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ABSTRACT

Role Analysis of School Superintendents in Utah

by

Derwin Don Francom, Doctor of Education
Utah State University, 1980

Major Professor: Dr. Terrance E. Hatch
Department: Secondary Education

The purpose of the study was to determine how superintendents in the state of Utah perceived their role as superintendent. It focused on: (1) how superintendents perceived their role as superintendents, (2) what demands were affecting their role, (3) if superintendents in different-size school districts perceived their role differently, (4) how the superintendent-board relationship was viewed by the superintendents, and (5) what the superintendents considered to be the greatest problems facing them in Utah today.

A survey research design was used to collect the data from all 40 superintendents. For the purposes of analysis, the districts they represented were divided into three categories based on district size.

Two instruments were used to collect the data. They were: (1) the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire developed by Raymond Fast (1968), and (2) a personal data sheet and interview guide. In addition, three questions were used to find out how superintendents spent their time.
The information obtained from the questionnaire and personal data sheet were analyzed in two ways. First, a one-way analysis was done between the independent variable (school district size) and the subscores on the nine dimensions of the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire. No significant differences were found. Second, an item-by-item analysis was done between the demographic data and the 37 items of the questionnaire using Chi-square crosstabulations. Only 21 of the 407 crosstabulations were significant at $\alpha = .05$ and above.

It was found that: (1) superintendents had a positive perception of their role as superintendent and a positive relationship with the local boards of education; (2) there was no difference in how superintendents in different-size school districts perceived their role; (3) the highest-ranking demands from federal and state agencies and local constituencies were paperwork, resolving problems of parents-students-staff in terms of patron input and teacher militancy, and handling increasing costs and inflation.

The three highest-ranking problems superintendents stated they were facing were: (1) financial demands in terms of providing more services on a limited tax base, dealing with inflation, and increasing energy costs; (2) time and resources to provide quality education for a growing school population, and teacher problems in terms of teacher militancy, loss of good teachers to other occupations, and the removal of mediocre teachers; and (3) the expectations of special interest groups.

(96 pages)
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Within the past ten years, a renewed interest in formal education at all levels has been reflected in national legislation, recent court decisions, increased attention of university scholars, and in the organization of new business firms designed to enter the educational arena (Campbell, 1975). This renewed interest has impacted local school districts with many new demands that were formerly non-existent. Some of the new demands are: sex equity, Affirmative Action, All Handicapped Children's Act, safety in building design and construction, due process procedures, student transportation, tax limitation, mistrust of public officials and, presently, the energy crisis. Knezevich (1975) believes that new demands upon the local school districts result from changes in society and that these demands impact upon the school superintendent.

Pressures that stem from the knowledge explosion, the technological revolution, and the social and economic ferment in contemporary society make imperative not only quality preservice education for the successful administration, but also the generation of a new vehicle dedicated to the continuing professional development of practicing school administrators (p. 358).

With such demands or pressures being placed upon them, superintendents in local school districts have had to re-evaluate their roles and learn to deal with these new demands. These new demands and pressures result in a need for the clarification of the superintendent's role.

Background of the Problem

In the state of Utah there is a lack of a clear role definition for
superintendents. In fact, a legal definition of the office of the superintendent of schools in Utah has not been made by the legislature, other than stating that the superintendent is an officer of the local board of education, is the budget officer, and that his or her term of office is two years (School Laws of the State of Utah, School Code 53-6-11, 1978).

An attempt by the Utah School Boards Association to make a more definitive description of the superintendent's role was made in ABC's of Boardmanship (1967) in the form of delegated powers. More recently the same organization, in the article "The Critical Status of Board-Superintendent Relations" (Utah School Boards Association Newsletter, 1979), stated that "In order to avoid misunderstandings, every board of education should develop criteria depicting its 'expectations' of the superintendent. Such criteria should include not only age, educational achievement, and experience, but a list of less tangible items which the board deems vital to success." ABC's of Boardmanship (1967) lists 14 items from "integrity of the highest order" to "a willingness to bring educational issues before the board for evaluation and study."

Researchers have been concerned with the lack of information about the role of the superintendent, not only in Utah, but in other states as well. Rigby (1955), in a dissertation completed at the University of Utah, considered the status and functions of the district superintendents in Utah. He explored the emerging concept of democratic school administration, traced the history of the superintendency, studied the superintendents' academic training and professional experience in education, and the superintendents' personal and economic status. Rigby also made an analysis of the superintendent's administrative functions,
his role in the instructional program, his relationship to the community, and the basic competencies needed by educational leaders. Within the framework of Rigby's research there was no attempt made to study the superintendent's relationship to the building program, supervision, curriculum, educational personnel or pupil services, nor was his relationship to financial matters considered. Rigby did suggest that the superintendency was becoming a more viable and important position within the state of Utah.

Two other studies that relate to superintendents in Utah are Bell (1966) and Williams (1969). Bell found that personality in relation to administrative behavior did not make any difference in the success or failure of the superintendent. Williams recommended that an in-service program be implemented for Utah's superintendents to help them keep up with new ideas and demands being placed on them; however, superintendents were not really amenable to such a program.

On a wider basis Heller (1977), a professor at Loyola University in Chicago stated, "In reviewing the literature, one finds that little has been done on the role of the superintendents since the classic study by Gross and Associates (1958)." Heller went on to say that "The assumption is that the superintendent's role is becoming increasingly specialized and technical in nature." Details of his study are given in Chapter II.

In contrast to Heller's statement Monahan, Dean of the College of Human Resources and Education at West Virginia University, as cited in a study by Schutz (1977), stated that research done by Schutz, "Leaders of Schools," may well be the most important study of instructional management in the last 50 years because of its extensive nature, which
covered aspects of the personalities of administrators as well as the roles in which administrators find themselves. Some of the relationships described in Schutz's study were:

1. Administrators who rate high on intelligence do very well on technical knowledge, both as principals and as superintendents.
2. Administrators who are conservative in political outlooks and educational values do very poorly as superintendents, as judged by both staff and board members.
3. Administrators who come from large families do well as superintendents except in large population-center districts.
4. An administrator with many years of teaching experience is outstandingly unsuccessful both as principal and as superintendent.
5. A female administrator is highly regarded as superintendent by her staff (Schutz, 1977, pp. 125-137).

The study included all levels of school administration.

The Problem

Although there is information about the role of superintendents of schools in literature and research studies (Knezevich, 1975; Campbell, 1975; Heller, 1977; Schutz, 1977), there is little information about the role of superintendents in the state of Utah except for the Rigby (1955) and Williams (1969) studies.

The problem is not peculiar to Utah and is more widespread than one might realize. Knezevich (1975) indicated, in reporting McCann's findings, that only about half the states' school codes define the relationship between the school board and the superintendent. With respect to whether or not a superintendent is an officer of the board, or an employee of the board, the courts in 13 states have declared the superintendent to be an officer of the board, whereas six others have ruled that he is an employee (Knezevich, 1975). The problem is a lack of role
definition of the office of superintendent of schools, as established by either legislative statutes or State Office of Education directives. In addition, there is a dearth of information on how superintendents perceive their role.

In Utah neither the state legislature nor the Utah State Office of Education has attempted to correct this problem by defining what the role should be. Thus, each superintendent establishes his or her own role as he or she sees fit, regardless of what is written about it in research.

Presently, it is now known how superintendents perceive their roles. McBride (1976) commented, "The basic problem with the role of the superintendent is that it varies from district to district. The perception of the role changes with every authority that attempts to establish the role of superintendency" (p. 126).

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to analyze how 40 superintendents in the state of Utah actually perceived their roles as superintendent and what they perceived to be the major demands being placed on them. The results of the study will provide greater insight into the role of superintendents in the state and will reduce the ambiguity surrounding that role.

The focus of the study was: (1) to determine how superintendents perceive their role as superintendent, (2) to determine what demands affected their roles, (3) to determine if superintendents in different-size school districts perceive their role differently, and (4) to solicit information about superintendents, as it relates to their systems of
This study is the first in-depth study in Utah to consider the role of the superintendent of schools as perceived by the superintendents, and the demands they perceived were impacting on them in today's world.

**Objectives**

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Find out how superintendents perceived their role with respect to:
   a. Instructional Leader;
   b. Curriculum Director;
   c. Staff Personnel Administrator;
   d. Pupil Personnel Administrator;
   e. Financial Administrator;
   f. School Plant and Business Manager;
   g. Public Relations Manager;
   h. District Structure and Organization Administrator;
   i. General Planner.

2. To determine if school district size was related to superintendent role perception of the following:
   a. Instructional Leader;
   b. Curriculum Director;
   c. Staff Personnel Administrator;
   d. Pupil Personnel Administrator;
   e. Financial Administrator;
   f. School Plant and Business Manager;
   g. Public Relations Manager;
h. District Structure and Organization Administrator;
i. General Planner.

3. To identify new demands from federal agencies, state agencies, local boards of education, school patrons, and other segments of society which affected the superintendent's role.

Questions to be Answered

Because of the rapid growth of most school districts in the state of Utah and the increased demands being made on the local school system by federal, state, and local sources, the following questions were asked the superintendents:

1. What demands are being placed on superintendents by the federal agencies (including court decisions)?

2. What demands are being placed on superintendents by the state agencies?

3. What demands are being placed on superintendents from the local board of education and patrons?

4. From the superintendents' point of view, what is the relationship between the local board of education and the superintendent with respect to:
   a. Dependency of the local board on the superintendent for data gathering and data analysis.
   b. How secure the superintendents felt with respect to their boards.
   c. Overall management and administration of the educational program.
   d. In light of all the above, determine what the super-
intendents considered to be the greatest problems facing them today in the state of Utah.

