43 (10), 14-19.

Gardner, J. W. (1987). Self-Renewal. The Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 67, 16-19.

Genck, F. H. (1983). Improving School Performance. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Gerla, S. E. (1987). Examiniation of the conditions and expectations surrounding Superintendent selection in Washington State School Districts. (ERIC ED 300 913)

Glass, T. E. and Sclafani, S. B. (1988). Here are the skills you need to succeed as a superintendent. The Executive Educator, 10 (7), 19-20.

Gollnick, D. M. and Chinn, P. C. (1989). Multicultural Education in a Pluralistic Society. London: Merrill Publishing Co.

Gousha, R. P. (1981). What's happening to Superintendents? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of School Administrators, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC ED 204 845)

Grieder, C., Pierce, T. M. and Jordan, K. R. (1969). Public School Administration. New York: The Ronald Press.

Griffiths, D. E. (1966). The School Superintendent. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.

Griffiths, D. E., Clark, D. L., Wynn, D. R., and Iannaccone, L. (1962). Organizing Schools for Effective Education. Danville: Interstate.

Gross, N. (1958). Who runs over school's. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Guthrie, J. W., Garms, W. I., and Pierce, L. C. (1988). School Finance and Educational Policy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Hart, J. H. (1954). Milestones. Des Moines, IA: Iowa State Education Association.

Hayden, J. C. (1986). Crisis at the helm. The School Administrator, 43 (10), 17-19.

Heller, R. W. and Conway, J. A. (1987). Look for your profile in this portrait of school executives. The Executive Educator, 9 (12), 25-30.

Hendrix, D. F. (1988). Spotlight on superintendents in school reform. The School Administrator, 4 (45), 17-19.

Hentges, J. T. (1985). The politics of superintendent school board linkages: A study of power, participation and control. (ERIC ED 256 064)

Hess, F. R. (1986). Causes for Executive Dismissal. The School Administrator, 43 (4), 14-15, 18.

Hodgkinson, H. L. (1985). All one system. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Holifield, M. (1985). Leadership strategies for times of plenty and scarcity. The School Administrator, 42 (6), 27.

Hoyle, J. R. (1988). The 21st Century Superintendent: A great motivator. Paul B. Salmon Memorial Lecture. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Las Vegas, NV. (ERIC ED 295 290)

Hunkins, R. V. (1931). The Superintendent of work in smaller schools. New York: D. C. Heath.

Iowa Association of School Boards Committee on Strategies for Excellence. (1987). Strategies for Excellence. Des Moines: The Iowa Association of School Boards.

Kelley, E. A. (1980). Improving School Climate. Reston: The National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Kennedy, R. and Barker, B. (1986). Rural School Superintendents: A National Study of Perspectives of school board presidents. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the rural education association, Little Rock, AR. (ERIC ED 274 497)

Kimbrough, R. B. and Nunnery, M. Y. (1988). Educational Administration. New York: Macmillan.

Knezevich, S. J. (1975). Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper & Row.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1988). The Leadership Challenge, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lagana, J. E. (1989). Ready set empower Superintendents can sow the seeds for growth. The School Administrator, 1 (46), 20-23.

Larson, L. L., Bussom, R. S., Vicars, W. M. (1981). The Nature of a School Superintendents Work. Final Technical Report. Carbondale, Ill: Southern Illinois University. (ERIC ED 210 782).

Lease, S. A. (1984). Areas of Special Study for Oklahoma School Superintendency. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education. (ERIC ED 243 221)

Lewis, E. E. (1929). Problems in the Administration of a Small School System. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing.

Luckett, R., Underwood, K. E. and Fortone, J. C. (1987). Board Survey, What you worry about. The American School Board Journal, 173 (1), 27-28.

McAdams, R. P. (1989). A rude awakening to the 1980's. The School Administrator, 3 (46), 41-42.

Moore, H. A. (1964). The Ferment in School Administration. The Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 11-32, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nassif-Ajluni, C. and Baldwin, R. D. (1986). Public Relations Handbook for Iowa School. Johnston: Heartland Education Agency.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Institution of Education. (1981). Board or Superintendent: Who manages the schools. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC ED 209 722)

Norusis, M. J. (1983). User's Guide SPSS^{x}. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ogletree, E. J. (1985). Illinois Superintendent's Opinion and Implementation of the National Education Reforms. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago State University Foundation. (ERIC ED 267 480)

Paulu, N. (1989). Key player in School reform: The Superintendent. The School Administrator, 3 (46), 8-14.

Peck, L. (1988). Today's teacher unions are looking well beyond collective bargaining. The American School Board Journal, 175 (7), 32-36.

Penning, N. (1987). Who's in Control? The School Administrator, 44 (11), 32-35.

Perkins, G. F. (1987). Small Schools. The School Administrator, 44 (2), 49.

Rada, R. D. and Carlson, R. O. (1985). Community Disatisfaction and School Governance. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill. (ERIC ED 263 684)

Reller, T. L. (1935). The Development of the City Superintendency in the United States. Philadelphia: privately published.

Rist, M. C. (1989). Herenton Brings Reform to Memphis. The Executive Educator, 11 (7), 13-16.

Ross, R. S. (1987). The role of the local school board. The American School Board Journal, 174 (11), 5-12.

Sales, M. V. and Taylor, J. C. (1983). The Arkansas School Superintendent 1983. Research Bulletin. Jonesboro, Ark.: Arkansas State University. (ERIC ED 016 887)

Sergiovanni, T. J. and Carver, F. D. (1980). The New School Executive. New York: Harper & Row.

Sergiovanni, T. J. and Moore, J. H. (1989). Schooling for Tomorrow. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Shannon, T. A. (1989). How School Chiefs can handle board conflict. The American School Board Journal, 176 (6), 25-28.

Shephard, G. D. (1986). Survival Strategies and the Superintendency. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC ED 018 526)

Sistrunk, W. E. (1988). A study of the Impact of the educational reform movement on Mississippi Schools. (ERIC ED 302 926)

Spady, W. G. and Marx, G. (1984). Excellence in Our Schools: Making it Happen. A Joint Publication of the American Association of School Administrators and the Far West Laboratory.

Stern, J. D. and Chandler, M. O. (1988). The Condition of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Tagg, G. J. (1982). The Trials and Tribulations of a Rural School Superintendent. Paper presented to the Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC ED 225 749)

Thomas, J. H. (1981). Educational Administration: A Forty year perspective. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC ED 207 225)

Trotter, A. and Downey, G. W. (1989). Superintendent's don't think so. The American School Board Journal, 176 (6), 21-23.

Vance, M. and Taylor, J. C. (1983). The Arkansas Superintendent 1983. Alexandria, VA: Computer Microfilm International. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 245 344)

Volp, F. D. (1978). Beyond the Myth of the Imperial School Superintendent. Paper presented at the Canadian School Trustees Association Congress on Education, Toronto, Ontario, June 17-21. (ERIC ED 158 373)

Wallace, R. C. (1985). The Superintendent of Education: Data Based Instructional Leadership. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh, Learning Research and Development Center. (ERIC ED 017 686)

Wendel, F. C. and Bryant, M. T. (1988). New Directions for Administrator preparation. UCEA Monograph Series. Lincoln: University Council for Educational Administration.

Wildman, L. (1987). What can superintendents and Boad members do to help each other be successful. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, San Diego, CA. (ERIC ED 294 312)

Williams, A. S. (1983). Some notes on reduction in force. (ERIC ED 229 868)

Willower, D. J. and Fraser, H. W. (1979). School superintendents on their work. Administrator's Notebook, 28 (5), 1-4.

Wilson, R. E. (1960). The Modern School Superintendent. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Woll, D. W. (1988). Do two hats spell double trouble? The School Administrator, 11 (45), 40-41.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special thanks goes to the following individuals for their help and support in conducting this study:

To Sandy Morrison, my best friend and wife, who cheerfully adapted her life to the strenuous schedule required to undertake this study. Your constant encouragement in my professional pursuits has truly been appreciated.

To my family - you are my reason for being here and all of your patience with dad while he was completing this study were greatly appreciated.

To Dr. Jim Sweeney - I don't know where to begin to say thank you. Your guidance and assistance through this study has been great. Your patience, cooperation, and dedication have truly been appreciated. You have been exemplary role model and will have a lasting impact on me as I continue my career in education.

To my committee - Dr. Mary Huba, Dr. Ross Engel, Dr. Gary Phye, and Dr. Richard Herrnstadt. I have learned a great deal from our discussions. I have enjoyed my association with you. Thank you for taking time from your busy schedules to serve on my committee. Your suggestions and cooperation have helped me tremendously while working on this study.

To Kyle Rose for an excellent job typing and everything else you have done.

To Barbara Ranney - The surveys would never have been coded so easily without your help and assistance.

To Gaylord Tryon - I am grateful to the School Administrators of Iowa

for the use of their instrument and the financial support of the study. It would have been impossible to have done this study without you. Gaylord, I owe you a debt of gratitude for your time, patience, critiques of the instrument and encouragement through the study.