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested. There will be no difference in how superintendents in different-size school districts (large, medium, and small) perceive their role as superintendent with respect to the following:

1. Instructional Leader;
2. Curriculum Director;
3. Staff Personnel Administrator;
4. Pupil Personnel Administrator;
5. Financial Administrator;
6. School Plant and Business Manager;
7. Public Relations Manager;
8. District Structure and Organization Administrator;
9. General Planner.

**Definitions**

'Superintendent' in this study refers specifically to the 40 individuals who occupy the position ('position' will be used to refer to the location of the superintendent in a system of social relationships) of chief executive officer of the board of education in the local school districts in Utah (Gross, 1958, p. 48).

The definition of 'role' will be limited to: "A role is a set of expectations or, in terms of the definition of expectations, it is a set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular posi-
tion" (Gross, 1958, p. 60). Gross (1958) defined 'role' as a concept applicable to any of the various levels of rational and situational specificity which can be applied to positions.

An 'expectation' is defined as an evaluative standard applied to the incumbent of a position (Gross, 1958, p. 58).

A 'system of social relationships' will be described as follows:

The meaning of location in a system of social relationships is not, however, entirely self-evident. It is difficult to separate the idea of location from the relationships which define it. Just as in geometry, a point cannot be located without describing its relations to other individuals, the points imply the relationships and the relationships imply the points. In a system of social relationships, however, the points acquire labels or identities which may come to have an almost autonomous significance (Gross, 1958, pp. 48-49).

**Delimitations**

The study was delimited to data collected from questionnaires completed by the 40 school superintendents in Utah. It was assumed that the population of superintendents was normally distributed. No attempt was made to stratify the population except on the basis of district size. It was assumed that all superintendents were equally qualified to respond to the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to signify reactions on a scale of one to seven to components of the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Historical Development of the Superintendency

The first half of the nineteenth century saw a movement away from the single-room school toward numerous city-wide school districts which demanded more time and management than a volunteer board could give to public service. The office of the superintendent was created to meet this need.

The initiative in establishing the new office of superintendent was taken by the Buffalo Common Council on June 9, 1837. The newly created office gained popularity, and by 1860 twenty-seven cities or city schools had established the office of superintendent (Campbell, 1975).

Since the office of superintendent had been created by the boards of education, there was no question as to "whose man" the superintendent was. He came into being as an agent of the school board faced with perplexing educational problems, yet was considered an assistant to the board. He was assigned menial school chores or detail work and was allowed little opportunity to exhibit professional skills and leadership. The early superintendent was literally the superintendent of instruction and little else. Even today, after 60 years, the position in many districts remains immersed in "Administrivia" by choice of the superintendent or through the failure of the board to provide adequate clerical or professional assistance (Knezevich, 1975).

Establishment of non-city school districts did not take place until
the twentieth century. Two conditions appeared to affect the organization of school districts in these areas: first, the acceptance of the high school as part of the common school system was significant (legal credence to the high school concept was given by Michigan Supreme Courts in 1874 in the Kalamazoo Case); second, there was the growth of the suburban communities and the need for the people moving into suburbia to secure "good schools." In this regard, Utah was one of the early states to move toward large, consolidated school districts. In 1905, the Utah legislature passed an optional reorganization law and then, in 1915, mandated the so-called County Unit Plan of school district organization, which is still in existence.

As school districts developed, so did the superintendency. According to Griffiths (1966), the historical development of the superintendency in the United States falls into three stages:

1. 1837-1910: The superintendent was essentially instruction-oriented during this period.

2. 1910-1945: This period saw the superintendent as essentially a businessman more interested in the budget than in instruction.

3. 1945-Present: In this period, the superintendent was viewed as a professional school administrator. An AASA (American Association of School Administrators) committee, chaired by Willard Goslin, undertook studies to develop professionalism, improved training programs, and refined standards of selection by school boards, along with others who were concerned about educational administration (Griffiths, 1966, p. 2).

The above dates are not sharp demarcations, but rather arbitrary estimates of the beginning and end of major trends (Griffiths, 1966). Although trends can be depicted, the description of the office of super-
intendent is nebulous.

Superintendent's Role Defined by Authors

Legally, the superintendent of schools appears to occupy an ambiguous state (Campbell, 1975). The office of the superintendent has, to a large degree, evolved without much legislative direction. In states where the position of superintendent is a constitutional office, however, it is more clearly defined. Thus, in Florida, the position of county superintendent of schools is rather well defined in terms of authority, responsibility, and the superintendent's relationship with the county board of public instruction.

With respect to the superintendents in the state of Utah, the position is not well defined. For example, the following is found in School Laws of the State of Utah, 1978:

(AGO): Local Superintendents of Schools--Legal Employment Status.

A superintendent of schools of a local board of education is an officer who may be removed from office for cause as provided in § 53-6-11, UCA 1953.

The Utah School Code says:

Superintendent of Schools--Appointment--Qualifications--Term--Salary.

At the first meeting in June of each county board of education in odd-numbered years, and at the first meeting in June of each city board of education in even-numbered years, a superintendent of schools for each district shall be appointed by the boards, who shall be holder of at least a diploma of grammar school grade, shall subscribe the constitutional oath of office, and shall enter upon his duties on the first day of July thereafter. His term of office shall be two years and until his successor shall be appointed and has qualified. He shall receive for his services such compensation as the board may fix and determine (Utah Code Annotated, 1953, 53-6-11).
From the above, it can be determined that the superintendents of local school districts in the state of Utah are officers of their local boards of education, can be hired, and can be terminated. In another section of the code (§ 53-20-1) it refers to the superintendent as also being the budget officer of the board. In reference to other relations with the board, there is little written in the code.

The Utah School Boards Association has tried to be more definitive in recent years in defining the role of the superintendent. In ABC's of Boardmanship (1967), written and published by the Utah School Boards Association and distributed by the Utah State Office of Education to newly elected local board members in the state, requirements that a superintendent must meet in order to be a candidate for the office of superintendent are suggested. Among these are: (1) "... the Utah State Board of Education suggests that every superintendent has a certificate of school administration;" (2) new candidates must have six years of formal prescribed university training to qualify for the certificate; (3) they must have been successful classroom teachers for at least three years; (4) the superintendent must be responsible to the board of education for the total school program; and (5) the board should delegate power, authority, and responsibility to the superintendent to act and then let him redelegate authority and responsibility at his discretion to provide the staff with means of maintaining effective communication and fixing responsibility to those assigned.

The power, authority, and responsibilities or duties most commonly delegated by a board to its superintendents in the state of Utah are:

1. Responsibility for the general conduct of the schools;
2. Supervision over all decisions of the school system
and responsibility for coordination of the functions of the schools in the district;
3. Responsibility for the nomination to the board for employment of all district employees;
4. Supervision and in-service training of the staff;
5. Preparation of the tentative annual budget as prescribed by Utah state law;
6. Care and maintenance of buildings, grounds, and equipment;

Morphet, Johns, and Reller (1974) also indicate there are relatively few powers conferred on superintendents and that educators favor keeping the important function of defining the responsibilities of the superintendent in the hands of the board of education.

Some of the powers, responsibilities, or duties of the superintendent suggested by Morphet, Johns, and Reller are:

1. To serve as chief executive officer of the board of education and thus be responsible for all aspects of the educational service;
2. To provide leadership in the planning, management, and evaluation of all phases of the educational program;
3. To select and recommend all personnel for appointment and to guide staff development;
4. To prepare the budget for submission to the board and to administer it after its adoption by the board;
5. To determine building needs and to administer building programs--construction, operation, and maintenance;
6. To serve as leader of the board, the staff, and the community in the improvement of the educational system (Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1974, p. 315).

The delegated powers, authority, and responsibilities or duties of the superintendent defined by the Utah School Boards Association and the duties suggested by Morphet, Johns, and Reller appear to parallel each other rather closely. The above three authors go on to say that the role of superintendent is now more "demanding and formidable" than suggested in the listing of the superintendent's duties. They quote Bennis' consideration of past bureaucratic leadership. Bennis states that
the duties or responsibilities involve

... four important sets of competencies: (1) knowledge of large complex human systems; (2) practical theories of intervening and guiding these systems, theories that encompass methods for seeding, nurturing, and integrating individuals and groups; (3) interpersonal competence, particularly the sensitivity to understand the effects of one's own behavior on others and how one's own personality shapes his particular leadership style and value system; and (4) a set of values and competencies which enables one to know when to confront psychological safety so necessary for growth (Morphet, Johns, and Reller, 1974, p. 316).

It is apparent that Bennis suggests that it is the duty of administrators to understand the organization and administration of the educational process, that they possess the skills of group dynamics, that they become grounded in philosophical foundations and learning theory, and that they gain survival skills for both themselves and staff members.

Knezevich (1975) gives further understanding to the superintendency and its powers, authority, and duties. He describes the powers, authority, and duties of the superintendent as containing 14 fundamental aspects. They are:

1. The superintendent is the chief executive officer of the board.
2. He is responsible for carrying out all policies, rules, and regulations established by the board. In matters not specifically covered by board policy, he is to take appropriate action and report the same to the board no later than the next regular meeting.
3. All individuals employed by the board are responsible directly or indirectly to the superintendent of schools.
4. The superintendent has the authority to prepare regulations and to give such instruction to school employees as may be necessary to make the policies of the board effective. He may delegate responsibilities and assign duties. Such delegation and assignment does not relieve the superintendent of responsibility for actions of subordinates.
5. Except when matters pertaining to his reemployment are being considered, the superintendent is to be present at all meetings of the board and its special committees. He may be held responsible for preparing the agendas for board meetings.
6. He is responsible for preparing and submitting the budget to cover school operations.
7. The superintendent has the authority, within limits of major appropriations approved by the board, to authorize and direct all purchases and expenditures.
8. He recommends all candidates for employment. The board has the authority to reject specific candidates recommended, but personnel finally accepted should be employed only upon the recommendations of the superintendent.
9. The superintendent formulates and recommends personnel policies necessary to the functioning of the schools.
10. The superintendent provides professional leadership for the educational program of the schools and is responsible for developing a system of regular reporting.
11. The superintendent is responsible for keeping the school board informed on all vital matters pertaining to the school system.
12. He is responsible for the development of a program of maintenance and improvement or expansion of the buildings and the site. This includes recommendation for employment and supervision of all building custodians.
13. He is responsible for formulating and administering a program for supervision for all schools.
14. The superintendent is responsible for submitting an annual report on the operation of the school system (Knezevich, 1975, pp. 344-345).