APPENDIX A:

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

IOWA SUPERINTENDENTS' STATUS AND OPINION STUDY

We are studying the status of Superintendents in Iowa, and we are asking your opinions on selected issues. If you are a superintendent in more than one district and you receive more than one survey, please fill out only one survey. If you are a superintendent/principal, please fill out only the superintendents' survey from your perspective as a superintendent. We will be publishing the results in the near future. We ask your help by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it by February 10, 1989 to:

School Administrators of Iowa Survey
P. O. Box 65578
West Des Moines, IA 50265

Your response will remain anonymous.

School Administrators of Iowa
Departments of Educational Administration, Iowa State University and University of Northern Iowa

Name and Title of Respondent (please print): _____

Name of School: _____

Street Address or P.O. Box: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____

APPENDIX B:

LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT

school administrators of iowa

REGENCY WEST 5, SUITE 140
4500 WESTOWN PARKWAY
P.O. BOX 65578
WEST DES MOINES, IOWA 50265-0578
(515) 224-3370

January 18, 1989

Fellow Administrator:

Enclosed is a survey being sponsored by the School Administrators of Iowa. The instrument was developed in cooperation with Iowa State University and the University of Northern Iowa.

We recognize that surveys can be an imposition on your busy schedules. We are also well aware of the number of questions on the enclosed survey.

However, because of the importance of this project to our long-range planning efforts, we would sincerely appreciate your completing the form and mailing it to us by February 10, 1989. Several SAI study committees will be using the results to develop services and programs to be implemented during the next membership year.

We sincerely thank you for your help

Respectfully,

Gaylord Tryon
Executive Director

APPENDIX C:

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

school administrators of iowa

REGENCY WEST 5, SUITE 140
4500 WESTOWN PARKWAY
PO BOX 65578
WEST DES MOINES, IOWA 50265-0578
(515) 224-3370

February 10, 1989

Fellow Administrator:

Approximately three weeks ago we sent you a letter and a survey instrument which dealt with the individual who serves as the Superintendent of Schools in Iowa.

As you will recall, the study focused on several key areas of the superintendency. We will analyze our data and provide information that will be helpful to our long range planning efforts. We also hope the information will be helpful, to Universities, AEA's, school boards, superintendents, and all of those who support you in your role as Iowa School Superintendents.

If you've set the instrument aside we're wondering if you might take a few minutes to complete and return it now.

Your time and thoughtful answers are greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

Gaylord Tryon

Gaylord Tryon
Executive Director

APPENDIX D:

SURVEY ITEMS USED FOR DATA ANALYSIS

SELECTED QUESTIONS FOR DATA ANALYSIS

The following questions were selected for data analysis from the Iowa Superintendents' Status and Opinion Survey conducted by School Administrators of Iowa and the researcher.

For the profile of the superintendent, Questions 1, 2, 3, 9, 14, 15, 31, 32, and 43 were selected from the complete survey.

For the analysis of the descriptive data, Questions 27, 8a, 8b, 10, 27, 29, 39, 41, 56, 57, 64, 66, 67, and 69 were selected from the complete survey.

For the hypotheses testing from following questions were selected to analyze data for each specific hypothesis:

Ho 1	Questions 27 and 29
Ho 2	Questions 29 and 14
Ho 3	Questions 29 and 64
Ho 4-8	Questions 29 and 66
Ho 9	Questions 29 and 57
Ho 10	Questions 64 and 14
Ho 12-16	Questions 66 and 14
Ho 17-21	Questions 66 and 57

The complete survey follows in Appendix E.

APPENDIX E:

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

IOWA SUPERINTENDENTS' STATUS AND OPINION STUDY

We are studying the status of Superintendents in Iowa, and we are asking your opinions on selected issues. If you are a superintendent in more than one district and you receive more than one survey, please fill out only one survey. If you are a superintendent/principal, please fill out only the superintendents' survey from your perspective as a superintendent. We will be publishing the results in the near future. We ask your help by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it by February 10, 1989 to:

School Administrators of Iowa Survey
P. O. Box 65578
West Des Moines, IA 50265

Your response will remain anonymous.

School Administrators of Iowa
Departments of Educational Administration, Iowa State University and University of Northern Iowa

Name and Title of Respondent (please print): _____

Name of School: _____

Street Address or P.O. Box: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____

IOWA SUPERINTENDENT'S STATUS AND OPINION STUDY

A. STATUS

1. What is your current title?
   _____ 1 Superintendent
   _____ 2 Assistant Superintendent
   _____ 3 Superintendent/Principal

   Are you responsible for more than one school district?
   _____ 1 Yes
   _____ 2 No

   If your responsibilities include assigned principal's duties in addition to superintendent's duties, what percent of your time is allocated to building level administration? _____ %

   What grades do you supervise?
   Indicate by 1 = Yes 2 = No
   _____ K-6
   _____ K-8
   _____ 7-12
   _____ 9-12

2. What is your age? _____ years

3. What is your sex?
   _____ 1 Male
   _____ 2 Female

4. How would you place yourself among the following racial or ethnic groups?
   _____ 1 Hispanic
   _____ 2 Black
   _____ 3 White
   _____ 4 Other

5. Regardless of whether you are currently a member of School Administrators of Iowa, have you even been a member?
   _____ 1 Yes
   _____ 2 No

6. Does your school district pay all or part of your dues?
   _____ 1 District pays 100% of my SAI dues.
   _____ 2 District pays part of my SAI dues.
   _____ 3 No, school district pays none of my dues.
   _____ 4 I am not currently a member.

7. In which of the following organizations do you currently hold a membership? (Indicate with 1 = Yes or 2 = No)
   _____ National Association of Elementary School Principals
   _____ National Association of Secondary School Principals
   _____ National Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
   _____ School Administrators of Iowa
   _____ Association of School Business Management
   _____ Iowa Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
   _____ American Association of School Administrators
   _____ Other (Specify: _____)

8a. Suppose you were starting out all over again, would you want to become a school superintendent?
   _____ 1 Certainly would
   _____ 2 Probably would
   _____ 3 Probably would not
   _____ 4 Certainly would not

8b. How well satisfied are you with your current superintendency?
   _____ 5 Very satisfied
   _____ 4 Satisfied
   _____ 3 Neutral
   _____ 2 Dissatisfied
   _____ 1 Very Dissatisfied

9. At what age (approximately) are you planning to retire from the superintendency?
   _____ years

   My anticipated year of retirement is _____.

10. Do you consider the school superintendency your final occupational goal?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

If NO, which position is your ultimate goal?
_____ 01 Elementary school teacher
_____ 02 Secondary school teacher
_____ 03 College teacher
_____ 04 Elementary school principal
_____ 05 Secondary school principal
_____ 06 Assoc/Asst superintendent of schools
_____ 07 Director of elementary education
_____ 08 Director of secondary education
_____ 09 Other central office personnel
_____ 10 Position outside field of education
_____ 11 Other (please identify: _____
_____)

11. Have you every been named in a civil suit related to your position?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

If YES, check ALL that apply.

To what was the complaint related?
_____ 1 Liability for student injury
_____ 1 Liability for staff injury
_____ 1 Dismissal of staff member
_____ 1 Provision of educational services
_____ 1 Reporting of suspected child abuse
_____ 1 Failure to report suspected child abuse
_____ 1 Other (please specify: _____)

What was the outcome?
_____ 1 Suit was dropped
_____ 2 Settled out of court
_____ 3 Case still in progress
_____ 4 Judgment in my favor
_____ 5 Judgment against me

From whom did you get formal support?
_____ 1 School district
_____ 1 Local administrator association
_____ 1 State administrator association
_____ 1 National administrator association
_____ 1 Insurance company
_____ 1 None of the above

12. How would you classify yourself in regard to your basic political philosophy?
_____ 1 Conservative
_____ 2 Tend to be conservative
_____ 3 Tend to be liberal
_____ 4 Liberal

B. YOUR SCHOOL DISTRICT

13. How many separately named buildings are under your direction? _____

14. What is your school districts' enrollment? (Please use September headcount. Count 1/2 day Kindergarten pupils as one pupil each.)
_____ pupils

15. How would you characterize the community which your school serves?
_____ 1 urban
_____ 2 suburban
_____ 3 small town(s)
_____ 4 rural

16. Is your school accredited by any agency other than the state?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

By what accrediting body?
_____ 1 NCA
_____ 2 Other _____

17. What is the approximate composition of the pupil enrollment of your school district? (Mark in 0 where appropriate.)
_____ % Hispanic
_____ % Native American
_____ % Asian/Pacific Islander
_____ % Black
_____ % White
_____ % Other nonwhite
100 % TOTAL

18. What is the approximate composition of the teaching staff in your school district? (Mark in 0 where appropriate.)

_____ % Hispanic
_____ % Native American
_____ % Asian/Pacific Islander
_____ % Black
_____ % White
_____ % Other nonwhite
100 % TOTAL

19. What is the composition of your district's teaching staff?

_____ % Male
_____ % Female

20. What is the composition of your district's administrative staff?

_____ % Male
_____ % Female

21. How many of the following are currently assigned to your school district?

° Classroom teachers (exclude special area teachers)
_____ full-time _____ part-time
° Special area teachers (i.e., special education, P.E., art, music)
_____ full-time _____ part-time
° Nurses
_____ full-time _____ part-time
° Counselors
_____ full-time _____ part-time
° Librarians/media specialists
_____ full-time _____ part-time
° Teacher Associates (with degree)
_____ full-time _____ part-time
° Teacher Aides
_____ full-time _____ part-time
° Other professional personnel (please specify type: _____)
_____ full-time _____ part-time

22. How many full-time equivalency administrators do you have to assist you?

_____ number

If a superintendent:

Do you have an assistant?