It can be seen that there is agreement among authors of literature on educational administration regarding the role of superintendents. However, no definite description of the superintendent's role in supervising school district operations has been made in Utah.

Research on the Superintendency

Because legislatures and boards of education in many states have been lax in their efforts to define the role of the superintendent in schools, Knezevich has joined the many authorities who call for recodification of statutes dealing with public education and the definition therein of the authority and responsibility of the superintendent (Knezevich, 1975, p. 344).

Sandler (1968) felt that in respect to his role, the school super-
intendant should be able to identify what he is actually doing in carrying out the functions of his position and what he should ideally do in carrying them out. Sandler found that "superintendents in large school systems perceived their actual and ideal roles to be the same" and "in small school systems, the superintendents perceived their actual and ideal roles to be different. In large and small school systems, the superintendents perceived the actual role of the superintendents to be the same" (Sandler, 1968, p. 186).

Kumagai (1975), in a study about the perception of county superintendents and district superintendents as to the role of the county intermediate district superintendent, found that a significant difference existed between them. This study found that large counties had the lowest consensus of opinion as to the role and functions of the county superintendents (Kumagai, 1975, p. 120). This may or may not be related to county superintendents with attendance districts because of the service function of this intermediate unit.

Heller, et al. (1977), would agree with Sandler as to the superintendent identifying the functions of his role, but felt that little research had been conducted on the role of superintendents since the classic study by Gross and his associates in 1958. The findings of the Gross study, based on the difference between large and small formal organizations, were:

1. Superintendents in larger formal organizations reflected a greater degree of support for incumbents of technical and executive positions within their organizations than those in smaller formal organizations.
2. Superintendents in large formal organizations assigned more responsibility to the subordinate than would position incumbents in smaller formal organizations.
3. There was no difference in superintendents in large or small formal organizations in rejecting a deviation from the established line of authority (Gross, 1958, p. 245).
Gross (1953) goes on to suggest:

that the conditions under which expectations are learned or taught and who defines them may be quite variable . . . The assumption that there is consensus on role definition on the basis of which socialization takes place is untenable for the occupational position we studied (Gross, 1958, p. 43).

Heller (1977) felt that the Gross study gave too little attention to components of the role that dealt with such aspects as professionalization and decision making. To overcome the lack of information on the superintendency and overcome the deficiencies he felt existed in the Gross study, Heller, et al. (1977), conducted a study of their own. They did their study on the role of the superintendent in terms of professionalism as it is influenced by formal academic training. They found that:

in terms of enrollment size, superintendents of larger districts placed more faith in using empirical research to evaluate curriculum and finance than superintendents of smaller districts . . . The important point is that superintendents believe that empirical research is important in evaluating a variety of policy areas (Heller, 1977, p. 117).

In other studies which compare the role perception of the superintendent as perceived by the superintendents and the school board presidents by using the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire developed by Fast (1968), some interesting results have been published. Casburn (1975) found that no significant difference existed between the role of the superintendent as perceived by the superintendent, and as perceived by the president of the board of education in relationship to district size. Sesker (1971) did not study district size, but found that principals, teachers, and board members perceived the superintendent's role to be different. Fast (1968) found that principals and board members perceived the superintendent's role as different than that perceived by the
superintendents. Lilley (1975), using the same instrument, found that a significant difference existed between the perceptions of the role of the superintendent held by the board president and superintendent.

In a study done by Pitner (1979), it was found that:

Much of the activity of superintendents is mundane and never approaches the lofty ideals of leadership. They spend a considerable portion of their time talking with insiders about minor things, making trivial decisions, holding meetings on unimportant agendas, and responding to the little irritants in organizational life. While superintendents were faced with numerous constraints, they did exercise some control over their own work; they initiated the majority of their contacts, created opportunities, and defined long-term commitments.

Similar studies of executives in educational institutions (Campbell and Cunningham, 1958; Helphill and Walberg, 1966; Cohen and March, 1973) show consistently that their work is characterized by variety, discontinuity, and brevity; they make decisions with superficial understanding; and their work is largely verbal in nature (Pitner, 1979, p. 30).

The role of superintendents is considerably different from Pitner's perspective as an observer from within the organization than it appears to persons outside the organization. The role of superintendent is not what it appears to be by superficial observation.

Several years earlier Morphet, along with Schutz, worked on the problem of how to identify persons with potential characteristics to serve as effective administrators. While the Pitner study was descriptive, the Schutz study attempted to determine behavioral characteristics that would predict the success of an administrator based upon characteristics of administrative incumbents and the social situation. Monahan at West Virginia University said, "The study may just be the most important study of institutional management in the last 50 years" (Schutz, 1977, p. xi).

The Schutz study appears to have application in the selection and
placement of administrators generally. People engaged in the selection of superintendents are provided tools to help them with their tasks (Schutz, 1977). Some of the findings of the study that relate to district size are:

1. Sophisticated suburbanites seem to look down on administrators who profess much liking and respect for people generally. Perhaps this attitude is seen as insincere because staff members, the people who know the superintendent best, are especially negative toward administrators manifesting this trait. On the other hand, the desire to be liked seems to be a very attractive trait to people in small communities and population centers. Perhaps it is a homely virtue, in keeping with the mores of such communities. Stereotypes of suburbia and small towns were supported by this finding.

2. Small-town principals succeed more if they take an impersonal, task-oriented attitude about the educational situation, while successful suburban principals prefer a more personal, less disciplinary relationship in the school. This may reflect the greater psychological sophistication of suburbia, where a more permissive educational philosophy must be espoused. Old-fashioned values, like strict regulation of the classroom and impersonal relations among children, teachers, and administrators in which everyone "keeps his place," characterize small-town school districts. Superintendents seem to be able to hold, successfully, values supporting nonconformity more easily than principals.

   a. One of the original hypotheses of this study was partially confirmed by this finding. The older child in a large family is a more successful principal in both suburban and small districts and a more successful superintendent in general. However, in population-center districts, administrators from small families seem to do better. The reasons for this are not clear.

   b. This result confirmed an earlier one supporting the stereotype of the small-town district as adhering to the more traditional, conservative values and the suburban district having a more sophisticated value system. In this case, the stability of being married is an important factor for small-town administrative success, while unmarried administrators may function well in a suburban area.

3. The conservatism of the small town is again supported in the area of religion. The contact theory of prejudice is supported by the fact that staff members, who know superintendents best, rate those with low-status religions very high. (The contact theory states that prejudice is reduced in people who have intimate contact with the group that is the target of prejudice.)
4. Successful, small-district principals are "proper." They do what they should, come from a large family, get married, keep their proper place, adhere to one of the more acceptable religions, and do not admit their problems. They are not "complainers." This contrasts considerably with successful suburban or population-center principals who tend to be relatively more liberal and nonconformist (though not necessarily complainers (Schutz, 1979, pp. 113-137).

Schutz's study is important because it establishes various criteria that apply to the role of the superintendent. Schutz makes a comment about one of his criteria for superintendents and public officials in general in light of Watergate, the CIA, and the waning confidence of the public in public officials. He says,

 Increasingly, the key role of honesty in effective human relations has become apparent. My observation of the administrative scene, enhanced by more recent experience, leads me to believe that a large percentage of administrators' problems would disappear, and a large number of administrators' energies would return, if they made honesty their policy (Schutz, 1977, p. 145).

The list of superintendent duties, responsibilities, etc., continues to grow, but no direction is coming from the legislatures. In a most recent article published by the Utah School Boards Association, "honesty and integrity" headed the list of 14 expectations of the superintendents (Newsletter, June 1979). Other criteria, or "should-be expectations" of the superintendents, listed by the Newsletter were based on the fact that the operational success of the school system is frequently dependent upon the actions of this one man and the understanding that he and the board have of his role as superintendent. The Newsletter indicated that failure to understand this role frequently leads to a school district's disaster. The expectations enumerated in the above article are:

1. Integrity of the highest order;
2. Ability to withstand a reasonable amount of intense pressure;
3. Ability to provide firm and definite recommendations to the board;
4. An understanding of the pressure to which a lay board is subjected by the community;
5. Adherence to a code of ethics of a state or national administrative organization;
6. Willingness and ability to delegate authority;
7. Ability to communicate clearly, both orally and in writing;
8. High competency in the technical aspects of the position such as finance, business management, personnel management, and school law;
9. Willingness to give accurate and honest evaluations of personnel and educational programs of the school district;
10. Understanding the role of the board in policy making;
11. Ability to be open-minded and to avoid becoming involved in personalities;
12. Willingness to keep the public informed;
13. Willingness to grow professionally by participation in workshops and seminars sponsored by his professional organizations;
14. Willingness to bring education issues before the board for evaluation and study.

This is not a complete list of expectations, but some suggested by the Utah School Boards Association that are deemed vital to a superintendent's success (Newsletter, June 1979, p. 5).