_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

If YES, how many?

_____ full-time _____ part-time

Indicate his/her THREE major responsibilities:

_____ 1 Supervision/evaluation of teachers
_____ 1 Supervision/evaluation of nonteaching staff
_____ 1 Supervision/evaluation of administration
_____ 1 Curriculum development
_____ 1 Parent/community contacts
_____ 1 Facilities management
_____ 1 Budget administration
_____ 1 Duties as assigned
_____ 1 Transportation management
_____ 1 Other (specify: _____)

23. How would you describe the attitude of the following groups toward your school/district and its programs? (Please circle ONE.) Use the following response categories:

5 Highly supportive
4 Highly supportive and involved
3 Supportive
2 Supportive and involved
1 Neither supportive nor involved

Parents	5	4	3	2	1
Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Non-certified	5	4	3	2	1
Board members	5	4	3	2	1
Administrators	5	4	3	2	1

24. How would you describe the following groups' general perceptions of school administrators? (Please circle ONE number for EACH category.) Use the following response categories:
    5 Highly positive
    4 Positive
    3 Neutral
    2 Negative
    1 Highly negative

Public	5	4	3	2	1
Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Students	5	4	3	2	1
Legislators	5	4	3	2	1
Board members	5	4	3	2	1

25. Which of the following factors have the greatest impact on the public's perception of the school administrator? (check three)
    _____ 1 Salary
    _____ 1 Personal life
    _____ 1 Unpopular decisions
    _____ 1 Facility maintenance
    _____ 1 Staff performance
    _____ 1 Individual performance
    _____ 1 Community involvement
    _____ 1 Other (please specify: _____)

26. Please approximate the percent of the student body in your school district that is from single-parent and latch-key homes?
    ° Single-parent: _____ % _____ Don't know
    ° Latch-key: _____ % _____ Don't know

27. Are the teachers in your school district covered by a collective bargaining contract?
    _____ 1 Yes
    _____ 2 No

28. What are the main sources of ideas for innovations that, during the past three years, have resulted in significant changes of practice in your school district (e.g., grouping, curriculum)? (CHECK THREE.)
    _____ 1 College or university courses
    _____ 1 Professional reading
    _____ 1 Consultants from outside the district
    _____ 1 State mandates or initiatives
    _____ 1 National professional associations
    _____ 1 State professional associations
    _____ 1 Local workshops
    _____ 1 Principals' Academy or Center
    _____ 1 Parents or other community contacts
    _____ 1 Other principals
    _____ 1 Teachers

29. How would you best describe your morale?
    _____ 4 Excellent
    _____ 3 Good, could be better
    _____ 2 Bad, could be worse
    _____ 1 Very bad

30. How would you describe your relationships with each of the parties listed below? (Please circle ONE number for EACH category.) Use the following response categories:
    5 Very good
    4 Good
    3 Neutral
    2 Poor
    1 Very poor

School Board	5	4	3	2	1
Principals	5	4	3	2	1
Other Central Office Staff	5	4	3	2	1
Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
Students	5	4	3	2	1
Parents	5	4	3	2	1
Community	5	4	3	2	1

C. THE SUPERINTENDENCY: EXPERIENCE AND PREPARATION FOR THE POSITION

31. How many total years (including your years as superintendent) have you been employed as a professional in education?

_____ years

32. Counting this year, how many years have you been a school superintendent?

° In your current school?: _____ years
° In other districts in Iowa?: _____ years
° Out of state?: _____ years
° All together?: _____ years

33. How many years did you teach before becoming a superintendent?

° Elementary teaching: _____ years
° Secondary teaching: _____ years
° College teaching: _____ years

34. What certifications do you currently hold in the state in which you're working?

_____ 1 Teacher
_____ 1 Principal
_____ 1 Superintendent
_____ 1 Other administrator or supervisor

35. What is the highest college degree you hold?

_____ 1 Bachelor's degree
_____ 2 Master's degree
_____ 3 CAS/EDS
_____ 4 Doctor's degree

36. How old were you when you were appointed to your first superintendency? _____ years

37. At what university did you complete your administrative training? (Please write the **APPROPRIATE NUMBER** in the blank.) Use the following response categories:

1 = University of Iowa
2 = University of Northern Iowa
3 = Iowa State University
4 = Drake University
5 = Other
6 = NA (Do not hold that degree)