Summary

The office of superintendent created in Buffalo, New York, in 1837 has grown to one of importance in the educational arena. The superintendent, for the most part, is not simply a menial clerk but a fully recognized professional.

The superintendent's role has evolved without much legislative direction in most states. Utah is one that has not been given much legislative direction; however, the Utah School Boards Association and the State Office of Education are trying to define the superintendent's role more fully.
Authorities writing on the superintendent's role today agree that a more definitive description of the role should be prescribed in an effort to help him or her become more effective in fulfilling his or her duties. The aspects or elements in a composite role of the superintendent that have gained the most acceptance by experts writing on the subject are as follows:

1. Have responsibility for the general conduct of the schools and serve as the chief executive of the board of education;
2. Supervise over all decisions of the school system and coordinate the functions of the schools in the district;
3. Have the responsibility for the nomination to the board of persons to be employed and guide staff development;
4. Provide leadership in the planning, management, and evaluation of all phases of the educational program;
5. Prepare the tentative annual budget as prescribed by law and provide direction in the development of policies;
6. Have responsibility for the care and maintenance of buildings, grounds, and equipment and the planning and procurement of new sites and buildings;
7. Be responsible for the preparation and the agendas for the board meetings and keeping the board informed on all vital matters.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

A survey research design was used in this study to collect data about superintendents in Utah. The collection tools were the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire and a personal data sheet. An examination of the superintendent's appointment calendar was originally intended but, because of incomplete information in the calendars, it was dropped and three questions were developed. They were:

1. What percent of the working day do you spend at desk work?
2. What percent of the working day do you spend in scheduled meetings; unscheduled meetings?
3. What percent of the working day do you spend with in-house personnel, as opposed to out-of-house people?

The questionnaire and personal data sheet were completed during a personal interview with each of the superintendents. When the interview was completed, a request to examine the superintendent's appointment calendar for the past three months was made in order to gain further information about how he spent his time and to help verify data gained by the first two instruments. Appointments with each of the superintendents were made by telephone prior to the interview to save time for both the superintendent and the researcher. All interviews were completed between January 7, 1980, and February 8, 1980.

Subjects

The subjects for the study were all 40 public school district su-
perintendents in Utah. The subjects were divided into three categories based upon the district size. The categories were: (1) large school districts, 6,000+ AMA (day school attendance membership average; see Table 1), 12 districts; (2) medium school districts, 1,500 to 5,999 AMA, 14 districts; and (3) small school districts, 0 to 1,499 AMA, 14 districts. The information used to make the above determinations was obtained from the 1978-79 State Supported Minimum School Program: Budget Estimates, produced by the External Support Services, Utah State Office of Education, Revised 3/26/79.

To make sure that the confidentiality of the subjects was protected, each school district was assigned at random a number from 101 to 140. The numbers so assigned were used for purposes of identifying the school districts during the process of gathering data and were destroyed after the study was complete.

**Measuring Instruments**

Two instruments were used in gathering data for this study. They were: (1) the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire, and (2) a personal data sheet and interview guide. In addition, three questions were used to find out how superintendents spent their time.

The Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire (developed by Fast, 1968) was selected to gather the primary data because it included the same aspects of the superintendent's role this study was concerned with, it took a relatively short period of time to complete, it had been used successfully in several research studies (Fast, 1968; Sesker, 1971; Casburn, 1975; Lilley, 1975; and McBride, 1976), and it was reliable (see Table 2 for details on reliability).
## Table 1

### Districts and District Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>**Total AMA</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>21,446</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td>7,710</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cache</td>
<td>7,243</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daggett</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>34,455</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesne</td>
<td>3,112</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>54,858</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>39,768</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juab</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebo</td>
<td>10,752</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sanpete</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Summit</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park City</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sanpete</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Summit</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tintic</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uintah</td>
<td>4,467</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5,207</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>18,661</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
<td>21,433</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>10,666</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>8,916</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AMA means day school attendance membership average**

Categories:
- 10-1,449 = 3
- 1,500-5,999 = 2
- 6,000+ = 1
Table 2
Reliability Coefficients for the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Personnel Administration</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Personnel Administration</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Administration</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Plant and Business Management</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Structure and Organization</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Planning</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expectations

| Instructional Leadership                     | .41| .67|
| Curriculum                                   | .35| .51|
| Staff Personnel Administration               | .48| .70|
| Pupil Personnel Administration               | .62| .82|
| Financial Administration                     | .64| .64|
| School Plant and Business Management         | .71| .86|
| Public Relations                             | .64| .84|
| Administrative Structure and Organization    | .58| .81|
| General Planning                             | .38| .70|

a = The correlation score for each dimension with its highest inter-correlated dimension

b = The Kuder-Richardson formula 21 reliability coefficient (Fast, 1968)
The questionnaire consisted of 37 items covering nine dimensions of the superintendent's role. The dimensions were:

1. Instructional Leadership;
2. Curriculum;
3. Staff Personnel Administration;
4. Pupil Personnel Administration;
5. Financial Administration;
6. School Plant and Business Management;
7. Public Relations;
8. Administrative Structure and Organization;
9. General Planning.

The instrument required a forced-choice response to each item on a Likert-type scale of one to seven. The scale ranged from one to seven as follows:

1. Never;
2. Almost Never;
3. Seldom;
4. Occasionally;
5. Often;
6. Almost Always;
7. Always.

A copy of the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire (Fast, 1968) is in Appendix A.

The second instrument used in the study was composed of two parts: (1) a personal data sheet, and (2) an interview guide.

The personal data sheet contained 11 items as follows:

1. The age of the superintendent;
2. The length of time in his present position;
3. The number of years of experience the superintendent had as superintendent or principal, and other administrative experience;
4. The number of years of classroom teaching experience;
5. The number of non-teaching years of experience;
6. His level of education;
7. Membership in civic organizations;
8. Membership in professional organizations;
9. The average number of hours worked per week;
10. The security the superintendent felt about his reemployment;
11. The dependency of the local board on the superintendent for information gathering and interpretation.

Each of these categories served as a variable to be compared to the individual items measured by the SBQ (Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire).

The interview guide portion contained six questions of a descriptive nature. Question (12) asked the superintendent to describe his relationship with the local board of education; (13-15) asked what demands were being placed on the superintendent by federal agencies, state agencies, and at the local level respectively; (16) asked about other demands placed on the superintendent, such as those brought about by the energy crisis; (17) asked the superintendent to name what he considered to be the three major problems facing superintendents in Utah today.

In addition, three questions were asked to determine how superintendents spent their time.
Analysis

The SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd edition, written by Nie, 1975) subprogram ONEWAY and subprogram CROSSTABS integer mode were used in the analysis of the data.

The subprogram ONEWAY, or one-way analysis of variance, is limited to problems involving only one independent variable and as many as 20 dependent variables. Since this study involved only one independent variable (school district size) and nine dependent variables (subscores on the nine dimensions of the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire), the ONEWAY analysis with its resulting standard tables was appropriate.

Because nine dependent variables were named, nine separate ANOVA summary tables were printed by the computer. The nine dependent variables were subscores on:

1. Instructional Leadership dimension;
2. Curriculum dimension;
3. Staff Personnel Administration dimension;
4. Pupil Personnel Administration dimension;
5. Financial dimension;
6. School Plant and Business dimension;
7. Public Relations dimension;
8. Administrative Structure and Organization dimension;
9. General Planning dimension.

The printout from ONEWAY always included a standard analysis of variance summary showing sums of squares, degrees of freedom, mean squares, and the F ratio formed by dividing the between-group mean square by the within-group mean square. The table also showed the sig-
nificance of the obtained F ratio (Nie, 1975). The F ratio was used to
determine whether or not to reject the nine null hypotheses being
tested.

The subprogram CROSSTABS enabled computation of two-way to n-way
joint frequency distribution tables. The relationship depicted in the
tables summarized a measure of association between any two variables.

The distribution tables, in essence, indicated how strongly the two
variables were related to each other. The integer mode was selected be-
cause of its timesaving factor and the greater number of tables it pro-
duced in a single pass from the same core storage.

The independent variables were the first 11 items on the interview
guide; i.e.:

1. The superintendent's age;
2. Time in present position;
3. Years of experience as an administrator;
4. Years of teaching experience;
5. Years of non-teaching experience;
6. Level of education;
7. Civic organizations;
8. Professional organizations;
9. Average number of hours worked per week;
10. Security with the board;
11. Board dependency.

The independent variables were crosstabulated with the dependent
variables (the 37 items found in the Superintendent Behavior Question-
naire). The seven classifications on the Likert-type scale used in the
SBQ were collapsed into three classifications: 1, 2 = 1; 3, 4, 5 = 2;
and $6, 7 = 3$. This was done to decrease the number of cells in the tables and reduce the processing time. For example, the variables were set up as follows: Crosstabs Variables=AgeItem 1 to Item 37/Tables Age By Item 1 to Item 37.

The appropriate tests of significance were made to see if the relationships between the variables were statistically significant.

The questionnaire and interview guide were submitted to the Computer Center prior to the time of data collection for evaluation and coding so that computer cards could be punched directly from the instruments, thus saving both time and money.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The Problem

In Utah there is a lack of role definition for the office of superintendent of schools established either by legislative statutes or Utah State Office of Education directives. Neither the state legislature nor the State Office has attempted to correct this problem by defining what that role should be. Thus, at present, each superintendent establishes his own role as he sees fit. McBride (1976, p. 35) states:

The basic problem with the role of the superintendent is that it varies from district to district. The perception of the role changes with every authority that attempts to establish the role of the superintendency.

This appears to be the case in Utah.

Objectives, Hypotheses, and Questions to be Answered

The objectives outlined in Chapter I are each discussed in turn.

Objective One

Find out how superintendents perceive their role with respect to:

1. Instructional Leader;
2. Curriculum Director;
3. Staff Personnel Administrator;
4. Pupil Personnel Administrator;
5. Financial Administrator;
6. School Plant and Business Manager;
7. Public Relations Manager;
8. District Structure and Organization Administrator;
9. General Planner.

With respect to the first objective, the superintendents had positive responses to the various aspects of their role as superintendent (see Table 3).

The data in Table 3 summarizes superintendents exhibited administrative behaviors in the following ways:

1. Instructional Leadership, Often;
2. Curriculum Direction, Occasionally to Often;
3. Staff Personnel Administration, Often;
4. Pupil Personnel Administration, Often;
5. Financial Administration, Occasionally to Often;
6. School Plant and Business Management, Almost Always;
7. Public Relations Management, Often;
8. Administrative Structure and Organization Management, Often;

Objective Two and Hypotheses

In determining if school district size was related to superintendent role perception, the following hypotheses were tested. There is no difference in how superintendents in different-size school districts (large, medium, and small) perceive their role as superintendent with respect to the following:

1. Instructional Leader;
2. Curriculum Director;
3. Staff Personnel Administrator;
4. Pupil Personnel Administrator;
5. Financial Administrator;
6. School Plant and Business Manager;
7. Public Relations Manager;
8. District Structure and Organization Administrator;
9. General Planner.

Table 3

Superintendents' Perception of How Often They Exhibited the Following Administrative Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of Role</th>
<th>Sum of All Possible Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leader</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Director</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Personnel Administrator</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Personnel Administrator</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Administrator</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Manager</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Planner</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In order for the means to be comparable, the means derived from each category were divided by the number of questions in each category.

The ONEWAY from the SPSS (Nie, 1975), or one-way analysis of variance, was done between the independent variable (district size) and the nine dependent variables:

1. Instructional Leader;
2. Curriculum Director;
3. Staff Personnel Administrator;
4. Pupil Personnel Administrator;
5. Financial Administrator;
6. School Plant and Business Manager;
7. Public Relations Manager;
8. District Structure and Organization Administrator;
9. General Planner.

With 100% of the superintendents responding to the questionnaire, there were no significant differences found between the independent variable and the nine dependent variables. Since there were no significant differences between school district size and the nine dependent variables, all nine null hypotheses were retained (see Table 4).

Objective Three, Demands, and Questions to be Answered

In the introductory chapter, four questions were posed. Three related directly to Objective Three (identifying new demands) and one addressed superintendent-board relations and problems facing superintendents in the state. The questions were:

1. What demands are being placed on superintendents by the federal agencies (including court decisions)?
2. What demands are being placed on superintendents by the state agencies?
3. What demands are being placed on superintendents by the local boards of education and patrons?
4. From the superintendents' point of view, what is the relation-
ship between the local boards of education and the superintendents with respect to:

a. Dependency of the local board on the superintendent for data gathering and data analysis.

b. How secure the superintendents feel with respect to their boards.

c. Overall management and administration of the educational program.

d. In light of all the above, determine what the superintendents consider to be the greatest problems facing them today in the state of Utah.

Federal demands. In answering the first question posed, that of federal demands being placed on the superintendents, the superintendents stated the number one demand was ever-increasing paperwork. Thirty-four (85%) of the superintendents identified this demand. The demands, they said, were coming in the form of reports for the growing number of federal agencies and the audits to which they were subjected (see Table 5). The agencies mentioned as the cause of these demands were: the Occupation, Safety, and Health Administration; the Office of Civil Rights; the Department of Agriculture's school lunch program; and the Department of Education with its programs in special education, with the corresponding All Handicapped programs. Sex equity regulations were a problem to some of the superintendents.

The second-ranking federal demands identified by six (15%) of the superintendents were:

1. The increased cost of administering the increasing paperwork without the funding to hire more personnel to handle it, an example
### Table 4

One-Way Analysis of Variance of School Size with Nine Dependent Variables (Administrative Behaviors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MSB(^a)</th>
<th>MSW(^b)</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.8238</td>
<td>8.3230</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1661</td>
<td>4.1795</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Personnel Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4560</td>
<td>13.2159</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Personnel Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0327</td>
<td>25.5489</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8845</td>
<td>6.9225</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Plant and Business Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.6899</td>
<td>16.6377</td>
<td>1.845</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.3185</td>
<td>4.3443</td>
<td>1.685</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Structure and Organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9024</td>
<td>5.7864</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7345</td>
<td>0.7603</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSB\(^a\) = mean square between groups  
MSW\(^b\) = mean square within groups
being the increased number of times social security has to be reported per year. It has been increased from quarterly reports to monthly reports. One superintendent said he had to hire another person just to do social security reports and received no money from the federal government to pay the new employee.

2. The feeling that the federal agencies are increasing their control of state and local levels of government. It was noted that not one superintendent mentioned anything about federal or state court decisions that affect education. (For information on other demands, see Table 5.)

Table 5
Federal Demands in Ranked Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Demands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Paperwork in the form of reports, red tape, audits, civil rights surveys, school lunch reports, etc., that take the time of the superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Increasing costs to carry out required regulations with no increased funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Federal government exercising too much control at the state and local levels of government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Federal policies that are unreasonable, restrictive, and are third party ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Federal agencies do not understand rural areas; the programs have been designed for urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Had no problems with federal demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attending meeting called by federal agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good feelings about special education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Withdrawal of PL 874 caused budget problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eliminate federal programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State demands. In answer to the second question (demands imposed by state agencies), the number one demand identified was the same as the first-ranking federal demand: too much paperwork without the funding to
compensate the districts for the increased costs of compliance. Twenty-eight (70%) of the superintendents identified this problem. The second-ranking comment identified by fourteen (35%) of the superintendents was that the Utah State Office of Education was a good source of help and that they had a positive relationship with the State Office. The third-ranking problem identified by eight (20%) of the superintendents was that the state agencies were interfering with local board autonomy. (For the other rankings, see Table 6.)

Table 6
State Demands in Ranked Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Demands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Paperwork in the form of audits, regulations, various forms, individual educational programs, work experience without providing funding for extra costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>State Office is a good resource, and there exists a positive relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>State interfering with local autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Meetings for both superintendents and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Over-runs on transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Competency-based education--the state should help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No equalization of capital outlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Building demands are not reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compliance with everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>State Office oriented toward special interest groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local demands. The third question was: "What demands are being placed on superintendents by the local boards of education and patrons?" At this level, the demands reported were more diffused. Half of the superintendents identified as the number one demand the problem of resolving difficulties with parents, students, and staff. They felt that pa-
trans were demanding and getting more input into the education program, and that teachers were becoming more militant in their demands for input into the education program and for salary increases.

The second-ranking demands identified by one of every five superintendents were:

1. Superintendents are expected to be members of too many community and/or special interest groups. (This is interesting in light of the fact that 12 superintendents did not belong to any civic organizations at all, 25 belonged to one or two civic organizations, and only three of them belonged to three or more civic organizations. They apparently feel a real demand, even though they do not belong to an excessive number of organizations.)

2. There is a public demand for better communications and coordination with other community agencies.

3. The third demand identified was that of more accountability from the school system. (See Table 7 for other demands.)

Energy-related demands. Other demands impinging on the superintendents come mostly from energy-related difficulties which everyone is facing today. First, sixteen (40%) of the superintendents stated that increasing cost of fuel, building materials, maintenance parts, and inflation are the number one demands. Second, because of increasing costs and with limitations on available money, proper budgeting becomes very important. The third demand is making building construction and use more energy- or cost-efficient. Many superintendents say they have taken measures that are now saving the districts money. One district's heating cost was reported to be the same as it was five years ago, even though the price of natural gas and heating oil has more than tripled in
cost. (Other demands are shown in Table 8.)

Table 7
Local Demands in Ranked Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Demands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Resolving problems of parents, students, and staff in terms of more patron input and teacher militancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Superintendent expected to be a member of community groups and/or special interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Coordinating programs with other agencies, and better communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>More accountability in terms of discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Expressed they had no pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Expected to be at extracurricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Special programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Busing (transportation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Curriculum and instructional improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Superintendent-board relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preparing for energy impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>More time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Single salary schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consolidation problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superintendent and Local Board Relations

In answer to part a, question four, dependency of the board on the superintendent, seven (17.5%) of the superintendents indicated that the board was totally dependent on them; twenty-nine (72.5%) indicated that the board was almost always dependent on them; and four (10%) indicated that the board was somewhat dependent on them for information gathering and analysis.

In answer to part b, how secure the superintendents felt about their reemployment by the board, twenty-three (57.5%) responded that
they were very secure; thirteen (32.5%) responded that they were secure; and four (10%) said they were fairly secure.

Table 8

Energy Demands in Ranked Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Demands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Increased cost of fuel, materials, maintenance parts, and inflation (The superintendents feel the state needs to provide more funding to meet these demands.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Proper budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Making buildings energy-efficient (management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Controls on busing and housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conserving energy in terms of overall program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Travel for extracurricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>More funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No demands are being made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Supplies of fuel (Most superintendents feel they can get adequate fuel if they are willing to pay for it.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tax increase resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prioritizing programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall management and administration of the educational program, part c, was responded to by thirty-five (87.5%) of the superintendents stating that they had an excellent-to-good relationship with their respective boards of education. They also stated that the board and the superintendent had a good understanding of their respective roles.