_____ MAE/MSE _____
_____ ED.S./CAS _____
_____ ED.D/PH.D. _____
_____ Other _____

38. How many of the following positions did you hold a) before your first superintendency and b) before your present position? Indicate 1 = Yes or 2 = No for EACH position:

	Before First	Before Present
Elementary teacher	_____	_____
Intermediate teacher	_____	_____
Secondary teacher	_____	_____
Asst. principal, elementary	_____	_____
Asst. principal, intermediate	_____	_____
Asst. principal, secondary	_____	_____
Principal	_____	_____
Supervisor	_____	_____
Director	_____	_____
Asst. Superintendent	_____	_____
Counselor	_____	_____
College faculty	_____	_____
Central office administrator	_____	_____
Coach	_____	_____
School supervisor or curriculum specialist	_____	_____
Other (_____)	_____	_____

39. What has been the value of the following types of preparation and experience to your becoming a successful superintendent? (Please circle **ONE** number for **EACH** category.) Use the following response categories:
3 Of much value
2 Of some value
1 Of little value

Graduate education	3	2	1
Experience as a teacher	3	2	1
Experience as a principal	3	2	1
Experience as an assistant superintendent	3	2	1
In-service study and training	3	2	1
On the job experience as a superintendent	3	2	1
Local/state meetings of superintendent	3	2	1
National meetings of superintendent	3	2	1
Internship in school administration	3	2	1

40. In which of the following areas do you feel your own need for professional development is highest? **(Check NO MORE THAN THREE.)**
_____ 1 Use of effective leadership behavior
_____ 1 Use of effective communications skills
_____ 1 Dynamics of group processes
_____ 1 Planning and implementation of curricular goals
_____ 1 Supervision of the instructional program
_____ 1 Assessment/evaluation of students
_____ 1 Assessment/evaluation of staff
_____ 1 Assessment/evaluation of instructional program
_____ 1 Improving staff performance
_____ 1 Improving student performance
_____ 1 Planning/organizing personal time
_____ 1 Effective fiscal administration
_____ 1 Coping with political forces influencing the school
_____ 1 Strategic planning
_____ 1 Other (please specify: _____)

41. Where do you believe you can get the best assistance in relation to your personal needs for professional development? (Check **THREE.**)
_____ 1 College or university
_____ 1 Local district
_____ 1 Area Education Agency
_____ 1 State Department of Education
_____ 1 School Administrators of Iowa
_____ 1 National association of administrators
_____ 1 School Board Association
_____ 1 Other (please specify: _____)

D. THE SUPERINTENDENCY: CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

42. What is the length of your contract?
_____ 1 1 year
_____ 2 2 year
_____ 3 3 year
_____ 4 Other (specify: _____)

43. What is your 1988-89 salary?
$ _____ per year

Amount of district paid tax sheltered annuity, if any?
$ _____

44. Does your district have a written performance pay plan for the following?

Administrators	_____ 1 Yes	_____ 2 No
Teachers	_____ 1 Yes	_____ 2 No
Superintendent	_____ 1 Yes	_____ 2 No
Other (Specify)	_____ 1 Yes	_____ 2 No

If **YES**, is any portion of it based on student achievement?

Administrators	_____ 1 Yes	_____ 2 No
Teachers	_____ 1 Yes	_____ 2 No
Superintendent	_____ 1 Yes	_____ 2 No
Other (specify)	_____ 1 Yes	_____ 2 No

45. Do you have the option of a paid sabbatical leave as an administrator?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

46. What is your term of employment this year?
_____ 1 9 but less than 10 months
_____ 2 10 but less than 11 months
_____ 3 11 but less than 12 months
_____ 4 12 months

47. Which of the following are you expected to work?
_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No Thanksgiving vacation
_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No Winter break (Christmas vacation)
_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No Spring break

48. Number of days on duty per year (exclude regularly-scheduled paid holidays and paid vacation days). _____ days

49. Taking into consideration the time you typically arrive at school in the morning and leave in the afternoon, how much time (excluding evenings and weekends) do you spend at school each day?
_____ hours per day

50. How many additional hours do you spend in school-related activities EACH WEEK? (Exclude summers.) _____ hours per week

51. Do you have a written job description with your school district for which you are held accountable and against which you are evaluated?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

52. How often do you receive a written evaluation of your administrative performance?
_____ 4 More than once a year
_____ 3 Once a year
_____ 2 Once every two or three years
_____ 1 Rarely or not at all

53. Does your board of education establish yearly goals that you are to accomplish, and are you accountable for and evaluated upon these?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