The boards were the policy makers, and the superintendents were: (1) the executive officers of the board, (2) agenda-setters, and (3) given full control of administering the schools of the district. Three (7.5%) perceived they had a fair relationship with the local board and two (5%) felt they had a questionable relationship because the respective roles of the board and superintendent were not defined, nor under-
stood, by the board members and there was an indication that the board members wanted to involve themselves with the administrative aspects of running the school district.

In answering part d, each superintendent was asked to name what he considered to be the three greatest problems facing superintendents in the state of Utah today. A composite was made and is recorded in Table 9.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Financial demands in terms of providing more services on a limited tax base, dealing with inflation, and increasing energy costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Time and resources to provide a quality education for a growing school population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher problems in terms of teacher militancy, loss of good teachers to other occupations, and the removal of mediocre teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>The expectations of special interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The loss of public confidence in public education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Problems with students in terms of their changing attitudes toward school, keeping them in attendance, and compulsory attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Defining the respective roles of the board and the superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Political problems with the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinating agencies in the local area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health pressures on the superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Keeping current with educational trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of unity among the superintendents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the superintendents, the three top-ranking problems they are facing in Utah are:

1. Financial demands that include providing more and more services
on a limited tax base, dealing with inflation as they relate to these
demands, and the ever-increasing cost of energy. Thirty-seven (92.5%)
of the superintendents made statements relative to this problem.

2. Time and resources to provide a quality education for a growing
student population. One-half of the superintendents made comments about
this.

3. Teacher militancy, loss of good teachers to other occupations,
and the removal of mediocre teachers from their respective districts
were ranked with the problem above, with one-half of the superintendents
commenting. (See Table 9 for a summary of these responses.)

The rapid growth of some school districts has had its impact. It
appears, however, that the superintendents are generally coping with the
problem well.

Association of Demographic Data with Each Item
of the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire

An item-by-item analysis was done using crosstabulations from the
SPSS Program (Nie, 1975) to get a measure of how strongly the indepen­
dent variables (demographic information from the personal data sheet)
and the dependent variables (the 37 questions in the Superintendent Be­
havior Questionnaire, SBQ) are related to each other. The personal data
sheet consisted of the following information:

1. Age;
2. Time in present position;
3. Years of experience as an administrator;
4. Years of teaching experience;
5. Years of non-teaching experience;
6. Level of education attained;
7. Civic organizations belonged to;
8. Professional organizations belonged to;
9. Average number of hours worked per week;
10. Reemployment security;
11. Dependency of the board on the superintendent for information.

The personal data sheet took district size into consideration. See the SBQ in Appendix B for the 37 questions that were crosstabulated with the demographics. In all, over 400 tables were computed, with only 21 of these tables showing significance at the .05 level and above. It is noted that this is the chance level. The following tables, with a corresponding brief explanation, indicate which variables had a strong association between them. The Chi-square value and significance level will be found at the bottom of each table.

It might be noted that, although all the data in Tables 10 through 19 is significant at the .03 level and above, the researcher is aware that there probably is not a cause and effect relationship. It can be assumed that some other unknown variable or variables could be responsible for the associations that exist between the variables tested in the item-by-item analysis. Tables 20 to 30, significant at .05 and above, have been placed in Appendix C for the readers' perusal. These tables also may contain spurious information.

The data in Table 10 indicate the older superintendents do not feel it is important to see that teachers are formally evaluated once a year. Of the three superintendents over the age of 60, each of them sees that an occasional evaluation is done. Of the other 37 superintendents, four almost never evaluate teachers once each year, five do so on occasion,
and 28 see that a yearly evaluation is completed.

Table 10
Yearly Formal Evaluation of Teachers Crosstabulated with Superintendents' Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 and Over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 16.38$ with 6 degrees of freedom  
Cramer's $V = 0.45$

Significance = 0.01

The data in Table 11 indicate that the less non-teaching experience a superintendent has, the more willing he is to have the staff involved with instructional changes within the district. This information appears to have some correlation with what Schutz (1979) found in his study. An administrator with many years of teaching experience is outstandingly unsuccessful both as principal and as superintendent.

Table 12 indicates that the more civic organizations a superintendent belongs to, the more prone he is to keep up with his profession in the areas of reading professional literature and doing research on his own. It appears that 33 of the superintendents make the effort occasionally and five always make the effort. The kind of person who joins organizations is more outgoing and, thus, gets involved in professional improvement.
Table 11
Non-Involvement of Staff in Instructional Changes Crosstabulated with Superintendents' Non-Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Number of Years of Non-Teaching Experience</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 20.74$ with 3 degrees of freedom
Cramer's $V = 0.72$
Significance = 0.0001

Table 12
Superintendents' Professional Improvement Crosstabulated with the Number of Civic Organizations to Which Superintendents Belong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 16.94$ with 4 degrees of freedom
Cramer's $V = 0.46$
Significance = 0.002
The data in Table 13 show that 31, approximately three out of four, superintendents are almost always making the attempt to hire the best non-professional staff, but those belonging to no civic organizations make slightly more effort to see that this is done than those belonging to one or two organizations.

Table 13
Superintendents' Hiring of Best Non-Professional Staff Crosstabulated with the Number of Civic Organizations to Which Superintendents Belong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 13.31 \text{ with } 4 \text{ degrees of freedom} \]
\[ \text{Significance } = 0.01 \]

Cramer's \( V = 0.41 \)

There is an indication in Table 14 that as the level of the superintendents' education increases, the more the superintendents take local values into consideration when hiring teachers. Of the 30 individuals with an education specialist degree or a doctor's degree, over one-half of them always take local values into consideration, while only one out of nine with a master's degree does. This could be due to the fact that the people in the districts may be conservative in their philosophy of life and the superintendents with higher degrees may be more sensitive to their feelings.
Table 14
Superintendents' Consideration of Local Values in Hiring Crosstabulated with Their Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>MA/MS + 30</th>
<th>Ed Sp</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 13.68$ with 6 degrees of freedom
Cramer's $V = 0.41$
Significance = 0.03

It appears from an analysis of the data in Table 15 that there is an association between the number of civic organizations the superintendents belong to and not over-budgeting in anticipation of cuts. Of the three who belong to more than three organizations, two over-budget occasionally.

Table 15
Superintendents' Over-Budgeting Crosstabulated with Number of Civic Organizations to Which Superintendents Belong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 8.42$ with 2 degrees of freedom
Cramer's $V = 0.46$
Significance = 0.01
Superintendents who belong to two or less civic organizations appear to be providing (almost always) adequate student transportation. In fact, 35 of the superintendents belong to this category, as shown in Table 16.

Table 16
Providing Adequate Student Transportation Crosstabulated with the Number of Civic Organizations to Which Superintendents Belong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 16.6$ with 4 degrees of freedom
Cramer's $V = 0.46$
Significance = 0.002

The data in Table 17 disclose that most of the superintendents are providing adequate student transportation, except for one outlying district.

Most of the superintendents have their offices open to the public, but as their level of education increases, it appears, so does the community's access to the superintendents' offices. This summary appears in Table 18. Thirty-six of the 40 superintendents almost always have their offices open, and four occasionally do.

When the superintendents' taking a neutral stand is crosstabulated with the number of civic organizations superintendents belong to, those who belong to two or less organizations are less neutral than those who
### Table 17
Providing Adequate Student Transportation Crosstabulated with the Boards' Dependence on the Superintendents for Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Totally</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 15.54 \text{ with 4 degrees of freedom} \]

Cramer's V = 0.44

Significance = 0.004

### Table 18
Superintendents Keeping Their Offices Open to all Community Members Crosstabulated with Their Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>MA/MS + 30</th>
<th>Ed Sp</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 9.68 \text{ with 3 degrees of freedom} \]

Cramer's V = 0.49

Significance = 0.02
belong to three or more civic organizations. These data are shown in Table 19.

Table 19

Superintendents' Always Taking a Neutral Stand Crosstabulated with the Number of Civic Organizations to Which Superintendents Belong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 18.69 \text{ with 4 degrees of freedom} \]

Contingency Coefficient = 0.56

Significance = 0.0009

For other tables that were significant but not discussed, see Appendix C, page 80.

The Superintendents' Perception of How They Spend Their Time

The superintendent's appointment calendar as a third source of data turned out to be of little value in obtaining verifying information because some of the superintendents were reluctant to let the researcher see their calendars and many of the calendars were incomplete. In lieu of this, the following three questions were asked each superintendent:

1. How much time he perceived he spent at desk work.
2. How much time he perceived he spent in scheduled meetings and unscheduled meetings.
3. How much time the superintendent spent with in-house personnel
(those employed by the district or attending school in the district) and out-of-house people (i.e., state officials, salesmen, etc.).

In answer to the three questions above, the following was revealed:

1. Superintendents spend 44.8% of their time at desk work. The range of time spent at desk work was from 10 to 75% of their time.

2. They spend about one-fourth of their time in scheduled meetings and 22% of their time in unscheduled meetings. The ranges were from five to 45% for scheduled meetings and five to 70% for unscheduled meetings.

3. They spend 71.67% of a 100% day with in-house personnel and 28.33% of that 100% day with out-of-house people. The time spent with in-house personnel ranged from 40 to 95%, and time spent with out-of-house people ranged from five to 60%.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine how school superintendents in Utah perceived their role as superintendent in deference to the problem of a lack of role definition for the office of superintendent.

The study focused on: (1) how superintendents perceived their role as superintendent, (2) what demands were affecting their role, (3) if superintendents in different-size school districts perceived their role differently, (4) what determined how the superintendent/board relationship was viewed by the superintendent, and (5) what the superintendents considered to be the greatest problems facing them in the state of Utah today.

Design and Procedures

A survey research design was used in this study of all 40 superintendents in Utah. The superintendents (subjects) were divided into three categories based on district size. There were 12 large-size school districts, 14 medium-size school districts, and 14 small-size school districts. The randomized code to protect the confidentiality of the respondents has been destroyed.

Instruments

Two instruments were used to gather the data. They were: (1) the
Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire, and (2) a personal data sheet and interview guide. In addition, three questions were asked to determine how superintendents spent their time. The questionnaire consisted of 37 items covering nine dimensions of the superintendent's role. The responses were given on a Likert-type scale from one to seven. The second instrument, the personal data sheet and interview guide, contained 11 demographic items and six questions about the demands being placed on the superintendents and the problems facing them. The three questions about the superintendents' calendars were brief because some of the superintendents did not keep a complete appointment calendar and accurate data could not be obtained.

The three questions that were developed were:

1. What percent of the working day do you spend at desk work?
2. What percent of the working day do you spend in scheduled meetings? Unscheduled meetings?
3. What percent of each working day do you spend with in-house personnel, as opposed to out-of-house people?

The superintendents perceived that they spent:

1. Forty-four and eight-tenths percent of their time at desk work. It ranged from 75 to 10%.
2. Twenty-three and one-half percent of their time in scheduled meetings and 22% in unscheduled meetings.
3. An average of 71.67% of their day with in-house personnel and 28.33% with out-of-house people.

Analysis

To analyze the data obtained from the questionnaire and personal
data sheet a subprogram ONEWAY, or one-way analysis of variance, was used. The independent variable, school district size, and nine dependent variables (subscores on the nine dimensions of the SBQ) were compared. The resulting F ratio from the printout was used to determine whether or not to retain the null hypotheses.

The subprogram CROSSTABS in the integer mode was used to do an item-by-item analysis of the demographic data in the personal data sheet and the 37 items in the questionnaire. The relationship depicted in the Crosstab Tables summarized the measure of association between any two of the variables. The seven classifications of the Likert-type scale of the questionnaire were collapsed into three classifications to decrease the number of cells in the tables. The appropriate tests of significance were made to determine if the relationships between the variables were statistically significant.

The data obtained from the open-ended questions in the interview guide were compiled into tables that ranked the demands superintendents perceived were being placed on them. The greatest problems facing superintendents were also ranked.

Findings

1. The analysis of the responses superintendents made in relationship to the first objective (Determine how superintendents perceive their role with respect to:
   a. Instructional Leader;
   b. Curriculum Director;
   c. Staff Personnel Administrator;
   d. Pupil Personnel Administrator;
e. Financial Administrator;
f. School Plant and Business Manager;
g. Public Relations Manager;
h. District Structure and Organization Administrator;
i. General Planner.)

indicated that superintendents have a positive perception of their role in all the dimensions of the SBQ. The number of times behaviors were exhibited with respect to each of the nine dimensions was above average.

2. The analysis of the second objective, which is directly related to the hypotheses (There is no difference in how superintendents in different-size school districts [large, medium, and small] perceive their role as superintendent with respect to the following:
   a. Instructional Leader;
   b. Curriculum Director;
   c. Staff Personnel Administrator;
   d. Pupil Personnel Administrator;
   e. Financial Administrator;
   f. School Plant and Business Manager;
   g. Public Relations Manager;
   h. District Structure and Organization Administrator;
   i. General Planner.)

indicated that no significant differences existed between the superintendents. All nine null hypotheses were retained (see Table 4, page 38).

3. In identifying the demands being placed on the superintendents stated in Objective Three and the first three questions of the section of this study entitled "Questions to be Answered" (identifying new de-
mands), the following demands were identified (the three highest ranking demands are given).

From the federal agencies, the demands were:

1. Paperwork in the form of filling out numerous reports, bureaucratic "red tape," audits, civil rights surveys, school lunch reports, etc., that take the time of the superintendent.
2. The increasing costs to comply with the multitude of regulations, with no increased funding to defray costs.
3. Federal policies that are unreasonable, restrictive, and are third party ideas that do not reflect the needs of the local school districts.

From the state agencies, the demands were:

1. Paperwork in the form of state audits, regulations requiring reports, various new reports (such as the "bubble sheet"), IEPs, work experience programs, etc., without funds to pay for the increased costs.
2. Many of the superintendents said that the State Office of Education is a good resource and that they had a positive relationship with the various departments.
3. State agencies are interfering more and more with local autonomy.

The local demands were:

1. Resolving problems of parents-students-staff in terms of more patron input and teacher militancy.
2. Superintendents are expected to be members of community and/or special interest groups.
3. Coordinating programs with other agencies, and the use of better communications.
Energy demands placed on the superintendents were:

1. The increasing costs of fuel, materials for repair and maintenance, replacement parts, and inflation.
2. Proper budgeting to take care of energy needs.
3. Making buildings energy efficient.

The findings for question four of the section "Questions to be Answered" were:

1. The superintendents perceived that 90% of the local boards of education were dependent on them for data gathering and data analysis.
2. Ninety percent of the superintendents responded that they were secure with their boards of education in relationship to reemployment.
3. Eighty-seven and one-half percent of the superintendents responded that they had an excellent-to-good relationship with their local boards. They also indicated that they: (1) were the chief executive officers of the board, (2) set the agendas for meetings of the board, and (3) were given full control of the schools in their respective districts.
4. According to the responses of the superintendents, the three highest ranking problems they were facing in the state of Utah were: (1) financial demands in terms of providing more services on a limited tax base, dealing with inflation, and increasing energy costs; (2) time and resources to provide a quality education for a growing school population; and (3) the expectations of special interest groups.

The findings of the item-by-item analysis, association of demographic data with each item in the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire, are presented in table and discussion form in Chapter IV or Appendix C. It is noted that the relationship may be spurious. A list of
the crosstabulated items that were significant and their level of significance is shown below or in Appendix C:

1. The yearly formal evaluation of teachers crosstabulated with the superintendents' age. Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$. (See Table 10.)

2. Non-involvement of staff in instructional changes crosstabulated with the superintendents' non-teaching years of experience. Significant at $\alpha = 0.0001$. (See Table 11.)

3. The superintendents' professional improvement crosstabulated with the number of civic organizations to which superintendents belong. Significant at $\alpha = 0.002$. (See Table 12.)

4. The superintendents' hiring of the best non-professional staff crosstabulated with the number of civic organizations to which superintendents belong. Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$. (See Table 13.)

5. The superintendents' consideration of local values in hiring crosstabulated with their level of education. Significant at $\alpha = 0.03$. (See Table 14.)

6. The superintendents' over-budgeting crosstabulated with the number of civic organizations to which superintendents belong. Significant at $\alpha = 0.01$. (See Table 15.)

7. The superintendents' seeing that adequate student transportation is provided crosstabulated with the number of civic organizations to which superintendents belong. Significant at $\alpha = 0.002$. (See Table 16.)

8. The superintendents' seeing that adequate student transportation is provided crosstabulated with local boards' dependence on the superintendents for data. Significant at $\alpha = 0.004$. (See Table 17.)

9. The superintendents' keeping their offices open to all commu-
nity members crosstabulated with their level of education. Significant at \( \alpha = 0.02 \). (See Table 18.)

10. The superintendents' always taking a neutral stand crosstabulated with the number of civic organizations to which superintendents belong. Significant at \( \alpha = 0.0009 \). (See Table 19.)

Conclusions

1. From the data received from the superintendents, it can be concluded that they generally have a positive perception of their role as superintendent of schools. Most of them seemed to understand what they had to do in their positions and had little difficulty with the board interfering in administrative aspects of running the school district.

2. It can be concluded from the data that superintendents in Utah have a homogeneous perception of their role as superintendent of schools with respect to the nine dimensions in the Superintendent Behavior Questionnaire. What brings this about is not known, but a common educational background, a similar socio-economic background, and the small number of district superintendents could have something to do with it. The many meetings the superintendents go to (such as the meetings called by the state educational agencies or the Society of Superintendents) could bring about a commonality of role perception. If there are significant differences among the variables, the study as designed was not discriminating.

3. From the information obtained from the writer's personal interview of each superintendent, it can be concluded that new demands (i.e., government reports, compliance regulations and non-discrimination reports, building code requirements from the Occupational Safety and
Health Agency and state agencies, etc.) have impacted on the superintendents. Such encroachments are taking more time away from their instructional leadership role and requiring that superintendents spend more time at their desks completing required forms.

4. The autonomy of local school boards, and thus the discretionary authority of the superintendents in Utah, is being eroded by both federal and state regulations and statutes that demand local board compliance.

5. It can be concluded that the greatest problem facing superintendents in Utah today is getting the financial support from the state and local sources they consider necessary to continue to finance an adequate educational program for a growing population of students and ever-increasing inflationary spiral.

6. It appears that because of the homogeneity of the superintendents' role perception, there is no need for the state legislature or the State Office of Education to define their role. The definition problem, then, should be left to the local boards of education and the superintendents.

**Recommendations**

1. If further study of the superintendency is undertaken, it is recommended that the researchers attempt to determine if the homogeneity of role perception found in this study is a reality and, if so, the causes of it.

2. It is recommended that a more effective technique for checking how the superintendent spends his working day be found. The calendar analysis as originally planned in this study was not productive.
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APPENDIX A
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

On the following pages is a list of 37 items that may be used to describe your behavior as superintendent. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It asks you to describe, as accurately as possible by circling the appropriate number, your actual behavior as superintendent.

NOTE: The questionnaires are completely anonymous. Your name should not appear on the questionnaire. The data will be strictly confidential, and no superintendent's name will appear in the study.
SUPERINTENDENT BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructional Leadership

1. The superintendent sees to it that teachers are evaluated on a formal basis at least once a year, and that reports on these evaluations are presented to the school board.