54. From whom are opinions about your evaluation normally solicited? (Check ALL that apply.)
_____ 1 School Board
_____ 1 Assistant superintendent
_____ 1 Other central office personnel
_____ 1 Other administrators
_____ 1 Non-certified employees
_____ 1 Teachers
_____ 1 Community members
_____ 1 Parents
_____ 1 Students
_____ 1 Myself
_____ 1 Other (Please specify: _____)

55. Do you have the opportunity to respond to the board after a formal evaluation?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No
_____ 3 Not evaluated formally

56. How frequently are you commended for something you have done? (In writing by the board.)
_____ 4 Frequently
_____ 3 Sometimes, but not frequently
_____ 2 Seldom (once a year or less)
_____ 1 Never

E. RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY

57. How would you describe the level of authority that you have to make decisions concerning your district?
_____ 1 High
_____ 2 Moderate
_____ 3 Low

58. How would you describe the level of authority that principals in your district have to make decisions concerning their schools?
_____ 1 High
_____ 2 Moderate
_____ 1 Low

59. In general is the authority to run your school district given to you by the school board in balance with the degree to which they hold you responsible when things to wrong?

_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

60. What is your role in evaluating your principals? (Check **APPROPRIATE COLUMNS** on items that apply.)

	Beginning Principals	Experienced Principals
formal evaluation	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Narrative format:		
At least once a year	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Every few years	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Checklist format:		
At least once a year	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Every few years	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Average number of school visits/observations per principal each year	_____ Observations	_____ Observations

61. Which one of the following items best describes your responsibility for instructional improvement in your school district?

_____ 1 Have primary responsibility
_____ 2 Share responsibility with principals
_____ 3 Have little responsibility

62. The concept of the "administrative team" is a structure or mechanism which attempts to bring the administrative and supervisory personnel in a school system together for purposes of interaction, consultation, and decision-making. Does your school system use such an arrangement?

_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No
_____ 3 Don't know

If **YES**, how would you describe the involvement of your administration?

_____ 4 Included in a meaningful way
_____ 3 Included but in name only
_____ 2 Not included
_____ 1 Don't know

63. Please provide estimates for the percent of your time you spend on each of the responsibilities listed below? (Mark in 0 percent if appropriate.)

° Supervision/evaluation of teachers	_____ %
° Supervision/evaluation of nonteaching staff	_____ %
° Curriculum development/ evaluation	_____ %
° Discipline/student management	_____ %
° Student evaluation/placement	_____ %
° Parent/community contacts	_____ %
° Facilities management	_____ %
° Budget administration	_____ %
° Policy development/ administration	_____ %
° Evaluation of Administrators	_____ %
° Collective Bargaining	_____ %
° Finance & Budget	_____ %
° Administrative teamwork	_____ %
° Phase III	_____ %
° Planning	_____ %
° Administrative team meetings	_____ %
° Master Contract Administration	_____ %
° Other (Specify: _____ _____)	
TOTAL	100 %

F. PROBLEMS OF THE SUPERINTENDENCY

64. Relative to your own feelings of job security, indicate the extent to which each of the items listed is currently or potentially (within the next year) a problem. (Please circle ONE number for EACH category.) Use the following response categories:

3 = Major 2 = Minor 1 = No

° Unsatisfactory student performance	3	2	1
° Conflicts with teacher	3	2	1
° Conflicts between my philosophy and that of school board	3	2	1
° Lack of liability insurance	3	2	1
° Reduction in force due to declining enrollment	3	2	1
° Reorganization of schools districts	3	2	1
° Poor personal performance evaluation	3	2	1
° Personal deficiencies in some skill areas needed for the superintendency	3	2	1
° Conflicts with principals	3	2	1
° Conflicts with central administration	3	2	1
° Other (please specify: _____)	3	2	1

65. In your opinion, has the responsibility of principal in relation to the following areas changed in the last five years? (Please circle ONE number for EACH category.) Use the following response categories:

3 = Increase 2 = No change 1 = Decrease

° Building level authority/responsibility	3	2	1
° Curriculum development	3	2	1
° Development of instructional practices	3	2	1
° Fiscal decision-making	3	2	1
° Personnel selection	3	2	1
° Personnel evaluation	3	2	1
° Participation in district policy development	3	2	1

66. For each item below, indicate the extent to which it is currently or potentially (within the next year) a challenge in the districts for which you are now responsible. (Please circle ONE number for **EACH** category.) Use the following response categories:

3 = Major 2 = Minor 1 = No

° Managing student behavior	3	2	1
° Use of drugs by pupils	3	2	1
° Use of alcoholic beverages by students	3	2	1
° Use of alcoholic beverages by staff	3	2	1
° Pupil absenteeism	3	2	1
° Teacher absenteeism	3	2	1
° Declining enrollment	3	2	1
° Increasing enrollment	3	2	1
° Changing composition of student body	3	2	1
° Complying with student records regulations	3	2	1
° Dismissing incompetent staff	3	2	1
° Crisis management	3	2	1
° Evaluating teachers	3	2	1
° Staff morale	3	2	1
° Teachers union activities	3	2	1
° Teacher shortages	3	2	1
° Vandalism	3	2	1
° Violence in the schools	3	2	1
° Providing programs for gifted and talented students	3	2	1
° Providing programs for underachievers	3	2	1
° Providing programs for handicapped learners	3	2	1
° Providing programs for At-Risk Students	3	2	1
° Level of teacher performance	3	2	1
° Level of parental involvement	3	2	1
° Inadequate availability of computers, video machines, etc., for instructional purposes	3	2	1
° Declining test scores	3	2	1
° Sexual behavior of pupils	3	2	1
° Non-English speaking students	3	2	1
° Efforts to effectively mesh routine classroom instruction with special academic pull-out programs	3	2	1
° Child abuse	3	2	1
° Central office involvement in school building decisions	3	2	1
° Coping with federal regulations	3	2	1
° Coping with state regulations/initiatives	3	2	1
° Special needs of latchkey children	3	2	1
° Teacher empowerment	3	2	1
° Site-based management	3	2	1
° Increased interest in pre-kindergarten programs	3	2	1
° Financing district	3	2	1
° Phase III	3	2	1
° Restructuring boundaries	3	2	1
° Shared programs	3	2	1
° Shared employees	3	2	1
° Board/superintendent relations	3	2	1
° School/community relations	3	2	1
° Administrator/employee relations	3	2	1
° Superintendent/other administrator relations	3	2	1
° Planning or goal setting	3	2	1
° Other (please specify: _____)	3	2	1

G. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

67. In your opinion, is collective bargaining by teachers having a good or bad effect on the quality of public education?
_____ 4 Good effect
_____ 3 Little if any effect
_____ 2 Bad effect
_____ 1 Don't know

68. How does your inclusion on the districts' bargaining team effect your working relationship with staff members?
_____ 4 Positive effect
_____ 3 Little or no effect
_____ 2 Negative effect
_____ 1 Not included on bargaining team

69. What effect, in your opinion, is collective bargaining in public education having on public opinion generally?
_____ 4 Good effect
_____ 3 Little if any effect
_____ 2 Bad effect
_____ 1 Don't know

H. CAREER SUPPORT

70. Were the following factors effective in advancing your career?
Indicate: 1 = Yes 2 = No
_____ Yes _____ No Competency
_____ Yes _____ No Visibility through leadership in association
_____ Yes _____ No Association from university
_____ Yes _____ No Political connections

71. Do you consider yourself to be a mentor?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

72. Do/Did you have a mentor?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

73. Have you utilized the "political connections network" in employing administrators?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

74. Have you utilized the "political connections network" in seeking employment?
_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

H. ADMINISTRATOR AND TECHNOLOGY

75. Do you consider yourself a computer user?

_____ 1 Yes
_____ 2 No

If YES, please indicate how you use it (check ALL that apply).

	School Related	Personal
Word processing	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Spreadsheets	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Database	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Graphics	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Communications (e.g., Compuserve, bulletin boards, Email, computer conferencing)	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Desktop publishing (e.g., newsletters)	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Entertainment (e.g., games)	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Work with family (e.g., homework)	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No
Other _____	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No	_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No

76. How have you learned what you know about computers? 1 = Yes 2 = No

By myself (e.g., experimentation, reading, trial and error)	_____ Yes	_____ No
From my colleagues and peers	_____ Yes	_____ No
From my family and friends	_____ Yes	_____ No
From meetings, workshops, conferences	_____ Yes	_____ No

These meetings were at:

_____ 1 my building/district
_____ 1 an AEA
_____ 1 a college/university
_____ 1 a local computer store
_____ 1 state/national conferences
_____ 1 other training providers (e.g., vendors, trainers)
_____ 1 computer users group
_____ 1 other, please specify _____

77. Approximately what percentage of teachers in your building/district use the following technology in instruction?

_____ % computers
_____ % VCR or other video

Please use the scale below to answer the following questions:

5 = Strongly disagree
4 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
2 = Agree
1 = Strongly agree
0 = Not applicable

78. The computer can be an effective tool for teaching and learning.	5	4	3	2	1	0
78. Adequate staff development is available in the use of computers for instruction from:						
Local district	5	4	3	2	1	0
AEA	5	4	3	2	1	0
Consultants (college/university/ other)	5	4	3	2	1	0