2. The superintendent sees to it that regular in-service seminars, workshops, and institutes are conducted frequently for teachers.

3. The superintendent is familiar with and encourages teachers to use new and improved methods and innovations as soon as they are available.

4. The superintendent spends much time developing instructional programs and working closely with his principals in this regard.

Curriculum

5. The superintendent encourages staff members to investigate new curricula through visits to other schools, reading, research, and experimentation.
6. The superintendent has committees of staff members in on all major decisions involving the changing of the instructional program, selection of new textbooks, audio-visual aids, and other instructional supplies.

7. The superintendent, together with the board, makes most of the curriculum and instructional changes without getting the staff very involved.

8. The superintendent spends much time reading professional articles, attending professional conferences, doing his own research, and writing for professional journals so that he will become familiar with the recent curriculum trends.

### Staff Personnel Administration

9. In considering promotions, the superintendent usually favors staff from within the system over outsiders.

10. The superintendent sees to it that the best non-professional staff (i.e., caretakers, repairmen, stenographers, and busdrivers) are employed by the board.

11. The superintendent gives consideration to local values or feelings regarding race, religion, or ethnic origin in filling vacant positions.
12. The superintendent promotes the general welfare of the staff by means of striving for better teachers' salaries, reduced teaching loads, smaller class sizes, and greater emphasis on specialization.

13. The superintendent keeps a watchful eye on the personal life of his staff because of the impact it may have on the children or community.

Pupil Personnel and Administration

14. The superintendent establishes school admission policies, including determination of age, testing, and planning for parent interviews.

15. The superintendent makes final recommendations with respect to cases of pupil suspension or expulsion.

16. The superintendent exercises some control over athletic and other co-curricular activities to see that they do not get out of hand.

17. The superintendent sees to it that pupil personnel records are kept on all pupils, dealing with such things as census, examination results, and promotions.
Financial Administration

18. The superintendent assists the school board in resisting demands for higher salaries from militant teacher groups.

19. In drawing up the budget, the superintendent places the educational needs of the school children above such factors as costs to the taxpayer.

20. The superintendent makes full use of teachers and other staff in drawing up pertinent items of the budget.

21. The superintendent "over-budgets" on his original draft in anticipation of large "cuts" by the school board.

22. The superintendent, through his staff, establishes adequate procedures for the handling and accounting of funds.

School Plant and Business Management

23. The superintendent conducts surveys and constantly keeps up-to-date to predict future building needs and trends.

24. The superintendent develops and conducts efficient programs of plant operation and maintenance.

25. The superintendent makes recommendations to the board with regard to the selection of types of buildings required, school sites, contractors, and architects.
26. The superintendent favors local firms of contractors, subcontractors, and architects over outside firms, all things being equal.

27. The superintendent, with the board, formulates and enforces policies governing the use of school facilities by community groups.

28. The superintendent develops an adequate system of pupil transportation.

Public Relations

29. The superintendent keeps his office open to all community members at all times.

30. The superintendent actively supports worthy community organizations by speaking to the groups or by holding office in them.

31. The superintendent establishes regular channels of communication with local newspapers, radio, and television.

32. The superintendent leaves the responsibilities of public relations to the board and staff. He lets the board members interpret their policies to the public, and principals and staffs handle the school-community relations.
Administrative Structure and Organization

33. The superintendent spends more time in the local area than on other state or regional projects and conferences.  
34. The superintendent urges people whose personality and ability are respected to run for the school board, and sometimes even gives them a helping hand.  
35. The superintendent provides board members with an agenda at least two or three days before each board meeting.  
36. The superintendent always takes a neutral stand on issues on which the community is evenly divided.

General Planning

37. The superintendent gives much of his effort to the development of long-range plans for the growth and improvement of the school system.
APPENDIX B
PERSONAL DATA

1. What is your present age?
   _____ 20-29
   _____ 30-39
   _____ 40-49
   _____ 50-59
   _____ 60 or over

2. How long have you held your present position (including present year)?
   _____ 0-5
   _____ 6-10
   _____ 11-15
   _____ 16-20
   _____ 21 or over

3. How many years of experience have you had as?
   _____ superintendent
   _____ principal
   _____ other
   _____ total years' experience as an administrator

4. How many years of teaching experience did you have before becoming an administrator?
   _____ 0-3
   _____ 4-6
   _____ 7-9
   _____ 10-12
   _____ 13 or over

5. How many years of non-teaching experience did you have before becoming an administrator?
   _____ 0-3
   _____ 4-6
   _____ 7-9
   _____ 10-12
   _____ 13 or over
6. What level of education have you attained?

- ___ MA/MS Degree
- ___ MA/MS + 30
- ___ Education Specialist
- ___ Doctorate

7. What civic organizations do you belong to?

- ___ Chamber of Commerce
- ___ Lions
- ___ Kiwanis
- ___ Rotary
- ___ Others - Name them

8. What professional organizations do you belong to?

- ___ AASA
- ___ Utah Society of Superintendents
- ___ Utah School Boards Association
- ___ ASCD
- ___ Others - Name them

9. What is the average number of hours per week you work?

- ___ 35-39
- ___ 40-44
- ___ 45-49
- ___ 50-54
- ___ 55-59
- ___ 60 plus

10. Do you feel secure with your board of education as far as reemployment is concerned?

- ___ Very secure
- ___ Secure
- ___ Fairly secure
- ___ Not secure
- ___ Very insecure

11. Is your board of education dependent on you for data gathering and data interpretation?

- ___ Totally
- ___ Almost always
- ___ Somewhat
- ___ Almost never
- ___ Never
12. Please describe your relationship with your local board of education. 
Are you the executive officer of the board? 
Do you set the agenda? 
Are you given full control of administering the schools of the district?

13. What demands are being placed on the superintendency by federal agencies, such as compliance with Section 504 regulations, implementation of PL 94-142 regulations, compliance with Affirmative Action requirements and other federal laws and regulations that demand the time of the superintendents?

14. What demands are being placed on the superintendency by the state agencies, such as compliance with competency-based high school graduation, compliance with regulations requiring implementation of cost accounting procedures, and compliance with school building planning and construction regulations and student transportation?
15. What demands are being placed on the superintendency at the local level, such as patron, board, other community agencies, hearings and time spent with legal counsel, etc.?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

16. What other demands are being placed on the superintendency in terms of lighting, heat, and the energy crisis?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

17. Name what you consider to be the three major problems facing superintendents in the state of Utah today.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX C
OTHER CROSSTABULATION TABLES

Table 20
Yearly Formal Evaluation of Teachers Crosstabulated with Superintendents' Perception of Reemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Very Secure</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Fairly Secure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 5.97$ with 2 degrees of freedom  
Cramer's $V = 0.39$

Significance = 0.05

Table 21
Superintendents' Encouragement of Teachers Using New Innovations Crosstabulated with Their Perception of Reemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Very Secure</th>
<th>Secure</th>
<th>Fairly Secure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 5.97$ with 2 degrees of freedom  
Cramer's $V = 0.39$

Significance = 0.05
Table 22
Involvement of Staff in Instructional Changes Crosstabulated with Superintendents' Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>MA/MS + 30</th>
<th>Ed Sp</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.74 \text{ with 3 degrees of freedom} \]
Cramer’s \( V = 0.44 \)

Table 23
Superintendent Having Final Decision on Expulsion Crosstabulated with the Number of Civic Organizations to Which Superintendents Belong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 9.51 \text{ with 4 degrees of freedom} \]
Cramer’s \( V = 0.34 \)

Significance = 0.05
Table 24
Superintendents’ Over-Budgeting Crosstabulated with Their Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>MA/MS + 30</th>
<th>Ed Sp</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 9.19$ with 3 degrees of freedom  
Significance = 0.03
Cramer’s $V = 0.48$

Table 25
Superintendents’ Favoring Local Firms Crosstabulated with Their Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 and Over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 13.09$ with 6 degrees of freedom  
Significance = 0.04
Cramer’s $V = 0.40$
Table 26
Superintendent and Board Control of the Use of School Facilities
Crosstabulated with the Number of Civic Organizations
to Which Superintendents Belong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 6.88 \text{ with 2 degrees of freedom} \]
\[ \text{Significance} = 0.03 \]
\[ \text{Cramer's V} = 0.415 \]

Table 27
Superintendents' Support of Community Organizations
Crosstabulated with Their Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60 and Over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 8.2 \text{ with 3 degrees of freedom} \]
\[ \text{Significance} = 0.04 \]
\[ \text{Cramer's V} = 0.45 \]
Table 28
Board Interprets School Policy to the Community Crosstabulated with Superintendents' Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>MA/MS + 30</th>
<th>Ed Sp</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 15.34$ with 6 degrees of freedom  
Cramer's $V = 0.44$  
Significance = 0.02

Table 29
Superintendent Always Taking a Neutral Stand Crosstabulated with District Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 14.51$ with 6 degrees of freedom  
Significance = 0.02  
Contingency Coefficient = 0.52
Table 30

Effort Superintendent Gives to General Planning Crosstabulated with the Superintendent's Non-Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 7.9 \text{ with 3 degrees of freedom} \]

Contingency Coefficient = 0.41

Significance = 0.05
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Taught: Social Studies Methods, Student Teacher Seminar, and supervised student teachers in the field.
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BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Graduated from Payson High School, Payson, Utah, 1957.


PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:

NEA, Utah Education Association, Daggett Educational Association, and NASSP.

CHURCH EXPERIENCE:

I am an active member. I have held various teaching and executive positions, including that of High Counselor.

PLACEMENT FILE:

Brigham Young University, Placement Center, D-240 Abraham Smoot Building, Provo, Utah, 84602.